

Meaningful Learning: Advancing Abstract Reasoning in Large Language Models via Generic Fact Guidance

Kai Xiong¹ Xiao Ding^{1†} Ting Liu¹ Bing Qin¹
Dongliang Xu² Qing Yang² Hongtao Liu² Yixin Cao[†]

¹Research Center for Social Computing and Information Retrieval
Harbin Institute of Technology, China

²Du Xiaoman (Beijing) Science Technology Co., Ltd.

{kxiong, xding, tliu, qinb}@ir.hit.edu.cn

{xudongliang, yangqing, liuhongtao01}@duxiaoman.com

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) have developed impressive performance and strong explainability across various reasoning scenarios, marking a significant stride towards mimicking human-like intelligence. Despite this, when tasked with simple questions supported by a generic fact, LLMs often fail to provide consistent and precise answers, indicating a deficiency in abstract reasoning abilities. This has sparked a vigorous debate about whether LLMs are genuinely reasoning or merely memorizing. In light of this, we design a preliminary study to quantify and delve into the abstract reasoning abilities of existing LLMs. Our findings reveal a substantial discrepancy between their general reasoning and abstract reasoning performances. To relieve this problem, we tailor an abstract reasoning dataset (AbsR) together with a meaningful learning paradigm to teach LLMs how to leverage generic facts for reasoning purposes. The results show that our approach not only boosts the general reasoning performance of LLMs but also makes considerable strides towards their capacity for abstract reasoning, moving beyond simple memorization or imitation to a more nuanced understanding and application of generic facts.

1 Introduction

Humans proceed meaningful learning to induce common patterns or high-level abstractions to acquire abstract reasoning abilities (Lake et al., 2017; Qiu et al., 2023). Such capabilities allow us to apply broad principles across diverse situations, demonstrating a deep understanding and versatile application of knowledge. As shown in Figure 1 (a), humans can deduce “rock dissolved” and “solution turns orange” when given “adding rock into hydrochloric acid” and “adding rust into sulphuric acid”, respectively. This stems from the established expertise in human mind (the generic fact “acid is




Figure 1: The responses of (a) Humans and (b) LLMs when facing two questions supported by a generic fact.

LLMs	Size	Vanilla Accuracy	AbsAcc
LLaMA-2	7B	51.67	24.82
	13B	68.45	42.94
Orca-2	7B	74.23	51.19
	13B	79.83	59.47

Table 1: The vanilla accuracy and abstract reasoning accuracy (AbsAcc) of LLaMA-2 (Touvron et al., 2023) and Orca-2 (Mitra et al., 2023) on e-CARE (Du et al., 2022). We will formally define AbsAcc in Sec 2.1.

corrosive”), and extends to applications in different scenarios. Of late, remarkable headways of LLMs have pushed AI much further towards human-like intelligence (Achiam et al., 2023; Touvron et al., 2023). Interestingly, can LLMs act like humans to instinctively consider the generic fact for flexible applications in different scenarios?

In our pilot investigation, we observed that LLMs appear to lack satisfying capabilities in abstract reasoning. As illustrated in Table 1, there is a notable discrepancy—exceeding 20%—between vanilla accuracy and abstract reasoning accuracy (AbsAcc). Despite the extensive pre-training of LLMs, which equips them with a vast repository of generic facts, they seem unable to leverage this information as flexibly as humans do (Figure 1 (b)).

In this paper, we aim to systematically and quantitatively investigate the abstract reasoning of LLMs. We first formally define the abstract reasoning metric. Then we carry out abstract reason-

[†]Corresponding Authors

ing and knowledge probing tasks for a preliminary study. Our investigation comprises two main components: the reasoning tasks can quantify the abstract reasoning capabilities of LLMs. The generic fact probing task can give a further analysis from the perspective of generic fact mastery. Hereafter, we improve abstract reasoning of LLMs based on the analysis of the preliminary study. Unlike existing chain-of-thought (CoT) methods (Wei et al., 2022a; Kojima et al., 2022), which conduct reasoning with uncontrolled step-by-step explanation, we create a dataset AbsR tailored for abstract reasoning. AbsR not only includes generic facts but also their guided explanations, offering a coached approach to understand the process of reasoning with common patterns. Finally, to make LLMs subconsciously exploit the generic fact like humans, we design a simple but effective learning paradigm called meaningful learning to simulate the implicit knowledge learning process (Du et al., 2019), enabling LLMs to implicitly learn and utilize generic facts for reasoning under the guidance of generic facts and the generic-fact-guided explanation.

Extensive experiments across multiple reasoning and natural language understanding benchmarks, demonstrate that our proposed paradigm for meaningful learning not only improves general reasoning of LLMs, but also excels in abstract reasoning. This distinction in performance is particularly pronounced in the realm of abstract reasoning, underscoring the unique efficacy of our approach in nurturing the higher-order thinking skills that are essential for sophisticated cognitive processing in artificial intelligence systems. Further analysis and ablation studies yield additional evidence supporting the effectiveness of our approach.

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 explanation.
- We propose a meaningful learning paradigm, which can stimulate the abstract reasoning capabilities of existing LLMs.
- We achieve significant improvement in general reasoning and abstract reasoning on a wide range of benchmarks.




Figure 2: The computation of abstract reasoning metric.

2 Abstract Reasoning Study

In this section, we initially define the evaluation metric of abstract reasoning to establish quantifiable standards. Then we introduce the LLMs used in this study. Finally, we conduct two experiments: one to directly estimate the abstract reasoning abilities of LLMs, and the other to further analyze it from the perspective of general fact mastery.

2.1 Abstract Reasoning Metric

Abstract reasoning requires models to apply general patterns of high-level abstractions to different scenarios or questions. Different from general reasoning, which focuses on each single example, abstract reasoning takes the examples supported by a generic fact as a whole. We define abstract reasoning accuracy due to the lack of a proper metric.

Given a dataset D with n generic facts $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\}$, for the i -th generic fact r_i , it supports m_i examples $S_i = \{s_1^i, s_2^i, \dots, s_{m_i}^i\} \in D$.

As shown in Figure 2, for hard constraint, akin to Qiu et al. (2023), we suppose an LLM \mathcal{LM} has grasped the generic fact r_i if and only if \mathcal{LM} can correctly answer all examples in S_i . Hence, we define the abstract reasoning accuracy as the proportion of generic facts that \mathcal{LM} has grasped:

$$\text{AbsAcc} = \frac{\sum_i \mathbb{I}(\Phi(L, S_i) = |S_i|)}{n}, \quad (1)$$

where Φ quantifies the number of examples in S_i that \mathcal{LM} answers correctly. \mathbb{I} serves as the indicator function, taking 1 when the specified condition is met and 0 otherwise.

2.2 Large Language Models

We offer an overview of the LLMs employed in our preliminary and upcoming experiments:

Examples		Generic Facts	
Original	Filtered	Original	Filtered
21,314	13,877	13,045	5,608

Table 2: The statistics of original and filtered e-CARE.

- **LLaMA-2** (Touvron et al., 2023) is an open-source LLM developed by Meta. We use 7B and 13B versions of LLaMA-2 for experiments.

- **Orca-2** (Mitra et al., 2023) is a chat LLM developed by Microsoft, which is finetuned on over 80K reasoning-specific examples. We use 7B and 13B versions of Orca-2 for experiments.

2.3 Experiment I: Abstract Reasoning

We formulate the first preliminary experiment to gain an initial insight into the abstract reasoning abilities of current LLMs.

To achieve this goal, we choose a multiple-choice question answering dataset e-CARE (Du et al., 2022) for implementation. e-CARE is a large-scale explainable causal reasoning dataset with a generic fact in each example, and a generic fact can support more than one example. The full set (train, test, and dev) of e-CARE is selected for experiments. We filter out the examples that the corresponding generic facts support only one example. Table 2 shows the statistics of e-CARE.

We follow zero-shot setting to prompt the LLMs for answer selection from multiple choices, and the generic facts are not provided in the inputs (refer to Appendix A.1). Table 1 shows the overall results:

(1) There is a significant disparity (more than 20%) between the vanilla accuracy and AbsAcc across all LLMs. This proves two aspects: on the one hand, vanilla accuracy is not ideal for estimating abstract reasoning. On the other hand, although LLMs could answer questions accurately, they still cannot capture the common patterns or generic facts behind the questions to reach the answers.

(2) Larger LLMs outperform smaller ones due to their richer and more accurate knowledge. Orca-2, fine-tuned on LLaMA-2 with extensive reasoning examples, notably outperforms LLaMA-2, indicating that supervised fine-tuning enhances both reasoning and abstract reasoning abilities. However, even with large-scale and reasoning-specific post-training, the significant gap between vanilla accuracy and AbsAcc remains unbridged.

LLMs	LLaMA-2		Orca-2	
	7B	13B	7B	13B
Accuracy	62.44	98.86	26.97	12.78

Table 3: The overall results of the generic facts probing.

Category	Metrics	LLaMA-2		Orca-2	
		7B	13B	7B	13B
Known	AbsAcc	34.26	43.51	64.98	81.51
Unknown	AbsAcc	17.19	41.84	49.00	58.38

Table 4: The categorized abstract reasoning accuracy based on whether the generic facts are known.

2.4 Experiment II: Generic Fact Probing

To delve into the abstract reasoning from the perspective of generic fact mastery, we design a generic fact probing task to ask LLMs whether they possess the given generic fact (refer to Appendix A.2). Drawing inspiration from knowledge uncertainty estimation (Amayuelas et al., 2023), we formulate this task as a yes or no problem.

We also use e-CARE and the above LLMs to carry out experiments. The overall results are shown in Table 3. We could conclude as follows:

(1) Both 7B and 13B LLaMA-2 have substantial knowledge reserves, with LLaMA-2-13B being particularly knowing nearly all generic facts in e-CARE. This indicates the poor AbsAcc might come from a lack of ability to utilize knowledge.

(2) In contrast, Orca-2 knows limited generic facts, and the larger the model, the less it knows. This contrasts sharply with its strong reasoning abilities (vanilla accuracy). We suppose training Orca-2 is more like rote learning rather than meaningful learning, which implies Orca-2 tends to lose knowledge while acquiring reasoning.

To delve into the relation between generic facts and abstract reasoning, we categorize the examples in e-CARE according to whether LLMs know the generic facts. The results are represented in Table 4, from which we can draw the following conclusions:

(1) The performance of “Known” category has superiority over “Unknown” category across all LLMs. This demonstrates knowing the generic facts is helpful for abstract reasoning, which provides a potential avenue for abstract reasoning enhancement through generic fact retrieval.

(2) Nonetheless, most of the results in “Unknown” category still have undeniable performance, suggesting that LLMs may engage in rea-

soning based on suspicious correlations or rely on memory recall. We can reasonably speculate that LLMs may consciously conduct memorization when answering reasoning-related questions.

In a conclusion, we can enhance the abstract reasoning abilities of LLMs in two ways: (1) **Knowledge**, injecting generic facts into the parametric memory of LLMs or offering LLMs the generic fact through prompts; (2) **Reasoning**, teaching LLMs how to utilize the generic facts to provide more precise responses to questions.

3 AbsR: Abstract Reasoning Dataset

To enhance the abstract reasoning abilities of LLMs through **Knowledge** and **Reasoning** ways, we need a dataset that can not only provide generic facts, but also teach LLMs how to exploit the generic fact to derive the correct answer in different scenarios (meaningful learning). Since there is no suitable dataset to assist us in achieving the goals, we create an **Abstract Reasoning** dataset (AbsR).

3.1 Generic Fact Collection

To obtain such a dataset described above, we need to collect the generic fact first. We choose GenericsKB (Bhakhavatsalam et al., 2020) as the foundation of AbsR to supply generic facts. GenericsKB is a large-scale knowledge base with over 3.4 million sentences (e.g. Dogs bark) expressing general truths, each of which also includes the corresponding concept (e.g. Dog) and the confidence score (between 0 and 1). Finally, we sample a collection of 4,613 generic facts from GenericsKB (details can refer to Appendix B).

3.2 Dataset Construction

To construct the whole dataset, and inspired by previous works (Wang et al., 2022a; Xu et al., 2023), we choose GPT-4 (Achiam et al., 2023) as our data annotator. The API we used is gpt-4-1106-preview.

Specifically, for each sampled generic fact r_i , we would ask GPT-4 to create samples $S_i = \{s_1^i, \dots, s_{m_i}^i | 1 \leq m_i \leq 3\}$ according to r_i . Each sample s_j^i contains the following terms: (1) a question X_j^i with a few options, (2) a response Y_j^i with an answer and an explanation guided by r_i . All terms form a triple $s_j^i = \langle r_i, X_j^i, Y_j^i \rangle$ for each sample. The prompt we used for dataset creation can refer to Appendix C. An illustration of the created examples is shown in Figure 3.

	Examples	Questions	Generic Facts
Train	18,020	14,010	4,613
Test	200	200	104

Table 5: The statistics of AbsR.

Finally, without loss of generality, given the j -th sample s_j^i of generic fact r_i , we can create two kinds of examples for our proposed meaningful learning. One is predicting Y_j^i given $\langle r_i, X_j^i \rangle$ (K-example), while the other is predicting Y_j^i given only X_j^i (R-example). The examples are used to implicitly enhance the abstract reasoning abilities of LLMs through **Knowledge** and **Reasoning** ways. Table 5 shows the statistics of AbsR.

4 Method: Meaningful Learning

To imitate humans’ instinctive use of general facts in reasoning, we develop a simple but effective learning paradigm called meaningful learning (MeanLearn). It can enhance the abstract reasoning abilities of LLMs in **Knowledge** and **Reasoning** ways. This is inspired by the implicit knowledge learning process, which uses hidden variables to learn event background knowledge (Du et al., 2019). MeanLearn can make LLMs implicitly learn generic facts and solve problems under the guidance of generic facts.

Specifically, given an LLM \mathcal{LM} with parameters θ and the input x , which constructs a conditional probability for the outputs y :

$$\mathcal{LM}(x, y, \theta) = - \sum_t \log p_\theta(y_t | x, y_{<t}). \quad (2)$$

In our proposed MeanLearn paradigm, for a K-example $\langle X, r, Y \rangle$ and R-example $\langle X, Y \rangle$ pair guided by generic fact r , we send the example pair into \mathcal{LM} together. Then \mathcal{LM} models two conditional probabilities:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{LM}(X, Y, \theta) &= - \sum_t \log p_\theta(Y_t | X, Y_{<t}), \\ \mathcal{LM}(X, r, Y, \theta) &= - \sum_t \log q_\theta(Y_t | X, r, Y_{<t}). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Hereafter, on the one hand, we train \mathcal{LM} to learn policies $p_\theta(Y_t | X, Y_{<t})$ and $q_\theta(Y_t | X, r, Y_{<t})$ together to push them closer, enabling \mathcal{LM} implicitly learn the generic fact r . On the other hand, \mathcal{LM} can learn how to apply r by learning to generate the explanation in Y . Finally, we can obtain better abstract reasoning abilities when only given

Generic Fact: More powerful computers allow for more colors at higher resolutions.

Question:

What is a benefit of using more powerful computers in graphic design?

Options:

- A) They can only display images in black and white.
- B) They reduce the need for artistic skills.
- C) They allow for the display of more colors at higher resolutions.
- D) They make images harder to edit.

Answer:

C)

Explanation:

As computing power increases, so does the ability to process and display graphics, which includes a broader range of colors at higher resolutions.

Question:

Why might a photographer prefer a more powerful computer for photo editing?

Options:

- A) To limit the range of colors.
- B) To work with high-resolution images and a wide color spectrum.
- C) To make the editing process more time-consuming.
- D) To rely solely on pre-set filters for editing.

Answer:

B)

Explanation:

A more powerful computer can handle the demands of high-resolution photo editing, which includes managing a wide color spectrum for better image quality.

Figure 3: Two examples of AbsR guided by the generic fact about “more powerful computer”.

the question X , just like humans instinctively answer questions with general facts.

5 Experiments

5.1 Training Details

We use LoRA (Hu et al., 2022) for parameter efficient finetuning of Orca-2. The batch size is set as 256 and 240 for 7B and 13B Orca-2, respectively. We train them for one epoch with a learning rate of $5e-5$. 7B and 13B Orca-2 are respectively trained on 2 and 3 NVIDIA A100 80GB PCIe GPUs.

5.2 Evaluation Benchmarks

To evaluate the MeanLearn paradigm, in addition to AbsR, we also include a wide range of benchmarks of reasoning and natural language understanding:

- **AGIEval** (Zhong et al., 2023) is a collection of standardized tests ranging from college admission tests, law-related tests, math competitions, to national civil service examinations.
- **RACE** (Lai et al., 2017) consists of English tests with reading comprehension questions for Chinese students aged between 12 to 18.
- **BBH** (Suzgun et al., 2023) is a subset of BigBench (Srivastava et al., 2023), which contains 23 hardest tasks focusing on challenging scenarios such as multi-step reasoning.
- **Commonsense** (Xiong et al., 2023) is a collection of 7 commonsense reasoning datasets: abductive reasoning (α NLI (Bhagavatula et al., 2019)), commonsense reasoning (CommonsenseQA (Talmor et al., 2019)), causal reasoning (COPA (Roemle et al., 2011) and e-CARE (Du et al., 2022)),

social interaction reasoning (SocialIQa (Sap et al., 2019)), physical interaction reasoning (PIQA (Bisk et al., 2020)), and implicit strategy reasoning (StrategyQA (Geva et al., 2021)).

- **MMLU** (Hendrycks et al., 2021) is a massive multitask language understanding benchmark, which consists of 57 tasks to evaluate language understanding and reasoning abilities.

- **ARC** (Clark et al., 2018) is a benchmark of multiple-choice science questions spanning from Grade 3 to Grade 9. ARC contains two subsets: Easy (ARC-e) and Challenge (ARC-c).

5.3 Evaluation Settings

Since the generation-based evaluation is time-consuming due to the limitations of computing resources, we follow OpenCompass (Contributors, 2023) to have hybrid evaluation criteria:

- (1) For free-form generation tasks (4 tasks in BBH), we ask LLMs to generate no more than 250 tokens with a temperature of 0.0, and then we utilize exact match for evaluation.
- (2) For the other classification and multiple-choice questions, perplexity (PPL) of each category or option is adopted for prediction. The evaluation templates can refer to Appendix E. Take Orca-2 and MeanLearn as an example, we use:

```
<|im_start|>system
{INSTRUCTION}<|im_end|>
<|im_start|>user
Question:{QUESTION}<|im_end|>
<|im_start|>assistant
Answer:{OPTION}<|im_end|>
```

The text enclosed within curly braces is a placeholder. `{INSTRUCTION}` will be filled with task-specific instruction. `{QUESTION}` will be filled with the question and all candidate options or categories. `{OPTION}` will be filled with the option index only (e.g. A).

To measure the performance, the option or category with the lowest PPL will be chosen as the prediction of corresponding LLM. The performance of each benchmark is weighted across all tasks of datasets in the benchmark.

5.4 Results: Vanilla Accuracy

Table 6 shows the Vanilla Accuracy of MeanLearn and baselines on AbsR and the benchmarks. We can infer that:

(1) Orca-2 significantly outperforms LLaMA-2 on most benchmarks, which indicates that massive reasoning-specific data can teach LLMs to develop much better reasoning abilities.

(2) MeanLearn has superiority over LLaMA-2 and Orca-2 on nearly all benchmarks. This demonstrates MeanLearn can use generic facts to effectively guide LLMs to reason more properly and logically, resulting in better reasoning capabilities.

(3) The more challenging the benchmark (e.g. BBH), the less pronounced the improvement in the performance of MeanLearn. This is mainly because the improvement is mostly constrained by the complex scenarios in harder benchmarks, which requires mightier base LLMs or more complex training data to perform and learn multi-step and compositional reasoning.

(4) Post-training (Orca-2 and MeanLearn) does not always bring improvements (e.g. AGIEval). The primary reason is the reasoning-specific post-training, which is bound to affect the general abilities and the handle of uncovered reasoning types.

(5) Larger LLMs do not always yield better results. We suppose the main factors behind this are in two ways: on the one hand, LLMs with different parameter sizes might be good at different tasks, excessive contemplation may lead to decreases on some tasks (Wei et al., 2022b). On the other hand,

the perplexity-based evaluation setting might has moderate cross-scale generalization ability.

5.5 Results: Abstract Reasoning Accuracy

Since the generic facts are not given in the benchmarks, we train a RoBERTa-Large (Liu et al., 2019) with contrastive learning to cluster examples supported by the same generic fact. In particular, we utilize e-CARE as the training set, examples guided by a same generic fact will be pushed closer, or they will be pushed away. Cosine similarity is used to measure the distance between examples. For clustering, examples sharing a similarity above 0.6 are considered to be supported by the same generic fact. Each cluster contains no more than 3 examples.

Hereafter, we calculate the abstract reasoning metrics based on the results of clustering. The overall results are shown in Table 6 (AbsAcc), we can have the following observations:

(1) The AbsAcc is much lower than the vanilla accuracy, indicating the large gap between general reasoning and abstract reasoning. Perhaps more training data can help to fill the gap between vanilla accuracy and abstract reasoning accuracy.

(2) MeanLearn surpasses Orca-2 and LLaMA-2, exhibiting greater advantages in AbsAcc than in vanilla accuracy. This suggests that the improvement in vanilla accuracy is more likely due to the enhancement of abstract reasoning abilities. MeanLearn can implicitly tell LLMs the generic fact and teach them how to utilize it, encouraging LLMs focus more on abstract reasoning.

6 Analysis

To further investigate the pros, cons, and effectiveness of MeanLearn and baselines, we conduct several in-depth analyses and ablation studies.

6.1 Performance on Different Domains

For potential future improvements, we categorize tasks of MMLU based on their respective domains to explore the domains where MeanLearn and baselines excel and where they does not excel. The results are shown in Figure 4 with a total of 16 categories (e.g. law), from which we can conclude:

(1) All LLMs possess poor vanilla accuracy and AbsAcc in math and chemistry. We conjecture the primary factors are the complexity of math problems and the shortage of chemistry knowledge.

(2) Compared to Orca-2, MeanLearn possesses considerable advantages in engineering, geography,

Size	LLMs	AbsR	AGIEval	RACE	BBH	Commonsense	MMLU	ARC-e	ARC-c	Average
<u>Vanilla Accuracy</u>										
7B	LLaMA-2	50.00	27.89	38.85	26.00	55.37	41.65	58.73	43.05	42.69
	Orca-2	73.50	38.57	73.32	34.51	71.58	50.11	79.19	73.90	61.84
	MeanLearn	77.00	38.33	77.22	35.71	76.55	53.04	86.60	78.31	65.35
13B	LLaMA-2	73.50	34.41	59.46	30.61	61.00	51.87	71.25	55.25	54.67
	Orca-2	66.50	43.75	66.86	39.39	65.92	47.27	82.19	70.85	60.34
	MeanLearn	66.00	43.95	70.47	40.45	69.93	51.62	89.59	82.03	64.26
<u>AbsAcc</u>										
7B	LLaMA-2	35.42	16.09	14.08	9.56	47.42	25.48	50.27	35.51	29.23
	Orca-2	60.42	26.27	50.90	15.67	64.02	33.68	72.16	67.76	48.86
	MeanLearn	64.58	25.27	57.10	16.67	71.17	37.24	81.35	73.83	53.40
13B	LLaMA-2	61.46	21.01	32.17	13.74	52.87	35.72	62.43	44.86	40.53
	Orca-2	50.00	29.50	42.12	20.61	56.41	31.11	75.95	62.15	45.98
	MeanLearn	45.83	30.06	47.89	22.00	61.06	35.24	85.41	77.10	50.57

Table 6: The overall vanilla accuracy and AbsAcc (%) of all LLMs.

Size	LLMs	AbsR	AGIEval	RACE	BBH	Commonsense	MMLU	ARC-e	ARC-c	Average
<u>Vanilla Accuracy</u>										
7B	MeanLearn	77.00	38.33	77.22	35.71	76.55	53.04	86.60	78.31	65.35
	w/o Knowledge	73.50	38.89	74.10	33.80	73.28	50.97	79.72	75.25	62.44
	w/o Reasoning	72.50	38.37	72.60	33.39	71.68	49.55	77.25	73.22	61.07
	w/o Guidance	73.50	38.53	73.14	33.65	73.57	50.96	80.60	75.25	62.40
13B	MeanLearn	66.00	43.95	70.47	40.45	69.93	51.62	89.59	82.03	64.26
	w/o Knowledge	63.50	44.07	67.19	36.80	70.45	47.88	84.13	74.58	61.08
	w/o Reasoning	56.00	43.95	58.05	35.91	68.09	45.31	82.54	69.83	57.46
	w/o Guidance	66.50	43.75	66.86	36.92	65.92	47.27	82.19	70.85	60.03
<u>AbsAcc</u>										
7B	MeanLearn	64.58	25.27	57.10	16.67	71.17	37.24	81.35	73.83	53.40
	w/o Knowledge	61.46	26.67	52.91	14.74	66.26	34.84	72.70	69.16	49.84
	w/o Reasoning	59.38	26.18	49.66	14.15	64.13	33.27	69.19	67.29	47.91
	w/o Guidance	61.46	26.44	52.24	14.76	55.56	34.88	74.05	69.16	48.57
13B	MeanLearn	45.83	30.06	47.89	22.00	61.06	35.24	85.41	77.10	50.57
	w/o Knowledge	46.88	30.43	42.87	18.83	62.95	32.10	78.11	66.82	47.37
	w/o Reasoning	36.46	30.81	31.19	18.26	59.70	29.12	75.68	61.68	42.86
	w/o Guidance	50.00	29.58	42.12	18.82	56.41	31.11	75.95	62.15	45.77

Table 7: The overall results of ablation studies. “w/o” denotes without.

and physics & astronomy domains. We suppose this is related to the domain coverage of AbsR.

(3) Since the overall AbsAcc is not relatively high, for potential improvement in the future, apart from focusing more on the domains with poor vanilla accuracy and AbsAcc, we should also increase the overall volume of finetuning data.

6.2 Effect of Knowledge and Reasoning

We utilize *Knowledge* and *Reasoning* ways to enhance abstract reasoning in LLMs. To investigate the effect of them, we conduct an ablation study of AbsR to respectively remove the *Knowledge* (generic facts) and *Reasoning* (explanations) in each example. Results are shown in Table 7 (w/o Knowledge and w/o Reasoning), we can observe:

(1) Removing *Knowledge* (generic facts) or *Reasoning* (explanation) leads to a decrease in performance. This is because the generic facts and their guided reasoning process in AbsR can teach LLMs to learn and utilize the generic fact behind the questions to reason more logically and properly.

(2) In MeanLearn, *Knowledge* contributes less in boosting the vanilla and abstract reasoning than *Reasoning*. It indicates the importance of teaching LLMs how to reason under the guidance of generic facts. Furthermore, it reveals the bottleneck of small-scale LLMs reasoning is caused more by reasoning itself rather than knowledge.

(3) MeanLearn without Knowledge can defeat Orca-2 on vanilla accuracy and AbsAcc, while MeanLearn without Reasoning cannot. This im-




Figure 4: Visualization of reasoning capabilities on MMLU, which is categorized by task domains.

plies the synergy effects between *Knowledge* and *Reasoning* (MeanLearn) can push LLMs further.

(4) In AGIEval, *Knowledge* and *Reasoning* are less critical due to its focus on complex reading comprehension without needing vast knowledge but. Moreover, *Knowledge* seems useless in Commonsense. When providing LLMs with knowledge, we should also teach them how to use it.

6.3 Effect of Guided Explanations

When constructing AbsR, we would ask GPT-4 to generate an explanation guided by the generic fact (Sec 3.2). Hence, we devise another ablation study to investigate the effect of the guidance brought by the generic fact.

To be precise, we follow the process of generating samples with GPT-4 in Sec 3.2, but we do not provide the generic fact in the prompt. Therefore, the explanation is guided by GPT-4 itself. We denote this dataset as AbsR*. Results are shown in Table 7 (w/o Guidance), from which we can infer:

(1) Training 7B and 13B Orca-2 with AbsR* can still outperform Orca-2 on vanilla accuracy. However, it cannot bring stable improvements on AbsAcc. This underscores that reasoning-specific post-training can boost performance, while improving abstract reasoning performance might depend on the difficulty of the benchmarks.

(2) MeanLearn without Knowledge outperforms MeanLearn without Guidance, showing the supe-

riority of training with generic-fact-guided explanation. This stems from the generic-fact-guided explanation that can teach LLMs to use the regular pattern behind the questions for better reasoning.

7 Related Work

7.1 Reasoning with LLMs

LLMs have overturned the research paradigm of NLP, which makes reasoning more accessible. Using LLMs to perform reasoning can be categorized into tuning-based and prompt-based methods.

Tuning-based methods, originating from T0 (Victor et al., 2022) and FLAN (Wei et al., 2022a), finetuned T5 (Raffel et al., 2020) and LaMDA-PT (Thoppilan et al., 2022) on massive NLP tasks, achieving notable zero-shot performance on unseen tasks. Flan-PaLM (Chung et al., 2022) and Tk-INSTRUCT (Wang et al., 2022b) further scaled up the model and task size for improvement. Orca (Mukherjee et al., 2023) and Orca-2 (Mitra et al., 2023) leveraged vast instruction data to teach small-scale LLMs reasoning skills.

As for prompt-based methods, Wei et al. (2022b) introduced CoT prompt to elicit reasoning in LLMs by encouraging step-by-step thinking. Additionally, Kojima et al. (2022) presented zero-shot CoT to bypass manual annotation issues. Subsequently, Zhang et al. (2023) proposed AutoCoT to automatically generate few-shot examples with CoT for reasoning. Various CoT-based methods have since emerged, such as complex CoT (Fu et al., 2023), and tree of thought (Yao et al., 2023), etc.

These methods are designed for improving the general reasoning abilities of LLMs, while we focus on the abstract reasoning capabilities of LLMs.

7.2 LLMs-as-Annotators

LLMs are increasingly employed for data labeling due to their advanced ability to follow instructions.

Some studies distilled various CoT data from LLMs to train student models (Li et al., 2023; Ho et al., 2023; *inter alia*), achieving impressive performance. For instance, Li et al. (2023) distilled symbolic CoT from GPT-3 and observed enhanced performance in commonsense reasoning. With the advent of open-source LLMs like LLaMA (Touvron et al., 2023), other studies distilled instruction data from large-scale LLMs to train small-scale LLMs (Xu et al., 2023; Mukherjee et al., 2023; *inter alia*). For example, Xu et al. (2023) employed

an evolving strategy to obtain complex data, training LLaMA and achieving strong performance.

We employ LLMs to generate training data and develop AbsR tailored for abstract reasoning.

8 Conclusion

In this paper, we investigate the abstract reasoning of open-source LLMs. To achieve this, we first define the evaluation metric of abstract reasoning and design a series of preliminary experiments. Then we discover a large performance gap between general reasoning and abstract reasoning. Hence, we tailor an abstract reasoning dataset AbsR with the help of GPT-4 to enhance LLMs. Finally, we devise a simple but effective paradigm (MeanLearn) to teach LLMs abstract reasoning in **Knowledge** and **Reasoning** ways. Extensive experiments demonstrate the superiority and effectiveness of MeanLearn in vanilla and abstract reasoning accuracies.

Limitations

There are several limitations of our work: First, the size of the training data should be larger to obtain better and more stable results. Second, since the large performance improvement might be due to the PPL-based evaluation, the evaluation setting should be in a generative way to get more precise results. There should be some examples (whether MeanLearn can generate meaningful explanations) to demonstrate the superiority of MeanLearn. Third, more efforts should be made to focus more on abstract reasoning itself. Finally, more LLMs should be incorporated for training to demonstrate the generalizability of MeanLearn.

References

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Alfonso Amayuelas, Liangming Pan, Wenhui Chen, and William Wang. 2023. Knowledge of knowledge: Exploring known-unknowns uncertainty with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13712*.
- Chandra Bhagavatula, Ronan Le Bras, Chaitanya Malaviya, Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ari Holtzman, Hannah Rashkin, Doug Downey, Wen-tau Yih, and Yejin Choi. 2019. Abductive commonsense reasoning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Sumithra Bhakthavatsalam, Chloe Anastasiades, and Peter Clark. 2020. Genericskb: A knowledge base of generic statements. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.00660*.
- Yonatan Bisk, Rowan Zellers, Jianfeng Gao, Yejin Choi, et al. 2020. Piqa: Reasoning about physical commonsense in natural language. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 7432–7439.
- Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Yunxuan Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, et al. 2022. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.11416*.
- Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. 2018. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05457*.
- OpenCompass Contributors. 2023. Opencompass: A universal evaluation platform for foundation models.
- Li Du, Xiao Ding, Ting Liu, and Zhongyang Li. 2019. Modeling event background for if-then commonsense reasoning using context-aware variational autoencoder. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 2682–2691.
- Li Du, Xiao Ding, Kai Xiong, Ting Liu, and Bing Qin. 2022. e-care: a new dataset for exploring explainable causal reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 432–446.
- Yao Fu, Hao Peng, Ashish Sabharwal, Peter Clark, and Tushar Khot. 2023. Complexity-based prompting for multi-step reasoning. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Mor Geva, Daniel Khashabi, Elad Segal, Tushar Khot, Dan Roth, and Jonathan Berant. 2021. Did aristotle use a laptop? a question answering benchmark with implicit reasoning strategies. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:346–361.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Namgyu Ho, Laura Schmid, and Se-Young Yun. 2023. Large language models are reasoning teachers. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 14852–14882, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Edward J Hu, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen, et al. 2022. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:22199–22213.
- Guokun Lai, Qizhe Xie, Hanxiao Liu, Yiming Yang, and Eduard Hovy. 2017. Race: Large-scale reading comprehension dataset from examinations. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 785–794.
- Brenden M Lake, Tomer D Ullman, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Samuel J Gershman. 2017. Building machines that learn and think like people. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 40:e253.
- Liunian Harold Li, Jack Hessel, Youngjae Yu, Xiang Ren, Kai-Wei Chang, and Yejin Choi. 2023. Symbolic chain-of-thought distillation: Small models can also “think” step-by-step. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2665–2679, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*.
- Arindam Mitra, Luciano Del Corro, Shweti Mahajan, Andres Coda, Clarisse Simoes, Sahaj Agarwal, Xuxi Chen, Anastasia Razdaibiedina, Erik Jones, Kriti Aggarwal, et al. 2023. Orca 2: Teaching small language models how to reason. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.11045*.
- Subhabrata Mukherjee, Arindam Mitra, Ganesh Jawahar, Sahaj Agarwal, Hamid Palangi, and Ahmed Awadallah. 2023. Orca: Progressive learning from complex explanation traces of gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02707*.
- Linlu Qiu, Liwei Jiang, Ximing Lu, Melanie Sclar, Valentina Pyatkin, Chandra Bhagavatula, Bailin Wang, Yoon Kim, Yejin Choi, Nouha Dziri, et al. 2023. Phenomenal yet puzzling: Testing inductive reasoning capabilities of language models with hypothesis refinement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.08559*.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(1):5485–5551.
- Melissa Roemmele, Cosmin Adrian Bejan, and Andrew S Gordon. 2011. Choice of plausible alternatives: An evaluation of commonsense causal reasoning. In *2011 AAAI Spring Symposium Series*.
- Maarten Sap, Hannah Rashkin, Derek Chen, Ronan Le Bras, and Yejin Choi. 2019. Social iqa: Commonsense reasoning about social interactions. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 4463–4473.
- Aarohi Srivastava, Abhinav Rastogi, Abhishek Rao, Abu Awal Md Shoeb, Abubakar Abid, Adam Fisch, Adam R Brown, Adam Santoro, Aditya Gupta, Adrià Garriga-Alonso, et al. 2023. Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Scales, Nathanael Schärli, Sebastian Gehrmann, Yi Tay, Hyung Won Chung, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, Denny Zhou, and Jason Wei. 2023. Challenging BIG-bench tasks and whether chain-of-thought can solve them. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 13003–13051, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alon Talmor, Jonathan Herzig, Nicholas Lourie, and Jonathan Berant. 2019. Commonsenseqa: A question answering challenge targeting commonsense knowledge. 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 4149–4158.
- Romal Thoppilan, Daniel De Freitas, Jamie Hall, Noam Shazeer, Apoorv Kulshreshtha, Heng-Tze Cheng, Alicia Jin, Taylor Bos, Leslie Baker, Yu Du, et al. 2022. Lamda: Language models for dialog applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08239*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Sanh Victor, Webson Albert, Raffel Colin, Bach Stephen, Sutawika Lintang, Alyafeai Zaid, Chaffin Antoine, Stiegler Arnaud, Raja Arun, Dey Manan, et al. 2022. Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A Smith, Daniel Khashabi, and Han-naneh Hajishirzi. 2022a. Self-instruct: Aligning language model with self generated instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10560*.

- Yizhong Wang, Swaroop Mishra, Pegah Alipoormolabashi, Yeganeh Kordi, Amirreza Mirzaei, Atharva Naik, Arjun Ashok, Arut Selvan Dhanasekaran, Anjana Arunkumar, David Stap, et al. 2022b. Supernaturalinstructions: Generalization via declarative instructions on 1600+ nlp tasks. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5085–5109.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2022a. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022b. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Kai Xiong, Xiao Ding, Yixin Cao, Ting Liu, and Bing Qin. 2023. Examining inter-consistency of large language models collaboration: An in-depth analysis via debate. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 7572–7590.
- Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Kai Zheng, Xiubo Geng, Pu Zhao, Jiazhan Feng, Chongyang Tao, and Daxin Jiang. 2023. Wizardlm: Empowering large language models to follow complex instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12244*.
- Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Thomas L Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2023. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10601*.
- Zhuosheng Zhang, Aston Zhang, Mu Li, and Alex Smola. 2023. Automatic chain of thought prompting in large language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Wanjun Zhong, Ruixiang Cui, Yiduo Guo, Yaobo Liang, Shuai Lu, Yanlin Wang, Amin Saied, Weizhu Chen, and Nan Duan. 2023. Agieval: A human-centric benchmark for evaluating foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06364*.

A Abstract Reasoning Study

A.1 Prompt for Experiment I

```
<|im_start|>system
You are Orca, an AI language model created by Microsoft. You
are a cautious assistant. You carefully follow instructions.
You are helpful and harmless and you follow ethical guidelines
and promote positive behavior.<|im_end|>
<|im_start|>user
{premise} Hypothesis1 or Hypothesis2?
Hypothesis1: {hypothesis1}
Hypothesis2: {hypothesis2}
Your answer should follow the format like "Answer: Hypothesis(1
or 2) is more plausible.
Explanation: ____"<|im_end|>
<|im_start|>assistant
```

The placeholders `{premise}`, `{hypothesis1}`, and `{hypothesis2}` will be filled with the corresponding terms in each example of e-CARE dataset.

A.2 Prmpt for Experiment II

```
<|im_start|>system
You are Orca, an AI language model created by Microsoft. You
are a cautious assistant. You carefully follow instructions.
You are helpful and harmless and you follow ethical guidelines
and promote positive behavior.<|im_end|>
<|im_start|>user
Question: {premise} Hypothesis1 or Hypothesis2?
Hypothesis1: {hypothesis1}
Hypothesis2: {hypothesis2}
Do you think {fact} can be used to answer this question?
You answer should follow the format like "Answer: Yes or
No."<|im_end|>
<|im_start|>assistant
```

The placeholders `{premise}`, `{hypothesis1}`, `{hypothesis1}`, and `{fact}` will be filled with the corresponding terms in each example of e-CARE dataset.

B Details for Generic Facts Filtering

We apply the following steps to filter generics fact from GenericsKB:

- (1) Exclude sentences with confidence < 0.7 .
- (2) Categorize the sentences by the concepts.
- (3) Randomly sample 4,613 concepts, and then randomly sample one sentence as the generic fact from the category of each sampled concept.

Hereafter, we can obtain a collection of 4,613 generic facts.

C Prompt for AbsR Construction

We use the following prompt to generate our AbsR examples.

You are an expert in creating questions, you should first offer a question together with some options based on the fact the user gives. Second, you should give an answer and an explanation guided by the given fact. You can propose questions in any area, including but not limited to history, law, medical, math, science, computer science, psychology, AI, politics, economics etc. Your response should follow the following format: “Question: ____ Options:____ Answer: ____ Explanation: ____”. NOTE that the fact should be an implicit explanation for obtaining the true answer, which means the fact SHOULD NOT appear explicitly in the questions or the options. The explanations should be short. Please create {number} examples.

The placeholder {number} will be randomly filled with “one”, “two” or “three”.

D K-example and R-example

D.1 K-example

```
<|im_start|>system
You are a cautious assistant. You carefully follow instructions.
You are given a question, a few options, and a rule, you
should follow the given rule to answer the question. Your
response should follow the format like "Explanation: ____Answer:
____"<|im_end|>
<|im_start|>user
Fact: Cookie files are simple text files that can be viewed in
Windows Notepad.
Question: What type of application can be used to open and view
cookie files on a Windows computer?
Options:
A) Microsoft Excel B) Adobe Photoshop C) Windows Notepad D) 3D
Modeling Software<|im_end|>
<|im_start|>assistant
Explanation: Windows Notepad is a text editor that is capable
of opening and displaying the contents of simple text files,
which is the format of cookie files.
Answer: C) Windows Notepad<|im_end|>
```

D.2 R-example

```
<|im_start|>system
You are a cautious assistant. You carefully follow instructions.
You are given a question together with a few options, you
should give an explanation first then answer the question. Your
response should follow the format like "Explanation: ___Answer:
___"<|im_end|>
<|im_start|>user
Question: What type of application can be used to open and view
cookie files on a Windows computer?
Options:
A) Microsoft Excel B) Adobe Photoshop C) Windows Notepad D) 3D
Modeling Software<|im_end|>
<|im_start|>assistant
Explanation: Windows Notepad is a text editor that is capable
of opening and displaying the contents of simple text files,
which is the format of cookie files.
Answer: C) Windows Notepad<|im_end|>
```

E Templates for Evaluation

E.1 LLaMA-2

The following are multiple choice questions (with answers) about abstract algebra.

Find the degree for the given field extension $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{3}, \sqrt{18})$ over \mathbb{Q} .

- A. 0
- B. 4
- C. 2
- D. 6

Answer: A

E.2 Orca-2 and MeanLearn

```
<|im_start|>system
The following are multiple choice questions (with answers) about
abstract algebra.<|im_end|>
<|im_start|>user
Question: Find the degree for the given field extension
 $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{3}, \sqrt{18})$  over  $\mathbb{Q}$ .
Options:
A. 0
B. 4
C. 2
D. 6<|im_end|>
<|im_start|>assistant
Answer: A<|im_end|>
```