

Visual Contexts Clarify Ambiguous Expressions: A Benchmark Dataset

Heejeong Nam[†]
Yonsei University

hatbi2000@yonsei.ac.kr

Jinwoo Ahn[†]
UC Berkeley

andrewahn@berkeley.edu

Abstract


The ability to perform complex reasoning across multimodal inputs is essential for models to effectively interact with humans in real-world scenarios. Advancements in vision-language models have significantly improved performance on tasks that require processing explicit and direct textual inputs, such as Visual Question Answering (VQA) and Visual Grounding (VG). However, less attention has been given to improving the model capabilities to comprehend nuanced and ambiguous forms of communication. This presents a critical challenge, as human language in real-world interactions often convey hidden intentions that rely on context for accurate interpretation. To address this gap, we propose VAGUE, a multimodal benchmark comprising 3.9K indirect human utterances paired with corresponding scenes. Additionally, we contribute a model-based pipeline for generating prompt-solution pairs from input images. Our work aims to delve deeper into the ability of models to understand indirect communication and seek to contribute to the development of models capable of more refined and human-like interactions. Extensive evaluation on multiple VLMs reveals that mainstream models still struggle with indirect communication when required to perform complex linguistic and visual reasoning. We release our code and data at <https://github.com/Hazel-Heejeong-Nam/VAGUE.git>.

1. Introduction

A core motivation behind Artificial Intelligence is to develop systems that assist and, in the long term, emulate human behavior. Recent advancements in vision-language models (VLMs) like GPT [35], Gemini [12, 13], LLaVA [29, 30], and others have increasingly aimed at closing the gap between model capabilities and human skills. While these models have successfully expanded from handling single to multiple modalities and shown promising performances across complex tasks like Visual Question Answering (VQA) and Visual Grounding (VG), a significant divide still remains.

[†] Authors contributed equally to this work.

Q. Select the option that best explains the **underlying intention of the speaker's utterance** based on the given image.



Hey person3, it's nice to see some things are more interesting than my cooking tonight.

a) The speaker wants person3 to adjust the holographic display's brightness to see the meal better.

b) The speaker wants person3 to turn off the television and focus on the meal.

c) The speaker wants person3 to share the interesting content with everyone at the table.

✓ d) The speaker wants person3 to put down the smartphone and focus on the meal.

Figure 1. **Task Preview.** The speaker expresses dissatisfaction with the behavior of person3. While the text does not explicitly state the issue, the scene shows person3 focused on his phone rather than the meal in front of him. From this context, an ideal interpretation from the model would be to have person3 to put down his phone.

One of the critical differences lies in understanding and interpreting ambiguity, a fundamental aspect of human communication. Most studies fail to take this concept into account, as requests made to models today are generally simple and direct. Consider a model that analyzes an interaction like the one depicted in Figure 1. With the underlying intention not directly stated, the models are required to interpret the implicit text and infer from visual context to accurately disambiguate the intent. Tasks like this are intuitively straightforward for humans but remain challenging for models trained primarily on explicit commands. This gap highlights the importance of models being capable of handling nuanced,




Figure 2. **Task Difficulty Comparison.** We compare the difficulty of our task against various existing benchmarks on text ambiguity and image complexity. Our benchmark is uniquely crafted to challenge models in both modalities, ensuring that text demands nuanced interpretation and the scenes are also visually intricate.

indirect communication, enabling them to act more naturally and intuitively in real world situations.

Consistent efforts have been made to equip models with the ability to interpret subtle, indirect cues in human communication. In particular, certain works present novel benchmarks targeted towards evaluating model capabilities in understanding indirect text [28, 41, 44]. Research efforts have also been made to develop language models that effectively comprehend metaphorical and sarcastic inputs [4, 21, 42]. For example, FLUTE [4] and SBU [21] both leverage their custom datasets to finetune various T5 models to enhance the model performances in figurative language understanding tasks. However, these works are restricted to a single modality, limiting their ability to interpret ambiguous texts due to a lack of contextual information naturally accessible to humans through other modalities. More recent works expand to incorporate other modalities like vision and audio [11, 18, 19] yet fail to achieve a comparable depth in visual or auditory representations.

To this end, we introduce **VAGUE: Visual Contexts Clarify ambiGUous Expressions**, a benchmark designed to contribute to advancing model capabilities for disambiguating complex textual inputs within multimodal contexts. VAGUE consists of over 3.9K ambiguous text utterances paired with visual scenes across diverse real-world scenarios, specifically targeting the interpretation of indirect utter-

ances in human interactions. Each input problem requires the models to decipher the underlying intention behind the ambiguous text utterances by leveraging the contextual and relational information provided in the visual scene. Our work differs from existing works, as summarized in Fig. 2, by not only preserving a similar level of textual ambiguity as methods that operate within a single modality [4, 11, 18, 28] but also by incorporating intricate visual scenes that encompass rich contextual and relational information.

This distinction broadens the range of ambiguities that we can address. As opposed to how language can become open to multiple interpretations if overly ambiguous, our work restricts this issue of misinterpretation by providing visually detailed scenes. We include reference solutions in both multiple-choice and free-response formats and evaluate models of various sizes on our benchmark task. Each counterfactual option in the multiple-choice format, discussed further in Section 4, is carefully crafted to address factors that lead models to make incorrect selections, allowing further analysis on the reasoning behind each choice.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We curate VAGUE, a novel benchmark to evaluate the capabilities to disambiguate the underlying intention from indirect text utterances in multimodal contexts.
- We propose a data generation pipeline for the direct and indirect utterances along with the corresponding solutions and the incorrect choices for the multiple-choice test.
- We evaluate a total of eight multimodal models on the proposed benchmark in two different response formats and perform ablations using six different task prompts.

2. Related Works

2.1. Visual Grounding

Recent advancements in vision-language models (VLMs) have demonstrated significant improvements in aligning visual and textual information, enhancing their abilities to reason across multiple modalities. Central to this progress has been the enhanced capability to perform visual grounding (VG) tasks, which aims to locate objects within an image that are most relevant to natural language queries. At large, VG has been explored through two main methodologies: one-stage approaches [8, 14, 32] that perform grounding in a single pass and two-stage approaches [2, 14, 27] that first generate region proposals, then use the textual inputs to ground these locations. More recent works aim to align visual regions with more ambiguous descriptions of objects, which naturally exist in human interactions. For example, the tasks might involve instructing a robot to pick up “something to eat” without specifying the exact target. Earlier research approached such ambiguity through multiple rounds of user interactions to clarify unclear parts of the task prompt. In contrast, recent methods focus on word disambiguation

[17, 20, 25, 33], aiming to align ambiguous text with information from other modalities. Our proposed task goes a step beyond conventional VG tasks in that it requires interpreting the underlying intention behind longer and more ambiguous text queries rather than simply stopping at aligning information between the two modalities.

2.2. Intention Disambiguation Within Text

Ambiguity is an intrinsic feature of text, naturally arising from a wide range of possible interpretations. Therefore, some works concentrate on disambiguating indirect and figurative language. A common approach to resolving textual ambiguity is to request clarifications from users [10, 48]. Alternatively, other works leverage classification techniques for text disambiguation, where models categorize ambiguous inputs into predefined intents or meanings [31, 34, 43]. This approach often involves training models, such as BERT [9], to have models learn the nuance behind indirect texts yet suffer to generalize on unseen text disambiguation tasks.

With the advent of large language models (LLMs), sentence disambiguation has increasingly shifted towards utilizing models with enhanced fluency and comprehensive text understanding capabilities. Despite this promising direction, training-based methods even on these large models still struggle to generalize to out-of-distribution instances, raising concerns about their applicability in real-world scenarios, especially given the wide range of possible interpretations. Most studies today, therefore, make simply rely on pre-trained LLMs built on massive datasets for interpreting ambiguous text. For example, a recent study [45] evaluates off-the-shelf models, ranging from 7B to 70B parameters, on the Metaphor and Sarcasm Scenario Test (MSST) [1] consisting of 10 questions that assess nuanced communication abilities. These developments highlight the potential of LLMs to advance text disambiguation, yet underscore the need for new approaches that can handle a wider range of scenarios with greater robustness.

2.3. Intention Disambiguation Beyond Text

The ambiguity of text alone is inherently constrained, as short, standalone text fragments are prone to multiple interpretations. To address this issue, some approaches extend from single to multiple modalities to better tackle the challenge of interpreting indirect text. A prime example is multimodal sarcasm understanding (MSU) [11, 18, 19, 36], also referred to as sarcasm explanation in dialogue (SED) [18], which focuses on detecting and explaining sarcasm within movie dialogues. Figurative language, such as sarcasm, is particularly challenging to detect and understand through dialogue alone due to its brevity and lack of context, making it essential for models to extract additional cues, such as speaker emotion or tone, to aid in deciphering its meaning. However, combining information from multiple

modalities can be a complex task. While researchers have developed attention mechanisms and information fusion methods [11, 18, 19, 36] to effectively integrate video, audio, and text into a shared representation space, such training-based approaches face challenges, including the need to curate large-scale datasets. Avoiding such approaches has constrained research to rely on smaller transformer-based models like BERT [9], BART [22], and CLIP [39], which in turn exacerbates the issue of limited generalizability.

Recent works have shifted focus from interpreting textual intent to visual intent [15, 24, 38, 46], primarily centered around the Intentionomy dataset [15]. The ambiguity in these works arises from the visual domain. Some approaches address ambiguous scenes by pairing them with textual hints, such as hashtags commonly found on social media platforms, to help resolve uncertainties in the visual scene, while others employ localization methods to uncover visual intent by leveraging contextual information from the images [15, 38, 46]. In contrast to these approaches, our benchmark presents a more complex ambiguity interpretation task by centering ambiguity in the text domain while incorporating visual scenes that are themselves nuanced and non-trivial as complementary aids.

3. Multimodal Intention Disambiguation

In this section, we outline the structure and rationale behind the format of our primary task, which we term multimodal intention disambiguation. Then, we further define and specify the necessary components that form the basis of the task.

3.1. Task Format

Each multimodal intention disambiguation problem involves an input image I and a text prompt p , which represents a complaint expressed by an imagined observer of the scene. The goal of the task is to interpret the underlying intention T behind the complaint by leveraging the contextual information from the depicted scene. Despite the simplicity of the intentions behind the complaints, exploring all variations of valid interpretations T_n is a labor-intensive and time-consuming task, requiring the need to account for all nuanced ways intentions can be expressed. For example, in Figure 3, T_1 = “the speaker wants person3 to focus on the dining experience” is a valid interpretation. However, an interpretation like T_2 = “The speaker wants person3 to turn off his phone” could also be valid, as it conveys a similar overall intention of wanting person3 to focus on the meal. In practice, we do not have the capacity to consider all variations of T_n . Therefore, we structure the task as a multiple-choice test comprising of four distinct options.

Let C be the set of all multiple choice options c_n . With the new structure, the task transforms into identifying the *most valid* interpretation of the input prompt p from a pre-defined set of options, conditioned on the input image I ,




Figure 3. **Task Overview** of multimodal intention disambiguation with comprehensive counterfactual choices.

which provides the necessary contextual information. This approach mitigates the issue of multiple valid interpretations by designing the options to be incorrect for various reasons, challenging models in both linguistic and visual reasoning perspectives. Formally, we define T as follows:

$$T(I, p) := \operatorname{argmax}_{c_n \in C} \Pr(c_n | I, p) \quad (1)$$

While our primary focus is on evaluating model performance using the multiple-choice format, we also assess their ability to generate answers in a free-response format. To evaluate these responses, we use BLEU [37] and BERT-F1 [49] scores. These metrics, however, primarily focus on surface-level similarity or contextual overlap and may not fully capture the nuanced reasoning required for the task. As a result, we treat these scores as reference points to provide additional insights into the performance rather than definitive measures.

3.2. Prompt Categories

By the design of our task, curating an effective input prompt p is crucial to ensure accurate interpretation. What makes a *good* prompt, though? Ideally, a *good* prompt must successfully hide its underlying intention, simply hinting towards the right direction like the example from Section 3.1. For example, “hey person3, focus on your meal” already reveals its intention, making the task less meaningful. We classify this difference into two categories, **direct** and **indirect**, and define them based on the criteria explained below.

3.2.1. Directness

The direct prompt is an utterance from the speaker that clearly conveys its intention without ambiguity. However, it is important that this intention aligns with the context of the scene. For example, a prompt p that says “hey person3, I want you to stop the fireworks” clearly reveals its intention of wanting a certain action in return of the statement yet fails to align with the scene from Figure 3, which shows no connection to fireworks. Therefore, a direct prompt must not only reveal its intention but also remain relevant to the image, which makes **relevance** one of the criteria that defines directness. In the context of our task, relevance is determined by whether a human can reasonably establish a connection between the prompt and the scene portrayed in the image. For example, a prompt may be completely irrelevant, meaning it has no discernible relationship to the visual scene, making it impossible to draw a meaningful connection. In contrast, a relevant prompt is one that is clearly tied to the visual context, with the connection between the text and the image being immediately apparent.

Relevance alone does not guarantee that a prompt is useful for our task. As outlined earlier in Section 3.1, the prompt p must specifically express a complaint highlighting discomfort with the current situation. This means that the prompt must be solvable, pointing to a problem that the listener can reasonably address. This introduces **solvability** as an additional criterion, requiring that the problem presented in the prompt be actionable and within capacity to address. We

say that a direct prompt is solvable if and only if there is one independent solution to the prompt. For example, during the prompt generation process, the model frequently outputted prompts with multiple requests like $p_1 = \text{“hey person2, put the gun down immediately and get behind the car for cover”}$. This prompt can be decomposed into two independent prompts: $p_{1a} = \text{“hey person2, put the gun down”}$ and $p_{1b} = \text{“hey person2, get behind the car for cover”}$. Such prompts are considered invalid in our standards because they allow for multiple distinct solutions, violating the requirement for a single actionable response. A solvable prompt must clearly define one specific problem that can be addressed independently, ensuring the listener is not left to choose between multiple potential actions. This ensures that the overall prompt still aligns with the criterion of having one actionable and cohesive solution.

Overall, the direct prompt is carefully curated by considering relevance and solvability. This approach ensures that the prompt not only remains relevant to the context of the image but ensures to be solvable within the intended scope, providing a well-grounded foundation for the task at hand.

3.2.2. Indirectness

Unlike the direct prompt, indirect prompts must ideally hide its true intention. Nevertheless, they hold the same underlying intention, essentially complaining about the same topic and requesting the same solution. Since we use the direct prompt in generating the indirect prompt, **consistency** serves as one of the criteria for indirectness. We say that a direct prompt p_d and an indirect prompt p_i are consistent if the two interpretations could potentially have matching intentions. We make use of the term “potentially” because indirect prompts, by nature, could have multiple valid interpretations. For example, $p_i = \text{“hey person3, it’s nice to see some things are more interesting than my cooking tonight”}$ could be literally referring to other dishes that are more interesting than the speaker’s without additional information from the image. Yet, we say p_i is consistent with $p_d = \text{“hey person3, please put down the smartphone during dinner”}$ because one of the potential interpretations of p_i aligns with the underlying intention of requesting person3 to focus on the meal.

A prompt that is consistent with the direct prompt with no other specifications has no meaningful difference from the direct prompt. As previously discussed in Section 3.2.1, it is essential for an indirect prompt to obscure its underlying intention, which we define as the **ambiguity** of the prompt. The high level idea behind this criterion is that neither the action intended to address the complaint nor the specific entity involved in the process should be explicitly or implicitly mentioned within the prompt itself. Once these two critical elements are concealed, further refinements, such as adjusting the tone to make it more indirect or even subtly sarcastic, can be introduced to enhance the overall nuance and the difficulty of the prompt.

To conclude, the process of crafting the indirect prompt builds on consistency and ambiguity. This way, the indirect prompt retains alignment with the direct prompt’s underlying intention while introducing interpretative complexity, thereby achieving a robust and nuanced design for generating useful input prompts.

4. VAGUE Benchmark

4.1. Benchmark Summary

We present VAGUE, a novel benchmark designed to evaluate the ability of mainstream VLMs to perform human-like reasoning and comprehension in the presence of ambiguities across multiple modalities. VAGUE consists of 3,996 images sourced from the VCR [47] dataset. Unlike existing multimodal benchmarks that rely on limited contextual cues, such as emotion and tone [11, 18, 19, 36], the scenarios included in VAGUE reflect real-world complexities, requiring sophisticated reasoning for accurate responses. In other words, our benchmark emphasizes the concept of joint reasoning to ensure that both modalities contribute equally to the overall reasoning process. To facilitate this task, each instance in our dataset includes the indirect prompt, direct prompt, solution triplet, image caption, and four answer choices for the multiple-choice task. Aside from these primary components central to our task, we also provide supplementary information to facilitate the process, such as bounding boxes, which are described further in the Supplement.

4.2. Data Collection

Images. We use the VCR dataset [47] as our parent dataset, which contains 110K movie scenes from the Large Scale Movie Description Challenge [40] and YouTube clips. These images are filtered through its own “interestingness” criteria, which ensures there are more than two people present. Although the parent dataset provides high-quality scenes, we refrain from using all of them, as many adjacent frames exhibit minimal variations, resulting in nearly identical images. Instead, we sample 10K images, while ensuring that the sampling process avoids selecting neighboring frames.

Physical Objects. Our prompts, both direct and indirect, are crafted as instructions that request the recipient to perform specific manipulations on an object within the scene. Such formulation of the task prompt requires the scene to be visually complex, containing diverse interactions and various objects. To retain images with sufficient complexity only, we filter the sampled images by extracting the physical objects from the scenes. Although existing datasets often utilize COCO [26] object tags, they frequently fall short in capturing the full complexity of real-world scenes. Therefore, we process our images using the Recognize Anything Model (RAM) [50] to identify the physical objects present in




Figure 4. Overview of the data generation process: We propose a model-in-the-loop pipeline using LLMs and VLMs. “LLM” in the figure refers to GPT-4 [35] with text input, while “VLM” refers to its multimodal input version.




Figure 5. **Dataset statistics.** (a) and (b) show the word count distribution for direct and indirect prompts, respectively. (c) shows the distribution of people per image, while (d) depicts the distribution of physical objects per image.

each image. However, as RAM [50] often generates tags for instances that are not strictly physical objects, we manually curated a list of 2,403 physical objects from the full set of 4,585 items detectable by RAM [50]. Using this refined list, we processed the detected objects across the sampled 10K images from Section 4.2 and ranked them in ascending order based on the number of objects present. From this ranking, we selected the top 4K images as our final benchmark set, with an average of seven tags per image.

Person Indicators. In our benchmark, we assume the speaker is outside the scene and talks to a person inside the image. However, identifying the addressee is not always straightforward, since each image contains at least two peo-

ple. Although grounding the person specified by utterance can make our task even more complex, it is not a focal aspect of our evaluation. To relieve burden coming from ambiguous addressee, we used provided bounding boxes from VCR and assigned numbers to the center of each bounding box. After applying indicators, we got five people per image in average.

4.3. Data Generating Process

4.3.1. Direct Prompt, Caption, and Solution.

Although the direct prompt is not used in our task problem itself, it serves an important foundation for crafting the indirect prompt, as they hold the same underlying intention. We generate the direct prompt conditioned on the input image I and a task prompt T that includes the definition of relevance and solvability discussed in Section 3.2 to align the output with the definition of directness. While generating direct prompt, we simultaneously ask the model to output the solution triplet in the following format: (subject, action, object). Since direct prompts explicitly mention their intentions in the utterance itself, extracting each component from the solution triplet is straightforward. Importantly, the “object” from the solution triplet is restricted among extracted physical objects to meet the **solvability** discussed in Section 3.2.1.

4.3.2. Indirect Prompt

Previously, in Section 3.2, we explain that the direct and indirect prompts share the same underlying intention, which allows us to use the direct prompt as a basis for generating its indirect counterpart. The indirect prompt, however, involves complex requirements that must be met, often resulting in generated outputs that are not consistently satisfactory in the human perspective. To address this issue, our approach

leverages off-the-shelf VLMs to generate indirect prompts through a two-stage process: **proposal** and **verification**. In the initial step, the VLM is prompted to produce three distinct candidate options following the criteria explained in Section 3.2.2. We then prompt the model to identify the candidate that best obscures the direct prompt’s intention while avoiding explicit references to actions or functionalities inherently tied to the objects in the direct prompt.

In the subsequent process, we calculate the BERT F1-score [49] between the direct prompt and each of the three candidates. Based on these scores, the options are ranked on a scale from one to three, with three assigned to the candidate demonstrating the lowest BERT F1-score [49]. We then calculate the total score across all prompts to evaluate the alignment between the score ranks and model selection. The computation turns out to be that the average score per sample is 2.19 out of 3. This result demonstrates that the model consistently selects the options that diverge contextually from the direct prompt. This model-driven selection with verification ensures that the chosen prompt genuinely disguises the intention in a meaningful way.

4.3.3. Counterfactual Choices

While creating the correct choice can be easily derived from a direct prompts, generating high-quality counterfactual choices for multiple-choice questions is both important and challenging. To provide more realistic and plausible options for humans, and to trace the reasoning process from the model’s choice, we developed interpretable counterfactual choices. Before exploring each, we first identified the capabilities required for multimodal intent disambiguation as image inference and text understanding. For cases where one of these tasks is not performed well, we designed three plausible interpretations alongside the correct choice. To create each option, we used well-curated prompts with GPT-4o, which demonstrates state-of-the-art performance. Additionally, we restricted all answers to no more than 15 words to ensure they have similar lengths, all starting with “The speaker wants person N to.” Our counterfactual choices allow for detailed analysis of specific weaknesses when testing the multimodal intent disambiguation ability across various models and question types, as we have shown in Section 5.3.

Fake Scene Understanding. The first counterfactual choice is an interpretation that could arise when the model largely ignores the image. This process is conducted in two steps. In the first step, a fake caption is generated by assuming an imaginary scene. In the second step, the generated fake caption is combined with the speaker’s indirect statement to derive the most likely interpretation. However, if the fake scene imagined in the first step does not overlap at all with the actual image, the resulting choice might be too apart and easy. To address this, physical objects present in the actual image are provided as prior knowledge. Nonetheless,

if any entity provided as a prior is part of the solution triplet, the fake scene might end up being too similar to the real image. To balance between getting too similar or dissimilar, only two entities unrelated to the solution are selected as priors. Once a suitably distracting fake scene caption is generated, it is now able to be combined with the indirect prompt in the second step for generating a plausible interpretation.

Superficial Understanding. The subsequent choice corresponds to an interpretation generated when the model fails to reason about the implicit intent of the sentence and instead relies on surface-level understanding. We enforce the model to focus only on the literal wording, without considering any implied or deeper meaning of the indirect sentence. To enhance quality, three curated example cases carefully curated by humans were provided at the same time.

Nonexistent Entity. The last choice arises when the model interprets the text correctly but fails to adequately consider the details of the image, resulting in a plausible yet incorrect choice. This resembles the correct answer in structure or is a simple paraphrase of it but replaces the solution entity with one that does not exist in the image. To prevent the model from generating implausible or irrelevant entities, we constrain the substituted object to one that, while absent from the image, is highly expected to be present in the scene and could reasonably replace the solution entity. To identify such entities, the model is provided with the image as input to infer objects that align with the scene’s context. This method ensures that the counterfactual choice leverages the expected coherence between the scene and its potential entities while rigorously testing the model’s attention to visual details.

5. Experiments

5.1. Baseline models

We conducted experiments on our VAGUE dataset using various large multimodal models, including both open-source and private models of different sizes. Seven open-source models ranging from 7B to 25B parameters and one private model were evaluated extensively. The LLaVA NeXT [23] series includes a 7B model based on Mistral [16] and a 13B model based on Vicuna [7], featuring high-resolution image processing, improved OCR, and refined visual instruction tuning for commonsense reasoning. We also tested the LLaVA 1.5 [29] 13B model, fine-tuned on GPT-generated multimodal instruction-following data. The InternVL2 [6] models, designed for tasks like OCR (Optical Character Recognition), infographics QA, and multimodal scientific reasoning, were tested in two configurations: an 8B model combining InternViT with InternLM-Chat (7B) and a 25B model using InternViT with InternLM2-Chat (20B). The ShareGPT-4v [5] models (7B and 13B), trained on 1.2 million high-quality samples, leverage a CLIP-Large vision en-

Table 1. Results of multimodal intention disambiguation with off-the-shelf models. We report multiple-choice accuracy and the ratio of each incorrect answer selection over the valid count. Detailed results are provided in Table 2.

Model	Multiple Choice Question								Free Answer			
	Plain				Zeroshot CoT				Plain		Zeroshot CoT	
	Accuracy	Incorrect (%)			Accuracy	Incorrect (%)			BERT Score	BLEU (1-gram)	BERT Score	BLEU (1-gram)
FSU		SU	NE	FSU		SU	NE					
ShareGPT-4v (7B)	0.35	14.0%	39.1%	12.3%	0.33	17.9%	38.0%	10.8%	0.693	0.174	0.635	0.113
LLaVA Next (7B)	0.44	11.3%	37.4%	7.3%	0.37	14.1%	40.1%	8.9%	0.681	0.143	0.628	0.113
InternVL (8B)	0.39	12.8%	39.0%	9.3%	0.39	14.6%	36.9%	9.4%	0.664	0.130	0.644	0.127
LLaVA 1.5 (13B)	0.42	11.2%	37.1%	9.2%	0.39	14.9%	34.1%	11.6%	0.694	0.165	0.635	0.113
ShareGPT-4v (13B)	0.41	10.8%	36.9%	11.2%	0.39	13.5%	36.0%	11.5%	0.691	0.160	0.663	0.147
LLaVA Next (13B)	0.44	10.0%	36.9%	9.2%	0.4	13.8%	34.4%	11.4%	0.688	0.156	0.618	0.098
InternVL (25B)	0.52	11.2%	25.9%	11.1%	0.44	13.0%	31.8%	11.1%	0.663	0.138	0.508	0.050
Gemini 1.5 Pro	0.49	19.2%	22.8%	9.2%	0.51	18.1%	22.8%	7.8%	0.683	0.156	0.675	0.154

coder and a Vicuna v1.5-based LLM, achieving competitive performance despite their smaller size. Finally, we evaluated Gemini 1.5 Pro [13], which excels in visual reasoning, image captioning, and complex instruction-following by combining a high-resolution vision encoder with a robust language model. These models collectively provide a comprehensive benchmark for multimodal reasoning tasks.

5.2. Setup

Answer Types and Metrics We note in Section 3.1 that the evaluation are performed in two distinct formats: multiple-choice and free-response. The multiple-choice format consists of four candidate options, with three incorrect answers that are each designed to challenge the capabilities of model to reason either linguistically or visually, as outlined in Figure 3. Depending on the instruction type, which is explained in the next section, we parse final letter choice from the model to measure the accuracy as performance. On the other hand, we require the model to respond in “The speaker wants person N to...” format to ensure alignment of the recipient of the utterance and prompt the models to limit their response to within 15 words to avoid extremely lengthy responses. For evaluation, we calculate the BLEU score [37] and BERT F1-score [49] between the model response and the solution. We exclude the segment stating “The speaker wants person N to...” to ensure that the scores are not artificially inflated due to inevitable overlaps from the design of the initial request.

Instruction types In addition to the basic setting, we conducted tests across various instruction configurations. Recognizing the promising results demonstrated by chain-of-thought (CoT) and in-context learning (ICL) [3] strategies, we incorporated these prompting techniques to evaluate whether they could enhance the model’s performance. Ultimately, we designed six types of instructions: plain, zeroshot CoT, caption, caption with ICL, and caption with manual

CoT. Each instruction type is tested in both the multiple-choice question (MCQ) setting and the free-form answer.

- **Plain:** The model is provided with an image and indirect utterance and selects the most likely intention.
- **Zeroshot CoT:** The model is prompted to explicitly reason step-by-step before answering, using the instruction “Let’s think step by step...”.
- **Text-Only:** The model is presented with indirect utterance without any contextual information about the visual scene.
- **Caption:** Captions replace images from the plain setting.
- **Caption + ICL:** Examples are provided alongside captions to enable few-shot learning.
- **Caption + Manual CoT:** Carefully crafted reasoning processes for each example are provided alongside captions, explicitly guiding the model’s reasoning steps.

5.3. Multimodal Reasoning

Our primary focus was on joint reasoning for ambiguous text in combination with image modalities, which led us to conduct main experiments on eight models using the plain and zero-shot chain-of-thought (CoT) instructions.

Plain. Fig 7 presents the results of the multiple-choice question (MCQ) analysis, illustrating the frequency with which models selected each option. Generally, the most frequent incorrect choice was the counterfactual option driven by surface-level understanding, while the fake scene option resulted in slightly higher error rates compared to the non-existent entity option. The model’s difficulty in surface understanding suggests that while current vision-language models (VLMs) have made advancements in joint reasoning and handling task complexity, they struggle to interpret ambiguous text effectively, highlighting limitations in performing deep, human-like reasoning. As shown in Table 1, the best accuracy in the plain setting was achieved by InternVL 25B, which notably reduced the tendency to rely on




Figure 6. Results comparing six models across all instruction types. (a) shows multiple-choice accuracy, and (b) presents the BERT F1-Score between free-form answers and reference answers.




Figure 7. Count of each choice selected in multimodal cases for a multiple-choice question. The total count is 3,993. The error denotes that no answer was selected from the given choices.

surface understanding. Gemini 1.5 Pro demonstrated similarly strong performance but showed a higher tendency to select the fake scene option, indicating that it might not fully leverage image information during reasoning. When com-

paring models with similar parameter counts, ShareGPT-4v demonstrated slightly lower accuracy, whereas LLaVA-Next outperformed its peers. These findings underscore the varying degrees to which different models handle ambiguous text and image integration, providing insights into the strengths and limitations of current VLMs in reasoning tasks.

Zeroshot Chain-of-Thought. This instruction requires model to perform reasoning before answering, yet it did not yield the positive results. As shown in Fig.7 (b), there were many instances of errors during MCQ, where the model either failed to select a single correct answer or responded that the answer was unknown. This appears to stem from the difficulty language models face in generating lengthy responses following complex instructions. Even when the model successfully responded, its performance was slightly worse compared to the plain setting. The only exception was Gemini 1.5, which not only outperformed other models in the zero-shot CoT setting but also achieved a higher accuracy than in the plain setting. Overall, zero-shot CoT performance showed a linear relationship between the model’s parameter size and accuracy. In free-answer generation experiments evaluated with BERT F1-Score and BLEU 1-gram, similarity to the correct answer was lower than in the plain setting, with relatively small variance across models.

5.4. Ablation Study

Other than the plain and zero-shot CoT settings, the remaining settings are text-only, so they cannot be considered re-




Figure 8. Three images from the COCO [26] dataset which were used assessing OCR capability. We asked about the t-shirt color of person 1 in (a) and (b), and person 5 in (c). The correct answer, "red," was identified correctly by all selected models during testing.

sults of multimodal reasoning. However, several interesting observations were made. We conducted ablation experiments on six models, excluding the two InternVL series. The most notable finding was that the caption with in-context learning (ICL) setting consistently outperformed others in both MCQ and free-answer formats. This improvement is likely due to two factors: (1) captions being better integrated into the model compared to images, and (2) ICL effectively guiding the task. The significant performance boost compared to the caption-only setting, which lacks ICL, highlights the advantages of few-shot learning even in the disambiguation task. The caption with manual CoT prompting simply added reasoning on top of the caption with ICL. However, the ShareGPT-4v models showed a significant drop in MCQ accuracy under this setting, while other models performed comparably. The text-only setting, without any scene context provided through images or captions, was essentially unsolvable, resulting in very poor MCQ performance. From a model perspective, Gemini 1.5 consistently outperformed others across most tasks by a large margin, while LLaVA Next and LLaVA 1.5 13B demonstrated strong instruction robustness and followed closely behind.

5.5. OCR capabilities

In Section 4.2, we incorporate person indicators into images to distinguish individuals when interpreting prompts in various contexts. While this provides a straightforward method for grounding the target person, it requires models to perform basic Optical Character Recognition (OCR) to interpret phrases such as "Hey person3." To evaluate this capability, we selected three images from the COCO [26] dataset, each containing a different number of people. Fig. 8 presents these images, featuring two, five, and ten individuals wearing t-shirts in various colors. By asking the models to identify the t-shirt color of specific individuals, we concluded that the selected models consistently performed perfectly in recognizing person indicators.

6. Limitation

While crafting the VAGUE benchmark and evaluating it on various models, we encountered several limitations. The first

limitation was the inability to use results from GPT-4o [35]: Over half of the questions resulted in a "cannot answer" response. Although modifying the instruction yielded more comprehensive results, applying customized prompts to a specific model was deemed unfair, and thus, these results were excluded. Another limitation was the inability to experiment with the few-shot learning approach in a multimodal setting, limiting the scope of experimentation. While few-shot learning with captions yielded the best performance among the six instruction prompts, we were not able to provide results of few-shot learning with images due to the default setting of models allowing only a single image per execution. The data generation process also presented challenges, as it depended on the quality of the parent dataset and the performance of the models during prompt generation. Occasionally, the bounding boxes of people in the VCR [47] dataset were duplicated, leading to a higher reported number of people than actually present. Yet, we investigated that this issue generally did not affect the integrity of our task. Furthermore, the tagging model [50] sometimes misidentified objects, adding incorrect entities to the list. These issues could introduce potential instability to evaluations. Lastly, due to limited computational resources, we were unable to experiment with larger open-source models.

7. Conclusion

Our research introduces a novel benchmark **VAGUE: Visual Contexts ClArify ambiGUous Expressions**, designed to advance the capabilities of models to comprehend nuanced, indirect communication in complex multimodal contexts. By addressing the challenges of interpreting hidden intentions in human interactions, our benchmark expands the scope of reasoning beyond explicit textual inputs, setting a new standard for evaluating indirect and context-dependent understanding. The model-based pipeline offers scalability and efficiency in generating prompt-solution pairs, enabling more robust analysis of model performance. Extensive evaluations highlight the limitations of current vision-language models in handling ambiguous communication, emphasizing the need for further advancements. Our work opens up promising avenues for research in developing systems capable of deeper reasoning and more natural, human-like interactions.

Table 2. Full results

Model	Instruction Type	Multiple Choice Question					Free Response			
		Accuracy	Incorrect count			Valid Count	Bert Score	BLEU (1-gram)	BLEU (2-gram)	Valid Count
			FSU	SU	NE					
ShareGPT (7B)	Plain	0.35	560	1560	493	3993	0.693	0.174	0.041	3991
	Zeroshot CoT	0.33	538	1140	325	3000	0.635	0.113	0.011	3989
	Text Only	0.18	936	1675	655	3993	0.671	0.149	0.025	3991
	Caption	0.42	432	1542	355	3993	0.688	0.179	0.051	3991
	Caption (ICL)	0.53	309	949	617	3993	0.743	0.260	0.119	3991
	Caption (CoT)	0.25	965	1018	993	3993	0.733	0.232	0.104	3991
LLava NeXT Mistral (7B)	Plain	0.44	452	1493	293	3993	0.681	0.143	0.029	3991
	Zeroshot CoT	0.37	562	1601	355	3990	0.628	0.113	0.013	3991
	Text Only	0.21	1000	1609	554	3993	0.668	0.127	0.023	3991
	Caption	0.49	379	1483	193	3993	0.693	0.172	0.045	3991
	Caption (ICL)	0.50	340	1302	335	3993	0.745	0.244	0.117	3991
	Caption (CoT)	0.46	512	1275	352	3993	0.703	0.199	0.066	3991
LLaVA 1.5 Vicuna (13B)	Plain	0.42	447	1483	367	3993	0.694	0.165	0.038	3991
	Zeroshot CoT	0.39	587	1340	458	3932	0.635	0.113	0.011	3991
	Text Only	0.23	947	1576	563	3993	0.679	0.146	0.028	3991
	Caption	0.49	376	1450	215	3993	0.698	0.185	0.054	3991
	Caption (ICL)	0.57	331	1085	284	3993	0.738	0.235	0.103	3991
	Caption (CoT)	0.57	364	1010	341	3993	0.712	0.206	0.072	3991
ShareGPT-4v (13B)	Plain	0.41	432	1473	449	3993	0.691	0.160	0.035	3991
	Zeroshot CoT	0.39	460	1230	394	3412	0.663	0.147	0.024	3956
	Text Only	0.21	922	1610	633	3993	0.681	0.143	0.027	3991
	Caption	0.46	386	1474	287	3993	0.701	0.180	0.054	3991
	Caption (ICL)	0.49	396	1287	356	3993	0.732	0.192	0.086	3991
	Caption (CoT)	0.30	866	1055	890	3993	0.721	0.210	0.081	3991
LLaVA NeXT Vicuna (13B)	Plain	0.44	398	1474	366	3993	0.688	0.156	0.034	3991
	Zeroshot CoT	0.40	510	1269	419	3686	0.618	0.098	0.008	3985
	Text Only	0.22	889	1670	556	3993	0.677	0.144	0.026	3991
	Caption	0.51	336	1403	198	3993	0.698	0.188	0.055	3991
	Caption (ICL)	0.58	303	1097	282	3993	0.737	0.227	0.102	3991
	Caption (CoT)	0.57	334	1066	299	3989	0.720	0.224	0.085	3991
Gemini 1.5 Pro	Plain	0.49	766	906	365	3980	0.683	0.156	0.035	3991
	Zeroshot CoT	0.51	710	897	306	3927	0.675	0.154	0.029	3991
	Text Only	0.36	1046	796	1444	3982	0.673	0.132	0.023	3991
	Caption	0.36	1059	799	688	3988	0.695	0.162	0.052	3991
	Caption (ICL)	0.71	200	761	181	3991	0.731	0.185	0.086	3991
	Caption (CoT)	0.72	240	712	175	3984	0.724	0.224	0.090	3991
InternVL (8B)	Plain	0.39	511	1559	371	3993	0.664	0.130	0.020	3991
	Zeroshot CoT	0.39	563	1419	360	3845	0.644	0.127	0.016	3962
InternVL (25B)	Plain	0.52	448	1032	445	3992	0.663	0.138	0.020	3991
	Zeroshot CoT	0.44	379	925	322	2907	0.508	0.050	0.007	3991

References

- [1] Taeko Adachi, Shinichi Hirabayashi, Madoka Shiota, Shuhei Suzuki, Eiji Wakamiya, Shinji Kitayama, Masaki Kono, Yukinori Maeoka, and Tatsuya Koeda. [study of situational recognition of attention deficit/hyperactivity disorders, asperger’s disorder and high functioning autism with the metaphor and sarcasm scenario test (msst)]. *No to hattatsu. Brain and development*, 38:177–81, 2006.
- [2] Mohit Bajaj, Lanjun Wang, and Leonid Sigal. G3rphground: Graph-based language grounding. In *2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 4280–4289, 2019.
- [3] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020.
- [4] Tuhin Chakrabarty, Arkadiy Saakyan, Debanjan Ghosh, and Smaranda Muresan. FLUTE: Figurative language understanding through textual explanations. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7139–7159, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [5] Lin Chen, Jisong Li, Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Conghui He, Jiaqi Wang, Feng Zhao, and Dahua Lin. Sharegpt4v: Improving large multi-modal models with better captions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12793*, 2023.
- [6] Zhe Chen, Weiyun Wang, Hao Tian, Shenglong Ye, Zhangwei Gao, Erfei Cui, Wenwen Tong, Kongzhi Hu, Jiapeng Luo, Zheng Ma, et al. How far are we to gpt-4v? closing the gap to commercial multimodal models with open-source suites. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.16821*, 2024.
- [7] Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality, 2023.
- [8] Jiajun Deng, Zhengyuan Yang, Tianlang Chen, Wengang Zhou, and Houqiang Li. Transvg: End-to-end visual grounding with transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 1769–1779, 2021.
- [9] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [10] Kaustubh D. Dhole. Resolving intent ambiguities by retrieving discriminative clarifying questions. *arXiv:2008.07559*, 2008.
- [11] Hang Du, Guoshun Nan, Sicheng Zhang, Binzhu Xie, Junrui Xu, Hehe Fan, Qimei Cui, Xiaofeng Tao, and Xudong Jiang. Docmsu: A comprehensive benchmark for document-level multimodal sarcasm understanding. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 17933–17941, 2024.
- [12] Gemini Team. Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023.
- [13] Gemini Team. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05530*, 2024.
- [14] Binbin Huang, Dongze Lian, Weixin Luo, and Shenghua Gao. Look before you leap: Learning landmark features for one-stage visual grounding. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2021.
- [15] Menglin Jia, Zuxuan Wu, Austin Reiter, Claire Cardie, Serge Belongie, and Ser-Nam Lim. Intentionomy: a dataset and study towards human intent understanding. In *CVPR*, 2021.
- [16] Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, L  lio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth  e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. Mistral 7b, 2023.
- [17] Connie Jiang, Yiqing Xu, and David Hsu. Llms for robotic object disambiguation. *arXiv:2401.03388*, 2024.
- [18] Shivani Kumar, Atharva Kulkarni, Md Shad Akhtar, and Tanmoy Chakraborty. When did you become so smart, oh wise one?! sarcasm explanation in multi-modal multi-party dialogues. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5956–5968, Dublin, Ireland, 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [19] Shivani Kumar, Ishani Mondai, Md Shad Akhtar, and Tanmoy Chakraborty. Explaining (sarcastic) utterances to enhance affect understanding in multimodal dialogues. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Thirty-Fifth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence and Thirteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence*. AAAI Press, 2023.
- [20] Xin Lai, Zhuotao Tian, Yukang Chen, Yanwei Li, Yuhui Yuan, Shu Liu, and Jiaya Jia. Lisa: Reasoning segmentation via large language model. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 9579–9589, 2024.
- [21] Yash Kumar Lal and Mohaddeseh Bastan. SBU figures it out: Models explain figurative language. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Figurative Language Processing (FLP)*, pages 143–149, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates (Hybrid), 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [22] Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. BART: Denoising sequence-to-

- sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, Online, 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [23] Feng Li, Renrui Zhang, Hao Zhang, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Wei Li, Zejun Ma, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-next-interleave: Tackling multi-image, video, and 3d in large multimodal models, 2024.
- [24] Jiapeng Li, Ping Wei, Wenjuan Han, and Lifeng Fan. Intentqa: Context-aware video intent reasoning. In *2023 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 11929–11940, 2023.
- [25] Zhihao Li, Yishan Mu, Zhenglong Sun, Sifan Song, Jionglong Su, and Jiaming Zhang. Intention understanding in human–robot interaction based on visual-nlp semantics. *Frontiers in Neurobotics*, 14, 2021.
- [26] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C. Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *Computer Vision – ECCV 2014*, pages 740–755, Cham, 2014. Springer International Publishing.
- [27] Daqing Liu, Hanwang Zhang, Zheng-Jun Zha, and Wu Feng. Learning to assemble neural module tree networks for visual grounding. In *The IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2019.
- [28] Emmy Liu, Chenxuan Cui, Kenneth Zheng, and Graham Neubig. Testing the ability of language models to interpret figurative language. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 4437–4452, Seattle, United States, 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [29] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning, 2023.
- [30] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. In *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [31] Annie Louis, Dan Roth, and Filip Radlinski. “I’d rather just go to bed”: Understanding indirect answers. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 7411–7425, Online, 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [32] Gen Luo, Yiyi Zhou, Xiaoshuai Sun, Liujuan Cao, Chenglin Wu, Cheng Deng, and Rongrong Ji. Multi-task collaborative network for joint referring expression comprehension and segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2020.
- [33] Jinpeng Mi, Hongzhuo Liang, Nikolaos Katsakis, Song Tang, Qingdu Li, Changshui Zhang, and Jianwei Zhang. Intention-related natural language grounding via object affordance detection and intention semantic extraction. *Frontiers in Neurobotics*, 14, 2020.
- [34] Maryam Sadat Mirzaei, Kourosh Meshgi, and Satoshi Sekine. What is the real intention behind this question? dataset collection and intention classification. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 13606–13622, Toronto, Canada, 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [35] OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [36] Kun Ouyang, Liqiang Jing, Xuemeng Song, Meng Liu, Yupeng Hu, and Liqiang Nie. Sentiment-enhanced graph-based sarcasm explanation in dialogue. *arXiv:2402.11414*, 2024.
- [37] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 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, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA, 2002. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [38] Mang Ye Qu Yang and Dacheng Tao. Synergy of sight and semantics: Visual intention understanding with clip. In *ECCV*, 2024.
- [39] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021.
- [40] Anna Rohrbach, Atousa Torabi, Marcus Rohrbach, Niket Tandon, Chris Pal, Hugo Larochelle, Aaron Courville, and Bernt Schiele. Movie description. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 2017.
- [41] Settaluri Sravanthi, Meet Doshi, Pavan Tankala, Rudra Murthy, Raj Dabre, and Pushpak Bhattacharyya. PUB: A pragmatics understanding benchmark for assessing LLMs’ pragmatics capabilities. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 12075–12097, Bangkok, Thailand, 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [42] Chuandong Su, Fumiyo Fukumoto, Xiaoxi Huang, Jiyi Li, Rongbo Wang, and Zhiqun Chen. DeepMet: A reading comprehension paradigm for token-level metaphor detection. In *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Figurative Language Processing*, pages 30–39, Online, 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [43] Junya Takayama, Tomoyuki Kajiwara, and Yuki Arase. DIRECT: Direct and indirect responses in conversational text corpus. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 1980–1989, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [44] Hiromu Yakura. Evaluating large language models’ ability using a psychiatric screening tool based on metaphor and sarcasm scenarios. *arXiv:2309.10744*, 2023.
- [45] Hiromu Yakura. Evaluating large language models’ ability using a psychiatric screening tool based on metaphor and sarcasm scenarios. *Journal of Intelligence*, 12(7), 2024.
- [46] Mang Ye, Qinghongya Shi, Kehua Su, and Bo Du. Cross-modality pyramid alignment for visual intention understanding. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 32:2190–2201, 2023.
- [47] Rowan Zellers, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. From recognition to cognition: Visual commonsense reasoning. *2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 6713–6724, 2018.

- [48] Michael J. Q. Zhang and Eunsol Choi. Clarify when necessary: Resolving ambiguity through interaction with lms. *arXiv:2311.09469*, 2023.
- [49] Tianyi Zhang*, Varsha Kishore*, Felix Wu*, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [50] Youcai Zhang, Xinyu Huang, Jinyu Ma, Zhaoyang Li, Zhaochuan Luo, Yanchun Xie, Yuzhuo Qin, Tong Luo, Yaqian Li, Shilong Liu, Yandong Guo, and Lei Zhang. Recognize anything: A strong image tagging model. In *2024 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops (CVPRW)*, pages 1724–1732, 2024.