

Investigating the Pre-Training Dynamics of In-Context Learning: Task Recognition vs. Task Learning

Xiaolei Wang^{1,3*}, Xinyu Tang^{1,3*}, Wayne Xin Zhao^{1,3†}, Ji-Rong Wen^{1,2,3}

¹Gaoling School of Artificial Intelligence, Renmin University of China

²School of Information, Renmin University of China

³Beijing Key Laboratory of Big Data Management and Analysis Methods
wxl1999@foxmail.com, txy20010310@163.com, batmanfly@gmail.com

Abstract

The emergence of in-context learning (ICL) is potentially attributed to two major abilities: *task recognition* (TR) for recognizing the task from demonstrations and utilizing pre-trained priors, and *task learning* (TL) for learning from demonstrations. However, relationships between the two abilities and how such relationships affect the emergence of ICL is unclear. In this paper, we take the first step by examining the pre-training dynamics of the emergence of ICL. With carefully designed metrics, we find that these two abilities are, in fact, *competitive* during pre-training. Moreover, we observe a strong negative correlation between the competition and ICL performance. Further analysis of common pre-training factors (*i.e.*, model size, dataset size, and data curriculum) demonstrates possible ways to regulate the competition. Based on these insights, we propose a simple yet effective method to better integrate these two abilities for ICL at inference time. Through adaptive ensemble learning, the performance of ICL can be significantly boosted, enabling two small models to outperform a larger one with more than twice the parameters. The code is available at <https://github.com/RUCAIBox/Competitive-ICL>.

1 Introduction

In-context learning (ICL) (Brown et al., 2020) represents a significant advancement in the capabilities of large language models (LLMs). It allows models to rapidly adapt to new tasks without updating the parameters by adding only a few examples as demonstrations to the input. This capability has profound applications on a wide range of tasks (Dong et al., 2022; Lin et al., 2023).

To explore the underlying mechanism, existing work (Pan et al., 2023; Wei et al., 2023) mainly focuses on how LLMs perform ICL during inference.

* Equal contribution.

† Corresponding author.




Figure 1: The performance of MiniCPM-2B and Amber-7B for ICL and its two abilities (*i.e.*, task recognition and task learning). The emergence of ICL encounters many fluctuations, where the performance of task recognition and task learning changes in the opposite direction.

Two main abilities are considered to play important roles in ICL: task recognition (TR), which recognizes the task from demonstrations and utilizes pre-trained priors, and task learning (TL), which directly learns to solve the task from demonstrations. Furthermore, recent research (Pan et al., 2023) has found that TR is relatively easier to obtain and can be observed in small models with only 350M parameters, while TL would often emerge in large models with billions of parameters. Based on this, Wei et al. (2023) further explore the relationships between these two abilities and show that TR takes the dominant in smaller LLMs while TL is more emphasized in larger LLMs. However, how these two abilities quantitatively affect the emergence of ICL is under-explored.

In this work, we take the first step towards unraveling the mystery, *i.e.*, *relationships between the two abilities and how such relationships affect the emergence of ICL*, by examining the pre-training dynamics of LLMs. To achieve this goal, we first propose to disentangle the two abilities by manipulating the input-label settings (Pan et al., 2023), so as to measure the performance of TR and TL for each model checkpoint in the pre-training. As

illustrated in Figure 1, we can observe that the emergence of ICL encounters many fluctuations, along with competition between its two abilities (*i.e.*, their performance actually changes in the opposite direction). To quantify such a competitive relationship, we propose new measurements to reflect how one ability suppresses the other.

With the proposed metrics, we find that the competitive relationship widely exists for existing LLMs with various training settings. More importantly, it demonstrates a strong correlation with ICL. First, during pre-training, the competition exhibits a “stable-rise” pattern, typically reflecting fluctuations and improvements in the performance of ICL. Second, with respect to the entire pre-training process, the average intensity of competition (defined in Section 2) is negatively correlated with the final ICL performance: the less competition, the better the ICL performance. These findings suggest that regulating the competition between the two abilities of ICL could be crucial for its emergence. We further investigate the influence of common pre-training factors (*i.e.*, model size, dataset size, and data curriculum) on the competition. We find that: (1) scaling model size can lead to the early appearance of competition but effectively reduce the average intensity of competition; (2) scaling dataset size can postpone the competition; and (3) specific data curricula can adjust the intensity of competition for the enhancement or specialization of LLMs.

Furthermore, we propose a simple yet effective method to fuse the two abilities of ICL for better performance at inference time. Specifically, we first select two checkpoints from the pre-training process with the best abilities of TR and TL, respectively. Then, they are fused with adaptive ensemble learning, where the contribution of each one is adaptively determined by its performance. To validate the effectiveness of our approach, we conduct experiments on extensive datasets and LLMs with various training settings. Experimental results show that this simple method can effectively boost the performance of ICL and outperform several competitive baselines, even if the total parameters are less than half of a single larger LLM.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that the competitive relationship between the two abilities of ICL (*i.e.*, TR and TL) and its emergence has been investigated. By examining the pre-training dynamics of ICL, we demonstrate a

strong negative correlation between the emergence of ICL and the competition between TR and TL.

- We conduct a fine-grained analysis of common pre-training factors (*i.e.*, model size, dataset size, and data curriculum) to understand their influence on the competition between TR and TL.

- We propose a simple but effective method to better integrate TR and TL for ICL at inference time. Through adaptive ensemble learning, the performance of ICL can be significantly boosted, enabling two small models to outperform a larger one with more than twice the parameters.

2 Background and Measurement

In this section, we introduce the background of TR and TL and further propose new measurements to quantify the competition between them.

2.1 Task Recognition and Task Learning

Typically, an LLM performs ICL by using input-label pairs from the target task as demonstrations, *i.e.*, $D_k = \{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_k, y_k)\}$, to predict the label for the test input. In existing literature (Pan et al., 2023; Lin and Lee, 2024), it has been widely recognized that ICL can be attributed to two major underlying abilities, namely *task recognition (TR)* and *task learning (TL)*. Specifically, TR refers to the ability of an LLM to recognize the target task from demonstrations and only utilize its own knowledge obtained from pre-training to solve the task, while TL refers to the ability of an LLM to solve the target task solely based on demonstrations.

To disentangle ICL into the two main abilities, existing studies (Pan et al., 2023; Lin and Lee, 2024) are mainly developed based on an important assumption: the mapping information between input and label in demonstrations is more important for TL. Following Pan et al. (2023), we consider three settings to study the effect of TR and TL:

- *Gold*: It refers to the standard ICL setting, where we use the correct input-label pairs. This reflects both TR and TL abilities.

- *Random*: To evaluate TR ability, we randomly sample labels from the label space of the target task for each input in demonstrations.

- *Abstract*: To evaluate TL ability, we map the original labels in demonstrations to semantically unrelated ones (*e.g.*, numbers, letters, or symbols).

With the above settings, we can conduct the corresponding empirical experiments by manipulating the input-label relations (*i.e.*, *random* and *abstract*

settings) to quantify the effect of TL and TR.

2.2 Competition Measurement

In this paper, an important hypothesis is that competitive relationships exist between TR and TL during pre-training. To investigate this, we assume that the intermediate checkpoints of LLMs are available, denoted as $\mathcal{M}_\theta = \{M_{\theta_1}, M_{\theta_2}, \dots, M_{\theta_i}\}$. Specifically, we first calculate the performance change of TR and TL during pre-training as follows:

$$\Delta\text{TR}_i = \text{Acc}_{i+1}^{\text{rand}} - \text{Acc}_i^{\text{rand}}, \quad (1)$$

$$\Delta\text{TL}_i = \text{Acc}_{i+1}^{\text{abs}} - \text{Acc}_i^{\text{abs}}, \quad (2)$$

where $\text{Acc}_i^{\text{rand}}$ and $\text{Acc}_i^{\text{abs}}$ denote the accuracy of the intermediate checkpoint M_{θ_i} under the *random* and *abstract* settings introduced in Section 2.

If the performance of TR and TL changes in opposite directions, it would indicate that competition actually occurs, which can be represented as:

$$C_i^h = \mathbb{I}(\Delta\text{TR}_i \cdot \Delta\text{TL}_i < 0) \cdot \mathbb{I}(|\Delta\text{TR}_i| > \epsilon) \cdot \mathbb{I}(|\Delta\text{TL}_i| > \epsilon), \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$ is the indicator function. Here, we consider two additional indicator functions to reduce the influence of inaccurate performance estimation. ϵ is set to 0.01 in our experiment. Furthermore, to measure the intensity of competition C_i^s , we consider using the ratio between the performance changes of TR and TL:

$$C_i^s = C_i^h \cdot \left[\mathbb{I}(\Delta\text{TR}_i < 0) \cdot \left| \frac{\Delta\text{TR}_i}{\Delta\text{TL}_i} \right| + \mathbb{I}(\Delta\text{TL}_i < 0) \cdot \left| \frac{\Delta\text{TL}_i}{\Delta\text{TR}_i} \right| \right]. \quad (4)$$

Here, we assume that an increase in the performance of one ability at the cost of a decrease in the performance of the other ability indicates the intensity of competition. A larger value of C_i^s suggests more intense competition, as it implies a greater decrease in the performance of one ability for a given increase in the performance of the other. Moreover, to investigate the dynamics of competition during pre-training, we calculate the cumulative intensity score R_i as follows:

$$R_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^i C_j^s}{\sum_{j=1}^N C_j^s}. \quad (5)$$

This measure tracks the cumulative proportion of the total competition intensity up to the i -th training step, providing insight into how competition evolves over time.

3 Empirical Analysis

In this section, we present the empirical analysis of the competition relationships between TR and TL for ICL.

3.1 Experimental Setup

Tasks and Datasets. Following Pan et al. (2023), we select 16 datasets across four types of tasks for the experiment: sentiment analysis, topic/state classification, toxicity detection, and natural language inference/paraphrase detection. Details about the datasets are depicted in Appendix A. Due to computational constraints, we sample 1000 examples from each dataset for evaluation.

Models. Since our work focuses on the pre-training dynamics of ICL, we select LLMs that have more than 350M parameters and provide their intermediate checkpoints: the Pythia suite (6 model sizes ranging from 410M to 12B) (Biderman et al., 2023), MiniCPM-2B (Hu et al., 2024), Baichuan2-7B (Yang et al., 2023), Amber-7B (Liu et al., 2023), CrystalCoder-7B (Liu et al., 2023), and OLMo-7B (Groeneveld et al., 2024). Due to computational constraints, we sample 16 checkpoints in addition to the final one. They are evenly distributed in the pre-training process. Experiments with other numbers of checkpoints yield similar results, which are shown in Appendix B.1. To make the output as deterministic as possible, we set temperature=0.

Other Details. We use 16 randomly sampled examples as demonstrations by default across the paper following Min et al. (2022). The discussion about the number of examples can be found in Appendix B.2. We use minimal templates to construct demonstrations following Pan et al. (2023). Specifically, we use a single newline character (*i.e.*, `\n`) to connect each input-label pair and three ones to separate examples. We utilize symbols as labels in the abstract setting. Other kinds of abstract labels yield similar results as discussed in Appendix B.3. The results are averaged across five random seeds.

3.2 Task Recognition and Task Learning Are Competitive During Pre-Training

Figure 1 shows that the emergence of ICL meets many fluctuations, along with competition between its two abilities (*i.e.*, TR and TL). In this section, we delve into this competition and unveil its relationship with ICL.




Figure 2: Average ratio of competition for LLMs.




Figure 3: The performance of ICL and the evolution of competition (R_i) during the pre-training of MiniCPM-2B and Amber-7B.

The Existence of Competition. To confirm the existence of competition between TR and TL, we investigate the pre-training process of 8 LLMs with various training settings. Specifically, we calculate the average ratio of competitions according to the indicator metric C_i^h defined in Eq. (3). As illustrated in Figure 2, all the LLMs exhibit certain levels of competition during pre-training. For some LLMs, even more than half the time there exists competition. It suggests that the competition between TR and TL is a widespread phenomenon during pre-training.

The Dynamic of Competition. We further explore the intensity of competition and its evolution during pre-training. Specifically, we choose MiniCPM-2B and Amber-7B, which are trained with over a trillion tokens with different amounts of parameters. We track the evolution of the intensity of competition using the metric R_i defined in Eq. (5). Results are shown in Figure 3. We can observe that




Figure 4: ICL performance of the final checkpoint and the average intensity of competition (C^s) for LLMs.

the intensity of competition typically repeats the “stable-rise” pattern, which usually corresponds to the fluctuation and increase in the performance of ICL. Such an interesting phenomenon inspires us to further examine the relationship between the competition and the performance of ICL.

The Relationship Between Competition and ICL.

We first examine the relationship between the competition and the performance of ICL based on pre-training dynamics. As shown in Figure 3, when there exists competition, the performance of ICL tends to increase (78% of the time for MiniCPM-2B and 57% for Amber-7B). However, when there is no competition, the performance of ICL shows fluctuations, making the situation complicated. To make it clear, we shift our perspective to the entire pre-training process. Specifically, we examine the relationship between the average intensity of competition \bar{C}^s defined in Eq. (5) and the ICL performance of the final checkpoint. As illustrated in Figure 4, with the increase of \bar{C}^s , the ICL performance tends to drop, with the exception of MiniCPM-2B and CrystalCoder-7B (they will be discussed in Section 3.3). To further verify their correlation, we calculate the Pearson correlation coefficient. The result is -0.591, validating their negative correlation. This finding has important implications for optimizing pre-training processes and suggests that managing the competition between TR and TL could be crucial for enhancing ICL ability.




Figure 5: The evolution and average intensity (\bar{C}_i^s) of competition of LLMs with different model sizes.

3.3 How Do Factors of Pre-Training Influence the Competition?

As discussed in Section 3.2, the competition between TR and TL during pre-training demonstrates a strong correlation with the final ICL performance. This motivates us to investigate the influence of pre-training factors on the competition level. Specifically, we investigate several common factors, *i.e.*, model size, dataset size, and data curriculum.

3.3.1 Effect of Model Size

We investigate the effect of model size on the competition between TR and TL. Specifically, we use the Pythia suite for experimentation since these models share the same training setting in addition to the number of parameters.

We first pay attention to the differences in the evolution of competition. We can observe from Figure 5a that as the model size increases, the evolving curve of competition keeps moving to the left. This suggests that scaling up model size could make the appearance of competition appear earlier. One possible reason is that the learning ability of larger LLMs is stronger, and they can possess TR and TL more quickly, thus causing competition between them to occur earlier.

Then, we focus on the changes in the average competition intensity. As illustrated in Figure 5b, the average competitive intensity sharply decreases with the increase of model size, with the exception of Pythia-1B. This indicates that scaling up the model size is helpful in reducing the overall competition. This may be attributed to the fact that LLMs with more parameters have a larger capacity, where TR and TL can be allocated with more exclusive resources (*e.g.*, neurons). As a result, although the competition becomes earlier in larger LLMs, the average intensity of competition becomes lower. Interestingly, we can observe that overall, the average intensity of competition scales




Figure 6: Competition evolving process (R_i) of LLMs trained with different dataset sizes.

as a power-law with model size, which follows a similar pattern with the training loss in the scaling law of LLMs (Kaplan et al., 2020). We leave the exploration of the relationship between the scaling law of LLMs and the competition between TR and TL as future work.

3.3.2 Scaling Dataset Size

In this part, we explore the impact of dataset size on the competition between TR and TL. We conduct experiments using models with roughly the same number of parameters but trained with different dataset sizes. Specifically, we make the comparison among two sets of LLMs: (Pythia-2.8B and MiniCPM-2B) and (Pythia-6.9B, Amber-7B, and OLMo-7B).

Figure 6 illustrates the evolution of competition during pre-training for these two sets of LLMs. It can be observed that, for both sets of LLMs, the evolving curve keeps moving to the right with the increasing of dataset size. This suggests that scaling up dataset size could postpone the competition. The possible reason behind this is that, when pre-trained on a small dataset, LLMs can quickly memorize the knowledge contained in the dataset. Thus, they can develop the TR ability for performing ICL in an early stage. Meanwhile, the TL ability can also be easily acquired, as it primarily involves directly utilizing the information in context, as discussed by Singh et al. (2024). As a result, the competition between TR and TL occurs in the early stage of pre-training. With the increase in dataset size, the development of the TR ability becomes slower since there is more knowledge required to memorize. Therefore, more competition happens at a later time, which makes the evolving curve shift to the right.

3.3.3 Scheduling Data Curriculum

In this part, we explore the influence of data curriculum on the competition between TR and TL. Here, we consider two representative strategies for




Figure 7: ICL performance and competition intensity (C^s) of MiniCPM-2B and Pythia-2.8B. The dashed line is used to distinguish between different training stages.




Figure 8: ICL performance and competition intensity (C^s) of CrystalCoder-7B and Amber-7B. Dash lines are used to distinguish between different training stages.

scheduling data curriculum: (1) quality curriculum, which makes arrangements for data of different qualities, and (2) domain curriculum, which makes arrangements for data from different domains.

We first pay attention to the influence of quality curriculum on the competition. Specifically, we use MiniCPM-2B for experimentation, which utilizes coarse-quality unlabeled data in the first stage and mixes high-quality labeled data in the second stage. We compare its pre-training process with that of Pythia-2.8B, which has a similar model size and dataset size. As illustrated in Figure 7, the ICL performance of MiniCPM-2B traps in fluctuations in the latter half of the first stage while starting to increase again in the second stage. Meanwhile, the competition in MiniCPM-2B also becomes active in the second stage, and its intensity rapidly increases. In contrast, the ICL performance of Pythia-2.8B keeps in fluctuation in the later stages of pre-training, and the competition is relatively less active. One possible reason for the success of quality curriculum is that part of the knowledge in high-quality labeled data is actually covered by large-scale coarse-quality data, which may cause competition between TR and TL to enhance their learning for the high-quality data.

We then focus on the influence of domain curriculum on the competition. Specifically, we use CrystalCoder-7B for experimentation, which utilizes general domain data (*i.e.*, SlimPajama (Sobolova et al., 2023)) in the first stage, mixes general

and code domain data (*i.e.*, SlimPajama and StarCoder (Li et al., 2023a)) in the second stage, and mainly uses specific programming language data (*i.e.*, Python and web-related data sampled from StarCoder) in the final stage. Similar to the quality curriculum, we compare its pre-training process with that of Amber-7B, which has a similar model size and dataset size. As shown in Figure 8, compared with Amber-7B, CrystalCoder-7B demonstrates much less competition in the second stage, along with a higher performance improvement. The underlying reason may be the domain difference between general text and code, which brings additional knowledge for LLMs to develop TR and postpone the competition between TR and TL on shared knowledge. In the final stage of CrystalCoder-7B, the competition becomes active again. This could be attributed to data duplication since training data is sampled from StarCoder, which has been utilized in the second stage. Duplicated data can stimulate the competition between TR and TL to strengthen their learning of specific skills or knowledge (*e.g.*, specific programming languages for CrystalCoder-7B), thus achieving better model specialization.

4 From Competition to Collaboration at Inference Time

As discussed in Section 3.2, the competitive relations between TR and TL abilities would lead

to a decrease in ICL performance, and our idea is to mitigate the competition effect and facilitate their collaboration at inference time. In this section, we first introduce the proposed adaptive ensemble learning method and then show the experimental results.

4.1 Method

Our previous analysis in Section 3.2 shows that although ICL achieves the best performance at the end of training under the gold setting (correct input-label mapping), the corresponding dual abilities usually do not achieve the best performance simultaneously. This observation suggests that it would achieve better ICL performance if we could integrate the best TR and TL capabilities in one model. Based on this idea, we propose to fuse the corresponding model checkpoints with ensemble learning. Specifically, we first select two checkpoints with the best ability of TR and TL respectively, and then integrate their probability distributions to make the prediction:

$$\arg \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} [w_r \Pr_r^{\text{rand}}(y|x) + w_l \Pr_l^{\text{abs}}(y|x)], \quad (6)$$

where $\Pr_r^{\text{rand}}(y|x)$ and $\Pr_l^{\text{abs}}(y|x)$ denote the probability for the TR and TL models to predict the label y under the random and abstract settings respectively, and w_r and w_l denote the weights for the prediction of the TR and TL models respectively.

In addition, considering the contribution of dual abilities to ICL is usually not equal (), we further propose an adaptive ensemble learning method for fusion. Specifically, we control the contribution of each checkpoint by setting the weight according to their performance, which is calculated as follows:

$$w_r = \frac{\text{Acc}_r^{\text{rand}} - b}{(\text{Acc}_r^{\text{rand}} - b) + (\text{Acc}_l^{\text{abs}} - b)}, \quad (7)$$

$$w_l = \frac{\text{Acc}_l^{\text{abs}} - b}{(\text{Acc}_r^{\text{rand}} - b) + (\text{Acc}_l^{\text{abs}} - b)}, \quad (8)$$

where $\text{Acc}_r^{\text{rand}}$ is the performance of the model for TR under the random setting, $\text{Acc}_l^{\text{abs}}$ is the performance of the model for TL under the abstract setting, and b is the performance of random guess.

4.2 Experimental Setting

To comprehensively validate the effectiveness of our method, we consider three different combinations of TR and TL models for fusion: (1) the same model (*i.e.*, Pythia-1B), (2) two models with

Model	# Params	Acc.
<i>Large models</i>		
Amber-7B _{ICL}	7B	50.08
Pythia-6.9B _{ICL}	6.9B	50.22
Pythia-12B _{ICL}	12B	51.74
OLMo-7B _{ICL}	7B	52.10
Baichuan2-7B _{ICL}	7B	52.77
CrystalCoder-7B _{ICL}	7B	55.66
<i>Small models</i>		
Pythia-1B _{ICL}	1B	44.55
Pythia-2.8B _{ICL}	2.8B	45.38
MiniCPM-2B _{ICL}	2.7B	50.08
<i>Fusion of small models</i>		
Pythia-1B _{TR} + Pythia-1B _{TL} (fixed)	2B	56.16
Pythia-1B _{TR} + Pythia-1B _{TL} (adaptive)		56.25
Pythia-1B _{TR} + Pythia-2.8B _{TL} (fixed)	3.9B	56.62
Pythia-1B _{TR} + Pythia-2.8B _{TL} (adaptive)		56.83
Pythia-1B _{TL} + Pythia-2.8B _{TR} (fixed)		55.23
Pythia-1B _{TL} + Pythia-2.8B _{TR} (adaptive)		55.39
Pythia-1B _{TR} + MiniCPM-2B _{TL} (fixed)	3.8B	55.21
Pythia-1B _{TR} + MiniCPM-2B _{TL} (adaptive)		55.31
Pythia-1B _{TL} + MiniCPM-2B _{TR} (fixed)		54.31
Pythia-1B _{TL} + MiniCPM-2B _{TR} (adaptive)		55.85

Table 1: Averaged accuracy across 16 datasets for different models and their fusion. We highlight the highest numbers among fusion with the same model combination.

a similar training setting (*i.e.*, Pythia-1B and Pythia-2.8B), and (3) two models with different training settings (*i.e.*, Pythia-1B and MiniCPM-2B). Each model is selected to play the roles of both TR and TL, respectively. We select checkpoints with the best performance for the required ability. Other settings are the same as in Section 3.1.

We compare our method with three types of baselines: (1) the TR or TL model itself used for fusion, (2) LLMs whose parameters are more than the sum of TR and TL models, and (3) fusion using the same weight (*i.e.*, $w_r = w_l$) (“fixed” in Table 1). All the baselines are tested in the gold setting.

4.3 Results

As presented in Table 1, our proposed method can significantly boost performance compared to the single TR or TL model. In addition, such an improvement is consistent across various model combinations, demonstrating that our method is widely applicable. To our surprise, two small models together can even outperform larger models by using this method, despite their total parameters being less than half of the larger ones. It suggests that

Models	TR Model	TL Model	Accuracy
TR: Pythia-1B TL: Pythia-1B	Random	Random	52.66
	Best	Random	53.52
	Random	Best	54.19
	Best	Best	56.25
TR: Pythia-1B TL: Pythia-2.8B	Random	Random	48.10
	Best	Random	50.76
	Random	Best	55.42
	Best	Best	56.83
TR: Pythia-2.8B TL: Pythia-1B	Random	Random	52.48
	Best	Random	53.89
	Random	Best	54.39
	Best	Best	55.39
TR: Pythia-1B TL: MiniCPM-2B	Random	Random	53.99
	Best	Random	54.79
	Random	Best	54.51
	Best	Best	55.31
TR: MiniCPM-2B TL: Pythia-1B	Random	Random	52.07
	Best	Random	53.61
	Random	Best	53.73
	Best	Best	55.85

Table 2: Ablation study for model fusion. Results are averaged across 16 datasets. We highlight the highest numbers among fusion with the same models for TR and TL. “Random” means that the checkpoint is randomly selected, while “Best” means that the checkpoint has the best performance for TR/TL.

our method can effectively fuse the abilities of TR and TL to achieve better ICL performance.

Furthermore, to verify the effectiveness of each component in our method, we conduct the ablation study. We consider substituting the best checkpoints with random ones or setting the weights of TR and TL to the same, respectively. As shown in Table 1 and 2, removing any design would lead to a decrease in performance. It demonstrates the effectiveness of all the components of our approach. In addition, the selection of checkpoints with the best sub-ability seems to be more important, which yields a larger performance drop after being removed. Checkpoints with the best sub-ability are more diverse in their predictions, which is important for successful fusion.

5 Related Work

Our work is closely related to the studies on the mechanisms of ICL and model fusion.

The Mechanism of ICL. Existing work primarily explores the mechanisms of ICL from the pre-training and inference stages of LLMs. Some work discusses how ICL emerges from pre-training by conducting analysis on pre-training factors like data (Chan et al., 2022; Reddy, 2023) and opti-

mization (Singh et al., 2024; Anand et al., 2024). Other work (Pan et al., 2023; Min et al., 2022; Dai et al., 2023) studies the operating mechanism of ICL at inference time. Researchers empirically find two main abilities in ICL: task recognition (TR) for recognizing the task and utilizing pre-trained priors of LLMs (Min et al., 2022) and task learning (TL) for learning from demonstrations (Dai et al., 2023). In this paper, we explore how TR and TL affect the emergence of ICL. By examining the pre-training dynamics of LLMs, we demonstrate a strong correlation between the emergence of ICL and the competition between TR and TL.

Model Fusion. Model fusion aims to enhance performance by combining the strengths of multiple models (Li et al., 2023b). One line of work aims to reduce the difference among different models from perspectives like mode connectivity (Nagarajan and Kolter, 2019) and alignment (Tatro et al., 2020). Another line of work studies how to leverage the diversity among models through techniques like weight average (Wang et al., 2019) and ensemble learning (Sagi and Rokach, 2018). In this paper, we propose adaptive ensemble learning to fuse checkpoints proficient in TR and TL and achieve better ICL performance.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we presented the first study of the competitive relationship of TR and TL abilities, and quantified their effect on the emergence of ICL. With specially designed metrics, we found that the competition between dual abilities widely exists in existing LLMs, and the competition intensity is negatively correlated with the ICL performance. Then, we conducted a detailed analysis of several pre-training factors (*i.e.*, model size, dataset size, and data curriculum) to demonstrate possible ways to regulate the competition. Furthermore, we proposed a simple yet effective method to better integrate dual abilities at inference time. Through adaptive ensemble learning, the performance of ICL can be significantly boosted, enabling two small models to outperform a larger one with more than twice the parameters. Overall, our work provides new insights and approaches to study and understand the underlying mechanism of ICL, which is worth deep exploration for improving the capacity of LLMs.

7 Limitations

Although our study provides valuable insights into the dual abilities of ICL and its emergence, several limitations should be noted. First, our research focuses on classification tasks since they can be easily adapted for the three evaluation settings of ICL. Other types of tasks are left for future work. Second, our investigation is confined to conventional ICL paradigms and does not explore alternative paradigms such as chain-of-thought prompting (CoT). Third, due to computational constraints, our study mainly considers LLMs with up to 12 billion parameters. Replicating our study with larger-scale LLMs could provide further insights and validate the robustness of our findings across different model sizes.

References

- Suraj Anand, Michael A Lepori, Jack Merullo, and Ellie Pavlick. 2024. Dual process learning: Controlling use of in-context vs. in-weights strategies with weight forgetting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.00053*.
- Valerio Basile, Cristina Bosco, Elisabetta Fersini, Debora Nozza, Viviana Patti, Francisco Manuel Rangel Pardo, Paolo Rosso, and Manuela Sanguinetti. 2019. Semeval-2019 task 5: Multilingual detection of hate speech against immigrants and women in twitter. In *SemEval@NAACL-HLT*, pages 54–63. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Stella Biderman, Hailey Schoelkopf, Quentin Gregory Anthony, Herbie Bradley, Kyle O’Brien, Eric Hallahan, Mohammad Aflah Khan, Shivanshu Purohit, USVSN Sai Prashanth, Edward Raff, Aviya Skowron, Lintang Sutawika, and Oskar van der Wal. 2023. Pythia: A suite for analyzing large language models across training and scaling. In *ICML*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2397–2430. PMLR.
- Samuel R. Bowman, Gabor Angeli, Christopher Potts, and Christopher D. Manning. 2015. A large annotated corpus for learning natural language inference. In *EMNLP*, pages 632–642. The Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Stephanie Chan, Adam Santoro, Andrew Lampinen, Jane Wang, Aaditya Singh, Pierre Richemond, James McClelland, and Felix Hill. 2022. Data distributional properties drive emergent in-context learning in transformers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:18878–18891.
- Damai Dai, Yutao Sun, Li Dong, Yaru Hao, Shuming Ma, Zhifang Sui, and Furu Wei. 2023. Why can gpt learn in-context? language models secretly perform gradient descent as meta-optimizers. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 4005–4019.
- William B. Dolan and Chris Brockett. 2005. Automatically constructing a corpus of sentential paraphrases. In *IWP@IJCNLP*. Asian Federation of Natural Language Processing.
- Qingxiu Dong, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Ce Zheng, Zhiyong Wu, Baobao Chang, Xu Sun, Jingjing Xu, and Zhifang Sui. 2022. A survey on in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.00234*.
- Dirk Groeneveld, Iz Beltagy, Pete Walsh, Akshita Bhagia, Rodney Kinney, Oyvind Tafjord, Ananya Harsh Jha, Hamish Ivison, Ian Magnusson, Yizhong Wang, Shane Arora, David Atkinson, Russell Authur, Khyathi Raghavi Chandu, Arman Cohan, Jennifer Dumas, Yanai Elazar, Yuling Gu, Jack Hessel, Tushar Khot, William Merrill, Jacob Morrison, Niklas Muennighoff, Aakanksha Naik, Crystal Nam, Matthew E. Peters, Valentina Pyatkin, Abhilasha Ravichander, Dustin Schwenk, Saurabh Shah, Will Smith, Emma Strubell, Nishant Subramani, Mitchell Wortsman, Pradeep Dasigi, Nathan Lambert, Kyle Richardson, Luke Zettlemoyer, Jesse Dodge, Kyle Lo, Luca Soldaini, Noah A. Smith, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2024. Olmo: Accelerating the science of language models. *CoRR*, abs/2402.00838.
- Shengding Hu, Yuge Tu, Xu Han, Chaoqun He, Ganqu Cui, Xiang Long, Zhi Zheng, Yewei Fang, Yuxiang Huang, Weilin Zhao, Xinrong Zhang, Zhen Leng Thai, Kai Zhang, Chongyi Wang, Yuan Yao, Chenyang Zhao, Jie Zhou, Jie Cai, Zhongwu Zhai, Ning Ding, Chao Jia, Guoyang Zeng, Dahai Li, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2024. Minicpm: Unveiling the potential of small language models with scalable training strategies. *CoRR*, abs/2404.06395.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*.
- Hector J. Levesque, Ernest Davis, and Leora Morgenstern. 2012. The winograd schema challenge. In *KR*. AAAI Press.
- Raymond Li, Yangtian Zi, Niklas Muennighoff, Denis Kocetkov, Chenghao Mou, Marc Marone, Christopher Akiki, LI Jia, Jenny Chim, Qian Liu, et al. 2023a. Starcoder: may the source be with you! *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Weishi Li, Yong Peng, Miao Zhang, Liang Ding, Han Hu, and Li Shen. 2023b. Deep model fusion: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.15698*.

- Bill Yuchen Lin, Abhilasha Ravichander, Ximing Lu, Nouha Dziri, Melanie Sclar, Khyathi Chandu, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. 2023. The unlocking spell on base llms: Rethinking alignment via in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.01552*.
- Ziqian Lin and Kangwook Lee. 2024. Dual operating modes of in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.18819*.
- Zhengzhong Liu, Aurick Qiao, Willie Neiswanger, Hongyi Wang, Bowen Tan, Tianhua Tao, Junbo Li, Yuqi Wang, Suqi Sun, Omkar Pangarkar, Richard Fan, Yi Gu, Victor Miller, Yonghao Zhuang, Guowei He, Haonan Li, Fajri Koto, Liping Tang, Nikhil Ranjan, Zhiqiang Shen, Xuguang Ren, Roberto Iriondo, Cun Mu, Zhiting Hu, Mark Schulze, Preslav Nakov, Tim Baldwin, and Eric P. Xing. 2023. LLM360: towards fully transparent open-source llms. *CoRR*, abs/2312.06550.
- Pekka Malo, Ankur Sinha, Pekka J. Korhonen, Jyrki Wallenius, and Pyry Takala. 2014. Good debt or bad debt: Detecting semantic orientations in economic texts. *J. Assoc. Inf. Sci. Technol.*, 65(4):782–796.
- Marco Marelli, Stefano Menini, Marco Baroni, Luisa Bentivogli, Raffaella Bernardi, and Roberto Zamparelli. 2014. A SICK cure for the evaluation of compositional distributional semantic models. In *LREC*, pages 216–223. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Sewon Min, Xinxu Lyu, Ari Holtzman, Mikel Artetxe, Mike Lewis, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. Rethinking the role of demonstrations: What makes in-context learning work? In *EMNLP*, pages 11048–11064. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Saif M. Mohammad, Felipe Bravo-Marquez, Mohammad Salameh, and Svetlana Kiritchenko. 2018. Semeval-2018 task 1: Affect in tweets. In *SemEval@NAACL-HLT*, pages 1–17. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ioannis Mollas, Zoe Chrysopoulou, Stamatis Karlos, and Grigorios Tsoumakos. 2020. ETHOS: an online hate speech detection dataset. *CoRR*, abs/2006.08328.
- Vaishnavh Nagarajan and J Zico Kolter. 2019. Uniform convergence may be unable to explain generalization in deep learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32.
- Jane Pan, Tianyu Gao, Howard Chen, and Danqi Chen. 2023. What in-context learning "learns" in-context: Disentangling task recognition and task learning. In *ACL (Findings)*, pages 8298–8319. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Gautam Reddy. 2023. The mechanistic basis of data dependence and abrupt learning in an in-context classification task. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Omer Sagi and Lior Rokach. 2018. Ensemble learning: A survey. *Wiley interdisciplinary reviews: data mining and knowledge discovery*, 8(4):e1249.
- Elvis Saravia, Hsien-Chi Toby Liu, Yen-Hao Huang, Junlin Wu, and Yi-Shin Chen. 2018. CARER: contextualized affect representations for emotion recognition. In *EMNLP*, pages 3687–3697. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Emily Sheng and David C. Uthus. 2020. Investigating societal biases in a poetry composition system. *CoRR*, abs/2011.02686.
- Aaditya Singh, Stephanie Chan, Ted Moskovitz, Erin Grant, Andrew Saxe, and Felix Hill. 2024. The transient nature of emergent in-context learning in transformers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Daria Soboleva, Faisal Al-Khateeb, Robert Myers, Jacob R Steeves, Joel Hestness, and Nolan Dey. 2023. SlimPajama: A 627B token cleaned and deduplicated version of RedPajama. <https://www.cerebras.net/blog/slimpajama-a-627b-token-cleaned-and-deduplicated-version>
- Richard Socher, Alex Perelygin, Jean Wu, Jason Chuang, Christopher D. Manning, Andrew Y. Ng, and Christopher Potts. 2013. Recursive deep models for semantic compositionality over a sentiment treebank. In *EMNLP*, pages 1631–1642. ACL.
- Norman Tatro, Pin-Yu Chen, Payel Das, Igor Melnyk, Prasanna Sattigeri, and Rongjie Lai. 2020. Optimizing mode connectivity via neuron alignment. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:15300–15311.
- Ellen M. Voorhees and Dawn M. Tice. 2000. Building a question answering test collection. In *SIGIR*, pages 200–207. ACM.
- Hongyi Wang, Mikhail Yurochkin, Yuekai Sun, Dimitris Papailiopoulos, and Yasaman Khazaeni. 2019. Federated learning with matched averaging. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jerry Wei, Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Dustin Tran, Albert Webson, Yifeng Lu, Xinyun Chen, Hanxiao Liu, Da Huang, Denny Zhou, et al. 2023. Larger language models do in-context learning differently. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.03846*.
- Aiyuan Yang, Bin Xiao, Bingning Wang, Borong Zhang, Ce Bian, Chao Yin, Chenxu Lv, Da Pan, Dian Wang, Dong Yan, Fan Yang, Fei Deng, Feng Wang, Feng Liu, Guangwei Ai, Guosheng Dong, Haizhou Zhao, Hang Xu, Haoze Sun, Hongda Zhang, Hui Liu, Jiaming Ji, Jian Xie, Juntao Dai, Kun Fang, Lei Su, Liang Song, Lifeng Liu, Liyun Ru, Luyao Ma, Mang Wang, Mickel Liu, MingAn Lin, Nuolan Nie, Peidong Guo, Ruiyang Sun, Tao Zhang, Tianpeng Li, Tianyu Li, Wei Cheng, Weipeng Chen, Xiangrong Zeng, Xiaochuan Wang, Xiaoxi Chen, Xin Men, Xin Yu, Xuehai Pan, Yanjun Shen, Yiding

Wang, Yiyu Li, Youxin Jiang, Yuchen Gao, Yupeng Zhang, Zenan Zhou, and Zhiying Wu. 2023. Baichuan 2: Open large-scale language models. *CoRR*, abs/2309.10305.

# Intermediate checkpoint	8	16	32
Pythia-6.9B	12.50	37.50	53.12
OLMo-7B	50.00	37.50	43.75
MiniCPM-2B	62.50	56.25	37.50

Table 3: Different numbers of intermediate checkpoints

A Tasks and Datasets

We conduct experiments on four types of tasks: Sentiment Analysis, Topic/Stance Classification, Toxicity Detection, and Natural Language Inference/Paraphrase Detection. For **Sentiment Analysis**, we use datasets including SST-2 (Socher et al., 2013), financial_phrasebank (Malo et al., 2014), emotion (Saravia et al., 2018), and poem_sentiment (Sheng and Uthus, 2020). For **Topic/Stance Classification**, we utilize TREC (Voorhees and Tice, 2000), tweet_eval_atheist, and tweet_eval_feminist (Mohammad et al., 2018; Basile et al., 2019). For **Toxicity Detection**, we include tweet_eval_hate, ethos_race, ethos_gender, ethos_national_origin, and ethos_religion (Mollas et al., 2020). For **Natural Language Inference/Paraphrase Detection**, we employ SICK (Marelli et al., 2014), SNLI (Bowman et al., 2015), WNLI (Levesque et al., 2012), and MRPC (Dolan and Brockett, 2005).

We follow Min et al. (2022) to select samples from the training set as demonstrations. Additionally, we randomly sample 300 examples as the development set for validation in Section 4 and another 1000 examples as the test set for evaluation in all experiments from the development set.

B More Experiments

B.1 The Number of Intermediate Checkpoints

In the paper, we use 16 checkpoints in addition to the final one. In this part, we conduct experiments using different numbers of checkpoints (*i.e.*, 8 and 32). We report the average competition ratio across 16 datasets and 5 random seeds. Table 3 shows that the number of checkpoints does not affect the experimental results. They consistently demonstrate that there is a competitive relationship between TR and TL during the pre-training process.

# Examples	4	8	16
Pythia-6.9B	18.75	25.00	37.50
OLMo-7B	5.00	37.50	37.50
MiniCPM-2B	43.75	31.25	56.25

Table 4: Different numbers of examples in demonstration

Abstract labels	Symbols	Numbers	Letters
Pythia-6.9B	37.50	18.75	37.50
OLMo-7B	37.50	50.00	43.75
MiniCPM-2B	56.25	43.75	50.00

Table 5: Different types of abstract labels.

B.2 The Numbers of Examples in Demonstration

In the paper, we use 16 randomly sampled examples as demonstrations. To explore the impact of the number of examples, we report the average competition ratio with other numbers (*i.e.*, 4 and 8) of demonstrations. As presented in Table 4, it can be observed that the number of examples does not affect the competitive relationship during the pre-training process.

B.3 The Type of Abstract Labels

In the paper, we utilize symbols in the abstract setting. In this part, we follow (Pan et al., 2023) to use other types of semantically unrelated labels (*i.e.*, numbers and letters). Table 5 shows the average competition ratio by using different labels. It indicates that, regardless of the choice of semantically unrelated labels, the conclusions are consistent with the abstract symbols.