

---

# VELOCITI: Can Video-Language Models Bind Semantic Concepts through Time?

---

Darshana Saravanan<sup>\*1</sup> Darshan Singh S<sup>\*1</sup> Varun Gupta<sup>\*1</sup>  
 Zeeshan Khan<sup>2</sup> Vineet Gandhi<sup>1</sup> Makarand Tapaswi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> CVIT, IIT Hyderabad, India

<sup>2</sup> Inria Paris and Département d’informatique de l’ENS, CNRS, PSL Research University

<https://katha-ai.github.io/projects/velociti/>

\* equal contribution

## Abstract

*Compositionality* is a fundamental aspect of vision-language understanding and is especially required for videos since they contain multiple entities (*e.g.* persons, actions, and scenes) interacting dynamically over time. Existing benchmarks focus primarily on perception capabilities. However, they do not study *binding*, the ability of a model to associate entities through appropriate relationships. To this end, we propose VELOCITI, a new benchmark building on complex movie clips and dense semantic role label annotations to test perception and binding in video language models (contrastive and Video-LLMs). Our perception-based tests require discriminating video-caption pairs that share similar entities, and the binding tests require models to associate the correct entity to a given situation while ignoring the different yet plausible entities that also *appear in the same video*. While current state-of-the-art models perform moderately well on perception tests, accuracy is near random when both entities are present in the same video, indicating that they fail at binding tests. Even the powerful Gemini 1.5 Flash has a substantial gap (16-28%) with respect to human accuracy in such binding tests.

## 1 Introduction

Comprehensive video-language understanding requires seamless alignment between vision and language modalities. Although progress has been made in several benchmarks [15, 16, 3], current state-of-the-art models struggle to discriminate between similar videos/descriptions such as *A girl wearing a hat is holding a dress* and *A girl wearing a dress is holding a hat*, something trivial for humans. We hypothesize that this failure stems from the lack of compositionality in the model’s representation. While several works (*e.g.* Winoground [30], SugarCrepe [12], Cola [26]) have studied this for image-based models, this is a serious challenge for videos as they contain multiple persons, objects, and scenes that dynamically interact and change over *time*.

Compositionality involves identifying atomic entities like persons, actions, objects, and scenes and binding these entities with each other through the right relationships. Existing evaluation benchmarks mainly focus on the former along with common-sense reasoning. Typical questions from SEED-Bench [15] address high level semantics: *Where is the dog located in the living room?*, or *What is the material of the table?*. Typical examples from MVBench [16] include: *What is the pose performed by the person?*, or *What will the person do after reading a book?* Such questions can often be answered by analyzing action or object cues independently, without requiring understanding the underlying compositional spatio-temporal scene dynamics. Examples from a recent work, VideoCon [3], contrast: *A person riding a brown horse.* vs. *A person riding a green horse.* Such examples may not even require visual understanding, as green horses are unlikely.

We propose *VELOCITI* (Video et Language Compositionality through Time), a new benchmark to objectively test different levels of perception and evaluate the compositional ability of video language models (both contrastive and LLM-based) through the lens of semantic concept *binding* [9, 6, 14]. We adopt VidSitu [27], a video situation recognition dataset that consists of dense annotations with *semantic role labels* (SRLs). Sourced from movie clips, VidSitu videos present challenging scenarios with frequent shot changes, fast action sequences, multi-event complex situations, role switching between the agent (doer) and patient (receiver), and co-referencing of entities, all entangled through time. To parse these complex videos, dense SRL annotations capture multiple and changing aspects of the events in the video, including the *action*, *doer*, *receiver*, *instrument*, *scene*, and *manner* in a structured way [27]. We build on these rich annotations to create a challenging and high-quality benchmark test suite that requires binding the correct concepts beyond a single object or action.

VELOCITI has four test suites: (i) **Intra-Video Association Test**: Similar to Winoground [30], this tests a model’s ability to discriminate between two events that have similar individual concepts separated by a short time gap (see Fig. 2). (ii) **Subtle Perception Tests** evaluate whether a model can identify the correct description from a plausible/adversarial hard negative generated purely based on language. (iii) **Visual Binding Tests** require binding the correct entity to a given situation and ignoring the different but plausible entities that *also appear in the same video* (Fig. 1, **agent binding**, **action binding** tests). Additionally, unique to our videos with dense SRLs, we evaluate whether a model is able to solve **agent co-reference** (AgCoref) tests across time. Visual distractors add an often complex description that makes AgCoref challenging even for the best commercial models (e.g. Gemini). Finally, (iv) **Chronology Test** evaluates a model’s understanding of temporal order in similar-looking events within a video, shown to be poor [2]. To evaluate *both* modeling strategies – Video-LLMs (e.g. Video-LLaVA [17]) and contrastive vision-language encoders (e.g. CLIP [23]) – our tests require distinguishing between the correct/incorrect pair of videos and descriptions.

In summary: (i) We propose to use rich video annotations in the form of *semantic role labels* (SRLs) together with visually complex movie clips to create VELOCITI, a manually verified and rigorous benchmark for video and language understanding. (ii) We introduce *binding* tests that prevent models from relying on a single point of difference and require them to associate different entities in the video and description. By implicitly requiring models to localize descriptions in time, we also gauge their ability to suppress distractors. (iii) We demonstrate that contrastive models and Video-LLMs struggle with performance close to or slightly above random, especially on binding tests. Powerful commercial models like Gemini 1.5 Flash [5], while significantly better, are also found to be lacking as compared to humans, who have innate expertise at such tests, with accuracy above 90%.

## 2 Related Work

**Visio-linguistic compositional understanding.** Recently, there has been a surge of benchmarks to evaluate the compositional understanding of vision-language models (VLMs) [30, 41, 20, 39, 12, 26]. These benchmarks typically evaluate models on the *image-to-text retrieval* task. Winoground [30] uses two similar images and captions containing an identical set of words, differing only in order, to probe visio-linguistic compositionality. ARO [39] evaluates different relationships, attributes, and order types. SugarCrepe [12] exposes biases in the previous benchmarks [20, 39] and then constructs negative captions using LLMs and with an adversarial refinement process. Differently, Cola [26] is an *text-to-image* retrieval benchmark focusing specifically on object-attribute compositionality. VLMs often struggle with such benchmarks, and [14] presents a systematic study of concept binding failures in CLIP through compositional distributional semantics models.

However, compositional understanding for videos is relatively under-explored. AGQA [10] tackles compositional spatio-temporal reasoning in videos. STAR [35] focuses on situated reasoning using multiple-choice questions (MCQs), with one option being a compositional distractor. However, both AGQA and STAR adopt simple videos from the Charades [28] dataset that contains indoor scenes with household actions, a single person, and no shot changes. Recently, several works [3, 21, 2] have explored the idea of contrast captions as distractors. Beyond such tests, we also study *visual binding* by creating negative captions containing entities *from the same video* instead of arbitrary replacements by entities that do not occur in the video. This requires models to associate the correct agents with their respective actions, action modifiers, and attributes *through time*.




Figure 1: The VELOCITI benchmark features complex movie videos with rich semantic role label (SRL) annotations from the VidSitu dataset [27] based on which we create multiple benchmark tests. These require models to perform fine-grained and compositional reasoning with semantic concept binding across agents, actions, and time. We refer to this figure for examples throughout the paper. Beyond the 7 tests shown here, an additional Intra-Video Association Test is shown in Fig. 2.

**Beyond Visual Recognition in Videos.** Our work is inspired by efforts to create datasets and models that move beyond basic visual pattern recognition to reasoning about temporal and causal event structures in videos. [4] introduces the atemporal probe (ATP) that finds a single frame to solve many video-language benchmarks, including those for temporal reasoning. CATER [8] is a synthetic dataset that tests long-term reasoning about compositions of object movements.

Subsequently, a series of video understanding benchmarks emerged. Mementos [33] evaluates the ability of Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) to describe and retrieve object and behaviour keywords from a sequence of images. SEED-Bench [15] is an MCQ benchmark targeting spatial and temporal reasoning. However, some of the MCQs can be answered based only on overall scene information. MVBench [16] utilizes various public datasets by transforming annotations into questions for static and dynamic video tasks. CVRR-ES [13] focuses on generic reasoning from videos, posing questions like: *how many people are exiting the car?*, *what is happening in the video?*, *etc.* The Perception Test [22] explicitly films videos to assess multimodal LLMs across diverse skill areas and reasoning types. Efforts concurrent to ours tackle long-term multi-modal reasoning [25] in diverse sets of videos, including movies. They also use additional information like subtitles, audio, and audio descriptions for long-form reasoning.

Different from the above, our work focuses on evaluating subtle perception and visual binding. While VELOCITI has short videos of 10 s, they are accompanied by structured, rich, and dense SRL descriptions. Even within this short video, we show that models struggle to relate (binding tests) and track (co-reference tests) entities across time. Thus, we believe that VELOCITI is a milestone that models should surpass and do well on before moving on to reasoning about longer videos.

### 3 VELOCITI Benchmark: Defining the Tests

Humans are amazing at perceiving the visual world. Two processes are continuously at play: (i) *compositionality* identifies atomic entities like objects, persons, actions, and scenes and binds them through appropriate relationships; and (ii) *distractors suppression* where irrelevant atomic entities are ignored and not confused with the entities of interest. We infuse these properties into VELOCITI (Video et Language Compositionality through Time). At the simplest level, each test in our benchmark compares the similarity between the video and text descriptions.




Figure 2: Illustration of how the VidSitu structure lends itself to the Intra-Video Association Test. See Section 3.2 for more details.

### 3.1 VidSitu Overview

We conceive a variety of tests to evaluate models along multiple dimensions using visually complex movie clips and detailed SRL annotations from VidSitu [27]. Each video in *VidSitu* is of 10 s, but is sub-divided into five 2 s *events*. Dense annotations are present at an event level, consisting of the most salient action and role descriptions that answer: *who* is doing the action (doer or agent), *to whom* (patient or receiver), *with what* (instrument, if applicable), *where* (scene or location), *how* (manner or adverb), and *why* (purpose or goal).

**Event Descriptions are aligned with the Entire Video.** Movies do not have precise shot boundaries every 2 s; thus, the event descriptions inevitably spill over into the neighboring events. In addition, events in a 10 s video clip are likely to be similar (same location with the same characters) due to the story continuity. For these reasons and to encourage compositionality without distractors, (typically) texts in our benchmark are designed at an event level, while the visuals span the entire video clip. For a model to perform well on VELOCITI, we expect it to suppress distractors from other events and *implicitly localize where* in the video, does the compositional description match (or mismatch). Using an LLM, we convert the SRL annotation of each event into a *positive* or *aligned* event caption.

**Control Tests.** By designing two simple control tests, we establish that movies are not out-of-domain for the models. *Control text-to-video* (C t2v) requires discriminating two videos given a caption; and *Control video-to-text* (C v2t) requires discriminating two captions given a video. In this test, the *negative* or *mismatched* caption is randomly chosen from the dataset and is typically *easy* based on any of the recognizable entities present in the video or in the caption.

### 3.2 Intra-Video Association Test (IVAT)

Inspired by the Winoground challenge that matches two images with two similar but distinct descriptions [30], we leverage the structure of VidSitu to create IVAT. As illustrated in Fig. 2, we use the first and last event descriptions to obtain two captions:  $C_0, C_1$ . To account for overlapping event descriptions, we consider the video’s first and last 4 s:  $V_0, V_1$ . A model is evaluated on its ability to correctly associate  $(V_0, C_0)$  and  $(V_1, C_1)$ . By sampling  $V_0$  and  $V_1$  from the same video, the overall scene, characters, and actions are highly likely to be similar, and fine-grained distinctions may be necessary. In Fig. 2, the common elements are *men in blue and brown jackets at a snowy cliff*, while the point of distinction is the action *shivering stare* and *grab by collar*.

### 3.3 Subtle Perception Tests

Recent benchmarks (*e.g.* MMVP [32], SugarCrep [12], VideoCon [3]) have explored the shortcomings in visual perception by asking models to discriminate between two minimally differing, yet contradictory captions. We present similar tests, however, for inherently complex videos that require encoding hard-to-perceive entities. In these tests, given a 10 s video, a model is required to select the positive (correct) caption over the negative (incorrect) one. Recall that the positive caption describes only one event in the video.

**Action Adversarial Test (ActAdv).** The negative caption is generated by replacing the action in the event description with a contradictory action that does not appear in the video. The [action adversarial test](#) in Fig. 1, features the positive caption *man in grey pants is greeting a man wearing a black hat*; and the negative caption *man in grey pants is chasing a man wearing a black hat*. Except for the




Figure 3: In this example, *concept binding* is required for models to identify who is covering their ears: the *lady in blue* or the *person in white*. Typical LLM-based benchmarks create negatives (shown on the left) that models can answer based on perception: *man in a hat* does not appear in the video.

action, the two captions are unchanged. Note, solving this test requires the model to not only identify actions but also implicitly localize them in the video while not being distracted by other events.

**Action Modifier Test (ActModif)** encompasses adverbs, emotions, facial expressions, mannerisms, *etc.* The negative caption is generated by replacing the manner with another plausible modifier. In Fig. 1, the action modifier for *spinning, on one leg* is replaced with *on both feet*. Identifying these subtle variations is challenging for most models.

### 3.4 Visual Binding Test

A truly compositional model should be capable of identifying *and* binding entities through the right relationship. A problem arises when there are two or more entities of the same kind [14, 6]. For instance, in Fig. 3, we see a *lady in blue* slowly covering her ears, as described in the positive caption, while the negative caption says that the *person in white* is covering her ears. To solve this test, merely perceiving the *lady in blue* and the *person in white* is insufficient. The model must capture and learn associations: *cover (lady in blue, ears, slowly)* and *gaze (person in white, lady in blue)*. We create tests for this concept of *binding* while keeping the similar evaluation format as Section 3.3.

**Agent Binding Test (AgBind)** has negative captions created by replacing the *agent* (the doer of the action), with another agent from the same video. The example discussed above and in Fig. 3 is of this category, and models without binding ability struggle at this test.

**Agent Identification Test (AgIden)** has negative captions where the agent is replaced by other random references from the *VidSitu* dataset. The LLM-based replacement in Fig. 3 is another example that is often solved easily. Agent Identification Test acts as a control test for Agent Binding Test as it shows that models perform well on out-of-video agent replacement but fail in concept binding. Fig. 1 shows another example of this type.

**Action Binding Test (ActBind).** In this test, the negative caption is created by replacing the action and its modifiers with another action and modifiers from a different event of the same video, while the primary agent remains unchanged. In the example in Fig. 1, the phrase *spinning around on one leg* is replaced with *clapping his hands* as a woman in a purple shirt is clapping in the same video. Like for AgBind, a non-binding model would struggle at this test as it perceives *clapping* and *the man in grey pants*, albeit separately.

**Agent Co-reference Test (AgCoref).** Co-reference means two or more expressions that refer to the same entity. In a video, entities are referred to using their appearance or the actions they perform. For instance, in a caption *A man in grey pants is greeting a man wearing a black hat*, the agent *man in grey pants* can be referred to using the phrase *The person who is greeting a man wearing a black hat*.

This test identifies videos with a single agent acting in at least two events. The positive caption is created by concatenating the two references. The video in Fig. 1 shows a man in grey pants greeting a man wearing a black hat and then spinning around. Hence, the positive caption is *The person who is greeting a man wearing a black hat is also the one who is spinning around on one leg*. The negative caption is created by concatenating references to two different agents: *The person who is greeting a man wearing a black hat is also the one who is smiling friendly at a woman*



Figure 4: More examples of tests in the VELOCITI benchmark.

in a purple shirt. This is a negative as the black hat man (and *not* the grey pants man) is smiling at the woman. Solving this test requires resolving multi-step binding across time: the model should bind *greeting* and *spinning* to the *man in grey pants*, while disregarding distractor bindings (*man in black hat* who is smiling with *greeting*).

### 3.5 Chronology Test (Chrono)

Time is a unique aspect of *video* understanding. Even in a short 10 s video, understanding the story progression across multiple events requires a model to bind each event to its internal representations of temporal concepts like *before*, *after*, *first*, *then*, etc. Inspired by [2] and benefitting from VidSitu’s structured annotations, we measure if a model can identify the correct order of the events in a video. The positive caption contains descriptions of two events that happen sequentially, while the negative caption contains the same descriptions reversed (see **Chronology Test** in Fig. 1).

We show an additional example of subtle perception tests, visual binding tests, and the chronology test in Fig. 4.

## 4 Experimental Setup

### 4.1 Positive and Negative Caption Details

We leverage an LLM, specifically the Llama-3-70B [1], for generating descriptions. All prompts are in the Appendix A and involve in-context learning and Chain-of-Thought (CoT) two-step reasoning.

**Positive captions.** We convert each SRL annotation into an event description using an LLM (Fig. 5). This results in high-quality positive captions for a total of 900 videos and 4500 events.

**Intra-Video Association Test captions.** Positive captions of the first and last event in the video are used directly for this test, and no negative captions are required.

**Subtle Perception Test.** Negative captions are generated by prompting the LLM with the SRL annotations and the entity-to-be-replaced (Fig. 6, Fig. 7). The LLM first generates the incorrect entity and then the negative caption where the positive entity is replaced by the negative entity.

**Agent Identification Test.** Negative captions are created by replacing the positive caption’s *agent* with another from a random selected event. We ensure that the replacement does not appear in the video *and* is not a subset of the description, e.g. *man in black shirt* is a subset of *man* and is ignored.

The agent in the SRL annotation dictionary is replaced by the selected agent, and an LLM is used to generate the negative caption (similar to positive captions).

**Agent Binding Test.** The negative caption follows the same process as above (AgIden) except that the agent is replaced by another from the other 4 events *of the same video*.

**Action Binding Test.** Here, the positive and the negative captions share the same agent while the rest of the sentence contains the action and corresponding modifiers replaced by another action and its modifiers *from the same video*. This is done by finding an SRL annotation from one of the other events of the video where the agent is unchanged.

**Agent Co-reference Test.** The positive caption for this test is generated by stitching two ordered positive captions from events of the *same video* with the *same agent*. The agent information is stripped from both captions, and a template is used to merge: *the person who is <Event A> is also the one who is <Event B>*. The negative caption is created in the same way, except instead of using Event B’s caption, we choose the caption from the ActBind, guaranteeing that the second part of the negative caption refers to some other agent (different from the one in the positive caption).

**Chronology Test.** The positive caption for this data is created by concatenating two positive captions with the template *First, <Event A>. Then, <Event B>.*, where event B is after A, but not consecutive. The negative caption is created using the same template with flipped events, resulting in *First, <Event B>. Then, <Event A>*.

Table 1: Number of videos, tests, and human evaluation samples in VELOCITI. We also present retention ratio (R %), the fraction of samples that are kept after QC.

	Task	R (%)	Videos	Tests	H Eval
	C v2t	-	900	4500	-
	C t2v	-	900	4500	-
	IVAT	-	900	900	150
Agent	Iden	73.9	643	1000	150
	Bind	70.1	707	1676	150
	Coref	71.3	270	418	150
Action	Gen	48.2	400	500	150
	Bind	97.0	590	1625	150
	Mod	47.3	411	500	150
	Chrono	-	669	1908	150

## 4.2 Quality Control (QC)

All test samples (except for the Control and Chronology Test) are verified by humans to ensure that the positive captions align with the video, and the negative captions do not. Table 1 presents some statistics. The retention ratio (R %), the ratio of samples retained post-QC, is quite low even with careful prompts to a strong LLM, indicating that ambiguity is best resolved by humans. We also report the final number of videos and tests used in each of the test categories (post-QC) and the number of samples used for human evaluation (H Eval).

## 4.3 Models

We evaluate 6 variants of contrastive image-language models (CLIP [23], EVA-CLIP [29], SigLIP [40], NegCLIP [39]), 2 video-language models (CLIP-ViP [37], ViFi-CLIP [24]), and 4 generative Video-LLMs (mPLUG-Owl-Video [38] abbr. mPLUG-V, PLLaVA [36], Video-LLaVA [17], Owl-Con [3]) on VELOCITI. For the 6 contrastive image models, the video representation is obtained by mean pooling across individual frames [19]. NegCLIP, CLIP-ViP, and ViFi-CLIP are further fine-tuned, and the latter two are video adaptations. We also evaluate humans (non-authors) and Gemini 1.5 Flash [5], a powerful closed-source model, on a subset of 150 samples for each test (except control as that performs well).

For the contrastive models, the alignment between a video and caption is measured using cosine similarity. For open-sourced generative models, we adopt the entailment score introduced by Video-Con [3]. We also tried multiple-choice options, however, similar to [42], we observed that models have an affinity to select the first option irrespective of correctness. Given an instruction  $I$  containing a video  $V$  and a caption  $C$ , we pass it to a model  $M$  and calculate the probability of generating responses  $p_y = M(\text{'Yes'}|I(V, C))$  and  $p_n = M(\text{'No'}|I(V, C))$ . Based on the scores, the probability for class ‘Yes’ is  $P_{yes}(V, C) = p_y / (p_y + p_n)$ . More details regarding the instructions are available in the Fig. 8. For brevity, we use  $s(V, C)$  to refer to both cosine similarity and entailment score. For Gemini 1.5 Flash, we prompt the model to choose between the positive and negative captions directly, as shown in Fig. 9.

#### 4.4 Metrics

**Intra-Video Association Test.** Let  $(V_0, C_0)$  and  $(V_1, C_1)$  be the two aligned video-caption pairs. The Matching t2v score is 1 if  $s(V_0, C_0) > s(V_1, C_0)$  and  $s(V_1, C_1) > s(V_0, C_1)$ . The Independent t2v score is 1 if both conditions are true and 0.5 if only one of them is true. Similarly, the Matching v2t score is 1 if  $s(V_0, C_0) > s(V_0, C_1)$  and  $s(V_1, C_1) > s(V_1, C_0)$  and the Independent v2t scores them separately as above. Finally, the Group score is 1 if all four conditions are satisfied.

**Other tests.** We report the accuracy of the positive pair scoring higher (more aligned) than the negative pair. In a v2t setup, given a sample  $(V, C_{pos}, C_{neg})$ , the score is 1 if  $s(V, C_{pos}) > s(V, C_{neg})$ ; and likewise for a t2v setup, the score is 1 if  $s(V_{pos}, C) > s(V_{neg}, C)$ .

### 5 Results and Discussion

We provide results and insights regarding each test.

**Control Tests.** In Table 2, columns C v2t and C t2v report results for the control tests. Every model performs well (90-97%), except mPLUG-Owl-Video. This confirms that models are not evaluated on out-of-domain data.

**Intra-Video Association Test** results are in Table 2. Columns I/M t2v/v2t report independent and matching scores that require both pairs to be correct. In comparison to the Control tests, performance drops significantly across all models. Since the events come from the same video, the model must perceive and distinguish them using fine-grained details. Surprisingly, contrastive models perform better than Video-LLMs, which typically use visual encoders pretrained with a contrastive objective. This may be indicative of a failure in instruction fine-tuning, challenges of evaluating Video-LLMs on multiple-choice [42], or both.

EVA-CLIP and NegCLIP performed well in this test. EVA-CLIP  $L/14$ , a larger model that is trained on more data, is better at fine-grained perception. This suggests that scaling can help improve perception to some extent. Additionally, NegCLIP is trained on hard negatives from the ARO dataset and also performs better than other CLIP  $B/32$  models and obtains the highest *Group score*. Interestingly, video contrastive models perform on par with CLIP, likely due to fine-grained perception requirements as events come from the same video.

**Plausible negatives.** Similar to SugarCrepe [12], we use VERA [18] to confirm that our negative captions do not score low on plausibility, making the tests easy to solve based only on linguistic information. VERA scores close to random (Table 3), particularly for the binding tests, indicating that VELOCITI requires visio-linguistic understanding.

**Agent tests** evaluate a model’s ability to understand the doer of the actions in the videos. From Table 3, we see that models perform better on Iden compared to Bind, confirming that the *binding test* is harder than a replacement of the agent by an LLM or from other random videos. The results on Bind and Coref are comparable and, in fact, quite close to random, indicating the need for evaluating progress in compositional video-language understanding. For Gemini, we see that Iden tests are almost solved, while Coref is harder than Bind as it requires multi-step reasoning and binding across multiple events.

Table 2: Results on Intra-Video Association Test. C: control test; I: independent test; M: matched test; and Group: overall group score that checks all pairs. t2v: text-to-video, v2t: video-to-text.

Model	C t2v	C v2t	I t2v	I v2t	M t2v	M v2t	Group
Random	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	16.7
CLIP $B/32$	95.5	91.8	73.4	67.5	49.8	36.9	26.8
CLIP $L/14$	96.3	94.2	73.3	68.8	49.4	39.9	27.0
EVA-CLIP $L/14$	<b>96.8</b>	<b>95.4</b>	<b>74.6</b>	71.6	<b>52.0</b>	45.2	30.9
SigLIP $B/16$	95.9	94.2	70.5	69.0	44.7	40.9	28.1
SigLIP $L/16$	96.7	95.0	72.2	69.7	46.9	42.6	29.5
NegCLIP $B/32$	95.4	94.1	71.8	<b>72.1</b>	47.2	<b>47.0</b>	<b>32.8</b>
CLIP-ViP $B/32$	92.5	93.6	67.5	68.7	38.0	40.8	24.5
ViFi-CLIP $B/16$	95.6	93.7	72.5	67.8	49.0	38.4	26.2
mPLUG-V	78.5	79.3	51.8	51.1	17.5	13.6	7.0
PLLAVA	89.6	88.3	65.8	63.1	36.9	30.3	19.1
Video-LLaVA	91.9	90.5	67.0	63.1	40.8	29.9	21.7
Owl-Con	93.0	90.1	66.6	63.1	42.4	33.2	24.8
Human	-	-	96.0	95.4	92.0	91.3	-



**Action tests** evaluate the model’s ability to identify the correct caption against negative captions created by altering the action or action modifiers. While the replacements in Adv are not arbitrary (like Aglden), models perform reasonably well, with some achieving over 70% accuracy on Adv compared to close-to-random 50-60% accuracy on Bind. Similar to Agent tests, this reinforces that binding (when the negative action also happens in the same video) is a hard concept that models do not learn based purely on scale. Accuracies for Modif are similar or slightly better than Adv. Generally, perceiving subtle Action Modifiers (expressions, manners) is challenging compared to the Actions themselves. Among the Video-LLMs, Owl-Con performs the best in all three tests, although the accuracy on Bind is near random. Even though Owl-Con was trained on contrasted captions that include verbs, its low performance on Bind validates the need for binding tests to evaluate Video-LLMs. Gemini performs well on all tests but still has a gap (15-20%) to human performance.

**Chronology test** evaluates the model’s ability to perceive the order of events. By design, CLIP-based video models that use mean-pooling fail since the order information is lost. However, it is surprising to note that except for Video-LLaVA, every other video model (CLIP-ViP, ViFi-CLIP, and other Video-LLMs) performs close to random. Note, Video-LLaVA, too, shows an underwhelming accuracy of 56%. While Gemini performs better than all models, given the strong performance on long-video needle-in-a-haystack tasks, it is surprising that a simple ordering test creates a 25% gap in human accuracy. Modeling *time* in video understanding remains an open challenge!

Table 3: Accuracy of contrastive and generative models on VELOCITI.

Model	Agent Tests			Action Tests			Chrono	Avg
	Iden	Bind	Coref	Adv	Bind	Modif		
Random	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Vera	58.4	53.3	63.6	66.4	52.8	57.0	52.0	57.7
CLIP <sub>B/32</sub>	77.6	56.3	52.6	64.0	57.6	52.1	49.4	58.5
CLIP <sub>L/14</sub>	82.6	55.4	<b>56.9</b>	66.2	58.0	56.8	50.2	<b>60.9</b>
EVA-CLIP <sub>L/14</sub>	83.3	53.4	55.0	<b>70.2</b>	55.3	51.2	51.1	59.9
SigLIP <sub>B/16</sub>	80.0	54.4	51.0	63.8	54.5	<b>61.1</b>	49.8	59.2
SigLIP <sub>L/16</sub>	78.8	53.3	52.2	61.6	52.4	57.0	49.1	57.8
NegCLIP <sub>B/32</sub>	<b>83.4</b>	55.6	50.5	61.8	52.3	<b>61.1</b>	<b>51.2</b>	59.4
CLIP-ViP <sub>B/32</sub>	75.3	52.4	55.7	<b>70.2</b>	53.5	51.2	48.5	58.1
ViFi-CLIP <sub>B/16</sub>	82.3	<b>58.7</b>	54.6	63.0	<b>59.3</b>	60.5	49.8	<b>61.2</b>
mPLUG-V	43.0	31.9	51.7	65.0	42.0	49.6	41.3	46.3
PLLaVA	68.6	43.3	<b>60.5</b>	62.4	46.6	56.0	49.6	55.3
Video-LLaVA	<b>74.1</b>	<b>50.4</b>	60.1	63.6	47.0	47.9	<b>56.0</b>	<b>57.0</b>
Owl-Con	67.4	44.6	50.0	<b>73.0</b>	<b>51.1</b>	<b>63.2</b>	45.6	56.4
Gemini	91.8	76.4	67.8	80.0	76.4	76.9	68.3	76.8
Human	94.7	93.3	96.0	100.0	92.7	91.3	93.3	94.4

## 6 Conclusion

Given the tremendous *speed* with which video-language models and benchmarks are evolving, we provide a *direction* to evaluate and improve models’ semantic concept binding and distractor suppression abilities through the VELOCITI benchmark. The videos in our benchmark are complex, with dense annotations often involving multiple persons, objects, actions, action modifiers, and more. We introduce multiple test suites with varying levels of difficulty, each requiring different abilities in order to succeed. We evaluate a wide range of video-language models, both contrastive and generative, on VELOCITI, including Gemini 1.5 Flash. On the Visual Binding Test, all models struggle and fall significantly short of human accuracy. Although Gemini strongly outperforms open-source models, it lags behind human performance significantly on certain tests such as Chronology and Agent Co-reference. These tests require binding across multiple events and can only be solved if the temporal information from the videos is modeled efficiently, which remains an open problem.

**Limitations and Ethics.** Since VidSitu is sourced from movie clips, the benchmark emphasizes human-centric understanding. However, movie videos, spanning multiple years and genres, may contain societal biases and stereotypes in their scripts, dialogues, and visuals, potentially reinforcing stereotypes related to gender, race, ethnicity, age, and socioeconomic status. This necessitates careful judgment and usage of the data. Additionally, the audio modality, an important aspect of video understanding, is not currently explored and represents a potential future direction for this work.

## References

- [1] Meta AI. Llama3. <https://llama.meta.com/llama3/>, 2024. 6, 18, 23, 24
- [2] Piyush Bagad, Makarand Tapaswi, and Cees GM Snoek. Test of Time: Instilling Video-Language Models With a Sense of Time. In Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), pages 2503–2516, 2023. 2, 6
- [3] Hritik Bansal, Yonatan Bitton, Idan Szpektor, Kai-Wei Chang, and Aditya Grover. VideoCon: Robust Video-Language Alignment via Contrast Captions. In Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 2023. 1, 2, 4, 7
- [4] Shyamal Buch, Cristóbal Eyzaguirre, Adrien Gaidon, Jiajun Wu, Li Fei-Fei, and Juan Carlos Niebles. Revisiting the "Video" in Video-Language Understanding. In Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), pages 2917–2927, 2022. 3
- [5] Google Deepmind. Gemini 1.5 Flash. <https://deepmind.google/technologies/gemini/flash/>, 2024. 2, 7
- [6] Jiahai Feng and Jacob Steinhardt. How do Language Models Bind Entities in Context? In International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR), 2023. 2, 5
- [7] Timnit Gebru, Jamie Morgenstern, Briana Vecchione, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, Hanna Wallach, Hal Daumé Iii, and Kate Crawford. Datasheets for datasets. Communications of the ACM, 64(12):86–92, 2021. 13, 23
- [8] Rohit Girdhar and Deva Ramanan. CATER: A diagnostic dataset for Compositional Actions and TEmporal Reasoning. In International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR), 2020. 3
- [9] Klaus Greff, Sjoerd Van Steenkiste, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. On the binding problem in artificial neural networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.05208, 2020. 2
- [10] Madeleine Grunde-McLaughlin, Ranjay Krishna, and Maneesh Agrawala. AGQA: A Benchmark for Compositional Spatio-Temporal Reasoning. In Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), pages 11287–11297, 2021. 2
- [11] Matthew Honnibal and Ines Montani. spaCy 2: Natural language understanding with Bloom embeddings, convolutional neural networks and incremental parsing. <https://spacy.io/>, 2017. 16
- [12] Cheng-Yu Hsieh, Jieyu Zhang, Zixian Ma, Aniruddha Kembhavi, and Ranjay Krishna. SugarCrepe: Fixing Hackable Benchmarks for Vision-Language Compositionality. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), 36, 2024. 1, 2, 4, 8
- [13] Muhammad Uzair Khattak, Muhammad Ferjad Naeem, Jameel Hassan, Muzammal Naseer, Federico Tombari, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Salman Khan. How Good is my Video LMM? Complex Video Reasoning and Robustness Evaluation Suite for Video-LMMs. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.03690, 2024. 3
- [14] Martha Lewis, Nihal Nayak, Peilin Yu, Jack Merullo, Qinan Yu, Stephen Bach, and Ellie Pavlick. Does CLIP Bind Concepts? Probing Compositionality in Large Image Models. In Findings of European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (EACL Findings), 2024. 2, 5
- [15] Bohao Li, Rui Wang, Guangzhi Wang, Yuying Ge, Yixiao Ge, and Ying Shan. SEED-Bench: Benchmarking Multimodal LLMs with Generative Comprehension. In Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 2024. 1, 3
- [16] Kunchang Li, Yali Wang, Yanan He, Yizhuo Li, Yi Wang, Yi Liu, Zun Wang, Jilan Xu, Guo Chen, Ping Luo, et al. MVBench: A Comprehensive Multi-modal Video Understanding Benchmark. In Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 2024. 1, 3
- [17] Bin Lin, Bin Zhu, Yang Ye, Munan Ning, Peng Jin, and Li Yuan. Video-LLaVA: Learning United Visual Representation by Alignment Before Projection. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.10122, 2023. 2, 7
- [18] Jiacheng Liu, Wenya Wang, Dianzhuo Wang, Noah A Smith, Yejin Choi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Vera: A General-Purpose Plausibility Estimation Model for Commonsense Statements. In Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP), 2023. 8

- [19] Huaishao Luo, Lei Ji, Ming Zhong, Yang Chen, Wen Lei, Nan Duan, and Tianrui Li. Clip4clip: An empirical study of clip for end to end video clip retrieval and captioning. Neurocomputing, 508:293–304, 2022. [7](#)
- [20] Zixian Ma, Jerry Hong, Mustafa Omer Gul, Mona Gandhi, Irena Gao, and Ranjay Krishna. CREPE: Can Vision-Language Foundation Models Reason Compositionally? In Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), pages 10910–10921, 2023. [2](#)
- [21] Jae Sung Park, Sheng Shen, Ali Farhadi, Trevor Darrell, Yejin Choi, and Anna Rohrbach. Exposing the Limits of Video-Text Models through Contrast Sets. In North American Chapter of Association of Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (NAACL-HLT), 2022. [2](#)
- [22] Viorica Patraucean, Lucas Smaira, Ankush Gupta, Adria Recasens, Larisa Markeeva, Dylan Banarse, Skanda Koppula, Mateusz Malinowski, Yi Yang, Carl Doersch, et al. Perception Test: A Diagnostic Benchmark for Multimodal Video Models. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), 36, 2024. [3](#)
- [23] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning Transferable Visual Models From Natural Language Supervision. In International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML), pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021. [2](#), [7](#)
- [24] Hanoona Rasheed, Muhammad Uzair Khattak, Muhammad Maaz, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Fine-Tuned CLIP Models Are Efficient Video Learners. In Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), pages 6545–6554, 2023. [7](#)
- [25] Ruchit Rawal, Khalid Saifullah, Ronen Basri, David Jacobs, Gowthami Somepalli, and Tom Goldstein. CinePile: A Long Video Question Answering Dataset and Benchmark. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.08813, 2024. [3](#)
- [26] Arijit Ray, Filip Radenovic, Abhimanyu Dubey, Bryan Plummer, Ranjay Krishna, and Kate Saenko. Cola: A Benchmark for Compositional Text-to-image Retrieval. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), 36, 2024. [1](#), [2](#)
- [27] Arka Sadhu, Tanmay Gupta, Mark Yatskar, Ram Nevatia, and Aniruddha Kembhavi. Visual Semantic Role Labeling for Video Understanding. In Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), pages 5589–5600, 2021. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [15](#), [23](#), [24](#), [25](#)
- [28] Gunnar A Sigurdsson, Gül Varol, Xiaolong Wang, Ali Farhadi, Ivan Laptev, and Abhinav Gupta. Hollywood in homes: Crowdsourcing data collection for activity understanding. In European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV), pages 510–526. Springer, 2016. [2](#)
- [29] Quan Sun, Yuxin Fang, Ledell Wu, Xinlong Wang, and Yue Cao. EVA-CLIP: Improved Training Techniques for CLIP at Scale. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.15389, 2023. [7](#)
- [30] Tristan Thrush, Ryan Jiang, Max Bartolo, Amanpreet Singh, Adina Williams, Douwe Kiela, and Candace Ross. Winoground: Probing Vision and Language Models for Visio-Linguistic Compositionality. In Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), pages 5238–5248, 2022. [1](#), [2](#), [4](#)
- [31] Maxim Tkachenko, Mikhail Malyuk, Andrey Holmanyuk, and Nikolai Liubimov. Label Studio: Data labeling software, 2020. Open source software available from <https://github.com/heartexlabs/label-studio>. [13](#), [25](#)
- [32] Shengbang Tong, Zhuang Liu, Yuexiang Zhai, Yi Ma, Yann LeCun, and Saining Xie. Eyes Wide Shut? Exploring the Visual Shortcomings of Multimodal LLMs. In Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 2024. [4](#)
- [33] Xiyao Wang, Yuhang Zhou, Xiaoyu Liu, Hongjin Lu, Yuancheng Xu, Feihong He, Jaehong Yoon, Taixi Lu, Gedas Bertasius, Mohit Bansal, et al. Mementos: A Comprehensive Benchmark for Multimodal Large Language Model Reasoning over Image Sequences. arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10529, 2024. [3](#)
- [34] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), 35:24824–24837, 2022. [24](#)

- [35] Bo Wu, Shoubin Yu, Zhenfang Chen, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, and Chuang Gan. STAR: A Benchmark for Situated Reasoning in Real-World Videos. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS): Track on Datasets and Benchmarks, 2021. [2](#)
- [36] Lin Xu, Yilin Zhao, Daquan Zhou, Zhijie Lin, See Kiong Ng, and Jiashi Feng. PLLaVA : Parameter-free LLaVA Extension from Images to Videos for Video Dense Captioning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.16994, 2024. [7](#)
- [37] Hongwei Xue, Yuchong Sun, Bei Liu, Jianlong Fu, Ruihua Song, Houqiang Li, and Jiebo Luo. CLIP-ViP: Adapting Pre-trained Image-Text Model to Video-Language Alignment. In International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR), 2022. [7](#)
- [38] Qinghao Ye, Haiyang Xu, Guohai Xu, Jiabo Ye, Ming Yan, Yiyang Zhou, Junyang Wang, Anwen Hu, Pengcheng Shi, Yaya Shi, et al. mPLUG-Owl: Modularization Empowers Large Language Models with Multimodality. arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14178, 2023. [7](#)
- [39] Mert Yuksekgonul, Federico Bianchi, Pratyusha Kalluri, Dan Jurafsky, and James Zou. When and Why Vision-Language Models Behave like Bags-Of-Words, and What to Do About It? In International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR), 2022. [2](#), [7](#)
- [40] Xiaohua Zhai, Basil Mustafa, Alexander Kolesnikov, and Lucas Beyer. Sigmoid Loss for Language Image Pre-Training . In International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV), pages 11975–11986, 2023. [7](#)
- [41] Tiancheng Zhao, Tianqi Zhang, Mingwei Zhu, Haozhan Shen, Kyusong Lee, Xiaopeng Lu, and Jianwei Yin. VI-checklist: Evaluating pre-trained vision-language models with objects, attributes and relations. arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.00221, 2022. [2](#)
- [42] Chujie Zheng, Hao Zhou, Fandong Meng, Jie Zhou, and Minlie Huang. Large Language Models Are Not Robust Multiple Choice Selectors. In International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR), 2024. [7](#), [8](#)

# Supplementary Material

This supplementary material provides details regarding prompts (Appendix A), human evaluations (Appendix B), data cleaning efforts (Appendix C), benchmark statistics (Appendix D), and the VELOCITI datasheet [7] (Appendix E).

## A Prompts

Prompts for generating various aspects of the tests are shown below: Fig. 5 for generating the positive caption, Fig. 6 for generating the Action Modifier negatives, and Fig. 7 for Action Adversarial Test negatives.

The prompt to compute the entailment scores for Video-LLMs is shown in Fig. 8. The prompt for Gemini 1.5 Flash is shown in Fig. 9. The temperature is set to 0 while top\_p and top\_k are set to 1 to enable greedy decoding.

## B Human Evaluations

Human evaluations were conducted in a standardized manner to establish the human performance on the various tasks presented in VELOCITI. The evaluations included 5 volunteers assigned 30 samples each for various tests in Table 2 and Table 3. For this, the Label Studio [31] annotation tool was used throughout. To ensure fair evaluations, humans were given randomized and non-overlapping video sets, along with a brief set of evaluation instructions, to ensure consistency across participants.

The evaluation instructions and the annotation dashboard in Fig. 10 were typical for video-to-text retrieval tasks - *I v2t*, *M v2t*, *AgI den*, etc. While the instructions and interface in Fig. 11 were used for the text-to-video retrieval tasks - *I t2v*, *M t2v*.

Prompt	
Using the provided dictionary containing verb and argument-role pairs in the style of PropBank, follow these steps to generate two captions:	
<b>Naive Caption</b>	
Generate a caption that faithfully reflects all details from the dictionary without adding or omitting any information.	
Ensure that every argument detail is accurately included in the Naive Caption.	
<b>Fluent Caption</b>	
If the Naive Caption is already fluent and naturally phrased, directly copy it to the Fluent Caption. If necessary, refine the Naive Caption for improved language fluency while strictly maintaining all original details and arguments from the dictionary.	
Please proceed with generating the Naive Caption first, ensuring it remains comprehensive and accurate based on the provided dictionary entries.	
Then, if adjustments are needed to enhance fluency, refine the Naive Caption into the Fluent Caption while ensuring that no details are overlooked or omitted.	
Few Shot Example 1	
Input	{ 'Verb': 'walk (walk)', 'Arg0 (walker)': 'man in suit', 'ArgM (direction)': 'into room', 'ArgM (manner)': 'slowly', 'Scene of the Event': 'warehouse' }
Naive Caption	In a warehouse, a man in suit is walking slowly into the room.
Fluent Caption	In a warehouse, a man in suit is walking slowly into the room.
Few Shot Example 2	
Input	{ 'Verb': 'burn (cause to be on fire)', 'Arg1 (thing burning)': 'Wreckage', 'ArgM (location)': 'Wreckage' }
Naive Caption	The wreckage is burning on the wreckage.
Fluent Caption	The wreckage is burning.
Few Shot Example 3	
Input	{ 'Verb': 'drive (drive a vehicle)', 'Arg0 (driver)': 'man in bow tie', 'ArgM (manner)': 'happily', 'ArgM (manner)': 'slowly', 'Scene of the Event': 'street' }
Naive Caption	On the street, a man in a bow tie is driving a scooter down the street happily.
Fluent Caption	The man in a bow tie is driving a scooter down the street happily.
Few Shot Example 4	
Input	{ 'Verb': 'walk (walk)', 'Arg0 (walker)': 'older woman', 'ArgM (direction)': 'towards younger women', 'ArgM (manner)': 'to see what younger woman is saying', 'Scene of the Event': 'street' }
Naive Caption	On the street, an older woman is walking towards a younger woman to see what the younger woman is saying.
Fluent Caption	An older woman is walking towards a younger woman on a street to see what she is saying.

Figure 5: Positive Caption Generation, Chain-of-Thought Prompting

**Prompt**  
Your objective is to generate a contradiction caption using the provided PropBank style "input dictionary" and the 'ArgM (manner)' labelled as 'source' based on a specific "misalignment scenario" called "manner misalignment". In this scenario, you should suggest an alternative contradictory value for the "source" and label it as "target".

**Key Requirements:**

1. "naive caption + manner misalignment": should be plausible and could theoretically occur in real life.
2. The "fluent caption + manner misalignment": If the "naive caption + manner misalignment" is already fluent and naturally phrased, directly copy it to the "fluent caption + manner misalignment". If necessary, refine the "naive caption + manner misalignment" for improved language fluency while strictly maintaining all original details and arguments from the dictionary.

**Guidelines:**

1. The "target" should introduce a contradiction when compared to "source", without being a mere negation.
2. The "naive caption + manner misalignment" should be clearly distinguishable from the scene described by the "input dictionary."
3. Your replacements should be creative yet reasonable.
4. If adjustments are needed to enhance fluency, refine the "naive caption + manner misalignment" into the "fluent caption + manner misalignment" while ensuring that no details are overlooked or omitted.

Few Shot Example 1	
Input	{ 'Verb': look (vision)', 'Arg0 (looker)': a man wearing all black', 'Arg1 (thing looked at or for or on)': 'a building', 'ArgM (direction)': 'in front of him', 'ArgM (manner)': 'breathing heavily', 'Scene of the Event': 'warehouse'}
Target	Whistling
Caption	Outside, a man wearing all black is looking in front of him at a building while whistling.
Fluent Caption	Outside, a man wearing all black is looking at a building in front of him while whistling.
Few Shot Example 2	
Input	{ 'Verb': burn (cause to be on fire)}, 'Arg0 (agent, entity causing something to be suspended)': 'climbing ropes', 'Arg1 (thing suspended)': 'woman in pink shirt', 'Arg2 (suspended from)': 'climbing ropes', 'ArgM (location)': 'on the face of the rocks', 'ArgM (manner)': 'precariously'}
Target	Securely
Naive Caption	climbing ropes are hanging the woman in a pink shirt securely on the face of the rocks.
Fluent Caption	The woman in a pink shirt is hanging on the face of the rocks from the climbing ropes securely.

Figure 6: Action Modifier caption generation, Chain-of-Thought Prompting

**Prompt**  
Your objective is to generate a contradiction caption using the provided PropBank style "input dictionary" and the 'Verb' labelled as 'source' based on a specific "misalignment scenario" called "verb misalignment". In this scenario, you should suggest an alternative contradictory value for the "source" and label it as "target".

**Key Requirements:**

1. "naive caption + verb misalignment": should be plausible and could theoretically occur in real life.
2. The "fluent caption + verb misalignment": If the "naive caption + verb misalignment" is already fluent and naturally phrased, directly copy it to the "fluent caption + verb misalignment". If necessary, refine the "naive caption + verb misalignment" for improved language fluency while strictly maintaining all original details and arguments from the dictionary.

**Guidelines:**

1. The "target" should introduce a contradiction when compared to "source", without being a mere negation.
2. The "naive caption + verb misalignment" should be clearly distinguishable from the scene described by the "input dictionary" and should be visually distinguishable.
3. Your replacements should be creative yet reasonable.
4. If adjustments are needed to enhance fluency, refine the "naive caption + verb misalignment" into the "fluent caption + verb misalignment" while ensuring that no details are overlooked or omitted.

Few Shot Example 1	
Input	{ 'Verb': speak (speak)}, 'Arg0 (talker)': 'a man with dark hair', 'Arg2 (hearer)': 'old man', 'ArgM (manner)': 'greeting him', 'Scene of the Event': 'warehouse'}
Target	Ignore
Caption	On the front porch, a man with dark hair is ignoring an old man, greeting him.
Fluent Caption	On the front porch, a man with dark hair is ignoring an old man.
Few Shot Example 2	
Input	{ 'Verb': open (open)}, 'Arg0 (opener)': 'woman with long hair', 'Arg1 (thing opening)': 'the front door', 'ArgM (manner)': 'slowly', 'Scene of the Event': 'inside a house'}
Target	Close
Naive Caption	Inside a house, a woman with long hair is closing the front door slowly.
Fluent Caption	Inside a house, a woman with long hair is closing the front door slowly.

Figure 7: Action Adversarial caption generation, Chain-of-Thought Prompting

---

**Prompt****User:**

&lt;video&gt;

Carefully watch the video and pay attention to the sequence of events, the details and actions of persons.  
Based on your observation, does the given caption entail the video?

Caption: &lt;caption&gt;

**Assistant:**

---

Figure 8: Entailment score prompt for evaluation of Video-LLMs.

---

**Prompt**

Carefully watch the video and pay attention to the sequence of events, the details and actions of persons.

Based on your observation, select the caption that best describes the video.  
Just print either *A*) or *B*).

A) {caption 1}

B) {caption 2}

Best Caption : (

---

Figure 9: Prompt for evaluating the Gemini 1.5 Flash. To ensure robustness against ordering, either caption 1 or caption 2 (with equal probability) may correspond to the positive (correct) caption.

## C Data Cleaning

To ensure that the data generated from the automated pipelines discussed earlier are correct, the authors filtered the data samples themselves, following specific guidelines discussed in this section. It is via this procedure that the final count of the data samples is calculated and reported in Table 1.

**Positive captions.** The instructions and the interface for positive caption filtering are described in Fig. 12. For each sample, three choices were provided: *positive* if the caption is correct, *negative* if the caption is wrong, and *neutral* if the caption cannot be negative but contains some ambiguity due to which it could not be considered positive. Out of the 380 samples that were processed, 356 were positive, 21 were neutral and 3 were negative. The retention ratio (ratio of positive and neutral samples) remained 99.2%, indicating a high quality of the positive captions in the data. Thus, no filtering was carried out for the positive captions.

**Intra-Video Association Test** For filtering samples of this test, two pairs of 4 s clips and positive captions corresponding to the first and last event in a video were presented. The instructions and the interface for this are in Fig. 13. The samples where both pairs were deemed correct were retained, and the rest were discarded.

**Other tests.** For all other filtering described in Table 1, the instructions and the interface are presented in Fig. 14. For each video, the green bar contains a positive caption, and the red bar contains a negative caption. Unlike human evaluations, the positive and the negative captions are known while filtering. Only the samples for which both positive and negative captions were deemed appropriate were retained.

## D VELOCITI Statistics

This section presents statistics highlighting the diversity and nuance in VELOCITI benchmark. Since this benchmark is a subset of VidSitu [27], we observe similar trends as presented in their work.

**Diversity.** Fig. 15 and Fig. 16 show the various verbs and nouns present in the benchmark. Each event’s SRL (Semantic Role Label) dictionary contains the prominent verb of that event, which was used for constructing the plot. The nouns are identified by parts-of-speech tagging the positive captions using Spacy [11], and their occurrences are counted using the SRL event dictionaries. For any point  $n$  on the horizontal axis, the bar plot shows the count of verbs/nouns with at least  $n$  annotations. In Fig. 16, at  $n = 4$ , 169 verbs occur in *at least* 4 distinct events. In Fig. 15, at  $n = 4$ , 325 nouns occur in at least 4 distinct videos.

**Nuance.** Videos in our benchmark are complex as there are multiple agents performing various actions. In Fig. 17-(c) we can observe that around 69% of the events contain 4 or more SRLs, indicating the detail-oriented nature of the annotations. Fig. 17-(a) shows that around 87% of the videos contain 4 or more unique verbs and Fig. 17-(b) shows that, over 83% of videos contain 2 or

### Instructions

*These instructions can be opened anytime by clicking ‘i’ on the bottom left of the panel*  
 You are given 1 video and 2 captions for each task.  
 Please watch the video and select the *most appropriate* caption within the two presented.

What does a “*most appropriate*” caption mean?

- It refers to the caption that provides a more accurate description of the event in the video, compared to the other caption.
- It should correctly identify the entities (*humans, animals, objects, etc.*) and the relationships (*action*) between them.

### Note

- Spelling/grammatical errors, if any, shall be ignored.
- You may watch the video multiple times, if required.




Figure 10: Instructions and interface for human evaluation of  $v2t$  task in the Intra-Video Association Test.



---

## Instructions

These instructions can be opened anytime by clicking 'i' on the bottom left of the panel.

You are given 1 caption and 2 videos for each task.

Please watch the videos and select the *most appropriate* video according to the given caption.

What does "more appropriate" mean?

- It refers to the video that has a more accurate portrayal of the event in the caption, compared to the other video.
- It should correctly contain the entities (*humans, animals, objects, etc.*) and the relationships (*action*) between them.

## Note

- Spelling/Grammatical errors in the caption, if any, shall be ignored.
  - You may watch the videos multiple times, if required.
- 




Figure 11: Instructions and interface for human evaluation of  $t2v$  task in the Intra-Video Association Test.

more unique agents. We evaluate binding by leveraging the fact that one agent can perform multiple actions in the video, and the richness of the SRLs ensure that these events are described adequately. Further, Fig. 17-(d) shows that over 72% of agents occur twice or more in their corresponding video annotation. These agents would most likely be performing two different actions, and we utilize this to create two references to the same agent in the Agent Co-reference Test.

---

## Instructions

*These instruction can be opened anytime by clicking 'i' on the bottom left of the panel*

Your objective is to mark whether the provided positive caption is an “accurate” description of the dictionary contents.

What does an “accurate”, positive-caption mean?

- The generated caption must include all ideas *inferred* from the dictionary, even though it may miss some exact phrases.
- Ideally, the caption should include everything from the dictionary, but if the caption misses some value of an argument (for example, *direction*), then the caption is correct only if the missing value is *implied* from the caption.
- It needs to be grammatically correct, even though it may sound uncommon in conversational English.

## Positive, Neutral, Negative

- Select *positive*, when the caption clearly meets the above requirements.
- Select *neutral*, when the caption partially meets the above requirement (not fully correct).
- Select *negative*, when the caption does NOT meet the above requirements.

## Other Rules

- You are only required to look at the provided dictionary, and not the video for this task.
  - Captions should NOT be marked incorrect because of noisy annotations in the dictionary.
  - Captions should NOT be marked incorrect because of abrupt capitalization inside the sentence.
- 

#107092418  
101 of 101

### Compositional Benchmark Human Evaluation

Name	Value
event	Ev2
video	v_bky6BtAbTU8_seg_85_95

Name	Value
.Verb	disbelieve (not believe)
Arg0 (non-believer)	girl in a gray hat
Scene of the Event	in the woods

In the woods, a girl in a gray hat disbelieves.

Positive  Neutral  Negative

Submit

Info Comments History

Add a comment

Regions Relations

Manual By Time

Regions not added

Figure 12: Instructions and interface to verify the quality of positive captions generated from LLaMA-3 70B [1].

---

## Instructions

*These instruction can be opened anytime by clicking 'i' on the bottom left of the panel*

Your objective is to mark whether the provided video-caption pairs are *accurate*.

What does an “*accurate*” video-caption pair mean?

- It refers to the video that has a matching portrayal of the event in the caption, and vice-versa.
- It should correctly contain the entities (*humans, animals, objects, etc.*) and the relationships (*action*) between them.
- Spelling/Grammatical errors in the caption, if any, shall be ignored.

## Other Rules

- Captions should NOT be marked incorrect because of abrupt capitalization inside the sentence.
  - You may watch the videos multiple times, if required.
- 

The screenshot displays the Intra-Video Association Test interface. It features two video clips, Video 1 and Video 2, each with a corresponding caption. Video 1 shows a man in a suit searching under a mattress, with the caption: "In a bedroom, the clean-shaven man in the suit is searchingly touching underneath a mattress with his hand." Video 2 shows the same man walking, with the caption: "In a bedroom, the clean-shaven man in the suit walks slowly and casually forward." Below the captions, there are checkboxes for "Pair 1 Correct?" and "Pair 2 Correct?", both of which are checked. The interface includes a search bar, a play button, and an "Update" button at the bottom right. The right side of the interface has tabs for "Info", "Comments", and "History", and a "Selection Details" section.

Figure 13: Instructions and interface to verify the video-caption pairs in the Intra-Video Association Test.

---

## Instructions

These instructions can be opened anytime by clicking 'i' on the bottom left of the panel  
You are given 1 video and 2 captions for each task, one **correct caption** and a **negative caption**.

Please watch the video and *verify* if the positive and the negative captions are “*logically correct*”.

What is a “*logically-correct*”, **positive caption**?

- Caption that provides a *correct* description of the event in the video.
- It should correctly identify the entities (*humans, animals, objects, etc.*) and the relationships (*action*) between them.
- Spelling/grammatical errors, if any, shall be ignored.

What is “*logically-correct*”, **negative caption**?

- Caption that provides an *incorrect* description of events in the video.

## Note

- You may watch the video multiple times, if required.
- Careful and precise judgement is requirement, as point-of-difference between the **positive** and the **negative** caption, may be subtle.

---

The screenshot shows a video player interface. The video frame displays a scene from a movie where a boy in a striped vest is interacting with a girl in a black suit. Below the video, two captions are shown: a green one for the positive caption and a red one for the negative caption. The interface includes a search bar, a progress bar, and a right-hand sidebar with tabs for 'Info', 'Comments', and 'History'. At the bottom, there are checkboxes for 'Pos-Cap-OK' and 'Neg-Cap-OK', and an 'Update' button.

Figure 14: Data cleaning instruction for Agent and Action Tests.




Figure 15: For any point  $n$  on the horizontal axis, the bar plot shows the count of verbs that occur in at least  $n$  unique events.




Figure 16: For any point  $n$  on the horizontal axis, the bar plot shows the count of nouns that occur in at least  $n$  unique videos.




Figure 17: (a) and (b) show the distribution of verbs and agents per video, respectively. (c) shows the density of SRLs per event. (d) shows the distribution agent coreference lengths in the benchmark

## E VELOCITI DataSheet

The foundational paper, *Datasheets for Datasets* [7], presents a series of questions designed to promote transparency and accountability and reduce biases. In alignment with these guidelines, we present a datasheet for VELOCITI, adhering closely to the established protocols. We have quoted the questions from [7] for consistency and ease of understanding. As VELOCITI is built on top of the VidSitu [27] dataset, some responses may overlap with the *DataSheet* provided by VidSitu.

### E.1 Motivation

- **For what purpose was the dataset created?**  
To keep up with the rapid pace with which Video-Language Models (VLM) are being proposed, our primary motivation is to provide a benchmark to evaluate current SoTA, as well as upcoming VLMs on *Compositionality*, which is a fundamental aspect of vision-language understanding. This is achieved through carefully designed tests, which evaluate various aspects of *perception* and *binding*. With this, we aim to provide a more accurate gauge of VLM capabilities, encouraging research towards improving VLMs and preventing shortcomings that may percolate into the systems that rely on such models.
- **Who created the dataset (e.g., which team, research group) and on behalf of which entity (e.g., company, institution, organization)?**  
We constructed VELOCITI using the validation set of the VidSitu [27] dataset. The VidSitu dataset was created by the authors of the PRIOR Team at Allen Institute for Artificial Intelligence (AI2).
- **Who funded the creation of the dataset?**  
The benchmark is partially funded through government grants and industry research gifts. The exact names will be included in the non-anonymized version of the paper under acknowledgments.

### E.2 Composition

- **What do the instances that comprise the dataset represent (e.g., documents, photos, people, countries)?**  
The dataset primarily contains 10 s videos obtained from the VidSitu dataset, sourced from movie clips from YouTube. The videos in the dataset are usually human-centric and contain interaction between actors in diverse and complex settings.
- **How many instances are there in total (of each type, if appropriate)?**  
The VELOCITI benchmark comprises 900 unique videos. Various tests proposed may have different counts of unique videos, owing to the data cleaning process used to filter noisy samples or because of the lack of appropriate data points in the VidSitu dataset, which limited the count of samples that can be generated for a given test category. Quantitative details are described in Table 1.
- **Does the dataset contain all possible instances or is it a sample (not necessarily random) of instances from a larger set?**  
The 900 videos in the VELOCITI benchmark are a subset of the *validation split* of the VidSitu [27] dataset.
- **What data does each instance consist of?**  
Each instance is a 10 s video of a movie clip sourced from the VidSitu dataset.
- **Is there a label or target associated with each instance?**  
Each instance in VELOCITI has a corresponding text annotation, a caption (*positive caption*) representing the correct details of the video. These are enabled by the SRL annotations in the VidSitu dataset as shown in Fig. 1, which we input to LLaMA-3 70B [1] and manually verify for correctness. The captions would further have a *negative* caption that *incorrectly* describes the video. Different tests in the dataset vary in how the negative caption is created. The captions are usually per event, and by design, each video in the VidSitu dataset is annotated at 2 s intervals with a verb describing the event, and corresponding argument roles for the verb co-referenced across the video.

- **Is any information missing from individual instances?**  
The data in the VELOCITI benchmark is complete across all tasks and instances. Creating certain benchmark tests requires specific attributes (*e.g. manner* for Action Adversarial task) in the VidSitu annotations, which may not exist for every event in the data. Further, because of the data cleaning process undertaken, the count of negative captions (or an overall number of tests) fluctuates per category.
- **Are relationships between individual instances made explicit (e.g., users’ movie ratings, social network links)?**  
With respect to our annotations, no direct links exist between samples, as each sample and test is treated independently. The video metadata may be leveraged to extract information such as the source of the larger YouTube clip (based on the YouTube ID) and, thereby, the name of the movie.
- **Are there recommended data splits (e.g., training, development/validation, testing)?**  
VELOCITI is an evaluation benchmark meant to test the compositional capabilities of VLMs, and thus, all samples in the data are to be used for testing the models.
- **Are there any errors, sources of noise, or redundancies in the dataset?**  
Since VELOCITI is built on top of the VidSitu dataset, some errors may have cascaded. Further, some methods in this work rely on LLMs to generate relevant captions, which may induce some errors and grammatical inconsistencies. However, we have used a SoTA LLM (LLaMA-3 70B [1]) and followed Chain-of-Thought [34] prompting to ensure minimal inconsistencies. Further, the authors have manually filtered the data being presented to ensure a high-quality dataset. The final number of samples in each test is presented in Table 1, and the data cleaning process in Appendix C.
- **Is the dataset self-contained, or does it link to or otherwise rely on external resources (e.g., websites, tweets, other datasets)?**  
The dataset in this evaluation benchmark is self-contained and consists of 900 video clips from movies, which we make available directly under the Fair Usage Policy. We do not claim ownership of the movie clip content; these clips have been sourced from publicly available YouTube clips.
- **Does the dataset contain data that might be considered confidential (e.g., data that is protected by legal privilege or by doctor–patient confidentiality, data that includes the content of individuals’ non-public communications)?**  
No, the benchmark data is derived from the VidSitu dataset, which further sourced movie clips publicly available on YouTube.
- **Does the dataset contain data that, if viewed directly, might be offensive, insulting, threatening, or might otherwise cause anxiety?**  
Content from action, crime, or horror movies in some videos may be distressing to viewers. Some of the videos might also feature scenes of violence and gore; thus, viewer discretion is advised. Some other considerations are also described in Section 6.

### E.3 Collection Process

- **How was the data associated with each instance acquired?**  
The data for this benchmark was sourced from the VidSitu dataset. We used LLMs to generate captions as described above.
- **What mechanisms or procedures were used to collect the data (e.g., hardware apparatuses or sensors, manual human curation, software programs, software APIs)?**  
The data for this benchmark was downloaded from the link provided by the VidSitu authors. Further, we use LLMs to generate relevant captions described in the above sections.
- **If the dataset is a sample from a larger set, what was the sampling strategy (e.g., deterministic, probabilistic with specific sampling probabilities)?**  
The dataset for the VELOCITI benchmark is sampled from the VidSitu [27] dataset, using only the validation set videos.
- **Who was involved in the data collection process (e.g., students, crowdworkers, contractors) and how were they compensated (e.g., how much were crowdworkers paid)?**  
Volunteers were involved in filtering and providing human evaluation for our benchmark.



- **Over what timeframe was the data collected?**  
This question does not pertain to our benchmark.
- **Were any ethical review processes conducted (e.g., by an institutional review board)?**  
Not applicable, as we build the benchmark on a subset of the VidSitu [27] dataset.

#### E.4 Preprocessing/cleaning/labeling

- **Was any preprocessing/cleaning/labeling of the data done (e.g., discretization or bucketing, tokenization, part-of-speech tagging, SIFT feature extraction, removal of instances, processing of missing values)?**  
Yes, the authors themselves cleaned the dataset extensively to ensure consistent and high-quality data. This was carried out in a principled manner, the details of which are elaborated in Appendix C. Primarily, positive (correct) captions, which did not accurately describe the video events, and negative (incorrect) captions, which were not a valid negative, were removed. Samples were also removed if they were confusing or ambiguous.
- **Was the “raw” data saved in addition to the preprocessed/cleaned/labeled data (e.g., to support unanticipated future uses)?**  
Yes, we have access to the original VidSitu annotations that are publicly available.
- **Is the software that was used to preprocess/clean/label the data available?**  
Yes, throughout this work, we have used the Label Studio [31] application, which is an open-source software.

#### E.5 Uses

- **Has the dataset been used for any tasks already?**  
Yes, in this work, we leverage the VELOCITI benchmark to demonstrate the shortcomings of existing SoTA vision models, both contrastive and generative, and encourage researchers proposing new VLMs to evaluate their models on the VELOCITI benchmark.
- **Is there a repository that links to any or all papers or systems that use the dataset?**  
We plan to maintain a leaderboard on our project page, <https://katha-ai.github.io/projects/velociti/>.
- **What (other) tasks could the dataset be used for?**  
In the current form, the benchmark is best suited to evaluate the compositional capabilities of VLMs, however, any task requiring contrastive data samples, *i.e. correct-incorrect caption* pairs, can also benefit from this work, and the negatives are quite challenging and propose a hard contrast to be distinguished.
- **Is there anything about the composition of the dataset or the way it was collected and preprocessed/cleaned/labeled that might impact future uses?**  
The dataset primarily consists of movie clips and, in rare cases, may not represent reality. Further, manual filtering was carried out to provide a clean and consistent dataset, which may limit the scale to which this work can be extended.
- **Are there tasks for which the dataset should not be used?**  
Similar to the VidSitu dataset’s answer, the VELOCITI is proposed for evaluating video models and may not generalize well to real-world cases.

#### E.6 Distribution

- **Will the dataset be distributed to third parties outside of the entity (e.g., company, institution, organization) on behalf of which the dataset was created?**  
The data for the VELOCITI benchmark will be made publicly accessible. We provide the video clips for convenience, but they are also available on YouTube through the “MovieClips” channel.
- **How will the dataset will be distributed (e.g., tarball on website, API, GitHub)?**  
For each task, we have standard JSON files. These are shared in the Google Drive link (check the [project page](#) for the latest links), which ensures its long-term availability and broader accessibility, and a preparatory Python notebook is provided to show how to load the data and view it one example at a time.

- **When will the dataset be distributed?**  
We will release the dataset once the paper is published or submitted to an archival repository (e.g. arXiv).
- **Will the dataset be distributed under a copyright or other intellectual property (IP) license, and/or under applicable terms of use (ToU)?**  
The VELOCITI benchmark is made available under the CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 license.
- **Have any third parties imposed IP-based or other restrictions on the data associated with the instances?**  
No.
- **Do any export controls or other regulatory restrictions apply to the dataset or to individual instances?**  
No.

## E.7 Maintenance

- **Who will be supporting/hosting/maintaining the dataset?**  
The dataset for the VELOCITI benchmark will be maintained by the authors of the current work.
- **How can the owner/curator/manager of the dataset be contacted (e.g., email address)?**  
Lead authors of the current work may be contacted for queries regarding the VELOCITI benchmark.
- **Is there an erratum?**  
None as of now.
- **Will the dataset be updated (e.g., to correct labeling errors, add new instances, delete instances)?**  
The dataset might be updated if any rectification is required.
- **If the dataset relates to people, are there applicable limits on the retention of the data associated with the instances (e.g., were the individuals in question told that their data would be retained for a fixed period of time and then deleted)?**  
This question does not pertain to our benchmark.
- **Will older versions of the dataset continue to be supported/hosted/maintained?**  
Yes, we will continue to maintain the older versions.
- **If others want to extend/augment/build on/contribute to the dataset, is there a mechanism for them to do so?**  
Yes, the dataset will be publicly available, and contributors are welcome to extend, augment, or build upon it in accordance with the CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 License.