## ECHo: Event Causality Inference via Human-Centric Reasoning

Yuxi Xie \* Guanzhen Li Min-Yen Kan National University of Singapore

#### Abstract

We introduce ECHo<sup>1</sup>, a diagnostic dataset of event causality inference grounded in visualand-linguistic social scenarios. ECHo employs real-world human-centric deductive information collected from crime drama, bridging the gap in multimodal reasoning towards higher social intelligence through the elicitation of intermediate Theory-of-Mind (ToM). We propose a unified framework aligned with the Chainof-Thought (CoT) paradigm to assess the reasoning capability of current AI systems. This ToM-enhanced CoT pipeline can accommodate and integrate various large foundation models in zero-shot visual-and-linguistic understanding. With this framework, we scrutinize the advanced large language and multimodal models via three complementary human-centric ECHo tasks. Further analysis demonstrates ECHo as a challenging dataset to expose imperfections and inconsistencies in model reasoning.

#### 1 Introduction

Social intelligence, as a widely-investigated concept in psychology and social sciences, becomes a prominent facet of artificial intelligence by indicating the ability to understand, navigate, and respond effectively in social scenarios (Walker and Foley, 1973; Kihlstrom and Cantor, 2000; Albrecht, 2006; Zadeh et al., 2019). Humans gain social intelligence along with the development of Theory-of-Mind (ToM) through experiencing and exploring real-world environments integrated with various modalities (e.g., language, vision, manipulation) (Davis, 2023). As a crucial ability of understanding and reasoning about mental states (i.e., beliefs, desires, intentions, emotions, and thoughts) (Premack and Woodruff, 1978; Apperly and Butterfill, 2009; Apperly, 2010), ToM is an important component to achieve artificial general



Figure 1: Scheme of the Theory-of-Mind enhanced Chain-of-Thought reasoning on human factors. We use scenes of the main character for visual representations.

intelligence (Goertzel, 2014; Zhong et al., 2023), especially towards better social intelligence.

Recently, large language (Chowdhery et al., 2022; Chung et al., 2022; Touvron et al., 2023; OpenAI, 2023) and multimodal (Radford et al., 2021; Alayrac et al., 2022; Li et al., 2022; Huang et al., 2023) models have exhibited remarkable advancements on a wide range of reasoning tasks. Despite the rapid evolution of these large foundation models, they still fall short to adapt to personalized scenarios effectively tailored to a specific user (Sap et al., 2022; Bubeck et al., 2023). This brings increasing focus on human-centric reasoning to enhance artificial social intelligence for seamless integration in human daily life (Bard et al., 2020; Yuan et al., 2020; Moghaddam and Honey, 2023). To this end, ToM inference is one of the central challenges to accelerating communication and ensuring safety in human-computer interac-

Correspondence to: Yuxi Xie (xieyuxi@u.nus.edu).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>https://github.com/YuxiXie/ECHo

tion, requiring complex and flexible human-centric reasoning across various modalities (Yuan et al., 2020; Sap et al., 2022; Jin et al., 2022; Sileo and Lernould, 2023). Specifically, current AI systems struggle with handling interleaved multimodal information for advanced reasoning that usually necessitates prior planning and faithful intermediate surmising for better consistency and interpretability (Lyu et al., 2023; Bubeck et al., 2023).

To enhance reasoning towards better consistency and faithfulness, research in natural language processing propose problem decomposition to refine reasoning via intermediate inference (Wei et al., 2022; Zhou et al., 2022; Xie et al., 2023). This scheme of Chain-of-Thought (CoT) reasoning has also presented impressive empirical improvement in result correctness on both textual and multimodal tasks (Wei et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2023; Driess et al., 2023), demonstrating a promising paradigm to integrate the ToM inference as an intermediate step in human-centric reasoning. In this work, we introduce ECHo (Event Causality Inference via Human-Centric Reasoning), a visual-and-linguistic dataset with annotated ToM inferences for eventcausality reasoning grounded in multimodal social scenarios. With rigorously annotated and manually validated human-centric factors, ECHo seeks to diagnose the reasoning robustness and faithfulness of current large language and multimodal models regarding artificial social intelligence. Specifically, we focus on human-centric causality reasoning which still remains challenging as shown in recent scrutiny on LLMs (K1c1man et al., 2023).

We envision ECHo as a challenging diagnostic benchmark for modern AI systems on humancentric reasoning. Each ECHo instance is grounded in a plot from the crime drama CSI: Crime Scene Investigation, enabling approximation of the realworld social interactions pertaining to human mental states. As shown in Figure 2, our core annotation process begins with ascertaining the identity of a specified character via attributes such as their role, age, and occupation. Next, we discern the emotional traits of the characters to capture human mental states. Leveraging this human-centric understanding, annotators then pinpoint key corresponding frames for visual representation. Finally, we ask annotators to infer the cause or effect of a plot event. To foster social intelligence, we enhance ToM by guiding annotators to make causal inferences that take into account the mental states (e.g., intentions, emotions, and thoughts) of characters. With ToM-enhanced CoT reasoning grounded in visual-and-linguistic plot data, ECHo is integrated with a unified framework to assess human-centric reasoning across multiple dimensions in the realworld social context. As detailed in Section 4, we propose a set of diagnostic tasks to evaluate the capabilities of AI systems to identify social roles, reason about emotional traits, and infer event causality adhering to logic elicited in the initial tasks.

In conclusion, our key contributions in this work include: 1) We introduce ECHo, a challenging diagnostic corpus to probe human-centric reasoning capacity in social scenarios; 2) We propose a unified framework to evaluate the existing large multimodal and language foundation models in zeroshot ToM-enhanced CoT reasoning; 3) Our further analysis demonstrates how the three complementary diagnostic tasks can be used to test multimodal understanding of human factors, revealing the deficiency in current AI systems to maintain consistent logic throughout reasoning.

## 2 Related Work

ECHo takes a further step towards social intelligence in visual-and-linguistic reasoning, which also relates to the literature on causal reasoning with a specific focus on event causality inference.

Visual-and-Linguistic Reasoning. Datasets and tasks in visual-and-linguistic reasoning span widely from descriptive information extraction (Antol et al., 2015; You et al., 2016; Gao et al., 2017), physical relation inference (Johnson et al., 2017; Hudson and Manning, 2019), to complex and deep reasoning on event and human factors (Krishna et al., 2017; Zellers et al., 2019; Park et al., 2020). ECHo follows this trend to enhance the reasoning depth towards human-specific facets. Unlike other recent works (Shen et al., 2020; Dong et al., 2022; Zhu et al., 2023b) of human-centric reasoning, ECHo is integrated with rigorous annotations of ToM, supporting the final inferences in the form of CoT reasoning for better consistency.

Large Multimodal and Language Models. Previous research in this area mainly complies with the paradigm of pre-training and fine-tuning to construct and train large-scale multimodal models to handle interleaved visual-and-linguistic information (Radford et al., 2021; Jia et al., 2021; Zellers et al., 2021; Alayrac et al., 2022; Li et al.,



Figure 2: Annotation Pipeline illustrating the dataset construction. We detail the second round annotation, where annotators provide ToM inferences in the first two stages following with the event causality inference.

2022; Huang et al., 2023). Recently, there is the emergence of offline methods which leverage the capacities of large foundation models to conduct direct few-shot or zero-shot inference (Wu et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2023; Lu et al., 2023; Zhu et al., 2023a). Similar with Zhu et al. (2023a), we propose a framework to enhance visual understanding via LLM prompting (Ouyang et al., 2022; OpenAI, 2023) and facilitate LLM reasoning with augmented multimodal information (Li et al., 2023).

## 3 ECHo Corpus

We present ECHo dataset, containing x event causality inferences collected following the scheme of Chain-of-Thought (CoT) (Wei et al., 2022) enhanced by Theory-of-Mind (ToM) (Premack and Woodruff, 1978) reasoning. To facilitate a closer approximation to real-world social interactions and inferences, we ground ECHo in *CSI: Crime Scene Investigation*, an American procedural forensics crime series (Wikipedia contributors, 2023). With visual appearance and evidence in frames and textual clues and deductions in screenplays, *CSI* provides a rich source of multimodal data, spanning widely factual, relational, and inferential elements. Based on *CSI*, we construct ECHo with a focus on human-centric information distillation and interpretation for ToM reasoning on plot event causality.

In this section, we detail the pipeline of data collection and annotation. We also outline the statistics of ECHo Corpus via data exploration pertaining to human factors in social intelligence.

#### 3.1 Construction Pipeline

We pair official *CSI* clips with screenplays crawled from a publicly available website hosting TV show transcripts <sup>2</sup>. Afterwards, we launch annotation in 3 rounds with 30 annotators working over 5 weeks after completing several training sessions <sup>3</sup>.

**Data Source Crawling and Preprocessing.** We acquire the official *CSI* videos with associated screenplays of 177 episodes spanning the first 8 seasons. We take 15 episodes for further annotation and task formulation to construct ECHo. Each episode usually features one case, where a team of recurring investigators attempt to reconstruct the crime and find the perpetrator. Specifically, we follow Freemann et al. (2018) to crawl the screenplays which comprise dialogues with character cues prefacing utterances and narrations of scene descriptions. We automatically denoise and categorize

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>https://transcripts.foreverdreaming.org/

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Find in Appendix A the details of annotator training.

Round	# Clip	# Character	# Instance
One	1,542	4,822	1,542
Two	1,349	2,193	5,746
Three	1,292	2,017	4,200

Table 1: Statisctis of ECHo collected at each round. The number of instances increases as we focus on one character to probe one event in each plot.



Figure 3: Distribution of screenplay length, event causality inference length, frame and character counts.

each script line as an utterance or a narration to represent a plot event for subsequent task formulation.

**Round One: Plot Segmentation.** The crawled screenplays are distributed in discrete blocks, each corresponding to an individual plot scene. We refine this segmentation with automatic data cleaning and filtering to collect plot segments of feasible length and substantive contents. Different from previous works which conduct the vision–language alignment automatically (Myers and Rabiner, 1981; Frermann et al., 2018), we manually synchronize the segmented screenplays with the time-stamped video clips to pinpoint the key characters in each plot for human-centric reasoning. In this round, we obtain 1, 542 plots grounded in the visual-and-linguistic context with an average of 3 identified key characters in each segment.

**Round Two: Inference Annotation.** This is the core round in our construction pipeline, as annotators produce human-centric inferences via chaining the ToM reasoning, which we utilize to formulate our diagnostic tasks in Section 4. Each instance to annotate features one key character and one specified event for human-centric causal reasoning. We operationalize this annotation process in 3 stages: 1. *Characteristics Identification.* Given one of the key characters to focus on, trained annotators

identify the role of the character in each instance.



Figure 4: Different varieties of keywords in the text of screenplays, roles, emotions, and causal inferences.

Specifically, we encourage annotators to consider the age range, occupation (if applicable), and relations amongst others of the given character for better social characteristics distillation.

2. *Keyframe-Grounded Emotion Interpretation*. In this stage, we take a further step of human-centric reasoning to interpret the emotional traits of the specified character in each plot. Annotators are provided with 13 primary emotions <sup>4</sup> to choose from, which are categorized by accommodating the 27 emotions (Cowen and Keltner, 2017) in the crime drama plots. Considering cases where no options are applicable, annotators can also supplement additional emotions in free text. With emotions, annotators extract associated frames that cover the development of the character's mental states. These frames are later utilized as human-centric visual representations, as illustrated in Figure 2.

3. *Event Causality Inference*. Following the human-centric inferences on both visual and textual information in the previous two stages, we ask annotators to conduct a further ToM reasoning step to provide the cause or effect of a specified event in the plot. Specifically, we encourage them to consider the social role and utilize related emotions in this stage to enhance logic consistency.

Since most of the annotation data is collected in the free-text form, we assign 2 to 4 different annotators

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Including anger; boredom; calmness; disgust; doubt; entrancement; fear; interest; joy; sadness; shame; surprise; sympathy. We provide detailed definitions in Appendix C.

for each instance <sup>5</sup>, where we collect a total of 5,746 annotated instances in this round.

**Round Three: Inference Validation.** To qualify the annotated instances for further reasoning diagnosis, we evaluate each data point via a validation round using both automatic and manual strategies. The automatic method is integrated directly into the annotation process, where we reject the annotator inputs immediately if they do not meet the strict requirements. These strict rules include the length and the word-level creativity of the input text to avoid simply copying and pasting. The filtered instances are then manually verified by the author team who then provide feedback to revise their annotations, as detailed in Appendix B.

#### 3.2 Dataset Exploration

With 4K inferences integrated with annotated ToM chains, ECHo provide a real-world approximation of human-centric reasoning, covering a wide variety of people roles across different crime cases.

**Statistics.** We detail the statistics of collected data after each round of annotations in Table 1. As a small visual-and-linguistic corpus, we foresee ECHo as a challenging diagnostic benchmark to test the zero-shot or few-shot learning abilities of AI systems, especially on fine-grained reasoning correctness and consistency.

**Further Exploration.** More details of the statistics of input modalities such as text length and frame features are displayed in Figure 3. We further demonstrate the capacity of real-world approximation of ECHo by visualizing the keyword and topic distributions in Figure 4.

## 4 Diagnose Human-Centric Reasoning

The rigorous annotation of human-centric information in ECHo demonstrate a paradigm of ToMenhanced CoT reasoning. Grounded in multimodal crime scenarios, ECHo approximates the real-world context interleaved with factual, relational, and inferential data. Using ECHo, we design three complementary tasks to diagnose artificial social intelligence in visual-and-linguistic scenarios.

**Notations.** Each ECHo instance consists of a sequence of visual frames  $V = [f_1, f_2, \dots, f_N] =$ 

 $f_{1:N}$ , a block of textual screenplays T (*i.e.*, dialogues and narrations), and a key character C to focus on in reasoning. We designate each utterance or narration to be an event  $E_i$  for subsequent causal inference, as  $T = [E_1, E_2, \dots, E_M]$ . We detail the formulation of our diagnostic tasks next.

Role Identification. Psychoanalysis on identity and interpersonal relationships is one of the main disciplines in social intelligence study (Miller, 1962). The role of a person in social interactions indicates their unique histories and identities, nurturing similar or potentially contradictory intentions, actions, and relations with others (Freese and Burke, 1994). Therefore, we test the ability of role identification to probe artificial social intelligence pertaining to the fundamental human-centric understanding in ToM reasoning. Given a frame  $f_i$  of the key character C and the corresponding screenplay T, we prompt the model to predict the role r of C in the manner of text generation. Specifically, the character role can be described using their age, occupation, and relation with others in the plot.

**Emotion Recognition.** As part of ToM, emotions convey clues beyond verbal messages about human mental states in social interactions (Hari and Kujala, 2009). Furthermore, emotional traits usually connect the fundamental understanding (*e.g.*, role identification) and further inference (*e.g.*, intent prediction) as an intermediate product in human-centric reasoning. We thus propose to evaluate the ability of emotion recognition as our second diagnostic task. We formulate this task as multi-choice question answering to test the alignment of model and human predictions, by adapting the taxonomy of Cowen and Keltner (2017) to the crime data.

**Event Causality Inference.** Despite the practical success of large foundation models on a wide range of reasoning tasks, there is a longstanding debate on whether they genuinely execute causal reasoning causal reasoning or merely replicate and reproduce memorized patterns (Bender et al., 2021; Marcus, 2022). Furthermore, these models still give imperfect outputs such as errors in both basic-logic and human-factor understanding (Ghazal et al., 2017; Bubeck et al., 2023; Zhong et al., 2023; Kıcıman et al., 2023). Hence, we adopt event causality inference as the third task to assess the capacity of causal reasoning among socially-grounded events integrated with human factors. We also test the rea-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>For some instances, we additionally assign more annotators when the inter-agreement is low.



Figure 5: Pipeline of integrating both large multimodal and language models to conduct Theory-of-Mind (ToM) enhanced Chain-of-Thought (CoT) reasoning. Specifically, we leverage LLM (L) reasoning to enhance visual understanding and utilize the multimodal model (M) to provide vision-augmented information for LLM inference.

soning consistency among intermediate inferences and the final predictions by leveraging the outputs in the two preliminary tasks. With the sequence of main frames V and associated screenplay T, we aim to infer the cause or effect of a given event  $E_i$ in the context through ToM reasoning. Here ToM integrates human factors (*i.e.*, roles and emotions) identified in the prior tasks, with their intentions, thoughts, and responses interpreted subsequently.

## 5 ToM-Enhanced CoT Reasoning

Given the inputs of visual frames V and textual screenplay T as x, our objective is to make inferences I on human-centric factors in the social context. We follow Wei et al. (2022) to decompose the inference process via intermediate reasoning steps denoted as R. With this formulation, we accommodate the diagnostic tasks in a unified framework to test the reasoning capacity of large language and multimodal models in a zero-shot manner:

• Role Identification. To predict the role r of a specified character C as the inference result I, where we advocate eliciting physical attributes such as appearance details in intermediate reasoning R.

• Emotion Recognition. To predict the emotional traits of a specified character C as the inference result I, where their facial expressions are interpreted in intermediate reasoning R.

• Event Causality Inference. To infer the cause or effect of a given event E as the final inference I through ToM reasoning, where human factors deduced in prior tasks, such as the roles and emotions, can represent the intermediate reasoning R.

As illustrated in Figure 5, our diagnostic framework adopts the Vision + Large Language Models (LLMs) paradigm (Huang et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2023) to fuse the abilities of multimodal understanding and complex reasoning inherent in multimodal (M) and language (L) foundation models. With this pipeline, we leverage the reasoning power of L to prompt M towards better ToM-enhanced CoT reasoning.

LLM-Enhanced Multimodal Understanding. Enlightened by the advanced capability of LLMs in complex reasoning (Brown et al., 2020; Kojima et al., 2022; Chowdhery et al., 2022), there is an emergent line of research to leverage LLMs to prompt and guide information extraction in visual understanding (Surís et al., 2023; Wu et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2023; Zhu et al., 2023a). To diagnose the ability of human-centric reasoning of current large foundation models, we follow this paradigm to enhance multimodal information extraction with LLM reasoning. Specifically, we incorporate the LLM guidance as information-seeking questions to prompt multimodal understanding via visual question answering. We simplify the framework of Zhu et al. (2023a) by directly generating one task-specific question instead of augmenting iterative questions with accumulated contextual information. Figure 6 demonstrates an example of using the LLM-generated question to enhance multimodal understanding for human-factor extraction.

**Vision-Augmented LLM Reasoning.** Reciprocally, the multimodal model can facilitate LLM reasoning by augmenting information grounded in the vision. To this end, the visual information should be projected into representations that LLMs can understand, such as discrete text words (Hu et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022; Zeng et al., 2022; Yang et al., 2022) and continuous features adapted into the textual space (Tsimpoukelli et al., 2021; Alayrac et al., 2022; Driess et al., 2023; Huang et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023). In our framework, we follow the former line of work to supplement the multimodal model generated textual descriptions into the LLM for vision augmentation. Specifically, the visual information covers knowledge of various granularities, extracted by general captioning and task-specific question-prompted answering. The task-specific questions here are generated by the LLM to guide reasoning via ToM inference.

## **6** Experiments

We probe the social intelligence of existing large language (Ouyang et al., 2022; OpenAI, 2023) and multimodal (Li et al., 2022, 2023) models using the unified framework in Section 5 on our diagnostic tasks in Section 4. Furthermore, we conduct qualitative analysis to identify problematic cases that indicate the deficiency of current AI systems or the potential bias in our ECHo corpus.

#### 6.1 Setup

**Backboned Large Foundation Models.** We use BLIP-2 (blip2\_t5) (Li et al., 2023) <sup>6</sup>, the latest public <sup>7</sup> and reproducible visual-and-linguistic model for multimodal understanding. As the LLM backends, we evaluate InstructGPT (text-davinci-003) (Ouyang et al., 2022) and ChatGPT (gpt-3.5-turbo) <sup>8</sup>.

**Prompt Template Construction.** For multimodal prompting, we adopt the form of visual question answering where specific instructions will be provided for human-centric information extraction and inference. For LLM prompting, we accommodate information comprising screenplays, textual descriptions of visual frames in multi-granularities, and specific instructions to stimulate reasoning. We illustrate our prompt construction in Figure 6.

**Evaluation Metrics.** For generation tasks such as role identification and event causality inference, we employ conventional metrics including CIDEr (Vedantam et al., 2015), Rouge-L (Lin, 2004), and BLeU-2 (Papineni et al., 2002) to measure the similarity between model outputs and human annotations, compared with the interagreement among annotators using the same met-

Models	CIDEr	Rouge-L	BLeU-2
М	5.90	11.2	4.78
$M, L_I$	0.35	9.95	2.57
$M, L_C$	0.04	5.37	1.23
Human	30.0	18.0	7.69

Table 2: Result comparison (with all scores scaled to be  $\in [0, 100]$ ) on role identification.

rics. Considering the limitation of the automatic metrics capped at the reference quality (Zhu et al., 2023a), we conduct a further case study to manually assess whether current AI systems can surpass human performance in human-centric reasoning. For emotion recognition as a multilabel classification task, we use the macro precision, recall, and F1 scores to measure both the model-human and inter-annotator agreement. The inter-annotator agreement considers the instance-wide similarity between one annotator and the others.

#### 6.2 Results

We compare the multimodal-only model (M) with the LLM-enhanced method (M, L) using different backends – InstructGPT ( $L_I$ ) and ChatGPT ( $L_C$ ). Specifically, on the task of event causality inference, we compare the impacts of ToM integration from different sources, including multimodal (M) and language (L) models and human (H).

**Role Identification.** The inter-annotator agreement shows that humans generally share consistent opinions on the task of role identification. However, we observe a trend of performance drop when enhancing the reasoning process with LLM prompting, where a stronger LLM (*i.e.*, ChatGPT) leads to worse scores. This shows the deficiency of the traditional metrics as they depend on automatic token-level matching. We further probe this gap between multimodal and language model generations in Section 6.4 to diagnose their reasoning abilities.

**Emotion Recognition.** Likewise, we see a similar trend of performance drop in the recall score as we leverage LLMs to enhance human-centric reasoning. The increase in precision score, on the other hand, provides a possible explanation. As we illustrate in Section 6.4, the multimodal model usually makes a less confident decision as it tends to check all provided emotion options. This leads to an extremely high recall score but can damage the output informativeness with lower precision.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>We use pretrain\_flant5xl due to computation limit.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>https://github.com/salesforce/LAVIS

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>Version-0301 results obtained on 15 May 2023.

[Causality Question] What has caused/enabled the event	that Gil Grissom says: If you get done early use channel seven on your walkie?
	<u>Holly Gribbs</u> : Pretty good. <u>Gil Grissom</u> : Good. Okay, look, this was a routine robbery. Dust for prints, check he videotape take lots of fun photos. I'll be back in about an hour to pick you up. <u>Holly Gribbs</u> : Okay. (HOLLY gets out of the car.) <u>Gil Grissom</u> : If you get done early use channel seven on your walkie. (GRISSOM pulls out of the parking lot.) (HOLLY heads inside the liquor store.)
M	
<ul> <li>A man and woman sitting in a car at night.</li> <li>A man in a black shirt and a woman in a white shirt.</li> <li>The man's eyes are wide and he is staring off into space.</li> <li>Grissom is a police officer or law enforcement officer.</li> <li>He is staring into the distance with a sad expression on h</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>What is the role or occupation of the man in the black shirt who stops the car in front of the liquor store in the given video clip?</li> <li>What is the expression on Gil Grissom's face when he stares off?</li> </ul>
[Role Identification] The probable ident [Emotion Recognition] The	ity of the person is Gil Grissom, an adult male who is a crime-solving detective. probable emotional traits of the person are sadness, loneliness, and resignation.
[Causality Inference] To ensure Holly's safety by providin	ng her with instructions on how to contact him if she finishes her task early.

Figure 6: Examples of model inputs and outputs through the ToM-enhanced reasoning process. The language and multimodal models enhance understanding and reasoning of each other in a dialogue-like form.

Models	Precison	Recall	<b>F1</b>
М	25.7	68.6	32.7
$M, L_I$	31.9	45.6	29.4
$M, L_C$	34.0	23.2	22.7
Human	85.2	67.5	75.3

Table 3: Result comparison (with all scores scaled to be  $\in [0, 100]$ ) on emotion recognition.

**Event Causality Inference.** Leveraging LLMs for inference generation also causes a drop in performance in the event causality task, especially as we observe on the CIDEr score in Table 4. However, the decrease in Rouge-L is comparatively slight amongst other metrics. As reflected in our further analysis, one direct reason is the less difference in the inference length of different methods. This also indicates higher confidence in the multimodal model compared with its redundant and wordy inferences when conducting role identification without the explicit context of ToM information. Furthermore, we see a more significant performance gain from human-annotated ToM with LLMenhanced reasoning, showcasing the potential to better integrate the LLM capacity into complex scenarios for visual-and-linguistic understanding.

#### 6.3 Ablation Study

We conduct further analysis to probe the impacts of different modalities, CoT reasoning, and ToM incorporation, respectively.

Models	CIDEr	Rouge-L	BLeU-2
$M_{ToM^M}$	6.80	12.7	6.66
$M_{ToM^{L_{I}}}$	7.88	13.4	7.19
$M_{ToM^{L_C}}$	7.29	13.4	7.19
$M_{ToM^H}$	7.59	12.8	6.61
M, $L_{ITOM^{L_I}}$	3.39	13.9	5.47
M, $L_{ITOM^H}$	3.23	14.8	5.62
M, $L_{C_{ToM^{L_C}}}$	0.81	14.7	5.80
$M, L_{C_{TOM}^H}$	1.17	14.8	5.89
Human	17.9	15.1	8.32

Table 4: Result comparison (with all scores scaled to be  $\in [0, 100]$ ) on event causality inference. The reasoning process is facilitated by ToM inferences, *i.e.*, information of roles and emotions, from different sources.

Vision vs. Language Models. In all three diagnostic tasks, we observe a big difference in the generations of BLIP-2 and LLMs. As shown in the different trends of changes in metrics such as CIDEr vs. Rouge-L and Precision vs. Recall, BLIP-2 tends to give redundant and verbose predictions when there is a lack of grounded information such as ToM inferences. This demonstrates the importance of LLM incorporation for multimodal understanding to enhance and guide information extraction and deduction.

**ToM-enhanced CoT Reasoning.** The performance gain from ToM incorporation in Table 4 varies when applied with different sources on dif-

Ha	(The door opens. HOLLY GRIBBS walks into the office.)
	(She looks around and grimaces at the various items on the shelves.) (Behind her, GRISSOM walks up to her.)
Gi	<u>I Grissom</u> : Hi. (HOLLY is startled. She gasps and turns around.)
	<u>Unisson</u> , sony, welcome to Forensics. On Onisson, 1m your supervisor on graveyard, <u>illy Gribbs</u> : Holly Gribbs. (They shake hands)
[Event Causality Inference] What probably has cau [Human] Grissom is working at the office at Foren He knows she is going to report today at	ised/enabled the event that <u>Behind her. GRISSOM walks up to her</u> ? sics, likely on his shift, when Holly, a new employee, enters.
[Role & Emotions] Grissom is supervisor in his m	iddle age (>50).
He seems to teel surprise, cain [(Hum-ToM) BLIP-2] Grissom has been waiting for [(Hum-ToM) InstructGPT] Holly has entered the r	ness, slightly sorry, and appreciation. or Holly to walk into the office. oom and Grissom noticed her presence. Grissom has curiosity and interest in meeting her
[Role & Emotions (BLIP-2)] Grissom is a young r He is interested in he [BLIP-2] Grissom is interested in Holly and wants	nan who works in forensics in his late twenties or early thirties. r and wants to get to know her better and indifferent to the situation. s to get to know her better.
[Role & Emotions (InstructGPT)] Grissom is the s He is likely to b [InstructGPT] Gil Grissom, the supervisor on grav the office by the sound of her voice.	upervisor on graveyard. He is an adult male. e surprise, shock, <mark>confusion</mark> , and curiosity. eyard, is likely looking for Holly Gribbs, the new employee. He has likely been drawn to

Figure 7: We compare the ToM-enhanced inferences between human annotators and different models. We consider three sources of the incorporated ToM information, including human, BLIP-2, and InstructGPT generations, as shown in green, pink, and blue, respectively. Imperfections are highlighted in yellow.

ferent backboned models. This gives insights on how to better elicit and utilize the ToM inferences towards better reasoning. Specifically, a stronger reasoning capacity to handle multiple pieces of information in complex cases is preferred, as shown by the more significant performance gain when utilizing advanced LLMs for inference generation.

## 6.4 Case Study

Considering the limitation of automatic evaluation metrics, we conduct case study of quality assessment on model outputs. We discuss our main findings by answering the following questions:

# **Q1.** Can models maintain reasoning robustness when input information varies in format?

As shown in Figure 7, LLMs present significantly higher adaptiveness to elicit different input information for reasoning. For example, InstructGPT directly synthesizes the character emotional traits such as "curiosity" in the human-annotated ToMenhanced inference, while BLIP-2 is still at copyand-paste level in text generation.

# **Q2.** Can models maintain consistency and faith-fulness throughout ToM-CoT reasoning?

At the token level, BLIP-2 shows consistency between intermediate ToM and the final inference via reiterating the keywords such as "interested" in Figure 7. However, it still struggles in further reasoning about the implicit implications in the context. On the other hand, despite the advancement brought by LLMs, they may produce problematic hallucination, *i.e.*, imperfect predicted ToM such as "confusion" can lead to wrong final inference that may be totally contradictory to the actual situation.

# Q3. What potential bias exists in ECHo that can lead to erroneous model predictions?

One crucial problem we find in the BLIP-2 outputs is that it tends to check all emotion options as observed in the plot. This indicates a high uncertainty in the multimodal model in the mental state interpretation of humans. Possible reasons can come from both the model and data sides. Specifically, visual information represented by still frames can cause ambiguity without clip details, as shown by the wrongly predicted "confusion" in Figure 7.

## 7 Conclusion

We introduce ECHo (Event Causality Inference via Human-Centric Reasoning), a diagnostic dataset designed to probe artificial social intelligence with a focus on human factors. Deriving from real-world social interactions and deductions, ECHo presents a challenge for current AI systems to perform complex reasoning given visual-and-linguistic information. We foresee follow-up works on both model and data facets for the development of faithful reasoning across a broader range of social scenarios.

#### **Ethics Statement**

We have received approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB)<sup>9</sup> for our data annotation. We design the training tutorial and experimental sessions as guided and reviewed by the IRB to maintain minimal risks to participants. The review process took two months to complete.

#### Acknowledgements

We would like to thank our annotators for their time and efforts in annotating and validating ECHo instances with insightful feedbacks for refinement.

#### References

- Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katherine Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, et al. 2022. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:23716–23736.
- Karl Albrecht. 2006. Social intelligence: The new science of success. John Wiley & Sons.
- Stanislaw Antol, Aishwarya Agrawal, Jiasen Lu, Margaret Mitchell, Dhruv Batra, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. 2015. Vqa: Visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference* on computer vision, pages 2425–2433.
- Ian Apperly. 2010. *Mindreaders: the cognitive basis* of" theory of mind". Psychology Press.
- Ian A Apperly and Stephen A Butterfill. 2009. Do humans have two systems to track beliefs and belief-like states? *Psychological review*, 116(4):953.
- Nolan Bard, Jakob N Foerster, Sarath Chandar, Neil Burch, Marc Lanctot, H Francis Song, Emilio Parisotto, Vincent Dumoulin, Subhodeep Moitra, Edward Hughes, et al. 2020. The hanabi challenge: A new frontier for ai research. *Artificial Intelligence*, 280:103216.
- Emily M Bender, Timnit Gebru, Angelina McMillan-Major, and Shmargaret Shmitchell. 2021. On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 610–623.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. Advances in neural information processing systems, 33:1877–1901.

- 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*.
- Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. 2022. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02311*.
- Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Eric Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, et al. 2022. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.11416*.
- Alan S Cowen and Dacher Keltner. 2017. Self-report captures 27 distinct categories of emotion bridged by continuous gradients. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 114(38):E7900–E7909.
- Ernest Davis. 2023. Benchmarks for automated commonsense reasoning: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04752*.
- Qingxiu Dong, Ziwei Qin, Heming Xia, Tian Feng, Shoujie Tong, Haoran Meng, Lin Xu, Zhongyu Wei, Weidong Zhan, Baobao Chang, Sujian Li, Tianyu Liu, and Zhifang Sui. 2022. Premise-based multimodal reasoning: Conditional inference on joint textual and visual clues. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 932–946, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Danny Driess, Fei Xia, Mehdi SM Sajjadi, Corey Lynch, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Brian Ichter, Ayzaan Wahid, Jonathan Tompson, Quan Vuong, Tianhe Yu, et al. 2023. Palm-e: An embodied multimodal language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.03378*.
- Lee Freese and Peter J Burke. 1994. Persons, identities, and social interaction. *Advances in group processes*, 11:1–24.
- Lea Frermann, Shay B Cohen, and Mirella Lapata. 2018. Whodunnit? crime drama as a case for natural language understanding. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 6:1–15.
- Jiyang Gao, Chen Sun, Zhenheng Yang, and Ram Nevatia. 2017. Tall: Temporal activity localization via language query. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 5267– 5275.
- Ahmad Ghazal, Todor Ivanov, Pekka Kostamaa, Alain Crolotte, Ryan Voong, Mohammed Al-Kateb, Waleed Ghazal, and Roberto V Zicari. 2017. Bigbench v2: the new and improved bigbench. In 2017 IEEE 33rd International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE), pages 1225–1236. IEEE.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup>https://www.nus.edu.sg/research/irb. The SoC DERC Reference Number is SOC-21-20.

- Ben Goertzel. 2014. Artificial general intelligence: concept, state of the art, and future prospects. *Journal of Artificial General Intelligence*, 5(1):1.
- Riitta Hari and Miiamaaria V Kujala. 2009. Brain basis of human social interaction: from concepts to brain imaging. *Physiological reviews*, 89(2):453–479.
- Yushi Hu, Hang Hua, Zhengyuan Yang, Weijia Shi, Noah A Smith, and Jiebo Luo. 2022. Promptcap: Prompt-guided task-aware image captioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09699*.
- Shaohan Huang, Li Dong, Wenhui Wang, Yaru Hao, Saksham Singhal, Shuming Ma, Tengchao Lv, Lei Cui, Owais Khan Mohammed, Qiang Liu, et al. 2023. Language is not all you need: Aligning perception with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.14045*.
- Drew A Hudson and Christopher D Manning. 2019. Gqa: A new dataset for real-world visual reasoning and compositional question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 6700–6709.
- Chao Jia, Yinfei Yang, Ye Xia, Yi-Ting Chen, Zarana Parekh, Hieu Pham, Quoc Le, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Zhen Li, and Tom Duerig. 2021. Scaling up visual and vision-language representation learning with noisy text supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4904–4916. PMLR.
- Zhijing Jin, Sydney Levine, Fernando Gonzalez Adauto, Ojasv Kamal, Maarten Sap, Mrinmaya Sachan, Rada Mihalcea, Josh Tenenbaum, and Bernhard Schölkopf. 2022. When to make exceptions: Exploring language models as accounts of human moral judgment. Advances in neural information processing systems, 35:28458–28473.
- Justin Johnson, Bharath Hariharan, Laurens Van Der Maaten, Li Fei-Fei, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Ross Girshick. 2017. Clevr: A diagnostic dataset for compositional language and elementary visual reasoning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference* on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 2901–2910.
- Emre Kıcıman, Robert Ness, Amit Sharma, and Chenhao Tan. 2023. Causal reasoning and large language models: Opening a new frontier for causality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.00050*.
- John F Kihlstrom and Nancy Cantor. 2000. Social intelligence.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11916*.
- Ranjay Krishna, Kenji Hata, Frederic Ren, Li Fei-Fei, and Juan Carlos Niebles. 2017. Dense-captioning events in videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 706–715.

- Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. 2023. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pretraining with frozen image encoders and large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12597.
- Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. 2022. Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pretraining for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12888–12900. PMLR.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81.
- Pan Lu, Baolin Peng, Hao Cheng, Michel Galley, Kai-Wei Chang, Ying Nian Wu, Song-Chun Zhu, and Jianfeng Gao. 2023. Chameleon: Plug-and-play compositional reasoning with large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.09842.
- Qing Lyu, Shreya Havaldar, Adam Stein, Li Zhang, Delip Rao, Eric Wong, Marianna Apidianaki, and Chris Callison-Burch. 2023. Faithful chain-ofthought reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13379*.
- Gary Marcus. 2022. How come gpt can seem so brilliant one minute and so breathtakingly dumb the next? *Substack newsletter. The Road to AI We Can Trust.*
- Daniel R Miller. 1962. The study of social relationships: Situation, identity, and social interaction.
- Shima Rahimi Moghaddam and Christopher J Honey. 2023. Boosting theory-of-mind performance in large language models via prompting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11490*.
- Cory S Myers and Lawrence R Rabiner. 1981. A comparative study of several dynamic time-warping algorithms for connected-word recognition. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 60(7):1389–1409.

OpenAI. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report.

- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:27730–27744.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the* 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pages 311–318.
- Jae Sung Park, Chandra Bhagavatula, Roozbeh Mottaghi, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. 2020. Visualcomet: Reasoning about the dynamic context of a still image. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part V 16*, pages 508–524. Springer.

- David Premack and Guy Woodruff. 1978. Does the chimpanzee have a theory of mind? *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 1(4):515–526.
- Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR.
- Maarten Sap, Ronan LeBras, Daniel Fried, and Yejin Choi. 2022. Neural theory-of-mind? on the limits of social intelligence in large lms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.13312*.
- Guangyao Shen, Xin Wang, Xuguang Duan, Hongzhi Li, and Wenwu Zhu. 2020. Memor: A dataset for multimodal emotion reasoning in videos. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 493–502.
- Damien Sileo and Antoine Lernould. 2023. Mindgames: Targeting theory of mind in large language models with dynamic epistemic modal logic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03353*.
- Dídac Surís, Sachit Menon, and Carl Vondrick. 2023. Vipergpt: Visual inference via python execution for reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08128*.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*.
- Maria Tsimpoukelli, Jacob L Menick, Serkan Cabi, SM Eslami, Oriol Vinyals, and Felix Hill. 2021. Multimodal few-shot learning with frozen language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:200–212.
- Ramakrishna Vedantam, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. 2015. Cider: Consensus-based image description evaluation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4566–4575.
- Ronald E Walker and Jeanne M Foley. 1973. Social intelligence: Its history and measurement. *Psychological reports*, 33(3):839–864.
- Zhenhailong Wang, Manling Li, Ruochen Xu, Luowei Zhou, Jie Lei, Xudong Lin, Shuohang Wang, Ziyi Yang, Chenguang Zhu, Derek Hoiem, et al. 2022. Language models with image descriptors are strong few-shot video-language learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10747*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11903.

- Wikipedia contributors. 2023. Csi: Crime scene investigation — Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index. php?title=CSI:\_Crime\_Scene\_Investigation& oldid=1152659091. [Online; accessed 21-May-2023].
- Chenfei Wu, Shengming Yin, Weizhen Qi, Xiaodong Wang, Zecheng Tang, and Nan Duan. 2023. Visual chatgpt: Talking, drawing and editing with visual foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.04671*.
- Yuxi Xie, Kenji Kawaguchi, Yiran Zhao, Xu Zhao, Min-Yen Kan, Junxian He, and Qizhe Xie. 2023. Decomposition enhances reasoning via self-evaluation guided decoding. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.00633.
- Zhengyuan Yang, Zhe Gan, Jianfeng Wang, Xiaowei Hu, Yumao Lu, Zicheng Liu, and Lijuan Wang. 2022. An empirical study of gpt-3 for few-shot knowledgebased vqa. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference* on Artificial Intelligence, volume 36, pages 3081– 3089.
- Zhengyuan Yang, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Kevin Lin, Ehsan Azarnasab, Faisal Ahmed, Zicheng Liu, Ce Liu, Michael Zeng, and Lijuan Wang. 2023. Mm-react: Prompting chatgpt for multimodal reasoning and action. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11381*.
- Quanzeng You, Hailin Jin, Zhaowen Wang, Chen Fang, and Jiebo Luo. 2016. Image captioning with semantic attention. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4651–4659.
- Luyao Yuan, Zipeng Fu, Jingyue Shen, Lu Xu, Junhong Shen, and Song-Chun Zhu. 2020. Emergence of pragmatics from referential game between theory of mind agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.07752*.
- Amir Zadeh, Michael Chan, Paul Pu Liang, Edmund Tong, and Louis-Philippe Morency. 2019. Socialiq: A question answering benchmark for artificial social intelligence. In 2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), pages 8799–8809.
- Rowan Zellers, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. 2019. From recognition to cognition: Visual commonsense reasoning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 6720–6731.
- Rowan Zellers, Ximing Lu, Jack Hessel, Youngjae Yu, Jae Sung Park, Jize Cao, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. 2021. Merlot: Multimodal neural script knowledge models. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 34:23634–23651.
- Andy Zeng, Adrian Wong, Stefan Welker, Krzysztof Choromanski, Federico Tombari, Aveek Purohit, Michael Ryoo, Vikas Sindhwani, Johnny Lee, Vincent Vanhoucke, et al. 2022. Socratic models: Composing zero-shot multimodal reasoning with language. arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.00598.

- Zhuosheng Zhang, Aston Zhang, Mu Li, Hai Zhao, George Karypis, and Alex Smola. 2023. Multimodal chain-of-thought reasoning in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.00923*.
- Wanjun Zhong, Ruixiang Cui, Yiduo Guo, Yaobo Liang, Shuai Lu, Yanlin Wang, Amin Saied, Weizhu Chen, and Nan Duan. 2023. Agieval: A human-centric benchmark for evaluating foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06364*.
- Denny Zhou, Nathanael Schärli, Le Hou, Jason Wei, Nathan Scales, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Olivier Bousquet, Quoc Le, and Ed Chi. 2022. Least-to-most prompting enables complex reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10625*.
- Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Kilichbek Haydarov, Xiaoqian Shen, Wenxuan Zhang, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. 2023a. Chatgpt asks, blip-2 answers: Automatic questioning towards enriched visual descriptions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.06594*.
- Yaochen Zhu, Xiangqing Shen, and Rui Xia. 2023b. Personality-aware human-centric multimodal reasoning: A new task. arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.02313.

## **A** Annotator Training

We initiated a pilot annotation session to test our preliminary annotation pipeline for further refinement. Applicants for annotation are first asked to watch the instruction video <sup>10</sup> and complete a pre-annotation quiz to show their understanding of tasks. The author team manually check applicants' responses to filter and admit them as participants. We show one example quiz question as follows.



General Qn: Select the important elements to focus on for each sample. \*

<sup>10</sup>https://vlcsr.comp.nus.edu.sg/static/video/ VL\_event\_causality\_annotation\_instruction.mp4

## **B** Annotation Interface

We provide a publicly available website <sup>11</sup> to demonstrate the example annotations on an instance in round two. Below is one example of the detailed annotation questions.

Character: Charlotte	
Q1: Please choose the n	nost likely age category of Charlotte.
Infant or Child (<12) Middle/Old-Age (>50)	Child, Teenager or Youth (10~25) Youth or Middle-Age (25~55) N.A.
22: Please identify the	occupation (if applicable) or the role (otherwise) of Charlotte in the clip.
e.g. 1) occupation: doctor,	officer; 2) role: driver, the girl who sits besides the driver
23 : Please select al Anger      Boredom Fear      Interest      Others      O	II the emotion(s) of <u>charlotte</u> within the duration of the clip. © Camness © Disgust © Doubt © Entrancement © Joy © Sadness © Shame © Surprise © Sympathy ©
M I Dianco col+-	
vhich can cover <u>the ch</u> harlotte within the cli	4 different frames in the order of timestamps (in MP : S5.5S5 format), aracter development (i.e., the changes of emotional or motional states) of p duration.           core from owner timestamp         resume from here
er ب : Please select 2- which can cover <u>the ch</u> harlotte within the cli frame 1: MM : SS.SSS frame 2: MM : SS.SSS	different frames in the order of timestamps (in 191: 55.555 format), aracter development (i.e., the changes of emotional or motional states) of duration.     copy from current timestamp resume from here     resume from here
<pre>view : Prease select 2- which can cover the chi- tharlotte within the cli frame 1: MM : SSSSS frame 2: MM : SSSSS</pre>	defiferent frames in the order of timestamps (in 1915 SS.SSS format),     anatter development (i.e., the changes of emotional or motional states) o     p duration.     copy from current timestamp     resume from here     copy from current timestamp     resume from here
Ar C i Prease select 2 harlotte within the cli frame 1: MM : 55555 frame 2: MM : 55555 24-Check :: : Below is iontain the (recognizal rames to be loaded.)	different frames in the order of timestamps (in 191; 55,555 format),     aracter development (i.e., the changes of emotional or motional states) o     p duration.     togy from current timestamp     resume from here     copy from current timestamp     resume from here     ste frame(s) you've selected in Q4, please check all the frame(s) which     le) character charlotte. (You may need to wait for a few seconds for the
er — : Prease select 2: har lotte within the cli frame 1: MM : SSSS frame 2: MM : SSSS 0 MM : SSSSS 44-Check (>: Below is ontain the (recognizat rames to be loaded.)	different frames in the order of timestamps (in 1915 SS.SSS format),     aratter development (i.e., the changes of emotional or motional states) o     p duration.     copy from current timestamp     resure from here     copy from current timestamp     resure from here     copy from current timestamp     resure from here     the frame(s) you've selected in (P4, please chard, all the frame(s) which     ple) character charlotte. (You may need to wait for a few seconds for the
(r	different frames in the order of timestamps (in MY 155.555 format),     aratter development (i.e., the changes of emotional or motional states) o     p duration.     cays from current timestamp i resume from here     copy from current timestamp i resume from here     copy from current timestamp i resume from here     the frame(s) you've selected in (04, please check all the frame(s) which     sle) character charlotte. (You may need to wait for a few seconds for the     above annotations, please answer the reasoning question. Please also     swer starts with the text span in front of the input bar.
et al. interase select 2: the constraints of the constraint in the recognization on the loaded.) 25 : Based on your make sure that your an effect 2: What is point of the constraints of the constraint	different frames in the order of timestamps (in 191; 55,555 format),     aratter development (i.e., the changes of emotional or motional states) o     p duration.     copy from current timestamp     resure from here     copy from current timestamp     resure from here     the frame(s) you're selected in (24, please check all the frame(s) which     ple) character charlotte. (You may need to wait for a few seconds for the     above annotations, please answer the reasoning question. Please also     save starts with the text span in front of the input bar.     obably caused/enabled by the event that LISA turns the car and     trecongize where they are?

## **C** Emotion Categorization

We adapt the 27 emotions (Cowen and Keltner, 2017) to crime plots into 13 emotions:

• **Anger**: wrath, outrage, fury, violence, irritability, hostility, resentment;

• **Boredom**: blahs, doldrums, ennui, weariness, listlessness, restlessness;

• **Calmness**: blahs, doldrums, ennui, weariness, listlessness, restlessness;

• **Disgust**: contempt, scorn, disdain, aversion, distaste, revulsion;

• **Doubt**: uncertainty, confusion, distrust;

• **Entrancement**: brooding, reverie, contemplation, daydreaming, cogitation, detachment;

- Fear: anxiety, dread, fright, panic, nervousness;
- **Interest**: trust, kindness, affection, devotion, acceptance, love, anticipation, friendliness;
- **Joy**: enjoyment, bliss, happiness, relief, delight, pride, thrill, ecstasy;

• **Sadness**: grief, sorrow, gloom, despair, melancholy, loneliness, depression;

- Shame: regret, guilt, embarrassment, remorse;
- Surprise: astound, shock, astonishment, wonder;
- Sympathy: commiseration, compassion, feeling.

<sup>11</sup>https://yuxixie.github.io/\_pages/CSI\_example. html