









Meaningful Learning: Enhancing Abstract Reasoning in LLMs via Generic Fact Guidance

Kai Xiong¹, Xiao Ding¹, Ting Liu¹, Bing Qin¹, Dongliang Xu³, Qing Yang³, Hongtao Liu³, Yixin Cao²

 ¹Research Center for Social Computing and Information Retrieval, Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin, China
²Fudan University, Shanghai, China
³Du Xiaoman (Beijing) Science Technology Co, Ltd., Beijing, China



Abstract reasoning

Definition: abstract reasoning requires models to apply general patterns or high-level abstractions to different scenarios or questions [1].



When tasked with several simple questions supported by a generic fact, LLMs often struggle to provide consistent and precise answers

[1] Brenden et al., 2017. Building machines that learn and think like people.



Image: Advantage of the second sec

Akin to [2], we suppose an LLM \mathcal{LM} has grasped the generic fact r_i if and only if \mathcal{LM} can correctly answer all examples supported by r_i



Figure 2: Computation of abstract reasoning metric.

[2] Qiu et al., 2023. Phenomenal yet puzzling: Testing inductive reasoning capabilities of language models with hypothesis refinement.

(IP) Experiment I: abstract reasoning

There is a significant disparity (over 17%) between the vanilla accuracy and AbsAcc for all LLMs

Methods	Size	Vanilla Accuracy	AbsAcc
LLaMA-2 [<mark>47</mark>]	7B 13B	51.67 68.45	24.82 42.94
Orca-2 35	7B 13B	74.23 79.83	51.19 59.47
GPT-3.5 [7]	>20B	83.25	66.08
Human [14]	_	92.00	89.90

(IR) Experiment II: generic fact probing

Massive reasoning-based post-training (Orca-2) might lose lots of knowledge
If LLMs know the knowledge, then they can perform well on the corresponding examples

Table 2: Accuracy of generic fact probing.

LLMs	LLa	МА-2	Orc	ca-2	GPT-3.5		
	7B	13B	7B	13B	>20B		
Accu.	62.44	70.32	26.97	12.78	77.30		

Table 3: The categorized abstract reasoning accuracy based on whether the generic facts are known.

Category	Metrics	LLa	MA-2	Ore	ca-2	GPT-3.5	
		7B	13 B	7B	13 B	>20B	
Known Unknown	AbsAcc AbsAcc	34.26 17.19	43.51 31.84	64.98 49.00	81.51 58.38	68.31 58.49	

I3 Method: meaningful learning

(R AbsR construction

Based on GenericsKB [3], we utilize gpt-4-1106-preview to synthesize multiple examples for a single generic fact, which are the applications of the generic fact on different scenarios

Generic Fact: Unusual conditions affect behavior

Question: Which of the following scenarios is most likely to influence a person's typical shopping habits?

Options:

- A) A regular day with no significant changes in weather or social conditions
- B) A holiday season with sales and promotions in stores
- C) When the person has not received their paycheck yet
- D) A day with consistent weather and social conditions as the previous week

Answer: B)

Explanation: Holiday seasons with promotions and sales present unusual conditions that can significantly alter a person's typical shopping behavior, often encouraging more spending.

Question: In a psychological study, which condition is most likely to yield atypical results in participants?

Options:

- A) A study conducted during a stressful event
- B) A study conducted in a controlled environment with no distractions
- C) A study conducted with the same participants as a previous similar study
- D) A study conducted with used questionnaires

Answer: A)

Explanation: A stressful event like a natural disaster creates an unusual condition that can significantly affect participants' behavior and responses, leading to atypical results in a psychological study.



We employ the constructed AbsR dataset to train LLMs autoregressively, and we model the following two conditional probabilities:

$$\mathcal{LM}(X, Y, \theta) = -\sum_{t} \log p_{\theta}(Y_t | X, Y_{< t}),$$

 $\mathcal{LM}(X, r, Y, \theta) = -\sum_{t} \log q_{\theta}(Y_t | X, r, Y_{< t}).$

14 Experiments

(B Main results

Size	LLMs	AbsR	AGIEval	RACE	BBH	Com.	MMLU	ARC-e	ARC-c	Average
Vanil	la Accuracy	y								
>20B	PaLM-2 GPT-3.5	75.76 84.00	15.83 25.84	75.82 83.36	48.73 54.15	78.05 74.80	58.73 65.98	89.95 94.71	82.37 88.81	$\begin{array}{c} 65.77 \pm 0.00 \\ 71.46 \pm 0.00 \end{array}$
7B	LLaMA-2 Vicuna WizardLM Orca-2 MeanLearn	50.00 75.00 65.00 73.50 77.00	27.89 32.56 22.27 38.57 38.15	38.85 65.75 22.11 73.32 77.15	26.00 31.93 25.99 34.51 35.64	55.37 64.77 43.63 71.58 76.59	41.65 49.40 23.26 50.11 52.98	58.73 74.78 25.57 79.19 86.67	43.05 57.63 22.37 73.90 78.06	$\begin{array}{c} 42.69 \pm 0.00 \\ 56.48 \pm 0.00 \\ 31.28 \pm 0.00 \\ 61.84 \pm 0.00 \\ \textbf{65.28} \pm 0.34 \end{array}$
8B	LLaMA-3 MeanLearn	82.50 84.50	36.33 38.53	76.75 77.02	36.60 37.67	71.76 71.73	61.86 62.35	88.54 88.89	75.25 77.97	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{66.20} \pm 0.00 \\ \textbf{67.12} \pm 0.18 \end{array}$
13B	LLaMA-2 Vicuna WizardLM Orca-2 MeanLearn	73.50 74.00 74.00 66.50 67.17	34.41 33.23 33.23 43.75 43.92	59.46 63.54 63.54 66.86 70.24	30.61 33.22 33.22 39.39 40.36	61.00 63.10 63.10 65.92 69.75	51.87 49.34 49.34 47.27 51.68	71.25 77.78 77.78 82.19 88.69	55.25 59.77 59.77 70.85 82.00	$\begin{array}{c} 54.67 \pm 0.00 \\ 56.75 \pm 0.00 \\ 56.75 \pm 0.00 \\ 60.34 \pm 0.00 \\ \textbf{64.23} \pm 0.25 \end{array}$
AbsAc	c									
>20B	PaLM-2 GPT-3.5	64.58 77.08	9.59 14.48	61.54 66.79	27.69 25.45	69.34 65.74	44.39 52.09	85.68 92.16	77.10 85.05	$\begin{array}{c} 54.99 \pm 0.00 \\ 59.86 \pm 0.00 \end{array}$
7B	LLaMA-2 Vicuna WizardLM Orca-2 MeanLearn	35.42 58.33 53.24 60.42 64.58	16.09 19.90 12.94 26.27 25.27	14.08 38.68 5.57 50.90 57.10	9.56 14.28 9.77 15.67 16.67	47.42 58.07 32.96 64.02 71.17	25.48 32.50 11.55 33.68 37.24	50.27 65.95 20.00 72.16 81.35	35.51 49.53 17.29 67.76 73.83	$\begin{array}{c} 29.23 \pm 0.00 \\ 39.84 \pm 0.00 \\ 20.42 \pm 0.00 \\ 48.86 \pm 0.00 \\ \textbf{53.39} \pm 0.32 \end{array}$
8B	LLaMA-3 MeanLearn	72.92 73.96	23.78 26.57	55.61 55.09	18.13 19.24	66.35 66.48	47.31 46.76	83.51 83.78	70.09 73.36	$\begin{array}{c} 54.71 \pm 0.00 \\ \textbf{55.66} \pm 0.17 \end{array}$
13B	LLaMA-2 Vicuna WizardLM Orca-2 MeanLearn	61.46 61.46 59.38 50.00 45.82	21.01 19.70 16.96 29.50 30.01	32.17 36.50 28.59 42.12 47.65	13.74 16.33 18.61 20.61 21.85	52.87 55.26 55.73 56.41 61.04	35.72 32.21 29.47 31.11 35.21	62.43 70.27 57.84 75.95 85.41	44.86 52.34 42.06 62.15 77.08	$\begin{array}{c} 40.53 \pm 0.00 \\ 40.37 \pm 0.00 \\ 38.58 \pm 0.00 \\ 45.98 \pm 0.00 \\ \textbf{50.51} \pm 0.23 \end{array}$

15 Conclusion

(R Conclusion

We summarize our contributions as follows:

- □ We provide a systematic and quantitative analysis of abstract reasoning in current LLMs, and we develop an abstract reasoning dataset with generic-fact-guided explanations.
- U We propose meaningful learning to improve abstract reasoning in LLMs with generic fact.
- We achieve improvement in general reasoning and abstract reasoning on various OOD reasoning and language understanding benchmarks.

(*R***)** For more details

If you have any questions, feel free to contact us.

e-mail: <u>kxiong@ir.hit.edu.cn</u>

Wechat: xiongkai_hhh

Telegram: kxionghhh



paper & code



homepage

