

# VISFACTOR: Benchmarking Fundamental Visual Cognition in Multimodal Large Language Models

Jen-Tse Huang<sup>1</sup> Dasen Dai<sup>1</sup> Jen-Yuan Huang<sup>2</sup> Youliang Yuan<sup>3</sup>  
Xiaoyuan Liu<sup>3</sup> Wenxuan Wang<sup>1\*</sup> Wenxiang Jiao<sup>4</sup> Pinjia He<sup>3</sup> Zhaopeng Tu<sup>4\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The Chinese University of Hong Kong <sup>2</sup>Peking University

<sup>3</sup>The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen <sup>4</sup>Tencent AI Lab

## Abstract

Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) have demonstrated remarkable advancements in multimodal understanding; however, their fundamental visual cognitive abilities remain largely underexplored. To bridge this gap, we introduce **VISFACTOR**, a novel benchmark derived from the Factor-Referenced Cognitive Test (FRCT), a well-established psychometric assessment of human cognition. **VISFACTOR** digitalizes vision-related FRCT subtests to systematically evaluate MLLMs across essential visual cognitive tasks including spatial reasoning, perceptual speed, and pattern recognition. We present a comprehensive evaluation of state-of-the-art MLLMs, such as GPT-4o, Gemini-Pro, and Qwen-VL, using **VISFACTOR** under diverse prompting strategies like Chain-of-Thought and Multi-Agent Debate. Our findings reveal a concerning deficiency in current MLLMs’ fundamental visual cognition, with performance frequently approaching random guessing and showing only marginal improvements even with advanced prompting techniques. These results underscore the critical need for focused research to enhance the core visual reasoning capabilities of MLLMs. To foster further investigation in this area, we release our **VISFACTOR** benchmark at <https://github.com/CUHK-ARISE/VisFactor>.

## 1 Introduction

Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) have revolutionized the field of multimodal artificial intelligence (Bubeck et al., 2023; Chow et al., 2025), showcasing unprecedented capabilities in diverse tasks such as text recognition (Liu et al., 2024a; Chen et al., 2025), mathematical problem-solving (Yang et al., 2024; Peng et al., 2024), and medical applications (Azad et al., 2023; Buckley et al., 2023). Although existing research has explored MLLMs’ visual capabilities (Fu et al., 2024;

Song et al., 2024), including spatial reasoning (Cai et al., 2024; Cheng et al., 2024), systematic investigations into their fundamental visual cognitive abilities remain limited. This knowledge gap arises from the scarcity of evaluation frameworks rigorously grounded in cognitive science. Indeed, most MLLM assessments prioritize downstream applications, often overlooking the essential foundational visual abilities.

In this study, we address this critical gap by introducing **VISFACTOR**, an automated testing pipeline derived from the Factor-Referenced Cognitive Test (FRCT) (Ekstrom and Harman, 1976). The FRCT is a well-established psychometric assessment battery specifically designed to evaluate distinct cognitive faculties, including verbal comprehension, spatial visualization, memory, and reasoning. In contrast to broad-spectrum intelligence tests that produce a general intelligence quotient, the FRCT focuses on precise cognitive constructs through *Factor Analysis*, providing a granular view of cognitive profiles and informing targeted interventions. Specifically, we select **seven** vision-oriented subtests from the FRCT—Closure Flexibility (**CF**), Closure Speed (**CS**), Induction (**I**), Perceptual Speed (**P**), Spatial Relations (**S**), Spatial Scanning (**SS**), and Visualization (**VZ**)—each addressing core facets of visual processing and reasoning. These categories offer a targeted lens for evaluating MLLMs’ core competencies in visual processing, spatial reasoning, and abstract pattern recognition, mirroring established benchmarks of human cognition.

Concretely, **VISFACTOR** digitizes key components of the FRCT manual: instructions, examples, image-based questions, correct answers, and human performance norms. This design facilitates direct prompting of MLLMs under standardized testing conditions, enabling meaningful comparisons with established human benchmarks. To further investigate model robustness, we incorporate a

\*Wenxuan and Zhaopeng are the corresponding authors.




Figure 1: An overview of the fifteen tests in our **VISFACTOR** benchmark, categorizing various visual and spatial reasoning tests. Each test evaluates distinct abilities such as pattern recognition, mental rotation, spatial visualization, and perceptual organization.

module that systematically perturbs input images by injecting noise, modifying contrast or brightness, and applying spatial transformations such as translations, rotations, and flips. Through this pipeline, we aim to quantify the extent to which current MLLMs can adapt to non-standard or degraded visual inputs.

Our experiments assess state-of-the-art MLLMs, including GPT-4o (OpenAI, 2024), Gemini-Pro (1.5 (Pichai and Hassabis, 2024), 2.0 (Pichai et al., 2024)), and Qwen-VL (Bai et al., 2023), under diverse prompting strategies. Despite employing techniques like few-shot demonstrations and Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting (Kojima et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2022), we observe notably poor performance, often approximating purely random responses. Even sophisticated methods, such as structured CoT (Qiao et al., 2024), Multi-Agent Debate (MAD) (Liang et al., 2023), and visual sketchpads (Hu et al., 2024), yield only marginal improvements. We conclude with qualitative analyses aimed at diagnosing the reasons for current MLLMs’ underperformance on these seemingly fundamental visual tasks. Our qualitative studies identify key limitations in current architectures, including deficiencies in spatial reasoning, an in-

ability to extrapolate from partial patterns, and sensitivity to minor visual perturbations.

Our contributions are as follows:

- We introduce **VISFACTOR**, the first standardized benchmark for evaluating MLLMs’ fundamental visual cognition using digitized FRCT, featuring automated prompt generation, human performance baselines, and a robustness assessment module with controlled visual perturbations.
- We present a comprehensive analysis of state-of-the-art MLLMs (*e.g.*, GPT-4o, Gemini-Pro) across seven FRCT vision subtests. Our findings highlight critical limitations: (a) MLLMs perform close to random chance on fundamental visual reasoning tasks, and (b) advanced prompting strategies (CoT and MAD) produce negligible performance gains.
- We make our **VISFACTOR** benchmark publicly available to facilitate further research and development in this critical area.

## 2 VISFACTOR Overview

To assess the cognitive capabilities of MLLMs, we select a subset from the FRCT battery. These

tests evaluate fundamental human cognitive abilities, known as *Factors*, which are crucial for visual perception, reasoning, spatial understanding, and rapid information processing. An overview of the 15 tests are shown in Fig. 1.

## 2.1 Closure Flexibility (CF)

Flexibility of closure is a cognitive ability that enables individuals to isolate and retain a specific visual configuration despite distractions. It is associated with field independence and relies on short-term memory processes (Wardell, 1973).

**CF1: Hidden Figures Test** Participants are required to identify which of five given figures is embedded within a more complex figure (Crutchfield, 1952). This test assesses *Perceptual Flexibility*, the ability to shift between visual representations and discern relevant patterns from background noise.

**CF2: Hidden Patterns Test** Participants must locate a specific pattern within each test figure (Thurstone, 1938a) This test evaluates *Visual Search Efficiency*, which is critical for identifying structured elements within noisy environments.

**CF3: Copying Test** Participants replicate a given pattern on a  $5 \times 5$  grid, starting from a designated point and determining its endpoint (Thurstone, 1938b, 41). This test measures *Visual-Motor Integration*, the ability to coordinate visual perception with fine motor execution.

## 2.2 Closure Speed (CS)

Speed of closure is a cognitive ability that enables the rapid integration of disparate visual elements into a coherent concept without prior knowledge. It is associated with recognizing ambiguous stimuli and relies on long-term memory processes (Fredriksen, 1967; Hoffman, 1968).

**CS1: Gestalt Completion Test** Participants are required to reconstruct a complete image from fragmented parts, inferring the whole from partial information (Street, 1968). This test assesses *Perceptual Closure*, the ability to recognize objects despite missing or occluded elements.

**CS2: Concealed Words Test** Participants must identify English words in noise or visual obstructions (Thurstone, 1944). This test evaluates *Visual-Linguistic Integration*, the capacity to integrate perceptual and linguistic cues for pattern recognition.

**CS3: Snowy Pictures Test** Participants must recognize objects obscured by random visual noise (Ekstrom and Harman, 1976). This test measures *Robust Object Recognition*, the ability to infer meaning from heavily degraded stimuli, which is critical for perceptual resilience.

## 2.3 Visualization (VZ)

The visualization factor refers to the capacity to mentally manipulate spatial patterns into novel configurations, demanding more complex restructuring than spatial orientation. It is often considered a secondary factor that integrates various spatial abilities, particularly emphasizing mental rotation and sequential operations (Carroll, 1976).

**VZ1: Form-Board Test** Participants select a combination of shaded figures that, when assembled, form a complete shape (Thurstone, 1938b, 34). This test measures *Spatial Integration*, the ability to mentally combine individual components into a unified whole.

**VZ2: Paper-Folding Test** Participants predict the appearance of a folded and cut piece of paper (Thurstone, 1938b, 37-38). This test assesses *Mental Manipulation of Objects*, a key skill for understanding transformations in shape and structure.

**VZ3: Surface Development Test** Participants visualize the unfolding of a three-dimensional object into a two-dimensional representation (Thurstone, 1938b, 36). This test evaluates *Mental Unfolding and Reconstruction*, which is crucial for spatial reasoning in problem-solving.

## 2.4 Spatial Relations (S)

Spatial orientation is the ability to perceive and maintain one's position relative to objects in space. Unlike visualization, which emphasizes component manipulation, spatial orientation relies on holistic perception and engages short-term visual memory and mental rotation process (Zimmerman, 1954; Werdelin and Stjernberg, 1969, 1971).

**S1: Card Rotations Test** Participants determine whether two cards are identical under rotation, with flipping prohibited (Thurstone, 1941, 50). This test assesses *Mental Rotation*, the ability to visualize and manipulate objects in the mind's eye.

**S2: Cube Comparisons Test** Participants compare different orientations of 3D cubes to determine

whether they represent the same structure (Thurstone, 1938b, 31-32). This test measures *3D Spatial Reasoning*, which is crucial for interpreting depth, perspective, and object transformations.

## 2.5 Spatial Scanning (SS)

The spatial scanning factor denotes the efficiency of visually exploring complex spatial fields, including rapid identification of openings, path-following, and rejection of false leads. Some studies suggest it involves a basic planning function in navigation tasks such as maze-solving (Carroll, 1976).

**SS2: Choosing a Path Test** Participants must identify the only viable route among five options that connects point “S” to point “F”, with the constraint of passing through the circle at the top (Harrell, 1949). This test assesses *Navigation and Route Optimization*, which are essential for spatial planning and movement efficiency.

**SS3: Map Planning Test** Participants first determine the shortest path between two designated points (e.g., “X” to “D”), while adhering to the restriction that paths containing small white circles are blocked and cannot be traversed (Harrell, 1949). Subsequently, they count the number of buildings (represented as numbered squares) that the chosen path intersects; an intersection is defined as crossing an edge of the square, while merely touching a vertex does not count. This test evaluates *Geospatial Reasoning*, a critical skill for way-finding and real-world navigation tasks.

## 2.6 Perceptual Speed (P)

Perceptual speed denotes the efficiency of visual processing tasks, involving the rapid comparison and identification of figures or symbols, and is shaped by factors such as perceptual fluency, decision speed, and immediate perceptual memory (Künnapas, 1969).

**P3: Identical Pictures Test** Participants identify identical images from a set of five, which includes four distractors with similar features (Thurstone, 1941, 63-64). This test measures *Visual Discrimination*, a crucial ability for rapid object recognition.

## 2.7 Induction (I)

Induction is a complex cognitive process including concept formation and hypothesis testing, with research identifying multiple subfactors and

substantial overlap with general reasoning abilities (Wardell, 1973).

**I3: Figure Classification** Participants classify figures into two or three groups based on shared properties (Thurstone, 1941, 56). This test assesses *Conceptual Abstraction*, the ability to derive general principles from specific instances.

## 3 VISFACTOR Implementation

**Digitization of FRCT** The official manual (Ekstrom and Harman, 1976) provides (1) instructions for participants to complete the task, (2) example questions for comprehension, (3) test images, (4) correct answers for each question, and (5) average human performance data. We extract the instructions and examples to construct input prompts for each test and use the provided answers to automatically assess whether MLLMs correctly respond to each question. **VISFACTOR** can autonomously generate inputs, query MLLMs, and process the results to determine their final accuracy.

**Simplification for MLLMs** **VISFACTOR** offers two testing modes: default and split. The default mode follows the original test design, whereas the split mode, introduced in this paper, aims to simplify problems for MLLMs. Specifically, the split mode transforms multiple-choice questions into binary (yes-no) questions. For instance, in the “VZ2 Paper Folding Test,” participants originally choose the correct unfolded paper figure from five options, resulting in a random guessing accuracy of 20%. In contrast, the split mode reframes the question to ask whether a given option correctly represents the unfolded figure, increasing the random guessing accuracy to 50%.

**Perturbations on Images** Since all tests in **VISFACTOR** involve images, we can introduce perturbations to increase the benchmark’s difficulty. The implemented perturbations are categorized into two groups: **Geometric** transformations and **Photometric** transformations. Geometric transformations include translation, rotation, and flipping, while photometric transformations include contrast and brightness adjustments, as well as noise addition. Photometric transformations, translation, and rotation are applicable to all tests, as they do not alter geometric properties. However, flipping is unsuitable for certain scenarios due to its impact on ground truth validity and is thus limited to CF1-S, CF2-S, S1-S, P3-S, and I3-S.

Tests	Random	GPT-4o					Gemini-1.5-Pro		Gemini-2.0-Pro		Qwen-VL-Max	
		Vanilla	Pert.	CoT	SCoT	MAD	Vanilla	CoT	Vanilla	CoT	Vanilla	CoT
CF1	20.0	21.9	18.8	15.6	<u>28.1</u>	18.8	6.3	21.8	18.8	25.0	9.4	<b>31.3</b>
CF1-S	50.0	56.3	35.6	40.6	55.6	<u>65.0</u>	33.8	35.6	51.2	15.6	62.5	<b>71.3</b>
CF2	50.0	58.0	53.8	55.8	<b>65.5</b>	26.4	56.8	<u>58.3</u>	53.5	49.5	51.0	53.3
CF2-S	50.0	<u>66.0</u>	<u>66.0</u>	<b>66.8</b>	65.5	49.8	51.0	48.3	57.0	8.0	58.0	53.3
CF3	4.0	1.6	1.6	<u>10.9</u>	7.8	3.1	1.6	<b>14.1</b>	6.3	1.6	6.3	0.0
CS1	-	<b>35.0</b>	20.0	<u>30.0</u>	<u>30.0</u>	5.0	20.0	25.0	10.0	20.0	10.0	10.0
CS2	-	<b>26.0</b>	14.0	<u>22.0</u>	<u>20.0</u>	16.0	0.0	18.0	10.0	2.0	8.0	6.0
CS3	-	20.8	8.3	<b>33.3</b>	<u>25.0</u>	12.5	12.5	20.8	8.3	4.2	8.3	4.2
VZ1	50.0	63.3	<u>67.5</u>	62.9	65.8	41.3	<b>70.4</b>	66.3	62.1	61.3	60.4	62.1
VZ2	20.0	<u>35.0</u>	22.5	15.0	30.0	<b>40.0</b>	20.0	15.0	10.0	10.0	15.0	15.0
VZ2-S	50.0	<b>80.0</b>	15.0	<u>71.0</u>	67.0	55.0	18.0	20.0	56.0	28.0	26.0	22.0
VZ3	14.6	<b>36.7</b>	61.0	31.7	<b>36.7</b>	23.3	21.7	31.7	26.7	30.0	30.0	<u>33.3</u>
VZ3-S	14.6	30.0	30.0	<u>33.3</u>	<b>38.3</b>	15.0	16.7	11.7	25.0	15.0	26.7	25.0
S1	50.0	<u>50.0</u>	28.3	<u>50.0</u>	<u>50.0</u>	43.8	<u>50.0</u>	49.4	47.5	<b>56.3</b>	46.9	47.5
S1-S	50.0	<u>56.3</u>	46.9	54.4	53.8	43.1	50.0	49.4	47.5	<u>56.3</u>	46.9	<b>58.1</b>
S2	50.0	52.4	<b>58.1</b>	52.4	<u>57.1</u>	47.6	40.5	<u>52.4</u>	50.0	38.1	42.9	38.1
SS2	20.0	25.0	<u>28.1</u>	18.8	21.9	<u>28.1</u>	<b>34.4</b>	15.6	<u>28.1</u>	<b>34.4</b>	21.9	18.8
SS3	9.1	<b>30.0</b>	28.1	<u>27.5</u>	<b>30.0</b>	25.0	12.5	<b>30.0</b>	15.0	15.0	5.0	20.0
SS3-S	9.1	<u>25.0</u>	20.0	<b>30.0</b>	<b>30.0</b>	10.0	15.0	10.0	12.5	22.5	22.5	15.0
P3	20.0	<b>44.8</b>	37.5	20.8	40.6	<u>41.7</u>	26.0	20.8	25.0	25.0	22.9	24.0
P3-S	50.0	<u>91.9</u>	79.8	90.4	<b>93.1</b>	74.0	76.9	64.0	77.7	60.8	68.5	70.0
I3	42.9	<b>55.8</b>	<u>54.5</u>	46.0	53.5	39.3	51.8	20.8	53.1	48.7	32.6	35.7
I3-S	42.9	<u>43.8</u>	<b>44.6</b>	39.3	36.6	<u>43.8</u>	34.8	34.4	31.3	21.4	34.4	25.9
Avg.	-	<u>37.1</u>	35.1	32.8	<b>37.5</b>	27.5	28.3	30.7	28.3	28.1	24.7	26.6

Table 1: **VISFACTOR** test results using GPT-4o, Gemini-Pro (1.5 and 2.0), and Qwen-VL-Max. Split tests (S) are marked in red, while default tests are marked in blue. The highest scores are marked in bold while the second highest scores are marked with underlines.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Vanilla Scenarios

We evaluate GPT-4o (OpenAI, 2024), Gemini-Pro (1.5 (Pichai and Hassabis, 2024), 2.0 (Pichai et al., 2024)), Gemini-Flash (see appendix), and Qwen-VL (Bai et al., 2023) using **VISFACTOR**. The results are presented in Table 1. The term ‘‘Vanilla’’ refers to using the original instructions and examples during testing, prompting MLLMs to output answers directly. ‘‘CoT’’ denotes instructing models to first generate step-by-step reasoning (output analysis) before producing the final answer. Key findings include: **(1) Performance Close to Random Guessing.** Random guessing performance is provided as a reference for each test in the first column in Table 1. Among the 20 tests, GPT-4o, Gemini-1.5, Gemini-2.0, and Qwen-VL yield performance not exceeding random guessing in 2, 9, 6, and 9 vanilla tests, respectively. This aligns with previous research indicating that MLLMs struggle with nuanced visual reasoning, particularly when

contextual or visual details are complex (Fu et al., 2024; Wu et al., 2024a). **(2) Limited Effectiveness of CoT Prompting.** Surprisingly, CoT prompting does not consistently improve performance and sometimes results in lower scores compared to direct output (Vanilla). For example, GPT-4o’s performance decreases in 16 tests with CoT, scoring 32.8%, which is 4.3% lower than its Vanilla score of 37.1%. Conversely, Gemini-1.5-Pro and Qwen-VL-Max show slight improvements with CoT, increasing by 2.4% and 1.9%, respectively. A recent study (Sprague et al., 2025) has found that while CoT prompting enhances mathematical reasoning, its benefits in other domains are limited. We conduct *t*-tests on the scores with and without CoT across all MLLMs, with *t*-values and *p*-values presented in Table 5. Among all tests, only CF1 shows a statistically significant improvement with CoT at the 95% confidence level. **(3) GPT-4o achieves the highest average score of 37.1%, outperforming other models.**

FRCT provides average human performance data collected from real-world subjects. Unlike conventional accuracy measures, the original FRCT design evaluates performance using the number of correct answers minus the number of incorrect ones. Consequently, these scores cannot be directly converted into accuracy. For clarity, we present accuracy results in Table 1, while scores calculated using the FRCT metric are shown in Table 2 and Table 4, alongside human performance benchmarks in the appendix. We find that MLLMs demonstrate greatly lower performance compared to humans.

## 4.2 Advanced Reasoning Techniques

We also explore advanced techniques to enhance the reasoning capabilities of MLLMs. **(1) Structured CoT (SCoT)** (Qiao et al., 2024) decomposes complex tasks into a series of logical, manageable steps, simulating human reasoning through intermediate observations and validations. Building on this framework, we designed a structured CoT prompt that systematically breaks down visual reasoning tasks into sequential steps, enabling intermediate evaluations at each stage. By aligning these intermediate outputs with expected outcomes, we iteratively refined the prompt to maximize task performance. Although this approach achieves the highest performance improvement, the gain is marginal, with only a 0.4% increase over the vanilla model. **(2) The Multi-Agent Debate (MAD)** (Liang et al., 2024) involves multiple agents debating a topic, with a judge determining the final answer, promoting diverse perspectives and mitigating biases. Adopting the MAD framework, we distributed tasks simultaneously among debaters and judges. The final answer emerged through interactive arguments and the judge’s decision-making. However, this approach resulted in a performance decrease of approximately 10% compared to the vanilla model.

## 4.3 Robustness Evaluation

For robustness evaluation, we assessed GPT-4o’s performance on input images with various transformations. For geometric transformations, each image is randomly translated from a normal distribution  $\mathcal{N}(0, 5)$ , rotated uniformly within  $[-10^\circ, +10^\circ]$ , and flipped when applicable. For photometric transformations, Gaussian noise from  $\mathcal{N}(0, 0.1)$  is added, with contrast and brightness factors set to 1.5. The results are presented in the “Pert.” column of Table 1. On average, these perturbations reduced performance by 2%.

## 5 Limitations of Current MLLMs

### 5.1 Insufficient Attention to Critical Details

In image content recognition tasks, capturing fine-grained local features is essential, as uniform attention across the image can overlook critical details. However, the current model struggles to focus effectively on key regions, resulting in missed information. For example, in the “CS2 Concealed Words Test” (Fig. 2a), the task involves identifying the partially erased word “women.” Correct identification of the first character requires recognizing the faint stroke in the lower left corner that differentiates “w” from “v.” Similarly, identifying the fifth character as “n” relies on detecting a small vertical stroke in the lower right corner of the letter. The model, however, misclassified these characters as “v” and “r,” respectively, indicating its limited ability to prioritize critical local features. This limitation suggests that GPT-4o’s visual attention mechanism is insufficient for capturing subtle cues necessary for accurate recognition.

### 5.2 Low Sensitivity to Length and Scale

GPT-4o exhibits notable limitations in processing geometric shapes, particularly in assessing length and proportion. In the “CF3 Copying Test,” the model is tasked with replicating lines from the left side onto a  $5 \times 5$  dot matrix on the right. While the model can approximate line directions, it frequently errs in determining their lengths. For instance, in Fig. 2c, the first line segment should extend two units upward from the starting point, but the model extends it only one unit. Similarly, in the “VZ1 Form Board Test” (Fig. 2d), although the model correctly identifies the need for a rectangle to construct a complex figure, it fails to select sides of the appropriate length. These results indicate that while the model possesses some geometric recognition abilities, it struggles with accurately gauging line lengths and proportions, limiting its performance in tasks requiring precise spatial measurements.

### 5.3 Difficulty in Assessing Relative Positions

GPT-4o exhibits limited spatial reasoning when assessing the relative positions of graphical elements. In “CF2 Hidden Patterns Test,” the prompt instructs the model to first map the image onto a numbered  $2 \times 2$  grid and then generate the corresponding undirected graph. However, the model demonstrates insensitivity to spatial relationships




Figure 2: Failure case study.

between elements. For instance, in Fig. 2b, the correct connection should be between points 2 and 3, not points 1 and 2. This is because linking points 1 and 2 would place their lower-left region outside the  $2 \times 2$  grid. Nonetheless, the model misinterprets this spatial relationship, incorrectly identifying a connection between points 1 and 2, resulting in an error. This indicates that GPT-4o struggles with reasoning about relative spatial relationships and interpreting complex spatial configurations.

## 5.4 Restricted Visual Reasoning Capability

GPT-4o’s reasoning ability primarily relies on textual descriptions of images rather than genuine visual reasoning. In the “VZ3 Surface Development Test,” the model accurately describes components of a 2D unfolded image but struggles to infer the corresponding 3D structure (Fig. 2e). Solving such tasks typically requires “spatial imagination,” which the model fails to exhibit. This indicates that, although GPT-4o excels at generating textual descriptions of visual content, it is limited in performing complex spatial reasoning and cannot effectively infer three-dimensional structures or spatial configurations from two-dimensional information.

## 5.5 Inability to Draw Auxiliary Lines

We also aim to enhance GPT-4o’s performance by instructing it to draw auxiliary lines on images, which can facilitate solving various tasks within **VISFACTOR**. Inspired by Visual Sketchpad (Hu et al., 2024), we guide GPT-4o to use functions from OpenCV<sup>1</sup> a Python library, to draw auxiliary lines for specific tasks. However, as shown in Fig. 2f, the code generated by the model for the “CF3 Copying Test,” after uploading an image is entirely independent of the image’s content. It consistently produces identical auxiliary lines, regardless of the input. This indicates that GPT-4o still lacks the ability to establish a coherent logical sequence connecting “image features  $\rightarrow$  coordinate computation  $\rightarrow$  geometric drawing.”

## 6 Related Work

### 6.1 Evaluating Visual Ability

Recent studies have introduced benchmarks to assess MLLMs’ visual and reasoning abilities. Fu et al. (2024) proposed Blink, revealing struggles with nuanced visual perception, while Wu et al.

<sup>1</sup><https://opencv.org/>

(2024a) found poor performance on *NLVR*, a task requiring compositional and spatial reasoning. Beyond perception, Zhang et al. (2024) highlighted MLLMs’ limitations in visual deductive reasoning using **Raven’s Progressive Matrices**, and Song et al. (2024) introduced *M3GIA*, a benchmark based on the *CHC* model, for broader intelligence assessment. Other studies focus on context-sensitive and cognitive reasoning. Wadhawan et al. (2024) found significant gaps in contextual reasoning over text-rich images, while Coda-Forno et al. (2024) introduced *CogBench*, showing how model size and RLHF impact behavioral performance. To enhance reasoning, Zhao et al. (2024) proposed *LOVA3*, equipping MLLMs with visual question-answering capabilities, improving performance on *GenQA* and *EvalQA* tasks. These studies highlight MLLMs’ ongoing challenges in perception, reasoning, and contextual understanding while introducing methods for improvement.

## 6.2 Evaluating Spatial Reasoning Ability

Recent studies have highlighted the challenges of spatial reasoning in MLLMs and introduced benchmarks to address these limitations. Kamath et al. (2023) attributed MLLMs’ struggles to insufficient spatial information in pretraining data. Liu et al. (2023) introduced the *VSR* dataset, revealing a significant performance gap across 66 spatial relations. To improve spatial understanding, Cai et al. (2024) leveraged RGB and depth images, proposing *SpatialQA* and *SpatialQA-E*. Cheng et al. (2024) enhanced region-level reasoning with depth integration and the *SpatialRGBT-Bench* benchmark. Li et al. (2024) focused on top-view spatial reasoning, introducing the *TOPVIEWRS* dataset. These efforts advance spatial reasoning evaluation in MLLMs.

## 6.3 Enhancing Visual Ability

Recent studies have explored enhancing MLLMs’ visual reasoning. *MVoT* (Li et al., 2025) generates visual thought traces to improve spatial reasoning beyond traditional CoT. *Visual Sketchpad* (Hu et al., 2024) enables LLMs to create visual sketches as intermediate reasoning steps for better interpretability. *Visual CoT* (Shao et al., 2024) introduces a large dataset to improve reasoning via multi-turn CoT processing. Similarly, *VoT* (Wu et al., 2024b) enhances spatial reasoning through mental image generation, benefiting tasks like navigation and visual tiling. *SpatialCoT* (Liu et al., 2025) aligns spatial coordinates with CoT grounding to aid MLLMs

in embodied AI. *CoI* (Meng et al., 2023) integrates visual intuition into logical reasoning via a multimodal dataset and symbolic LLM. Together, these approaches advance MLLMs by strengthening visual reasoning for better interpretability and problem-solving.

## 6.4 Other Psychometrics

Recent studies have explored human-like traits in LLMs, particularly personality, emotions, and cognitive abilities. Several works have assessed LLMs using the *Big Five Inventory*, including evaluations of its reliability on GPT-3.5 (Huang et al., 2024a), PaLM family (Serapio-García et al., 2023), and its applicability across multiple models (Jiang et al., 2023). Beyond personality, *PsychoBench* (Huang et al., 2024c) introduced a framework incorporating thirteen psychological scales for comprehensive LLM analysis. Emotional traits have also been studied, with *EmotionBench* (Huang et al., 2024b) analyzing affective states in LLMs, and Coda-Forno et al. (2023) investigating models’ anxiety levels. Additionally, research has explored LLMs’ Theory-of-Mind (ToM) abilities (Liu et al., 2024b; Liang et al., 2023; Huang et al., 2025) and role-playing abilities (Ng et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024, 2025). Building on these studies, our work provides a comprehensive framework for personality analysis, integrating multiple psychological dimensions.

## 7 Conclusion

In this work, we introduce **VISFACTOR**, a novel benchmark for evaluating fundamental visual cognition in MLLMs. By digitalizing and adapting vision-related tests from FRCT, **VISFACTOR** provides a standardized and rigorous framework for assessing core visual abilities. Our comprehensive evaluation of state-of-the-art MLLMs using **VISFACTOR** reveal a significant and unexpected limitation: current MLLMs struggle with fundamental visual cognitive tasks, exhibiting performance far below human norms and frequently approximating random guessing. Furthermore, we demonstrate that advanced prompting techniques, while effective in other domains, yield only minimal improvements in MLLMs’ performance on **VISFACTOR**. These findings highlight a critical gap in the current capabilities of MLLMs and suggest that while they excel in complex multimodal tasks, their foundational visual cognition abilities are still underdeveloped.



## References

- Bobby Azad, Reza Azad, Sania Eskandari, Afshin Bozorgpour, Amirhossein Kazerouni, Islem Rekik, and Dorit Merhof. 2023. Foundational models in medical imaging: A comprehensive survey and future vision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.18689*.
- Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. Qwen-vl: A frontier large vision-language model with versatile abilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12966*.
- Sébastien Bubeck, Varun Chandrasekaran, Ronen Eldan, Johannes Gehrke, Eric Horvitz, Ece Kamar, Peter Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Scott Lundberg, et al. 2023. Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12712*.
- Thomas Buckley, James A. Diao, Pranav Rajpurkar, Adam Rodman, and Arjun K. Manrai. 2023. Multimodal foundation models exploit text to make medical image predictions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05591*.
- Wenxiao Cai, Iaroslav Ponomarenko, Jianhao Yuan, Xiaoli Li, Wankou Yang, Hao Dong, and Bo Zhao. 2024. Spatialbot: Precise spatial understanding with vision language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.13642*.
- John B Carroll. 1976. Psychometric tests as cognitive tasks: A new “structure of intellect”. In *The nature of intelligence*, pages 27–56. Routledge.
- Song Chen, Xinyu Guo, Yadong Li, Tao Zhang, Mingan Lin, Dongdong Kuang, Youwei Zhang, Lingfeng Ming, Fengyu Zhang, Yuran Wang, et al. 2025. Ocean-ocr: Towards general ocr application via a vision-language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.15558*.
- An-Chieh Cheng, Hongxu Yin, Yang Fu, Qiushan Guo, Ruihan Yang, Jan Kautz, Xiaolong Wang, and Sifei Liu. 2024. Spatialrpt: Grounded spatial reasoning in vision-language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37.
- Wei Chow, Jiageng Mao, Boyi Li, Daniel Seita, Vitor Guizilini, and Yue Wang. 2025. Physbench: Benchmarking and enhancing vision-language models for physical world understanding. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Julian Coda-Forno, Marcel Binz, Jane X Wang, and Eric Schulz. 2024. Cogbench: a large language model walks into a psychology lab. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Julian Coda-Forno, Kristin Witte, Akshay K. Jagadish, Marcel Binz, Zeynep Akata, and Eric Schulz. 2023. Inducing anxiety in large language models can induce bias. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11111*.
- R. S. Crutchfield. 1952. *Gottschaldt Figures Test*. Institute of Personality Assessment and Research, University of California, Berkeley.
- Ruth B Ekstrom and Harry Horace Harman. 1976. *Manual for kit of factor-referenced cognitive tests, 1976*. Educational testing service.
- John R Frederiksen. 1967. Cognitive factors in the recognition of ambiguous auditory and visual stimuli. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 7(1p2):1.
- Xingyu Fu, Yushi Hu, Bangzheng Li, Yu Feng, Haoyu Wang, Xudong Lin, Dan Roth, Noah A Smith, Wei-Chiu Ma, and Ranjay Krishna. 2024. Blink: Multimodal large language models can see but not perceive. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 148–166. Springer.
- Thomas W Harrell. 1949. Printed classification tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 46(6):506–508.
- Kaaren I Hoffman. 1968. A factor analysis of the figural-cognition and figural-evaluation abilities.
- Yushi Hu, Weijia Shi, Xingyu Fu, Dan Roth, Mari Ostendorf, Luke Zettlemoyer, Noah A Smith, and Ranjay Krishna. 2024. Visual sketchpad: Sketching as a visual chain of thought for multimodal language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37.
- Jen-tse Huang, Wenxiang Jiao, Man Ho Lam, Eric John Li, Wenxuan Wang, and Michael R. Lyu. 2024a. On the reliability of psychological scales on large language models. In *Proceedings of The 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Jen-tse Huang, Man Ho Lam, Eric John Li, Shujie Ren, Wenxuan Wang, Wenxiang Jiao, Zhaopeng Tu, and Michael R Lyu. 2024b. Apathetic or empathetic? evaluating LLMs’ emotional alignments with humans. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37.
- Jen-tse Huang, Eric John Li, Man Ho Lam, Tian Liang, Wenxuan Wang, Youliang Yuan, Wenxiang Jiao, Xing Wang, Zhaopeng Tu, and Michael R Lyu. 2025. Competing large language models in multi-agent gaming environments. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jen-tse Huang, Wenxuan Wang, Eric John Li, Man Ho Lam, Shujie Ren, Youliang Yuan, Wenxiang Jiao, Zhaopeng Tu, and Michael R. Lyu. 2024c. On the humanity of conversational ai: Evaluating the psychological portrayal of llms. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Guangyuan Jiang, Manjie Xu, Song-Chun Zhu, Wenjuan Han, Chi Zhang, and Yixin Zhu. 2023. Evaluating and inducing personality in pre-trained language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.

- Amita Kamath, Jack Hessel, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2023. What’s “up” with vision-language models? investigating their struggle with spatial reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9161–9175.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:22199–22213.
- Teodor Künnapas. 1969. Figural reversal rate and personal tempo. *Scandinavian journal of psychology*, 10(1):27–32.
- Chengzu Li, Wenshan Wu, Huanyu Zhang, Yan Xia, Shaoguang Mao, Li Dong, Ivan Vulić, and Furu Wei. 2025. Imagine while reasoning in space: Multimodal visualization-of-thought. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.07542*.
- Chengzu Li, Caiqi Zhang, Han Zhou, Nigel Collier, Anna Korhonen, and Ivan Vulić. 2024. Topviewrs: Vision-language models as top-view spatial reasoners. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1786–1807.
- Tian Liang, Zhiwei He, Jen-tse Huang, Wenxuan Wang, Wenxiang Jiao, Rui Wang, Yujiu Yang, Zhaopeng Tu, Shuming Shi, and Xing Wang. 2023. Leveraging word guessing games to assess the intelligence of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.20499*.
- Tian Liang, Zhiwei He, Wenxiang Jiao, Xing Wang, Yan Wang, Rui Wang, Yujiu Yang, Zhaopeng Tu, and Shuming Shi. 2024. Encouraging divergent thinking in large language models through multi-agent debate. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Fangyu Liu, Guy Emerson, and Nigel Collier. 2023. Visual spatial reasoning. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 11:635–651.
- Yuecheng Liu, Dafeng Chi, Shiguang Wu, Zhanguang Zhang, Yaochen Hu, Lingfeng Zhang, Yingxue Zhang, Shuang Wu, Tongtong Cao, Guowei Huang, et al. 2025. Spatialcot: Advancing spatial reasoning through coordinate alignment and chain-of-thought for embodied task planning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.10074*.
- Yuliang Liu, Zhang Li, Mingxin Huang, Biao Yang, Wenwen Yu, Chunyuan Li, Xu-Cheng Yin, Cheng-Lin Liu, Lianwen Jin, and Xiang Bai. 2024a. Ocr-bench: on the hidden mystery of ocr in large multimodal models. *Science China Information Sciences*, 67(12):220102.
- Ziyi Liu, Abhishek Anand, Pei Zhou, Jen-tse Huang, and Jiayu Zhao. 2024b. Interintent: Investigating social intelligence of llms via intention understanding in an interactive game context. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Fanxu Meng, Haotong Yang, Yiding Wang, and Muhan Zhang. 2023. Chain of images for intuitively reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09241*.
- Man Tik Ng, Hui Tung Tse, Jen-tse Huang, Jingjing Li, Wenxuan Wang, and Michael R Lyu. 2024. How well can llms echo us? evaluating ai chatbots’ role-play ability with echo. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13957*.
- OpenAI. 2024. [Hello gpt-4o](#). *OpenAI Blog May 13 2024*.
- Shuai Peng, Di Fu, Liangcai Gao, Xiuqin Zhong, Hongguang Fu, and Zhi Tang. 2024. Multimath: Bridging visual and mathematical reasoning for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.00147*.
- Sundar Pichai and Demis Hassabis. 2024. [Our next-generation model: Gemini 1.5](#). *Google Blog Feb 15 2024*.
- Sundar Pichai, Demis Hassabis, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. 2024. [Introducing gemini 2.0: our new ai model for the agentic era](#). *Google Blog Dec 11 2024*.
- Yuxuan Qiao, Haodong Duan, Xinyu Fang, Junming Yang, Lin Chen, Songyang Zhang, Jiaqi Wang, Dahua Lin, and Kai Chen. 2024. Prism: A framework for decoupling and assessing the capabilities of vlms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37.
- Greg Serapio-García, Mustafa Safdari, Clément Crepy, Luning Sun, Stephen Fitz, Peter Romero, Marwa Abdulhai, Aleksandra Faust, and Maja Matarić. 2023. Personality traits in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.00184*.
- Hao Shao, Shengju Qian, Han Xiao, Guanglu Song, Zhuofan Zong, Letian Wang, Yu Liu, and Hongsheng Li. 2024. Visual cot: Advancing multi-modal language models with a comprehensive dataset and benchmark for chain-of-thought reasoning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:8612–8642.
- Wei Song, Yadong Li, Jianhua Xu, Guowei Wu, Lingfeng Ming, Kexin Yi, Weihua Luo, Houyi Li, Yi Du, Fangda Guo, et al. 2024. M3gia: A cognition inspired multilingual and multimodal general intelligence ability benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.05343*.
- Zayne Sprague, Fangcong Yin, Juan Diego Rodriguez, Dongwei Jiang, Manya Wadhwa, Prasann Singhal, Xinyu Zhao, Xi Ye, Kyle Mahowald, and Greg Durrett. 2025. To cot or not to cot? chain-of-thought helps mainly on math and symbolic reasoning. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- R. F. Street. 1968. *Street-Gestalt Completion Test*. APA PsycTests.

- Louis Leon Thurstone. 1938a. The perceptual factor. *Psychometrika*, 3(1):1–17.
- Louis Leon Thurstone. 1938b. Primary mental abilities. *Psychometric Monograph*, 1.
- Louis Leon Thurstone. 1941. *Factorial studies of Intelligence*. University of Chicago press.
- Louis Leon Thurstone. 1944. *A factorial study of perception*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Rohan Wadhawan, Hritik Bansal, Kai-Wei Chang, and Nanyun Peng. 2024. Contextual: Evaluating context-sensitive text-rich visual reasoning in large multimodal models. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Xintao Wang, Heng Wang, Yifei Zhang, Xinfeng Yuan, Rui Xu, Jen-tse Huang, Siyu Yuan, Haoran Guo, Jiangjie Chen, Wei Wang, et al. 2025. Coser: Coordinating llm-based persona simulation of established roles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.09082*.
- Xintao Wang, Yunze Xiao, Jen-tse Huang, Siyu Yuan, Rui Xu, Haoran Guo, Quan Tu, Yaying Fei, Ziang Leng, Wei Wang, et al. 2024. Incharacter: Evaluating personality fidelity in role-playing agents through psychological interviews. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1840–1873.
- D Wardell. 1973. Possible changes in the taxonomies in royce center for advanced study in theorecital psychology.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Ingvar Werdelin and Gunnel Stjernberg. 1969. On the nature of the perceptual speed factor. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 10(1):185–192.
- Ingvar Werdelin and Gunnel Stjernberg. 1971. The relationship between difficulty and factor loadings of some visual-perceptual tests. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 12(1):21–28.
- Anne Wu, Kianté Brantley, and Yoav Artzi. 2024a. A surprising failure? multimodal llms and the nlvr challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17793*.
- Wenshan Wu, Shaoguang Mao, Yadong Zhang, Yan Xia, Li Dong, Lei Cui, and Furu Wei. 2024b. Visualization-of-thought elicits spatial reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37.
- Zhen Yang, Jinhao Chen, Zhengxiao Du, Wenmeng Yu, Weihang Wang, Wenyi Hong, Zhihuan Jiang, Bin Xu, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. 2024. Mathglm-vision: Solving mathematical problems with multimodal large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.13729*.
- Yizhe Zhang, He Bai, Ruixiang Zhang, Jiatao Gu, Shuangfei Zhai, Josh Susskind, and Navdeep Jaitly. 2024. How far are we from intelligent visual deductive reasoning? In *The First Conference on Language Modeling*.
- Henry Hengyuan Zhao, Pan Zhou, Difei Gao, and Mike Zheng Shou. 2024. Lova3: Learning to visual question answering, asking and assessment. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37.
- Wayne S Zimmerman. 1954. Hypotheses concerning the nature of the spatial factors. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 14(2):396–400.

## A Comparison with Human Performance

Tests	Human	GPT-4o				Gemini-1.5-Pro		Gemini-2.0-Pro		Qwen-VL-Max	
		Vanilla	CoT	SCoT	MAD	Vanilla	CoT	Vanilla	CoT	Vanilla	CoT
CF1	14	-90	-110	-70	-100	-140	-90	-100	-80	-130	-60
CF1-S	14	20	-30	18	48	-52	-46	4	-110	40	68
CF2	139.9	64	46	124	-189	54	66	28	-4	8	26
CF2-S	139.9	128	134	124	-2	8	-14	56	-336	64	26
CF3	25.9	1	7	5	2	1	9	4	1	4	0
CS1	15.2	7	6	6	1	4	5	2	4	2	2
CS2	23.6	13	11	10	8	0	9	5	1	4	3
CS3	5.7	5	8	6	3	3	5	2	1	2	1
VZ1	124.8	13	12	15	-8	20	16	12	11	10	12
VZ2	13.8	-30	-70	-40	-20	-60	-70	-80	-80	-70	-70
VZ2-S	13.8	60	42	34	10	-64	-60	12	-44	-48	-56
VZ3	43.6	-16	-22	-16	-32	-34	-22	-28	-24	-24	-20
VZ3-S	43.6	-24	-20	-14	-42	-40	-46	-30	-42	-28	-30
S1	-	0	0	0	-20	0	-2	-8	20	-10	-8
S1-S	-	20	14	12	-22	0	-2	-8	20	-10	26
S2	22.7	2	2	6	-2	-8	2	0	-10	-6	-10
SS2	15.5	40	30	35	45	55	25	45	55	35	30
SS3	25	12	11	12	10	5	12	6	6	2	8
SS3-S	25	10	12	12	4	6	4	5	9	9	6
P3	68.6	-50	-280	-90	-80	-230	-280	-240	-240	-260	-250
P3-S	68.6	402	388	414	230	258	134	266	104	178	192
I3	92.8	26	-18	16	-48	8	-131	14	-6	-78	-64
I3-S	92.8	-28	-48	-60	-28	-68	-70	-84	-128	-70	-108

Table 2: **VISFACTOR** test results using GPT-4o, Gemini-Pro (1.5 and 2.0), and Qwen-VL-Max compared with **Human Performance**. Split tests (S) are marked in red, while default tests are marked in blue. The highest scores are marked in bold while the second highest scores are marked with underlines.

## B Gemini-Flash Results

Tests	Human	Gemini-1.5-Flash		Gemini-2.0-Flash	
		Vanilla	CoT	Vanilla	CoT
CF1	20.0	18.8	18.8	15.6	28.1
CF1-S	50.0	53.8	26.3	23.8	25.0
CF2	50.0	49.5	46.5	51.0	49.5
CF2-S	50.0	0.0	0.0	37.8	24.0
CF3	4.0	3.1	4.7	4.7	1.7
CS1	-	15.0	25.0	25.0	20.0
CS2	-	0.0	0.0	6.0	4.0
CS3	-	4.2	0.0	8.3	8.3
VZ1	50.0	53.3	55.4	60.8	63.3
VZ2	20.0	20.0	20.0	25.0	10.0
VZ2-S	50.0	15.0	10.0	28.0	30.0
VZ3	14.6	15.0	11.7	21.7	20.0
VZ3-S	14.6	11.7	11.7	23.3	25.0
S1	50.0	47.5	46.3	46.9	51.2
S1-S	50.0	47.5	46.3	46.9	51.2
S2	50.0	52.4	45.2	52.4	54.8
SS2	20.0	28.1	25.0	28.1	18.8
SS3	9.1	15.0	0.0	7.5	7.5
SS3-S	9.1	15.0	10.0	7.5	17.5
P3	20.0	14.6	12.5	20.8	22.9
P3-S	50.0	74.2	79.8	69.2	77.7
I3	42.9	43.3	42.4	51.3	51.3
I3-S	42.9	40.6	13.8	50.0	30.4

Table 3: **VISFACTOR** test results using Gemini-1.5-Flash and Gemini-2.0-Flash. Split tests (S) are marked in red, while default tests are marked in blue.

Tests	Random	Gemini-1.5-Flash		Gemini-2.0-Flash	
		Vanilla	CoT	Vanilla	CoT
CF1	14	-100	-100	-110	-70
CF1-S	14	12	-76	-84	-80
CF2	139.9	-4	-28	8	-4
CF2-S	139.9	-400	-400	-98	-208
CF3	25.9	2	3	3	1
CS1	15.2	3	5	5	4
CS2	23.6	0	0	3	2
CS3	5.7	1	0	2	2
VZ1	124.8	3	5	10	13
VZ2	13.8	-60	-60	-50	-80
VZ2-S	13.8	-70	-80	-44	-40
VZ3	43.6	-42	-46	-34	-36
VZ3-S	43.6	-46	-46	-32	-30
S1	-	-8	-12	-10	4
S1-S	-	-8	-12	-10	4
S2	22.7	2	-4	2	4
SS2	15.5	45	40	45	30
SS3	25	6	0	3	3
SS3-S	25	6	4	3	7
P3	68.6	-340	-360	-280	-260
P3-S	68.6	232	286	184	266
I3	92.8	-30	-34	6	6
I3-S	92.8	-42	-162	0	-88

Table 4: **VISFACTOR** test results using Gemini-1.5-Flash and Gemini-2.0-Flash compared with **Human Performance**. Split tests (S) are marked in red, while default tests are marked in blue.

**C  $t$ -Values and  $p$ -Values: Comparison With and Without CoT**

Tests	$t$ -Values	$p$ -Values
CF1	2.4114	0.0366*
CF1-S	-1.1164	0.2903
CF2	-0.5014	0.6270
CF2-S	-0.7889	0.4485
CF3	0.6274	0.5444
CS1	0.5160	0.6171
CS2	0.0618	0.9519
CS3	0.2456	0.8109
VZ1	0.0621	0.9517
VZ2	-1.7375	0.1129
VZ2-S	-0.5167	0.6166
VZ3	0.2346	0.8193
VZ3-S	-0.4290	0.6770
S1	1.2788	0.2298
S1-S	1.4575	0.1757
S2	-0.4257	0.6794
SS2	-1.7436	0.1118
SS3	0.4217	0.6821
SS3-S	0.3034	0.7678
P3	-1.0290	0.3277
P3-S	-0.4608	0.6548
I3	-1.2415	0.2428
I3-S	-2.4632	0.0335*

Table 5: The  $t$ -values and  $p$ -values from the comparison of test scores with and without CoT. An asterisk (\*) denotes a significance level exceeding 95%.