


# Can Input Attributions Interpret the Inductive Reasoning Process Elicited in In-Context Learning?

Mengyu Ye<sup>1</sup> Tatsuki Kuribayashi<sup>2</sup> Goro Kobayashi<sup>1,3</sup> Jun Suzuki<sup>1</sup>  
<sup>1</sup>Tohoku University <sup>2</sup>MBZUAI <sup>3</sup>RIKEN  
 {ye.mengyu.s1, goro.koba}@dc.tohoku.ac.jp  
 tatsuki.kuribayashi@mbzuai.ac.ae jun.suzuki@tohoku.ac.jp

## Abstract

Elucidating the rationale behind neural models' outputs has been challenging in the machine learning field, which is indeed applicable in this age of large language models (LLMs) and in-context learning (ICL). When it comes to estimating input attributions (IA), ICL poses a new issue of interpreting which example in the prompt, consisting of a set of examples, contributed to identifying the task/rule to be solved. To this end, in this paper, we introduce synthetic diagnostic tasks inspired by the *poverty of the stimulus design* in inductive reasoning; here, most in-context examples are ambiguous w.r.t. their underlying rule, and one critical example disambiguates the task demonstrated. The question is whether conventional IA methods can identify such an example in interpreting the inductive reasoning process in ICL. Our experiments provide several practical findings; for example, a certain simple IA method works the best, and the larger the model, the generally harder it is to interpret the ICL with gradient-based IA methods.<sup>1</sup>

 <https://github.com/muyo8692/input-attribution-icl>

## 1 Introduction

In past years, input attribution (IA) methods, e.g., gradient norm (Simonyan et al., 2014; Li et al., 2016a), have typically been employed in the natural language processing (NLP) field to interpret input-output associations exploited by neural NLP models (Vinyals and Le, 2015; Li et al., 2016b). Such IA approaches are now somewhat outdated because of the rise of large language models (LLMs) and mechanistic interpretability (MI) communities (Olah et al., 2020; Bereska and Gavves, 2024), where the general aim is to understand the internal mechanism of LLMs and control their behaviors by intervening in their internal representations

<sup>1</sup>We will make our data and scripts public upon the publication of this paper.




Figure 1: Overview of our experimental setup. The majority of in-context examples (gray) are ambiguous, supporting either Rule-A of adding two tokens or Rule-B of doubling tokens. A single disambiguating example (blue) reveals that Rule-A is correct. We investigate whether Input Attribution (IA) methods can track such an inductive reasoning process.

or weight parameters rather than elucidating their input-output associations. Despite the enriched scope of modern interpretability research, such rapid progress has missed some intriguing questions bridging the IA and MI eras: in particular, *do conventional IA methods still empirically work in the modern NLP setting, specifically in the context of LLMs and in-context learning (ICL)?*

In this paper, we perform a systematic, controlled evaluation of IA methods in interpreting the inductive reasoning process of LLMs in ICL (Brown et al., 2020) — *Can IA methods interpret the example in a few-shot prompt that most influenced LLMs' inductive learning of the task?* This question is worth investigating for several reasons. First, input attribution would still serve as a necessary and sufficient explanation in typical prac-

tical cases. Some users might simply seek which part of the context is heavily referred to by an LLM system; here, its detailed internal processes identified by MI methods will be rather redundant.

Second, the modern NLP setting, specifically ICL, differs from the conventional tasks where IA methods have been tested. Simply put, in the conventional settings, the task objective is given (e.g., sentiment analysis) in advance, during training, and the IA is employed to just identify the association between input  $X$  (i.e., tokens) and output  $y$ . In contrast, in ICL, the model should (i) first identify the *task* solely from limited examples demonstrated and then (ii) answer a new question; the former step particularly introduces a new aspect to be interpreted by IA methods — which *example*, the pair of  $(X_k, y_k)$  in input, contributed to identifying the *task* to be solved for a model. This is a type of instance-based interpretation of neural models (Wachter et al., 2017; Charpiat et al., 2019; Hanawa et al., 2021), and such an in-context, inductive learning process of LLMs attracts interest from a scientific perspective as well (Treutlein et al., 2024; Mueller et al., 2024).

This study investigates how well IA methods can identify an example in context, which provides more information to explicate the task in ICL than other examples. Nevertheless, formally defining such an informative example and assessing IA methods is challenging, especially in a wild, natural setting; such a critical example may sometimes not be unique (Min et al., 2022), there may be a gap in importance between faithfulness and plausibility perspectives (Bastings et al., 2022), and a model might rather rely on prior knowledge without using any input examples (Liu et al., 2022). To address such potential concerns, we introduce a test suit consisting of controlled synthetic tasks of inductive reasoning, where the most informative *eureka* example is inherently unique by the design of the tasks. These settings are inspired by the *poverty of the stimulus design* adopted in the cognitive science field (Wilson, 2006; Perfors et al., 2011; McCoy et al., 2018, 2020; Yedetore et al., 2023). Specifically, in our setting, most in-context examples are *ambiguous* in the sense that they are compatible with several possible rules, and only one *disambiguating (eureka)* example resolves the ambiguity and limits the correct rule to be unique, and, in this sense, is more informative than other examples (i.e., deleting one of the ambiguous examples does not change the ambiguity of the task,

but not for the *disambiguating* example). For example, in Figure 1, the few-shot examples consist of three *ambiguous* examples (e.g.,  $aa \rightarrow aaaa$ ) over two rules of (i) add the same two tokens or (ii) double the number of tokens, and one *disambiguating* example (e.g.,  $ttt \rightarrow ttttt$ ) reveals that the correct rule is (i) add two tokens, which leads to the correct answer to the target question ( $x \rightarrow xxx$ ). The question is whether such an informative example can be empirically caught by IA methods.

Our experiments reveal several findings:

- Certain simpler IA methods (input erasure, gradient norm) frequently outperform other IA methods (e.g., Integrated Gradient) and other interpretability approaches such as observing attention weights, suggesting the particular (dis)advantages of existing IA methods under the ICL×LLM settings.
- Gradient-based and other IA methods did not work stably across different tasks and models, posing their general limitations in interpreting the inductive reasoning part of ICL.
- Different approaches exhibited different properties against the scaling of the experimental setting; for example, IA methods perform better in many-shot scenarios, whereas a particular baseline (self-answer) tends to outperform IA in larger models.

## 2 Preliminary

### 2.1 Input attribution (IA) methods

Input attribution (IA) methods (Denil et al., 2014; Li et al., 2016a; Poerner et al., 2018; Arras et al., 2019; Yin and Neubig, 2022) are one of the most popular and traditional techniques for interpreting and explaining the predictions of machine learning models. Specifically, IA methods determine how much each input feature contributes to a particular prediction; that is, given input tokens  $X := [x_1, \dots, x_n]$  and output  $y$ , the IA methods yield the strength of contribution  $S(x_i)$  of each input  $x_i$  to the output  $y$ . Note that the input in ICL consists of several in-context examples (§ 2.2); here, we represent all the tokens in an input sequence as  $X$ , and the answer to the target question is denoted as  $y$ . We examine the following four representative IA methods in the ICL×LLM context:

**Input erasure (IE)** IE (Li et al., 2016c) measures how erasing a certain token  $x_i$  from the input prompt makes the target token  $y_t$  less likely to be

generated:

$$S_{\text{IE}}(x_i, y_t; \mathbf{X}) = q(y_t | \mathbf{X}) - q(y_t | \mathbf{X}_{-i}), \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  denotes the  $d$ -dim input token embedding for the  $i$ -th token in an input, and  $\mathbf{X} := [\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n]$  denotes the sequence of input token embeddings.  $\mathbf{X}_{-i} := [\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{i-1}, \mathbf{x}_{i+1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n]$  denotes the sequence of input token embeddings without  $\mathbf{x}_i$ . We emulate this partial input  $\mathbf{X}_{-i}$  by introducing an attention mask to zero-out the attention to  $\mathbf{x}_i$  in every layer (thus, the original position information holds).  $q(y | \mathbf{X})$  represents the model’s prediction probability for the token  $y_t$  given input  $\mathbf{X}$ .

**Gradient norm (GN)** GN (Simonyan et al., 2014; Li et al., 2016a) calculates the attribution (contribution) score for each input token  $x_i$  by computing the L1 norm of its gradient of the target token  $y_t$ :

$$S_{\text{GN}}(\mathbf{x}_i, y_t; \mathbf{X}) = \|g(\mathbf{x}_i, y_t; \mathbf{X})\|_{\text{L1}} \quad (2)$$

$$g(\mathbf{x}_i, y_t; \mathbf{X}) = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} q(y_t | \mathbf{X}). \quad (3)$$

where  $g(\mathbf{x}_i, y_t; \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  denotes the gradient computed for  $\mathbf{x}_i$ , given an output  $y_t$  and input embedding sequence  $\mathbf{X}$ .

**Input  $\times$  gradient (I  $\times$  G)** I  $\times$  G (Shrikumar et al., 2017; Denil et al., 2014) takes the dot product of the gradient with the input token embedding  $\mathbf{x}_i$ :

$$S_{\text{I} \times \text{G}}(\mathbf{x}_i, y_t; \mathbf{X}) = g(\mathbf{x}_i, y_t; \mathbf{X}) \cdot \mathbf{x}_i. \quad (4)$$

**Integrated gradients (IG)** IG (Sundararajan et al., 2017) computes attribution scores by accumulating gradients along a straight path from a baseline input  $\mathbf{X}'$  to the actual input  $\mathbf{X}$ :

$$S_{\text{IG}}(\mathbf{x}_i, y_t; \mathbf{X}) = (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}'_i) \times \int_0^1 \frac{\partial q(y_t | \mathbf{X}' + \alpha(\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}'))}{\partial \mathbf{x}_i} d\alpha \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathbf{X}' := [\mathbf{x}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}'_n]$  denotes the sequence of baseline embeddings<sup>2</sup>, and  $\alpha$  denotes the interpolation coefficient. In practice, the integral is approximated using numerical integration with a finite number of steps.

<sup>2</sup>We followed the common practice and employed a sequence of zero vectors as the baseline input. We used an interpretability library `captum` (Kokhlikyan et al., 2020) to calculate the IG score and keep all parameters as default.

**Contrastive explanations** For the IE, GN, and I  $\times$  G methods, we also adopt the contrastive explanation setting (Yin and Neubig, 2022). IA methods in this setting measure how much an input token  $x_i$  influences the model to increase the probability of target token  $y_t$  while decreasing that of foil token  $y_f$ . A foil token can be defined as an output with an alternative, incorrect generalization (§ 3). Contrastive versions of IE, GN, and I  $\times$  G are defined as follows:

$$S_{\text{IE}}^*(x_i, y_t, y_f; \mathbf{X}) = S_{\text{IE}}(x_i, y_t; \mathbf{X}) - S_{\text{IE}}(x_i, y_f; \mathbf{X}) \quad (6)$$

$$S_{\text{GN}}^*(\mathbf{x}_i, y_t, y_f; \mathbf{X}) = \|g^*(\mathbf{x}_i, y_t, y_f; \mathbf{X})\|_{\text{L1}} \quad (7)$$

$$S_{\text{I} \times \text{G}}^*(\mathbf{x}_i, y_t, y_f; \mathbf{X}) = g^*(\mathbf{x}_i, y_t, y_f; \mathbf{X}) \cdot \mathbf{x}_i \quad (8)$$

$$g^*(\mathbf{x}_i, y_t, y_f; \mathbf{X}) = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i} (q(y_t | \mathbf{X}) - q(y_f | \mathbf{X})) \quad (9)$$

We report the results with contrastive explanation in the main part of this paper § 5.

## 2.2 Interpreting in-context learning (ICL)

We focus on the ICL setting (Brown et al., 2020), which has typically been adopted in modern LLM-based reasoning. An input prompt in ICL setting consists of few-shot examples  $E$  and a target question.  $E$  is composed of  $n$  examples  $[e_1, \dots, e_n]$ , each of which contains an input-output pair  $e_i = (X_i, f(X_i))$ , given a function  $f$  associated with the task. Let  $X_{n+1}$  represent the target question  $q$  that the model must answer. The ICL setting is formed as follows:

$$\underbrace{\overbrace{X_1, f(X_1), \dots, X_n, f(X_n)}^{\text{few-shot examples } E} \underbrace{X_{n+1}}_q}_{\text{prompt}}, \underbrace{f(X_{n+1})}_{\text{completion}}$$

Here, a model is expected to (i) first induce the underlying function (rule)  $f$  from examples  $E$  and then generate the final output  $f(X_{n+1})$ .

**Eureka example** The interpretation of the model’s ICL involves the question of when, in the input, the model generalized the correct rule to be  $f$ . We address this new perspective in interpreting ICL, and this needs a unique benchmark with a kind of explicit “*eureka moment*”  $e^*$  within the input prompt, where the correct rule  $f$  is identified. Formally speaking, we define such an example as one without which the task cannot be (mostly) uniquely defined, following the conventional leave-one-out concept in instance-based interpretability (Koh and Liang, 2017).

**Instance-level attribution** Notably, we consider the use of IA methods to identify a particular example  $e^* \in E$  in input, instead of a particular token. To compute an IA score for an example  $S(e_i)$ , we sum up the IA scores for its constituent tokens:  $S(e_i) = \sum_{x_j \in (X_i, y_i) = e_i} S(x_j)$ .<sup>3</sup> Our interest is which example obtains the highest IA score, i.e.,  $\arg \max_{e_i \in E} S(e_i)$ .

### 3 Poverty of the stimulus scenarios as testbeds

We evaluate how well a particular IA method can identify the in-context example  $e^*$  that most contributes to identifying the task—specifically, whether the IA method assigns the highest attribution score to such an example. However, in real-world tasks, it is generally unclear which in-context example is the most influential in disambiguating the task. Moreover, in some cases, the task may be solved without relying on any of the examples (e.g., solved by leveraging prior knowledge). Therefore, these are not suitable as a benchmark to evaluate the interpretability method, and we decided to design a synthetic and controlled task setting.

With these motivations, we employ tasks inspired by the *poverty of stimulus scenarios* in inductive learning typically adopted in the cognitive science field (McCoy et al. 2020; *inter alia*). In these scenarios, a task  $f$  is mostly ambiguous in input examples  $E$  (or generally speaking, training data) in the sense that several rules can be compatible to explain the demonstrated transformations  $X \mapsto f(X)$ , and the original motivation of introducing such a setting is to inspect learner’s inductive bias toward generalization preferences (Mitchell, 1980; Kharitonov and Chaabouni, 2021), given humans’ particular strong inductive biases (Landau et al., 1988; Wilson, 2006). Instead of such analyses, we extend this setting by adding only one disambiguating example  $e^*$  (“*eureka example*”), which determines the correct rule  $f^*$  to be unique, and test whether each IA method can identify this special example as long as models undoubtedly employ this clue  $e^*$  in handling the problem correctly. For instance, most examples shown in Figure 1 are ambiguous (with black color) w.r.t. the two possible rules of (i) adding the same token twice or (ii) multiplying the number of tokens by two. This ambiguity is resolved by the example  $e^*$ :  $ttt \rightarrow ttttt$

<sup>3</sup>An exception applies in the IE method; the attribution score for an example  $e_i$  is simply computed by erasing the corresponding  $X_i$  and  $f(X_i)$  from the input sequence.

(blue example in Figure 1) as this violates the multiplication rule (ii), and thus as long as the model adopted the addition rule (i) correctly, it is expected to assign the highest attribution score to  $e^*$ . Similarly to the task in Figure 1, we designed the following tasks as a case study:

**LINEAR-OR-DISTINCT (LD)** The few-shot examples are ambiguous as to Rule-A: selecting a character in a particular linear position in an input  $X_i$ ; or Rule-B: selecting a character that differs from the others in an input  $X_i$ .

**ADD-OR-MULTIPLY (AM)** The ambiguity of this task is Rule-A: multiply the numbers of tokens in the input  $X_i$ ; or Rule-B: add a certain number of tokens to input  $X_i$ .

**VERB-OBJECT (VO)** This task requires distinguishing whether the controlling condition is the type of verb (Rule A) or the category of the object noun (Rule B). There are two verbs (“like” and “love”) and two categories of the object (city or animal).

**TENSE-ARTICLE (TA)** The potential rules are Rule-A: whether the main verb in the input  $X_i$  is in ing-form or not; or Rule-B: whether the first token of input  $X_i$  is “The” or not.

**POS-TITLE (PT)** This task involves two rules: Rule-A: whether there is an adjective in  $X_i$ ; or Rule-B: whether  $X_i$  is presented in title case.

In addition to them, we adopted a simple task of associative recall (AR), which is typically employed in studying ICL, where the model is supposed to simply memorize the key:value mapping rules demonstrated in the prompt and apply them to the target question. Linguists may be more interested in the task of, for example, syntactic transformation to an interrogative sentence (McCoy et al., 2020) based on the original poverty of the stimulus argument in the language domain (Chomsky, 1980). However, such a realistic task interferes with the models’ meta-linguistic knowledge; thus, we adopted artificial (and somewhat simpler) ones.

**Foil token** A contrastive explanation needs a foil token corresponding to an explicit negative label (§ 2.1). We use the token/answer corresponding to an alternative rule (conflicting the disambiguating example) as the foil token.

Task	Prompt example/template	Answer	Potential rules
ASSOCIATIVE-RECALL	a $\mapsto$ 6 g $\mapsto$ 3 w $\mapsto$ 5 g $\mapsto$	3	Key-value pairs are in the prompt. The task is to output a value associated with a given key.
LINEAR-OR-DISTINCT	a a b a $\mapsto$ b g g j g $\mapsto$ j k i k k $\mapsto$ k / i o o o p $\mapsto$	o / p	A. Generate the <i>n</i> -th token (3rd token in this example) B. Generate the <i>distinctive token</i>
ADD-OR-MULTIPLY	aa $\mapsto$ aaaa hh $\mapsto$ hhhh vvv $\mapsto$ vvvvv / vvvvvv i $\mapsto$	iii / ii	A. <i>Multiply</i> the number of tokens by <i>n</i> ( <i>n</i> = 2 in this example) B. <i>Add</i> <i>m</i> tokens ( <i>m</i> = 2 in this example)
VERB-OBJECT	like [CITY] $\mapsto$ True love [ANIMAL] $\mapsto$ False like [ANIMAL] $\mapsto$ True / False love [CITY] $\mapsto$	False / True	A. If "like" exists, then True B. If [CITY] exists, then True
TENSE-ARTICLE	The [NOUN] [VERB]-ing $\mapsto$ True A [NOUN] [VERB]-past $\mapsto$ False A [NOUN] [VERB]-ing $\mapsto$ True / False The [NOUN] [VERB]-past $\mapsto$	False / True	A. If the verb is in <i>ing</i> form, then True B. If the first token is "the", then True
POS-TITLE	The [NOUN] Was [ADJ] $\mapsto$ True The [noun] was [noun] $\mapsto$ False The [noun] was [adj] $\mapsto$ True / False The [NOUN] Was [NOUN] $\mapsto$	False / True	A. If <i>adjective</i> exist, then True B. If the sentence is in <i>title case</i> , then True

Table 1: General format of our inductive reasoning tasks. As a baseline setting, we also set ASSOCIATIVE-RECALL setting to just memorize key-value mappings. The remaining tasks span from somewhat superficial features to linguistic ones. The disambiguating example (the third one in these examples) determines the correct rule and answer (blue or orange) for the final question from two plausible generalizations shown in the "Potential rules" column.

## 4 Experimental setup

### 4.1 Overview

**Few-shot settings** We conduct experiments with different numbers of few-shot examples; specifically, we examined 10-shot, 50-shot, and 100-shot settings to test the robustness of IA methods toward somewhat longer demonstrations.

**Data** For each synthetic task, we create 200 different questions with different sets of few-shot examples and a target question. In the LD, AM, VO, TA, and PT tasks, the correct rule is selected out of the two candidates (rules A or B shown in Table 1) in a 1:1 ratio. The position of the most influential (i.e., disambiguating) example  $e^*$  is controlled to be uniformly distributed by chance. We test IA methods using only the questions that models answered correctly.

**Metrics** We report the ratio of questions where the most influential example  $e^*$  is picked by the highest IA score, i.e., how frequently  $\arg \max_{e_i \in E} S(e_i)$  is equal to  $e^*$ . Henceforth, we call this score *attribution accuracy*.

**Models** We evaluate five LLMs: Llama-2-7B, Llama-2-13B (Touvron et al., 2023), Gemma-2-2B, Gemma-2-9B, and Gemma-2-27B (Rivière et al.,

2024). As a prerequisite of our experiments, the models should be able to learn the task, i.e., be sufficiently sensitive to the disambiguating example  $e^*$  and correctly use this to determine the rule. To ensure this ability, we fine-tune these models on each task (see Appendix A), but the conclusions overall did not alter before and after fine-tuning (see Appendix B).

### 4.2 Baselines

Along with the IA methods introduced in § 2.1, we evaluate four baseline methods.

**Edit distance** This method identifies  $e^*$  simply using edit distance between the target example  $X_{n+1} \oplus y_{n+1}$  and each example  $X_i \oplus y_i$ , where  $\oplus$  is a string concatenation. Example with the minimum edit distance, thus the most similar example to the target question, is selected as an explanation. The weak performance of this problem probes that our experimental setting is so challenging that just relying on surface features does not resolve it.

**Attention weights** This method leverages attention weights, computed as the sum of attention weights across all tokens in input  $X$ . While attention weights are generally considered unreliable for model interpretation, we include this baseline




Figure 2: Attribution accuracies for each task/model in the 10-shot setting (thus, the chance rate is 10%; red dotted line). The edit distance and attention baselines are indicated by a black dotted line and gray bar, respectively.

to compare whether IA methods achieve superior performance.

**Self-answer** We also examine a somewhat naive approach of directly asking the models to generate their rationale. Specifically, we have models generate the most informative example in a prompt (Appendix C) in deriving their answer.

**Chance rate** We also report the chance rate of attribution accuracy when randomly selecting one example from a prompt.

## 5 Experiments

Figure 2 shows the results in 10-shot settings.<sup>4</sup>

### 5.1 Main results

**Input erasure works well** The IE method yielded the best attribution accuracy in identifying the most informative example in most cases. However, it is computationally costly since it requires multiple forward passes with different inputs ( $O(n^3)$  compared to the standard  $O(n^2)$  complexity). That is, if the computational costs are not the problem, simply applying the input erasure is the most reliable way to estimate the importance of each example in ICL. At the same time, despite our controlled task settings and nearly 100% accuracy of LLMs in yielding the correct answer, the IE method does not yield the perfect attribution

accuracy in some tasks; this limitation is discussed in § 6. Notably, baselines, such as edit distance of the examples, did not yield a good attribution accuracy overall, which proves that our test suites are challenging.

**Improved versions of gradient norm do not show advantage** Among the gradient-based methods, simple gradient norm tends to work the best in most (i.e., LD, AM, VO, SP, ST) tasks. In other words, whereas  $I \times G$  and IG are proposed as the improved version of simple gradient norm method, there were no substantial advantages of these methods in our settings. In particular, IG consistently yielded the lowest attribution accuracy across all six tasks among the gradient-based methods, suggesting its limitations in ICL scenarios. The plausible reason behind this inferiority is discussed in § 6.

### 5.2 Scaling properties

LLMs have progressively been scaled up toward model parameter size and its context length in the NLP community. We analyze how such a scaling affects the LLMs’ interpretability, particularly in our setting.

**Interpretability vs. model size** We first investigate the relationship between attribution accuracy and model size — is it more difficult to interpret larger LLMs? We observe somewhat intriguing patterns for this question (Figure 5); gradient-based methods tend to work worse in larger LLMs, and

<sup>4</sup>Additional results using fine-tuned models and non-contrastive IA methods are provided in Appendix D.



Figure 3: Attribution accuracy across six tasks for different Gemma-2 model sizes. Results demonstrate that gradient-based attribution methods show declining performance in larger LLMs, while the self-answer exhibits improved performance with increasing model size.

in contrast, the self-answer baseline works better in larger LLMs. That is, the (empirically) appropriate approach to interpret the LLMs may differ in their model scale.

**Interpretability vs. number of examples** Next, given the trend of long-context LLMs, we examine the relationship between attribution accuracy and the number of few-shot examples. Figure 4 shows the attribution accuracy for Gemma-2-2B across all six tasks. This demonstrates that gradient-based methods maintain accuracy or rather improve against the longer context, in contrast to the decreasing chance rate.<sup>5</sup> This suggests the robustness of IA methods in long-context scenarios, highlighting their potential for interpreting inputs with extensive contextual information. Notably, the quality of self-answer consistently degraded as the number of in-context examples increased, while the positive scaling effect observed in the previous analysis

<sup>5</sup>For IG in this setting, due to computation resource limitations, we did not conduct experiments.




Figure 4: Attribution accuracy for interpreting Gemma-2-2B models across all six tasks. Gradient-based methods is relatively robust to the number of few-shot examples, while there is a consistent, large drop in attribution accuracy in SA. Note that both x-axis and y-axis are in log scale, and we did not conduct experiments on 100-shot due to computation resource limitations.

of model size. That is, the gradient-based methods and self-answer approach exhibit an insightful trade-off between different scaling properties.

## 6 Discussion

This section discusses the potential reasons for the unexpected results presented in § 5, highlighting the challenging issues in interpreting ICL.

**Why did IE fail to achieve 100% attribution accuracy?** Our tasks can not be answered without disambiguating examples. Thus, it is somewhat unintuitive to see the non-100% attribution accuracy of the IE method (again, the LLMs understood the task as they achieved 100% accuracy in the tasks) — what happens here? To obtain a hint to clarify IE’s potential limitations, we analyze model behaviors when the disambiguating example is excluded. Interestingly, LLMs adopted a specific generaliza-

Task	Acc. (%)	IE Worked?
LD (a)	98.0	No
LD (b)	0.5	
AM (a)	34.5	Yes
AM (b)	65.5	
VO (a)	100.0	No
VO (b)	0.0	
SP (a)	98.0	No
SP (b)	2.0	
ST (a)	68.5	No
ST (b)	31.5	

Table 2: Task accuracy (not attribution accuracy) of Gemma-2-2B (excluding AR) when the disambiguating example is not included, separated by the correct rule. The accuracy drastically differs when the correct rule is different; thus, the models adopt a particular default rule with their inductive biases against fully ambiguous demonstrations, even in our controlled settings.

tion (rule) in each task when there was no disambiguating example (Table 2); in other words, they sometimes exhibited strong inductive biases in our tasks. That is, when the correct rule is equal to their preferred rule by their inductive bias, they can answer the task correctly even without disambiguating examples, and the IE method does not compute a proper attribution score. It is now common to see LLMs have particular inductive biases (not a *tabula rasa*) (Warstadt et al., 2020; Kharitonov and Chaabouni, 2021). Catching such generalization bias with IA methods represents an inherent challenge, highlighting their potential limitations in interpreting ICL.

**Why was  $I \times G$  worse than gradient norm?** One advantage of the  $I \times G$  method, compared to the simple gradient norm, is the consideration of the norm of the input embedding (Shrikumar et al., 2017; Denil et al., 2014). Since a large vector tends to have a large dot product with another vector, the norm of the input token embedding (vector) is expected to affect the IA score of  $I \times G$ . Then, no improvement of  $I \times G$  over the simple gradient norm suggests that, at least in our settings, the norm of the embeddings was not informative to estimate the input attribution. The norm of the embedding largely has decontextualized information about the word, such as frequency, and it may make sense that such information is not helpful to interpreting our controlled, artificial ICL tasks consisting of alphabet characters, numbers, or random words.

**Why was IG worse than gradient norm?** IG is a path-based approach; the gradient is accumulated

from a baseline vector (typically zero vector) to the targeted input representation (in our case, the sequence of input embeddings representing few-shot examples). This approach is somewhat intuitive when considering an attribution for a particular word or sentence; for example, suppose one computes an attribution to the word “excellent” in an input for a particular task-specific model, IG may trace the path from zero to the “excellent” vector, which will be in a kind of the *goodness* direction, involving the points corresponding to, e.g., “okay” “decent,” “good,” “excellent” (Sanyal and Ren, 2021). Then, one critical question is — what does this path mean in the prompt/task space? Different prompt representations will no longer correspond to the same task; thus, the attribution of a particular token in the middle of such a path in the prompt space may no longer be an attribution under a targeted task. This can be one concern toward the ineffectiveness of IG in our settings.

## 7 Related Work

**IA methods** Several lines of research are conducted to interpret neural language models. NLP researchers have adapted IA methods, which was originally applied to vision models (Simonyan et al., 2014; Springenberg et al., 2015; Zintgraf et al., 2017), to perform a post-hoc interpretation of input-output associations exploited by language models (Karpathy et al., 2015; Li et al., 2016a; Aras et al., 2016; Lei et al., 2016; Alvarez-Melis and Jaakkola, 2017), and its improved versions have also been developed (Denil et al., 2014; Sundararajan et al., 2017; Murdoch et al., 2018; Sinha et al., 2021; Ding and Koehn, 2021; Bastings et al., 2022; Yin and Neubig, 2022; Ferrando et al., 2023). In line with these studies, we provide a new perspective to evaluate these IA methods in ICL. Note that, as an orthogonal attempt, some research estimates the saliency scores to directly prompt models to generate such explanations (Rajani et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2019; Wu and Mooney, 2019; Narang et al., 2020; Marasovic et al., 2022). This method is indeed examined as one baseline in our study.

**Instance-based explanation** Instance-based explanation seeks for the explanation in training data rather than the immediate input during inference as IA methods (Wachter et al., 2017; Charpiat et al., 2019; Hanawa et al., 2021). These two paradigms of instance-based and IA-based explanations have been studied somewhat separately since the infor-



mation source to seek the explanation is clearly different. On the other hand, in ICL, the training examples are now in the input during inference that can be analyzed by IA methods. In this sense, our investigation can be seen as a new exploration of instance-based explanation with the help of IA methods.

**Mechanistic Interpretability** With the rise of large language models, such as GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020), the mechanistic interpretability community has shifted its focus from vision models to language models. Within which, the promising results using sparse autoencoders (SAEs) (Bricken et al., 2023; Templeton et al., 2024) have inspired a flurry of follow-up work (Gao et al., 2024; Lieberum et al., 2024; Rajamanoharan et al., 2024a,b; Karvonen et al., 2024; Braun et al., 2024; Kissane et al., 2024; Makelov, 2024). Such a scope of SAE, interpreting the model internals, is orthogonal to our direction of estimating the importance of input examples.

## 8 Conclusions

We have pointed out and tackled the problem of interpreting the inductive reasoning process in ICL as a missing but reasonable milestone to be explored in LLM interpretability research. Our revisit to the IA methods in interpreting this ICL process has clarified their limitations from a new angle as well as provided fruitful insights and discussions on their practical usage in modern NLP. These findings have highlighted some issues in the community; in particular, even the fundamental task of mapping input and output has not been accomplished, and there is room to sophisticate previously developed interpretability tools to be suitable for LLMs.

## Limitations

Our study has several limitations in scope. First, we focused primarily on popular gradient-based IA methods, leaving other approaches such as perturbation-based methods like LIME (Ribeiro et al., 2016) and SHAP (Lundberg and Lee, 2017) for future work.

Regarding model selection, we concentrated on widely-used open-weight LLMs. Since applying IA methods requires gradient computation through backward propagation, computational constraints limited our ability to evaluate all available models, particularly large ones such as Llama-2-70B (Touvron et al., 2023) and Llama-3.1-405B (Dubey et al., 2024), and limited us to evaluate IG in § 5.2.

Our experimental design used synthetic tasks to better identify influential examples in the few-shot setting. While this approach allowed for controlled experimentation, both the number and format of tasks were limited. Future work could explore more realistic tasks with greater variations.

We focused exclusively on pre-training models, excluding post-training models from our analysis. This choice was motivated by our interest in basic few-shot learning, which is more commonly used with pre-trained models. Although post-training models might demonstrate higher accuracy on our tasks and the self-answer setting due to their potentially superior capabilities (Rivière et al., 2024), our primary focus was on evaluating IA methods rather than model performance.

The optimization of the self-answer setting was not explored in depth, as our main interest lay in examining whether larger models showed improved performance in this setting rather than enhancing the setting itself.

Finally, while our ambiguous tasks were designed with two potential functions in mind, we acknowledge that models might interpret these tasks differently than intended. However, since our focus was on whether models could recognize these as ambiguous tasks with two possible answers and use specific examples to determine the appropriate response, we believe this limitation does not significantly impact our findings.

## Ethical Statements

This work advances our understanding of input attribution (IA) methods in the context of large language models’ (LLMs) in-context learning (ICL). Our findings contribute to the broader goal of devel-

oping more interpretable and safer AI systems by providing practical insights into the strengths and weaknesses of IA methods as tools for interpreting LLMs.

This study exclusively uses synthetic data generated through computational methods. No real user data, human annotations, or personally identifiable information was collected or used in our experiments. Our synthetic dataset generation process does not involve any human subjects, crowd workers, or demographic information.

## Acknowledgements

We would like to express our gratitude to the members of the Tohoku NLP Group for their insightful comments. And special thanks to Sho Yokoi for his valuable suggestions on how to improve clarity in several aspects. This work was supported by the JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP19H04162, JP22J21492; JST Moonshot R&D Grant Number JPMJMS2011 (fundamental research); JST BOOST, Japan Grant Number JPMJBS2421.

## References

- David Alvarez-Melis and Tommi Jaakkola. 2017. [A causal framework for explaining the predictions of black-box sequence-to-sequence models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 412–421, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Leila Arras, Franziska Horn, Grégoire Montavon, Klaus-Robert Müller, and Wojciech Samek. 2016. [Explaining predictions of non-linear classifiers in NLP](#). In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Representation Learning for NLP*, pages 1–7, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Leila Arras, Ahmed Osman, Klaus-Robert Müller, and Wojciech Samek. 2019. [Evaluating recurrent neural network explanations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACL Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, pages 113–126, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jasmijn Bastings, Sebastian Ebert, Polina Zablotskaia, Anders Sandholm, and Katja Filippova. 2022. [“will you find these shortcuts?” a protocol for evaluating the faithfulness of input salience methods for text classification](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 976–991, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Leonard Bereska and Stratis Gavves. 2024. [Mechanistic Interpretability for AI Safety - A Review](#). *Transactions on Machine Learning Research (TMLR)*.
- Dan Braun, Jordan Taylor, Nicholas Goldowsky-Dill, and Lee Sharkey. 2024. [Identifying functionally important features with end-to-end sparse dictionary learning](#). *CoRR*, abs/2405.12241.
- Trenton Bricken, Adly Templeton, Joshua Batson, Brian Chen, Adam Jermyn, Tom Conerly, Nick Turner, Cem Anil, Carson Denison, Amanda Askell, Robert Lasenby, Yifan Wu, Shauna Kravec, Nicholas Schiefer, Tim Maxwell, Nicholas Joseph, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Alex Tamkin, Karina Nguyen, Brayden McLean, Josiah E Burke, Tristan Hume, Shan Carter, Tom Henighan, and Christopher Olah. 2023. [Towards monosemanticity: Decomposing language models with dictionary learning](#). *Transformer Circuits Thread*. <https://transformer-circuits.pub/2023/monosemantic-features/index.html>.
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language Models are Few-Shot Learners](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33 (NeurIPS)*.
- Guillaume Charpiat, Nicolas Girard, Loris Felardos, and Yuliya Tarabalka. 2019. [Input similarity from the neural network perspective](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2019, NeurIPS 2019, December 8-14, 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, pages 5343–5352.
- Noam Chomsky. 1980. *Rules and Representations*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Misha Denil, Alban Demiraj, and Nando de Freitas. 2014. [Extraction of salient sentences from labelled documents](#). *CoRR*, abs/1412.6815.
- Shuoyang Ding and Philipp Koehn. 2021. [Evaluating saliency methods for neural language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 5034–5052, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Sravankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, Arun Rao, Aston Zhang, Aurélien Rodriguez, Austen Gregerson, Ava Spataru, Baptiste Rozière, Bethany Biron, Binh Tang, Bobbie Chern, Charlotte Caucheteux, Chaya Nayak, Chloe Bi, Chris Marra, Chris McConnell, Christian Keller, Christophe Touret, Chunyang Wu, Corinne Wong, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Cyrus Nikolaidis, Damien Al-lonsius, Daniel Song, Danielle Pintz, Danny Livshits, David Esiobu, Dhruv Choudhary, Dhruv Mahajan, Diego Garcia-Olano, Diego Perino, Dieuwke Hupkes, Egor Lakomkin, Ehab AlBadawy, Elina Lobanova, Emily Dinan, Eric Michael Smith, Filip Radenovic, Frank Zhang, Gabriel Synnaeve, Gabrielle Lee, Georgia Lewis Anderson, Graeme Nail, Grégoire Mialon, Guan Pang, Guillem Cucurell, Hailey Nguyen, Hannah Korevaar, Hu Xu, Hugo Touvron, Iliyan Zarov, Imanol Arrieta Ibarra, Isabel M. Kloumann, Ishan Misra, Ivan Evtimov, Jade Copet, Jaewon Lee, Jan Geffert, Jana Vranes, Jason Park, Jay Mahadeokar, Jeet Shah, Jelmer van der Linde, Jennifer Billock, Jenny Hong, Jenya Lee, Jeremy Fu, Jianfeng Chi, Jianyu Huang, Jiawen Liu, Jie Wang, Jiecao Yu, Joanna Bitton, Joe Spisak, Jongsoo Park, Joseph Rocca, Joshua Johnstun, Joshua Saxe, Junteng Jia, Kalyan Vasuden Alwala, Kartikeya Upasani, Kate Plawiak, Ke Li, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Stone, and et al. 2024. [The llama 3 herd of models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2407.21783.
- Javier Ferrando, Gerard I. Gállego, Ioannis Tsiamas, and Marta R. Costa-jussà. 2023. [Explaining how transformers use context to build predictions](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5486–5513, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Leo Gao, Tom Dupré la Tour, Henk Tillman, Gabriel Goh, Rajan Troll, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, Jan Leike, and Jeffrey Wu. 2024. [Scaling and evaluating sparse autoencoders](#). *CoRR*, abs/2406.04093.
- Kazuaki Hanawa, Sho Yokoi, Satoshi Hara, and Kentaro Inui. 2021. [Evaluation of similarity-based explanations](#). In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net.
- Andrej Karpathy, Justin Johnson, and Li Fei-Fei. 2015. [Visualizing and understanding recurrent networks](#). *CoRR*, abs/1506.02078.
- Adam Karvonen, Benjamin Wright, Can Rager, Rico Angell, Jannik Brinkmann, Logan Riggs Smith, Claudio Mayrink Verdun, David Bau, and Samuel Marks. 2024. [Measuring progress in dictionary learning for language model interpretability with board game models](#). In *ICML 2024 Workshop on Mechanistic Interpretability*.
- Eugene Kharitonov and Rahma Chaabouni. 2021. [What they do when in doubt: a study of inductive biases in seq2seq learners](#). In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net.

- Connor Kissane, Robert Krzyzanowski, Joseph Isaac Bloom, Arthur Conmy, and Neel Nanda. 2024. [Interpreting attention layer outputs with sparse autoencoders](#). In *ICML 2024 Workshop on Mechanistic Interpretability*.
- Pang Wei Koh and Percy Liang. 2017. [Understanding black-box predictions via influence functions](#). In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2017, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 6-11 August 2017*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1885–1894. PMLR.
- Narine Kokhlikyan, Vivek Miglani, Miguel Martin, Edward Wang, Bilal Alsallakh, Jonathan Reynolds, Alexander Melnikov, Natalia Kliushkina, Carlos Araya, Siqi Yan, and Orion Reblitz-Richardson. 2020. [Captum: A unified and generic model interpretability library for PyTorch](#). *arXiv preprint*.
- Barbara Landau, Linda B Smith, and Susan S Jones. 1988. The importance of shape in early lexical learning. *Cognitive development*, 3(3):299–321.
- Tao Lei, Regina Barzilay, and Tommi Jaakkola. 2016. [Rationalizing neural predictions](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 107–117, Austin, Texas. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiwei Li, Xinlei Chen, Eduard Hovy, and Dan Jurafsky. 2016a. [Visualizing and understanding neural models in NLP](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 681–691, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiwei Li, Michel Galley, Chris Brockett, Jianfeng Gao, and Bill Dolan. 2016b. [A diversity-promoting objective function for neural conversation models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 110–119, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiwei Li, Will Monroe, and Dan Jurafsky. 2016c. [Understanding neural networks through representation erasure](#). *CoRR*, abs/1612.08220.
- Tom Lieberum, Senthoran Rajamanoharan, Arthur Conmy, Lewis Smith, Nicolas Sonnerat, Vikrant Varma, János Kramár, Anca D. Dragan, Rohin Shah, and Neel Nanda. 2024. [Gemma scope: Open sparse autoencoders everywhere all at once on gemma 2](#). *CoRR*, abs/2408.05147.
- Hui Liu, Qingyu Yin, and William Yang Wang. 2019. [Towards explainable NLP: A generative explanation framework for text classification](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5570–5581, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiachang Liu, Dinghan Shen, Yizhe Zhang, Bill Dolan, Lawrence Carin, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. [What makes good in-context examples for GPT-3?](#) In *Proceedings of Deep Learning Inside Out (DeeLIO 2022): The 3rd Workshop on Knowledge Extraction and Integration for Deep Learning Architectures*, pages 100–114, Dublin, Ireland and Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Scott M. Lundberg and Su-In Lee. 2017. [A unified approach to interpreting model predictions](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, pages 4765–4774.
- Aleksandar Makelov. 2024. [Sparse autoencoders match supervised features for model steering on the IOI task](#). In *ICML 2024 Workshop on Mechanistic Interpretability*.
- Ana Marasovic, Iz Beltagy, Doug Downey, and Matthew E. Peters. 2022. [Few-shot self-rationalization with natural language prompts](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022, Seattle, WA, United States, July 10-15, 2022*, pages 410–424. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- R Thomas McCoy, Robert Frank, and Tal Linzen. 2018. [Revisiting the poverty of the stimulus: hierarchical generalization without a hierarchical bias in recurrent neural networks](#). In *40th Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society: Changing Minds, CogSci 2018*, pages 2096–2101.
- R. Thomas McCoy, Robert Frank, and Tal Linzen. 2020. [Does syntax need to grow on trees? sources of hierarchical inductive bias in sequence-to-sequence networks](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:125–140.
- Sewon Min, Xinxin 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 *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 11048–11064, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tom M Mitchell. 1980. *The need for biases in learning generalizations*. Citeseer.
- Aaron Mueller, Albert Webson, Jackson Petty, and Tal Linzen. 2024. [In-context learning generalizes, but not always robustly: The case of syntax](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4761–4779, Stroudsburg, PA, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- W. James Murdoch, Peter J. Liu, and Bin Yu. 2018. [Beyond word importance: Contextual decomposition to extract interactions from lstms](#). In *6th International*

- Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018, Vancouver, BC, Canada, April 30 - May 3, 2018, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net.
- Sharan Narang, Colin Raffel, Katherine Lee, Adam Roberts, Noah Fiedel, and Karishma Malkan. 2020. [Wt5?! training text-to-text models to explain their predictions](#). *CoRR*, abs/2004.14546.
- Chris Olah, Nick Cammarata, Ludwig Schubert, Gabriel Goh, Michael Petrov, and Shan Carter. 2020. [Zoom in: An introduction to circuits](#). *Distill*. <https://distill.pub/2020/circuits/zoom-in>.
- Amy Perfors, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Terry Regier. 2011. [The learnability of abstract syntactic principles](#). *Cognition*, 118(3):306–338.
- Nina Poerner, Hinrich Schütze, and Benjamin Roth. 2018. [Evaluating neural network explanation methods using hybrid documents and morphosyntactic agreement](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 340–350, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Senthooran Rajamanoharan, Arthur Conmy, Lewis Smith, Tom Lieberum, Vikrant Varma, Janos Kramar, Rohin Shah, and Neel Nanda. 2024a. [Improving sparse decomposition of language model activations with gated sparse autoencoders](#). In *ICML 2024 Workshop on Mechanistic Interpretability*.
- Senthooran Rajamanoharan, Tom Lieberum, Nicolas Sonnerat, Arthur Conmy, Vikrant Varma, János Kramár, and Neel Nanda. 2024b. [Jumping ahead: Improving reconstruction fidelity with jumprelu sparse autoencoders](#). *CoRR*, abs/2407.14435.
- Nazneen Fatema Rajani, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2019. [Explain yourself! leveraging language models for commonsense reasoning](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4932–4942, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Marco Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. 2016. [“why should I trust you?”: Explaining the predictions of any classifier](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Demonstrations*, pages 97–101, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Morgane Rivière, Shreya Pathak, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Cassidy Hardin, Surya Bhupatiraju, Léonard Hussenot, Thomas Mesnard, Bobak Shahriari, Alexandre Ramé, Johan Ferret, Peter Liu, Pouya Tafti, Abe Friesen, Michelle Casbon, Sabela Ramos, Ravin Kumar, Charline Le Lan, Sammy Jerome, Anton Tsitsulin, Nino Vieillard, Piotr Stanczyk, Sertan Girgin, Nikola Momchev, Matt Hoffman, Shantanu Thakoor, Jean-Bastien Grill, Behnam Neyshabur, Olivier Bachem, Alanna Walton, Aliaksei Severyn, Alicia Parrish, Aliya Ahmad, Allen Hutchison, Alvin Abdagic, Amanda Carl, Amy Shen, Andy Brock, Andy Coenen, Anthony Laforge, Antonia Paterson, Ben Bastian, Bilal Piot, Bo Wu, Brandon Royal, Charlie Chen, Chintu Kumar, Chris Perry, Chris Welty, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Danila Sinopalnikov, David Weinberger, Dimple Vijaykumar, Dominika Rogozinska, Dustin Herbison, Elisa Bandy, Emma Wang, Eric Noland, Erica Moreira, Evan Senter, Evgenii Eltyshev, Francesco Visin, Gabriel Rasskin, Gary Wei, Glenn Cameron, Gus Martins, Hadi Hashemi, Hanna Klimczak-Plucinska, Harleen Batra, Harsh Dhand, Ivan Nardini, Jacinda Mein, Jack Zhou, James Svensson, Jeff Stanway, Jetha Chan, Jin Peng Zhou, Joana Carrasqueira, Joana Iljazi, Jocelyn Becker, Joe Fernandez, Joost van Amersfoort, Josh Gordon, Josh Lipschultz, Josh Newlan, Ju-yeong Ji, Kareem Mohamed, Kartikeya Badola, Kat Black, Katie Millican, Keelin McDonnell, Kelvin Nguyen, Kiranbir Sodhia, Kish Greene, Lars Lowe Sjöstrand, Lauren Usui, Laurent Sifre, Lena Heuermann, Leticia Lago, and Lilly McNealus. 2024. [Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size](#). *CoRR*, abs/2408.00118.
- Soumya Sanyal and Xiang Ren. 2021. [Discretized integrated gradients for explaining language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10285–10299, Stroudsburg, PA, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Avanti Shrikumar, Peyton Greenside, and Anshul Kundaje. 2017. [Learning Important Features Through Propagating Activation Differences](#). In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research (PMLR)*, pages 3145–3153.
- Karen Simonyan, Andrea Vedaldi, and Andrew Zisserman. 2014. [Deep Inside Convolutional Networks: Visualising Image Classification Models and Saliency Maps](#). In *2nd International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) Workshop Track Proceedings*.
- Sanchit Sinha, Hanjie Chen, Arshdeep Sekhon, Yangfeng Ji, and Yanjun Qi. 2021. [Perturbing inputs for fragile interpretations in deep natural language processing](#). In *Proceedings of the Fourth BlackboxNLP Workshop on Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, pages 420–434, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jost Tobias Springenberg, Alexey Dosovitskiy, Thomas Brox, and Martin A. Riedmiller. 2015. [Striving for simplicity: The all convolutional net](#). In *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Workshop Track Proceedings*.
- Mukund Sundararajan, Ankur Taly, and Qiqi Yan. 2017. [Axiomatic attribution for deep networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine*

- Learning, ICML 2017, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 6-11 August 2017*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3319–3328. PMLR.
- Adly Templeton, Tom Conerly, Jonathan Marcus, Jack Lindsey, Trenton Bricken, Brian Chen, Adam Pearce, Craig Citro, Emmanuel Ameisen, Andy Jones, Hoagy Cunningham, Nicholas L Turner, Callum McDougall, Monte MacDiarmid, C. Daniel Freeman, Theodore R. Sumers, Edward Rees, Joshua Batson, Adam Jermyn, Shan Carter, Chris Olah, and Tom Henighan. 2024. [Scaling monosemanticity: Extracting interpretable features from claude 3 sonnet](#). *Transformer Circuits Thread*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton-Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurélien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2307.09288.
- Johannes Treutlein, Dami Choi, Jan Betley, Samuel Marks, Cem Anil, Roger Baker Grosse, and Owain Evans. 2024. Connecting the dots: LLMs can infer and verbalize latent structure from disparate training data. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Oriol Vinyals and Quoc V. Le. 2015. [A neural conversational model](#). *CoRR*, abs/1506.05869.
- Sandra Wachter, Brent D. Mittelstadt, and Chris Russell. 2017. [Counterfactual explanations without opening the black box: Automated decisions and the GDPR](#). *CoRR*, abs/1711.00399.
- Alex Warstadt, Yian Zhang, Xiaocheng Li, Haokun Liu, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2020. [Learning which features matter: RoBERTa acquires a preference for linguistic generalizations \(eventually\)](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 217–235, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Colin Wilson. 2006. [Learning phonology with substantive bias: an experimental and computational study of velar palatalization](#). *Cogn. Sci.*, 30(5):945–982.
- Jialin Wu and Raymond Mooney. 2019. [Faithful multimodal explanation for visual question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACL Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, pages 103–112, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aditya Yedotore, Tal Linzen, Robert Frank, and R Thomas McCoy. 2023. [How poor is the stimulus? evaluating hierarchical generalization in neural networks trained on child-directed speech](#). In *Proceedings of ACL 2023*, pages 9370–9393.
- Kayo Yin and Graham Neubig. 2022. [Interpreting language models with contrastive explanations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 184–198, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Luisa M. Zintgraf, Taco S. Cohen, Tameem Adel, and Max Welling. 2017. [Visualizing deep neural network decisions: Prediction difference analysis](#). In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net.

## A Finetuning Details

Fine-tuning data consisted of equal numbers of 10-shot, 50-shot, and 100-shot examples.

For each task, we create the train set for fine-tuning use tokens with no overlapping with the test set (the dataset we used for our main experiments).

We fine-tuned models on each task separately, this allows them to focus solely on learning the underlying rules of that task, without needing to identify which task is being presented during testing

This results in six fine-tuned models per LLM, one for each task, with the exception of Gemma-2-27B model, which we didn't fine-tune Gemma-2-27B on the ASSOCIATIVE-RECALL task as the original model performs good enough on this simple task.

### A.1 Finetuning parameters

We use a fixed LoRA configuration with rank  $r = 32$  and scaling factor  $\alpha = 64$ , applying a dropout rate of 0.05 across all linear modules. The LoRA adaptation includes bias terms in the training.

For optimization, we perform a learning rate sweep using a cosine scheduler with a 5% warm-up period relative to the total training steps. The optimal learning rate typically falls in the order of  $1 \times 10^{-5}$  when the loss reaches its minimum.

In our experiments, the Llama-2 models achieve zero loss, which is expected in such synthetic setting. The Gemma-2 models, however, converge to final loss values of approximately 0.2.

### A.2 Zero-shot Question Accuracy after Finetuning

We evaluate performance using exact match accuracy, with results presented in Tables 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. In the zero-shot setting, some tasks show accuracies significantly below chance rate (indicated in parentheses), as models occasionally generate responses outside the expected answer space. Notably, all models achieve zero-shot accuracies at or below chance rate across all tasks, suggesting that no superficial patterns were learned during fine-tuning to solve these tasks.

## B Base Model Results

Figure 5 presents the attribution accuracies of the base models. While the overall attribution accuracies for linguistic pattern tasks are relatively low, the performance trends across different tasks and

models exhibit similar patterns to those observed in the fine-tuned models (Figure 2).

## C Prompt

We present sample of the exact prompt we used for our task, including the ones we used for testing attribution accuracies and modified prompts for self-answer.

### Normal Prompt

```
Input: they, Output: 6
Input: not, Output: 3
Input: I, Output: 5
Input: tell, Output: 7
Input: them, Output: 6
Input: were, Output: 6
Input: at, Output: 0
Input: yes, Output: 1
Input: right, Output: 9
Input: say, Output: 3
Input: they, Output:
```

### Self-answer Prompt

```
<0>Input: they, Output: 6</0>
<1>Input: not, Output: 3</1>
<2>Input: I, Output: 5</2>
<3>Input: tell, Output: 7</3>
<4>Input: them, Output: 6</4>
<5>Input: were, Output: 6</5>
<6>Input: at, Output: 0</6>
<7>Input: yes, Output: 1</7>
<8>Input: right, Output: 9</8>
<9>Input: say, Output: 3</9>
<target>Input: they, Output: </target>
```

Among the 10 examples labeled <0> to <9>, select the single most helpful example for determining the answer to the <target> question. The correct answer to the target question is "6". To conclude this answer, we need to find one example that provides the necessary information. Therefore, the most helpful example is <

## D Non-contrastive IA Methods Results

We further evaluate attribution accuracies using non-contrastive IA methods (specifically, non-contrastive GN, non-contrastive-I $\times$ G, and non-contrastive IE), as shown in Figure 6. The results exhibit patterns that are highly consistent with those obtained from contrastive methods (Figure 2).

## **E More Results on Interpretability vs. Few-shot Number**

Table 8, 9, 10, and 11 show the Pearson correlation for Gemma-2-9B, Gemma-2-27B, Llama-2-7B and Llama-2-13B.



	Zero-shot (%)	Few-shot (%)
ASSOCIATIVE-RECALL	10.0	100.0 (10.0)
LINEAR-OR-DISTINCT	44.8	99.0 (50.0)
ADD-OR-MULTIPLY	11.8	100.0 (50.0)
VERB-OBJECT	0.0	100.0 (50.0)
TENSE-ARTICLE	0.0	100.0 (50.0)
POS-TITLE	0.0	98.0 (50.0)

Table 3: The zero-shot and few-shot accuracy of the fine-tuned Gemma-2-2B model across all evaluation tasks. The chance rate is indicated in parentheses.

	Zero-shot (%)	Few-shot (%)
ASSOCIATIVE-RECALL	12.0	100.0 (10.0)
LINEAR-OR-DISTINCT	50.0	85.5 (50.0)
ADD-OR-MULTIPLY	12.0	100.0 (50.0)
VERB-OBJECT	0.0	94.8 (50.0)
TENSE-ARTICLE	0.0	100.0 (50.0)
POS-TITLE	50.0	98.8 (50.0)

Table 4: The zero-shot and few-shot accuracy of the fine-tuned Gemma-2-9B model across all evaluation tasks. The chance rate is indicated in parentheses.

	Zero-shot (%)	Few-shot (%)
ASSOCIATIVE-RECALL	15.0	100.0 (10.0)
LINEAR-OR-DISTINCT	47.3	99.8 (50.0)
ADD-OR-MULTIPLY	48.5	97.3 (50.0)
VERB-OBJECT	0.0	99.5 (50.0)
TENSE-ARTICLE	50.0	100.0 (50.0)
POS-TITLE	45.5	97.8 (50.0)

Table 5: The zero-shot and few-shot accuracy of the fine-tuned Gemma-2-27B model across all evaluation tasks. The chance rate is indicated in parentheses.

	Zero-shot (%)	Few-shot (%)
ASSOCIATIVE-RECALL	10.0	100.0 (10.0)
LINEAR-OR-DISTINCT	44.8	100.0 (50.0)
ADD-OR-MULTIPLY	11.8	99.0 (50.0)
VERB-OBJECT	0.0	100.0 (50.0)
TENSE-ARTICLE	0.0	100.0 (50.0)
POS-TITLE	0.0	98.0 (50.0)

Table 6: The zero-shot and few-shot accuracy of the fine-tuned Llama-2-7B model across all evaluation tasks. The chance rate is indicated in parentheses.

	Zero-shot (%)	Few-shot (%)
ASSOCIATIVE-RECALL	10.0	100.0 (10.0)
LINEAR-OR-DISTINCT	50.0	99.8 (50.0)
ADD-OR-MULTIPLY	41.0	100.0 (50.0)
VERB-OBJECT	0.0	100.0 (50.0)
TENSE-ARTICLE	0.0	100.0 (50.0)
POS-TITLE	41.8	97.0 (50.0)

Table 7: The zero-shot and few-shot accuracy of the fine-tuned Llama-2-13B model across all evaluation tasks. The chance rate is indicated in parentheses.

Task	GN		I×G		SA	
	Corr.	Δ	Corr.	Δ	Corr.	Δ
AR	-0.39	0.05	0.44	0.05	-0.93	0.16
LD	1.00	0.35	0.89	0.07	-0.88	0.09
AM	0.88	0.27	1.00	0.02	-0.89	0.08
VO	0.99	0.13	-0.96	0.15	-0.88	0.10
TA	-0.90	0.01	-0.73	0.11	-0.90	0.09
PT	-1.00	0.07	-0.90	0.28	-0.93	0.09

Table 8: The Pearson correlation coefficient between attribution accuracy and the number of few-shot examples for Gemma-2-2B.

Task	GN		I×G		SA	
	Corr.	Δ	Corr.	Δ	Corr.	Δ
AR	-0.07	0.07	1.00	0.41	-0.86	0.90
LD	-0.75	0.07	0.00	0.04	-0.85	0.33
AM	0.98	0.09	-0.93	0.02	-0.88	0.06
VO	0.76	0.14	0.33	0.05	-0.85	0.14
TA	0.86	0.36	-0.93	0.18	-0.90	0.09
PT	0.90	0.22	0.65	0.06	-0.86	0.07

Table 9: The Pearson correlation coefficient between attribution accuracy and the number of few-shot examples for Gemma-2-9B.

Task	GN		I×G		SA	
	Corr.	Δ	Corr.	Δ	Corr.	Δ
AR	0.28	0.06	-0.73	0.11	-0.86	0.29
LD	0.97	0.24	-0.69	0.08	-0.89	0.09
AM	0.98	0.26	-0.07	0.03	-0.85	0.37
VO	-0.62	0.07	0.84	0.12	-0.86	0.15
TA	0.96	0.19	-0.48	0.06	-0.92	0.10
PT	0.90	0.14	0.25	0.04	-0.89	0.09

Table 10: The Pearson correlation coefficient between attribution accuracy and the number of few-shot examples for Llama-2-7B.

Task	GN		I×G		SA	
	Corr.	Δ	Corr.	Δ	Corr.	Δ
AR	-0.74	0.06	0.32	0.07	-0.89	0.49
LD	1.00	0.11	-0.85	0.07	-0.87	0.14
AM	1.00	0.49	-0.97	0.14	-0.87	0.15
VO	-0.81	0.04	-0.70	0.02	-0.84	0.43
TA	0.99	0.13	0.98	0.04	-0.87	0.44
PT	0.99	0.14	-0.87	0.02	-0.86	0.18

Table 11: The Pearson correlation coefficient between attribution accuracy and the number of few-shot examples for Llama-2-13B.




Figure 5: Attribution accuracies for each task for base models.




Figure 6: Attribution accuracy using non-contrastive methods on fine-tuned models.