

StaICC: Standardized Evaluation for Classification Task in In-context Learning

Hakaze Cho | *Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology*
 Naoya Inoue | *Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, RIKEN*
 Correspondence to: yfzhao@jaist.ac.jp.

Abstract

Classification tasks are widely investigated in the In-Context Learning (ICL) paradigm. However, current efforts are evaluated on disjoint benchmarks and settings, while their performances are significantly influenced by some trivial variables, such as prompt templates, data sampling, instructions, etc., which leads to significant inconsistencies in the results reported across various literature, preventing fair comparison or meta-analysis across different papers. Therefore, this paper proposes a standardized and easy-to-use evaluation toolkit (StaICC) for in-context classification. Including, for the normal classification task, we provide StaICC-NORMAL, selecting 10 widely used datasets, and generating prompts with a fixed form, to mitigate the variance among the experiment implementations. To enrich the usage of our benchmark, we also provide a sub-benchmark StaICC-DIAG for diagnosing ICL from several aspects, aiming for a more robust inference processing.

Library released: <https://github.com/hc495/StaICC>

1 Introduction

In-Context Learning (ICL) (Dong et al., 2022) is an emerging forward-calculation-only few-shot paradigm using Language Models (LMs) without parameter updating. ICL paradigm can be used on various task forms (Min et al., 2022b;c), where *classifications* with finite and fixed label space are concise and critical tasks for calibrating LMs for ICL (Zhao et al., 2021; Han et al., 2023b; Jiang et al., 2023; Fei et al., 2023; Zhou et al., 2024; Cho et al., 2024), aligning LMs towards ICL objective (Wei et al., 2022; Min et al., 2022b; Wei et al., 2023a; Iyer et al., 2022), and investigating the inner principle of ICL (Min et al., 2022c; Yoo et al., 2022; Dai et al., 2023; Han et al., 2023a; Wang et al., 2023; Kossen et al., 2024; Cho et al., 2025).

However, previous works use disjoint benchmarks to evaluate the ICL performance on classification tasks (Table 1), and performance even on the same model and dataset varies (Fig. 1) due to non-essential factors, such as the prompt template, data sampling, demonstration order, etc. Due to such an inconsistency, in current ICL research, scholars usually need to repeat the baseline experiments in a consistent setting to compare the results with previous works, even if these experiments are quite costly. This greatly increases the difficulty of comparing or meta-analyzing the results in the literature, causing a limited understanding of how ICL performance varies across models and additional algorithms for improving ICL.

To this end, in this paper, we propose StaICC, a standardized and easy-to-use toolkit for evaluating the classification performance of ICL. Concretely, we select 10 widely used datasets on single-sentence classification tasks to unify the usage of datasets and fix the prompt template, data sampling, and demonstration orders to generate stable-over-trial test inputs, to eliminate the inconsistency caused by these experimental settings. Moreover, to enrich the usage of StaICC, we propose StaICC-DIAG, for diagnosis data consisting of prediction bias, prompt sensitivity, label-noise robustness, etc., to help for a closer look and improvement of ICL inference methods.

Based on StaICC, we extensively measure the ICL capability on 29 modern LMs, and observe clear scaling laws of ICL classification performance against the model parameter numbers, confirming the robustness of

Table 1: Usage of datasets and metrics in 29 papers related to ICL. Significant variances are found in datasets and metrics usage in the literature. **Notation:** (Blank): un-used; ○: measured by Accuracy; ●: measured by Macro-F1; ●: measured by both Accuracy and F1; ○: measured by other metrics.

Literature	SST ₂	RTE	AGN	TREC	Subj.	MR	DBP	SST ₅	MRPC	CB	FinP	WNLI	TEE	Others
Kossen et al. (2024)	●	●	●		●				●		●	●		+2
Wang et al. (2023)	○		○	○										+1
Gu et al. (2023)	●	●	●		●	●		●		●				
Han et al. (2023a)	●		●											+4
Pan et al. (2023)	●								●		●		●	+9
Yoo et al. (2022)	●	●		●					●		●	●	●	+8
Min et al. (2022c)	●	●		●					●		●	●	●	+7
Jiang et al. (2023)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●				+3
Zhou et al. (2024)	●	●							●	●				+7
Han et al. (2023b)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●						+1
Fei et al. (2023)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	+9
Zhao et al. (2021)	●	●	●	●			●			●				+3
Zhao et al. (2024)	●	●							●		●		●	+6
Min et al. (2022b)	●	●		●		●			●			●		+37
Wei et al. (2023a)					●								●	+9
Wei et al. (2023b)	●	●			●						●	●		+4
Shi et al. (2024b)	●	●			●							●		+1
Chen et al. (2023)			○			○								+8
Min et al. (2022a)	●		●	●	●	●	●	●						+4
Li & Qiu (2023)	●		●	●	●	●	●	●						+1
Wei et al. (2022)	●	●							●	●		●		+27
Cho et al. (2024)		●	●			●					●		●	+4
Lu et al. (2022)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●				+2
Xu et al. (2023)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●				+2
Abbas et al. (2024)	●	●	●	●	●		●	●						
SU et al. (2023)		●					●	●	●					+1
Shi et al. (2024a)	●		●				●							+4
Hao et al. (2022)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●				
Li et al. (2023)	●		●	●		●	●	●						+4
count: 29	25	20	18	15	14	13	13	11	9	9	8	8	7	-

STAICC and responding to our initial motivation of a consistent inference evaluation. Moreover, we fairly evaluate the performance of 10 inference methods on STAICC, providing baseline and reference data for subsequent research.

1.1 Related Works

The models and datasets mentioned in this paper are cited in Appendix A.

In-context learning. Discovered by Radford et al. (2019), in-context learning is an emerging few-shot learning paradigm using only feed-forward calculation on LMs. Previous researches are focused on **improving ICL performance** by calibrating or recalculating the predicted likelihood (Zhao et al., 2021; Han et al., 2023b; Jiang et al., 2023; Fei et al., 2023; Zhou et al., 2024; Cho et al., 2024; Xu et al., 2023; Abbas et al., 2024; Min et al., 2022a), aligning LMs towards ICL objective (Wei et al., 2023a; Min et al., 2022b; Wei et al., 2022; Iyer et al., 2022; Brunet et al., 2023), finding better demonstration examples (Liu et al., 2022; Mavromatis et al., 2023; Gonen et al., 2023; Qin et al., 2023; Van et al., 2024), and applying better demonstration orders (Lu et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2024). Also, some works try to find the **principle of ICL** therioically (Olsson et al., 2022; Wies et al., 2024; Huang et al., 2023; Collins et al., 2024; Jeon et al., 2024) and empirically (Min et al., 2022c; Yoo et al., 2022; Dai et al., 2023; Han et al., 2023a; Wang et al., 2023; Kossen et al., 2024; Pan et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024; Cho et al., 2025). These works typically require benchmarks to validate their algorithms’ effectiveness or measure ICL-related data. However, we will show that the selection and usage of these benchmarks are inconsistent, making it difficult to compare and summarize their results across the literature.

Currently used ICL benchmarks. Currently used structured benchmarks for ICL include: BIG-Bench (Srivastava et al., 2023) and BIG-Bench Hard (Suzgun et al., 2023) for large-scaled and complex tasks, and OPT-IML (Iyer et al., 2022) for out-of-distribution tasks. However, for general classification




Figure 1: Summaries of experimental results in the literature: ICL results are disjoint in the literature. **Left:** Accuracies of various models with different sizes on specified datasets, where the results do not comply with the scaling laws w.r.t. the model scaling. **Right:** Accuracies of the same model (GPT2-XL) on vanilla ICL inference from different papers, where results have a considerable range even on the same model.

tasks, which are quite basic and important for performance validation and principle explanation, no unified benchmarks are found currently, while only piecemeal supervised datasets, such as some subsets of GLUE (Wang et al., 2019) are used.

2 Preparation

2.1 Task Definition: In-context Classification

Typical ICL receives structured input-label pair prompt made from a few-shot *demonstration set* $\mathcal{D}_k = [(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \dots, (x_k, y_k)]$ and a *query* x_q by a *template* \mathcal{T} . Fed with the formed input $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{D}_k, x_q)$, the causal language model Θ produces a probability distribution of the subsequent token, and in **In-context Classification (ICC)** task with a finite and certain label token set \mathbb{Y} depending on the verbalizer in the prompt template¹, we usually select the probabilities of the tokens (of amount $|\mathbb{Y}|$) presented in the label token set as the output label probabilities. Also, some calibrations \mathcal{C} are used to re-scale the output label probabilities. That is, the output of ICC is:

$$\mathbf{o}(x_q) = \mathcal{C} [\text{TokenSelect}(\Theta(\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{D}_k, x_q)))], \quad (1)$$

which is an $|\mathbb{Y}|$ -dimensional probability vector. Obviously, in ICC experiments, we should consider and control all the variables to get comparable results. The \mathcal{C} , Θ are often well-controlled since they are deemed remarkable while the $\mathcal{T}(\cdot, \cdot)$ and \mathcal{D}_k are often overlooked even with an over-expected impact as investigated follows.

2.2 Motivation: Investigating the Inconsistency in ICC Experiments

This section claims our proposition: the inconsistency in experimental settings leading to inconsistent results hinders comparison and meta-analysis across the literature. We analyze how the inconsistency happens so that we can propose principles for our benchmark to reduce these inconsistencies.

The disjoint in dataset selection. To find how the dataset usage and experiment implementations are disjoint, we investigated 29 papers that conducted experiments on ICC. We summarize the usage of the most-used 13 datasets and their metrics in Table 1, where we find that even if some datasets are favored, the datasets used in ICC-related papers are severely inconsistent from an overall perspective. Also, the metrics in these papers are inconsistent.




Figure 2: The influence of various prompt variables on ICL. Details are shown in Appendix B.2.

¹Notice that typically each label corresponds to **one** token.




Figure 3: Major schematic diagram of data pre-processing and input forming in STAICC. Raw datasets are first divided into 3 sub-sets with a frozen pre-processor for calibration, demonstration, and query. Based on these sub-sets, ICL inputs are built with a frozen demonstration sampler, and a frozen prompt template under a meta-template, shown in gray for an example.

The disjoint in numerical results. We also investigate the detailed experimental results on the dataset overlaps on these papers in Fig. 1, where we can find that: (1) These results do not fit the scaling laws (Kaplan et al., 2020), and (2) Results on the same dataset and model are significantly inconsistent. For such a reason, researchers can hardly conduct a robust comparison or meta-analysis between these results reported by different papers.

As an attribution for the numerical disjoint, we find that the consistency in the input formatting is often overlooked in these papers as trivial experimental settings. So, we analyze and measure the impact on various aspects in the input forming in Fig. 2, where we can see: **Prompt connectors**, the formative tokens to indicate and connect parts in the prompt (such as the “Label: ” in Fig. 3), have the most influence on the performance to obscure the difference with a significantly small model, also shown by previous works (Han et al., 2023b; Voronov et al., 2024). Since the prompt templates are quite different across papers, we attribute it to a main reason for inconsistent results in the literature. **Verbalizers** (label token selection) also strongly influence the results (Min et al., 2022c; Yoo et al., 2022) but within our trials, it is not sufficient for an obscure. Random **Demonstration Order** and **Data Split** also have a minor influence. It is obvious that restricting these experiment settings can help to obtain stable-over-trial and reproducible results.

3 StaICC

In this section, we propose a **Standardized Evaluation Toolkit for In-context Classification** (STAICC) to address the disjointing problems mentioned before. Based on the above discussion, we advocate controlling variables in ICL practice, specifically determining a universal testing script with unified datasets and stable-over-trial inputs, to stably test ICL abilities in a consistent condition.

3.1 Methodology

General principles. Given the discussion before, we propose an evaluation toolkit STAICC with 10 chosen datasets (listed in Appendix A). For each dataset, we apply a fixed prompt template, data sampling, and demonstration order as the default setting to produce inputs for testing. That is, we ensure that give the k fixed, the inputs for the test are invariable among different tries. To support the efforts on improving some of the aspects of the ICC process shown in Eq. 1, we open all the interfaces to modify all the conditions (including the remarkable ones and the trivial ones, e.g., the prompt template) arbitrarily while the other aspects are recommended to be kept as default. In addition, we try our best to maximize usability and simplicity, so that users only need to call the interface to modify their input forming or reload a forward propagation function (or use our template) to quickly validate their method.

Controlling variables in assembling ICL inputs. In detail, as shown in Fig. 3, to build a variable-controlled set of ICL-styled inputs, given each chosen raw supervised classification dataset (Appendix A), we process them as described following: (1) filter some data out from these datasets (typically some over-

length and error data), (2) divide the cleaned dataset into 3 splits for tuning additional improvement methods (*calibration set*), demonstration forming (*demonstration set*), and query (*test set*), then, (3) a dataset-specific default input formatting, including a template, a verbalizer, and a fixed demonstration sequence for each query sample in the test set is assigned. As a result, stable-over-trial testing inputs are built based on these default settings. We guarantee the repeatability invariance of this process, so that, dataset selection differences and irrelevant experimental variables can be robustly controlled, increasing the comparability between different implementations, and the variance among experiment repetitions is also reduced to 0, mitigating the cost of describing statistics and parallel repetition of experiments among different random seeds.

Prompt templates. As the default setting, we use simple prompt templates as shown as a case in Fig. 3 and listed in Appendix B.1. Also, to enable development on improving the template, we frame these templates into a *meta-template* shown in Fig. 3, where users can freely set the attributes of the meta-template to customize the templates they need.

Is a simple prompt template the optimal choice? Given that we limit the template to the simplest ones, a doubt is: **why is such a template representative?** or, **can an input template faithfully measure the investigated features in a generalizable way?** A previous work (Voronov et al., 2024) pointed out that some prompt templates can obscure the gap between various models and ICL methods, causing discriminability loss in the testing. Also, the *optimal* or *most faithful* templates are non-transferable between different models or methods, which makes determining **the most generalizable** template for a benchmark an ill-defined task. Therefore, we follow Occam’s Razor, using the simplest but valid template, which also acts as a baseline to support the comparison of research on improving prompt templates. Imageably, such discriminatory suspicion can occur in various aspects of the benchmark designing (such as the sampling, datasets selection, etc., “why . . . can be used for a faithful test?”), so, to empirically confirm the discriminability of STAICC, we will calibrate it through scaling laws, that is, if we find larger models perform better on STAICC, we can preliminarily confirm its discriminability. Also, we ensure the unbiasedness of the dataset sampling (Appendix B.2), and provide sufficient test examples to avoid accidental results.

Specifically, we propose several sub-benchmarks for different purposes based on the above principle, which is introduced below.

3.2 StaICC-Normal: Basic Standardized Benchmark for ICC

As the main objective of this paper, to test the basic prediction capacity of an ICC inference $\mathbf{o}(x_q)$, we build STAICC-NORMAL with standard input form and typical metrics for classification tasks.

Metric. We apply 4 metrics for this sub-benchmark: (1) Accuracy, (2) True label probability (TLP), (3) Macro F1, (4) Expected calibration error-1 (ECE-1) (Guo et al., 2017; Naeini et al., 2015), with various linearity (Schaeffer et al., 2024) and application focus. For each test sample x_i in the test set $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$, given the ground-truth label y_i and the prediction output $\mathbf{o}(x_i)$, the metrics can be formulated as below:

$$\text{Acc} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1} \left[\underset{\hat{y} \in \mathbb{Y}}{\text{argmax}} \mathbf{o}(x_q) = y_i \right], \quad \text{TLP} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{o}(x_i)_{y_i},$$

$$\text{Macro F1} = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{Y}|} \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathbb{Y}|} \frac{2 \cdot \text{Precision}_j \cdot \text{Recall}_j}{\text{Precision}_j + \text{Recall}_j}, \quad \text{Precision}_j = \frac{\text{TP}_j}{\text{TP}_j + \text{FP}_j}, \quad \text{Recall}_j = \frac{\text{TP}_j}{\text{TP}_j + \text{FN}_j},$$

$$\text{ECE}_1 = \sum_{b=1}^B \frac{|B_b|}{N} \left| \text{acc}(B_b) - \frac{1}{|B_b|} \sum_{i \in B_b} \max_j \mathbf{o}(x_i)_j \right|, \quad \text{acc}(B_b) = \frac{1}{|B_b|} \sum_{i \in B_b} \mathbb{1} \left[\underset{\hat{y} \in \mathbb{Y}}{\text{argmax}} \mathbf{o}(x_q) = y_i \right],$$

where TP_j , FP_j , and FN_j are the true positive, false positive, and false negative counts for class j , respectively, B_b is the set of prediction samples in the b -th confidence bin within a total B bins (set to 10 in




Figure 4: TLP results against model parameter numbers.




Figure 5: Absolute accuracy (%) improvement of various ICL-improving methods against model parameter numbers.

Table 2: Accuracies (%) of 10 representative models and 10 inference methods on STAICC-NORMAL. The best inference method on each model is shown in **bold**, *: Instruction-tuned models. More detailed results are in Appendix C.

Models Para. # / B	GPT-2 0.14	GPT-2 1.6	OPT 2.7	Llama2 6.7	Qwen2* 7.6	Qwen2 7.6	Llama3 8.0	Llama2 13 _{AWQ}	Llama2 34 _{AWQ}	Qwen2* 72 _{AWQ}
– Basic Inference –										
Vanilla	40.24	50.31	51.48	57.32	66.87	61.19	64.42	63.47	66.83	72.36
Noisy Ch.	47.97	52.12	56.78	61.35	63.76	63.71	66.47	64.96	61.11	68.72
– Output Probability Calibration –										
Context. Ca.	39.73	42.27	43.43	52.00	64.04	59.23	55.44	57.07	62.80	71.43
Domain Ca.	45.89	47.99	54.46	59.77	65.58	61.90	62.40	62.38	66.57	71.48
Batch Ca.	43.47	51.08	53.93	60.57	69.52	65.90	65.89	62.80	66.63	73.45
– Input Reforming –										
PPL-ICL	40.30	51.13	51.73	58.34	69.73	65.59	66.25	62.40	69.21	75.81
TopK	43.89	62.73	67.01	66.60	68.20	67.03	76.25	73.75	72.52	70.06
SA-ICL	43.85	63.28	69.24	68.18	69.34	67.54	77.13	75.37	74.34	70.78
– Downstream Classifier –										
k-NN	35.98	56.42	59.17	55.34	73.52	67.10	67.32	69.26	70.90	64.76
Hidden Ca.	38.42	63.39	63.19	67.74	80.53	75.94	73.56	70.12	68.91	80.70

default), that is, the prediction with max value in $[\frac{b-1}{B}, \frac{b}{B})$, $|B_b|$ is the number of samples in B_b . For each dataset, we test the ICC inference $\mathbf{o}(x_q)$ on these metrics, and take the averaged result on the 10 datasets.

Benchmark results: ICC baselines and scaling laws. We test 29 modern LMs on STAICC-NORMAL, with TLP results shown in Fig. 4, where a clear log-linear scaling law can be observed. This outcome remains valid even amid concerns about the discriminability of a simple prompt template, as the observed scaling law is widely recognized (Kaplan et al., 2020; Bahri et al., 2024) as a first principle in neural language models, and suggests that our approach remains robust.

Benchmark results: on the ICL-improving methods. Moreover, we evaluate 9 ICL-improving methods (referenced in Appendix A) on STAICC-NORMAL, with ensuring to the best of our ability that the amount of additional data (if used) remains consistent across methods for a fair comparison. Table 2 presents the results for selected representative models, where Hidden Calibration (Cho et al., 2024), and SA-ICL (Wu et al., 2023) outperforms frequently among these models. Additionally, scaling laws are not observed on the *improvement* of accuracies by these ICL-improving methods, as shown in Fig. 5.




Figure 6: Evaluation process for (left) contextual bias, where empty pseudo queries (\hat{x}) are included in the input; and (right) domainal bias, where pseudo queries (\hat{x}) consist of token sequences i.i.d. sampled from the token distribution of all real instances x . Entropy is calculated on the output distribution to measure how biased the distribution is.

3.3 StaICC-Diag: Diagnostic Evaluation for ICC

To enrich the usage of STAICC, we propose STAICC-DIAG for a set of fine-grained diagnostic analyses, focusing on two key aspects: (1) **prediction bias**, which identifies tendencies of LMs toward specific label tokens, and (2) **prediction robustness**, which evaluates the robustness of LMs against subtle variations in ICL inputs. STAICC-DIAG is composed of several sub-tasks, each for an aspect of the diagnostic, and utilizes various but stable-over-trial input forms different from the STAICC, to be introduced in detail as follows.

Prediction bias evaluation. We propose evaluations for 3 types of prediction bias:

(1) **Contextual bias** (Zhao et al., 2021). Given input with a meaningless pseudo query \hat{x} (in the calculation of contextual bias, an empty query is used as this \hat{x} , as shown in Fig. 6), an ideal non-bias inference is expected to produce neutral prediction with averaged probabilities², producing the maximum entropy on the prediction distribution. Therefore, we use an entropy-related metric to evaluate the bias magnitude:

$$\text{Contextual Bias} = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N H[\mathbf{o}(\hat{x})], \quad (2)$$

where the N is the input instance number same as the STAICC-NORMAL³, and $H[\cdot]$ is the entropy calculation. Notice that we use a minus sign to ensure that a larger value corresponds to a stronger bias.

(2) **Domainal bias** (Fei et al., 2023). Following the same principle as the contextual bias, the sampling method for \hat{x} is changed to randomly sample a sequence of tokens under the frequency distribution of the x s from the calibration set to calculate the domainal bias.

(3) **Empirical bias.** Contextual bias and domainal bias offer observations on the prior or “nature” output tendency without the influence of query. However, pseudo queries in the inputs of the aforementioned 2 bias calculations can cause a distribution gap between the bias evaluation and practical scenario, potentially harming their applicability. So, different from the above 2 bias evaluations, empirical bias utilizes real test inputs same with STAICC-NORMAL, and collects the averaged output probability distributions to calculate KL divergence with the ground-truth label frequency counted from the test set:

$$\text{Empirical Bias} = D_{\text{KL}} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{o}(x_i) \parallel \mathbf{p}_{\text{true}} \right), \quad \mathbf{p}_{\text{true},j} = \frac{\text{count}(y_i = j)}{N}. \quad (3)$$

Prediction robustness evaluation. We propose evaluations for 3 types of prediction robustness:

(1) **Prompt template robustness.** We construct 9 prompt templates under the meta-template shown in Fig. 3 (detailed in Appendix B.1) and repeat the standard inference process as STAICC-NORMAL once for

²e.g., $[\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}]$ for a 3-way scenario.

³In the implementation, we replaced the test set with pseudo samples, keeping the input forming processing as before.




Figure 7: Diagnostic results against model parameter numbers.

Table 3: Diagnostic results of 10 representative models on STAICC-DIAG. *: Instruction-tuned models. More detailed results are in Appendix C.

Models	Matrix	GPT-2	GPT-2	OPT	Llama2	Qwen2*	Qwen2	Llama3	Llama2	Llama2	Qwen2*
Para. # / B		0.14	1.6	2.7	6.7	7.6	7.6	8.0	13 _{AWQ}	34 _{AWQ}	72 _{AWQ}
Context. Bias	-Entropy	-0.85	-0.91	-0.90	-0.97	-0.74	-0.77	-0.78	-0.96	-0.97	-0.71
Domain Bias	-Entropy	-0.77	-0.87	-0.82	-0.95	-0.76	-0.76	-0.77	-0.92	-0.92	-0.69
Empirical Bias	KL div.	0.43	0.12	0.15	0.13	0.15	0.25	0.14	0.09	0.07	0.11
Temp. Robust.	Cons.(%)	87.0	80.5	88.7	83.8	87.4	89.7	88.5	88.7	82.4	87.7
Sample Robust.	Cons.(%)	87.2	81.6	80.9	75.9	87.6	92.8	84.2	82.8	80.1	93.0
GLER(↓)	Slope/0.1	0.13	0.32	0.47	0.65	0.73	0.63	0.85	0.55	0.69	0.98

each template, totaling 9 repeats. Then, for each demonstrations-query sample, we evaluate the prediction consistency among the 9 parallel repeats, by calculating the majority rate of predicted label tokens⁴, regardless the correctness. For example, if 6 “negative” prediction is given to one query over 9 templates, then the consistency is calculated as $\frac{6}{9}$. We take the average of consistency on all the demonstrations-query instances as the prompt template robustness evaluation.

(2) **Demonstration sampling robustness.** Similarly, we repeat the inference among 8 demonstration sequences sampled randomly and calculate the demonstration sampling robustness by consistency.

(3) **Label noise robustness: GLER (Yoo et al., 2022).** We repeat the inference the same as the STAICC-NORMAL on various label noise rates p , which controls the percentage of falsified labels in the demonstrations (for example, given $p = 0.5$ and $k = 4$, then 2 labels in the demonstrations are turned into wrong labels in the input-forming processing). For 5 uniformly sampled p from 0 to 1, we can get 5 accuracies Acc_p , then we run a linear regression on the Acc_p against p , and get a slope, which is used as the metric for the label noise *sensitivity* (also named GLER by Yoo et al. (2022)), which is a negative metric for the label noise robustness.

Benchmark results. Same as STAICC-NORMAL, we test 29 modern LMs on STAICC-DIAG, with results shown in Fig. 7 and Table 3, where the bias is globally descending, and the robustness is ascending against the model scaling, while with a statistically insignificant correlation strength. However, the GLER has a significant ascending correlation against the model scale (that is, descending robustness), suggesting that a larger LM can be affected by the label noise more severely, aligning with the previous findings (Wei et al., 2023b; Shi et al., 2024b; Cho et al., 2025).

⁴That is, the prediction after the argmax operation on the predicted probability distribution.

4 Discussion

Summary. Motivated by the disjoint in the literature on the evaluation of in-context learning, this paper proposes a standardized evaluation toolkit STAICC for classification task under the in-context learning paradigm and conducts extensive measurement on various LMs.

Rethinking the influence of bias and robustness of ICL. We visualize the statistical covariate among the metrics evaluated in this paper, shown in Fig. 8. We highlight some non-trivial covariation or dis-covariation, as: (1) Weak correlation between accuracy/F1 and contextual/domainal bias suggests a limited influence of prediction bias to ICL inference, aligning with the results in Fig. 5, where calibration methods are with relatively weaker improvement on the accuracy, while the correlations from ECE-1 are relatively stronger, suggesting that the benefit of mitigating such bias is towards a more faithful prediction, rather a more accurate one. (2) Template robustness tends to be positively correlated with ECE-1, and sampling robustness tends to be positively correlated with accuracy, indicating the benefits of improving the prediction robustness, (3) A larger GLER (lower robustness) seems to improve accuracy, but given the confounding variable of model size, such a positive covariation can not be regarded as a reliable causal relationship, where further causal inference can be beneficial for a deeper insight.

Position of this paper. The problem addressed in this paper is significant and holds substantial value for future works in the ICL area, while the authors believe the novelty of the works in this paper will not impress readers a lot, with just “dirty works” towards an easy-to-use toolkit. Given these considerations, we have chosen to release this work as a scientific report rather than submit it to a peer-reviewed conference.

Limitation. (1) This paper and STAICC mainly take classification tasks in the scope, while other tasks without a fixed and limited output space can still benefit from ICL, raising a need for evaluation of ICL models and methods on these tasks. (2) Also, single-sentence classification tasks are also limited, as tasks with more complex input forms, such as what is defined in RTE (Dagan et al., 2005; Haim et al., 2006; Giampiccolo et al., 2007; Bentivogli et al., 2009) can be non-trivial extensions of the current tasks, and may be considered in the future construction of the benchmark.

Acknowledgments

Mariko Kato and Yoshihiro Sakai participated in our discussion but didn’t meet the author criteria.

References

- Qwen2 technical report. 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2407.10671v4>.
- Momin Abbas, Yi Zhou, Parikshit Ram, Nathalie Baracaldo, Horst Samulowitz, Theodoros Salonidis, and Tianyi Chen. Enhancing in-context learning via linear probe calibration. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 307–315. PMLR, 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2401.12406v1>.
- Ebtesam Almazrouei, Hamza Alobeidli, Abdulaziz Alshamsi, Alessandro Cappelli, Ruxandra Cojocaru, Merouane Debbah, Etienne Goffinet, Daniel Heslow, Julien Launay, Quentin Malartic, Badreddine Noune,




Figure 8: Multivariate covariate analysis on the metrics in this paper. Spearman correlation is calculated.

-
- Baptiste Pannier, and Guilherme Penedo. Falcon-40B: an open large language model with state-of-the-art performance. 2023. URL <https://huggingface.co/tiiuae/falcon-40b>.
- Sören Auer, Christian Bizer, Georgi Kobilarov, Jens Lehmann, Richard Cyganiak, and Zachary Ives. Dbpedia: A nucleus for a web of open data. In *international semantic web conference*, pp. 722–735. Springer, 2007. URL https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/978-3-540-76298-0_52.pdf.
- Yasaman Bahri, Ethan Dyer, Jared Kaplan, Jaehoon Lee, and Utkarsh Sharma. Explaining neural scaling laws. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 121(27):e2311878121, 2024. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2311878121>.
- Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, Binyuan Hui, Luo Ji, Mei Li, Junyang Lin, Runji Lin, Dayiheng Liu, Gao Liu, Chengqiang Lu, Keming Lu, Jianxin Ma, Rui Men, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Chuanqi Tan, Sinan Tan, Jianhong Tu, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Wei Wang, Shengguang Wu, Benfeng Xu, Jin Xu, An Yang, Hao Yang, Jian Yang, Shusheng Yang, Yang Yao, Bowen Yu, Hongyi Yuan, Zheng Yuan, Jianwei Zhang, Xingxuan Zhang, Yichang Zhang, Zhenru Zhang, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, Xiaohuan Zhou, and Tianhang Zhu. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*, 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2309.16609v1>.
- Valerio Basile, Cristina Bosco, Elisabetta Fersini, Debora Nozza, Viviana Patti, Francisco Manuel Rangel Pardo, Paolo Rosso, and Manuela Sanguinetti. SemEval-2019 task 5: Multilingual detection of hate speech against immigrants and women in Twitter. In Jonathan May, Ekaterina Shutova, Aurelie Herbelot, Xiaodan Zhu, Marianna Apidianaki, and Saif M. Mohammad (eds.), *Proceedings of the 13th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pp. 54–63, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/S19-2007. URL <https://aclanthology.org/S19-2007/>.
- Luisa Bentivogli, Peter Clark, Ido Dagan, and Danilo Giampiccolo. The fifth pascal recognizing textual entailment challenge. *TAC*, 7:8, 2009. URL https://tac.nist.gov/publications/2009/additional_papers/RTE5_overview.proceedings.pdf.
- Stella Biderman, Hailey Schoelkopf, Quentin Gregory Anthony, Herbie Bradley, Kyle O’Brien, Eric Hallahan, Mohammad Aflah Khan, Shivanshu Purohit, USVSN Sai Prashanth, Edward Raff, et al. Pythia: A suite for analyzing large language models across training and scaling. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 2397–2430. PMLR, 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/pdf/2304.01373>.
- Sid Black, Gao Leo, Phil Wang, Connor Leahy, and Stella Biderman. GPT-Neo: Large Scale Autoregressive Language Modeling with Mesh-Tensorflow, March 2021. URL <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5297715>. If you use this software, please cite it using these metadata.
- Marc-Etienne Brunet, Ashton Anderson, and Richard Zemel. Icl-markup: Structuring in-context learning using soft-token tags. In *R0-FoMo: Robustness of Few-shot and Zero-shot Learning in Large Foundation Models*, 2023. URL <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/1eddc4e36632342309885131a63ebd0bac1d837f>.
- Yanda Chen, Chen Zhao, Zhou Yu, Kathleen McKeown, and He He. On the relation between sensitivity and accuracy in in-context learning. In *2023 Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pp. 155–167. Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL), 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2209.07661v3>.
- Hakaze Cho, Yoshihiro Sakai, Mariko Kato, Kenshiro Tanaka, Akira Ishii, and Naoya Inoue. Token-based decision criteria are suboptimal in in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.16535*, 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2406.16535v2>.
- Hakaze Cho, Mariko Kato, Yoshihiro Sakai, and Naoya Inoue. Revisiting in-context learning inference circuit in large language models. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.04468>.

-
- Liam Collins, Advait Parulekar, Aryan Mokhtari, Sujay Sanghavi, and Sanjay Shakkottai. In-context learning with transformers: Softmax attention adapts to function lipschitzness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11639*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.11639>.
- Ido Dagan, Oren Glickman, and Bernardo Magnini. The pascal recognising textual entailment challenge. In *Machine learning challenges workshop*, pp. 177–190. Springer, 2005. URL <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/e808f28d411a958c5db81ceb111beb2638698f47>.
- Damai Dai, Yutao Sun, Li Dong, Yaru Hao, Shuming Ma, Zhifang Sui, and Furu Wei. Why can gpt learn in-context? language models implicitly perform gradient descent as meta-optimizers. In *ICLR 2023 Workshop on Mathematical and Empirical Understanding of Foundation Models*, 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2212.10559v3>.
- Ona de Gibert, Naiara Perez, Aitor García-Pablos, and Montse Cuadros. Hate Speech Dataset from a White Supremacy Forum. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Abusive Language Online (ALW2)*, pp. 11–20, Brussels, Belgium, October 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/W18-5102. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W18-5102>.
- Marie-Catherine De Marneffe, Mandy Simons, and Judith Tonhauser. The commitmentbank: Investigating projection in naturally occurring discourse. In *proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung*, volume 23, pp. 107–124, 2019. URL <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/39e801ca0dbc69c3697f118e24dac964abb63d4a>.
- Bill Dolan and Chris Brockett. Automatically constructing a corpus of sentential paraphrases. In *Third international workshop on paraphrasing (IWP2005)*, 2005. URL <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/475354f10798f110d34792b6d88f31d6d5cb099e>.
- Qingxiu Dong, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Ce Zheng, Zhiyong Wu, Baobao Chang, Xu Sun, Jingjing Xu, and Zhifang Sui. A survey on in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.00234*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.00234>.
- Yu Fei, Yifan Hou, Zeming Chen, and Antoine Bosselut. Mitigating label biases for in-context learning. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 14014–14031, 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.19148v3>.
- Danilo Giampiccolo, Bernardo Magnini, Ido Dagan, and William B Dolan. The third pascal recognizing textual entailment challenge. In *Proceedings of the ACL-PASCAL workshop on textual entailment and paraphrasing*, pp. 1–9, 2007. URL http://dl.acm.org/ft_gateway.cfm?id=1654538&type=pdf.
- Hila Gonen, Srini Iyer, Terra Blevins, Noah A Smith, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Demystifying prompts in language models via perplexity estimation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pp. 10136–10148, 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2212.04037v2>.
- Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv e-prints*, pp. arXiv–2407, 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2407.21783v3>.
- Yuxian Gu, Li Dong, Furu Wei, and Minlie Huang. Pre-training to learn in context. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 4849–4870, 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/pdf/2305.09137>.
- Chuan Guo, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q Weinberger. On calibration of modern neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1321–1330. PMLR, 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1706.04599v2>.
- R Bar Haim, Ido Dagan, Bill Dolan, Lisa Ferro, Danilo Giampiccolo, Bernardo Magnini, and Idan Szpektor. The second pascal recognising textual entailment challenge. In *Proceedings of the Second PASCAL Challenges Workshop on Recognising Textual Entailment*, volume 7, pp. 785–794, 2006. URL <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/136326377c122560768db674e35f5bcd6de3bc40>.

-
- Xiaochuang Han, Daniel Simig, Todor Mihaylov, Yulia Tsvetkov, Asli Celikyilmaz, and Tianlu Wang. Understanding in-context learning via supportive pretraining data. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 12660–12673, 2023a. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2306.15091v1>.
- Zhixiong Han, Yaru Hao, Li Dong, Yutao Sun, and Furu Wei. Prototypical calibration for few-shot learning of language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023b. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2205.10183v2>.
- Yaru Hao, Yutao Sun, Li Dong, Zhixiong Han, Yuxian Gu, and Furu Wei. Structured prompting: Scaling in-context learning to 1,000 examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.06713*, 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2212.06713v1>.
- Eduard Hovy, Laurie Gerber, Ulf Hermjakob, Chin-Yew Lin, and Deepak Ravichandran. Toward semantics-based answer pinpointing. In *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Human Language Technology Research*, 2001. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/H01-1069>.
- Yu Huang, Yuan Cheng, and Yingbin Liang. In-context convergence of transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05249*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.05249>.
- Srinivasan Iyer, Xi Victoria Lin, Ramakanth Pasunuru, Todor Mihaylov, Daniel Simig, Ping Yu, Kurt Shuster, Tianlu Wang, Qing Liu, Punit Singh Koura, et al. Opt-impl: Scaling language model instruction meta learning through the lens of generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.12017*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.12017>.
- Hong Jun Jeon, Jason D Lee, Qi Lei, and Benjamin Van Roy. An information-theoretic analysis of in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.15530*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.15530>.
- Zhongtao Jiang, Yuanzhe Zhang, Cao Liu, Jun Zhao, and Kang Liu. Generative calibration for in-context learning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pp. 2312–2333, 2023. URL <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/bd2bbaa226be8fe6564e878e262942dd54c4fdad>.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*, 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2001.08361v1>.
- Jannik Kossen, Yarin Gal, and Tom Rainforth. In-context learning learns label relationships but is not conventional learning. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2307.12375v4>.
- Hector Levesque, Ernest Davis, and Leora Morgenstern. The winograd schema challenge. In *Thirteenth international conference on the principles of knowledge representation and reasoning*, 2012. URL <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/128cb6b891aee1b5df099acb48e2efecf689f>.
- Jiaoda Li, Yifan Hou, Mrinmaya Sachan, and Ryan Cotterell. What do language models learn in context? the structured task hypothesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.04216*, 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2406.04216v3>.
- Xiaonan Li and Xipeng Qiu. Finding support examples for in-context learning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pp. 6219–6235, 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2302.13539v3>.
- Xiaonan Li, Kai Lv, Hang Yan, Tianyang Lin, Wei Zhu, Yuan Ni, GUOTONG XIE, Xiaoling Wang, and Xipeng Qiu. Unified demonstration retriever for in-context learning. In *The 61st Annual Meeting Of The Association For Computational Linguistics*, 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.04320v2>.
- Xin Li and Dan Roth. Learning question classifiers. In *COLING 2002: The 19th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, 2002. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/C02-1150>.

-
- Ji Lin, Jiaming Tang, Haotian Tang, Shang Yang, Wei-Ming Chen, Wei-Chen Wang, Guangxuan Xiao, Xingyu Dang, Chuang Gan, and Song Han. Awq: Activation-aware weight quantization for on-device llm compression and acceleration. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 6:87–100, 2024. URL <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/db9507cdd3e2d7d9c90ed185bd831e55c62dcec9>.
- Jiachang Liu, Dinghan Shen, Yizhe Zhang, William B Dolan, Lawrence Carin, and Weizhu Chen. 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*, pp. 100–114, 2022. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.deelio-1.10.pdf>.
- Yinpeng Liu, Jiawei Liu, Xiang Shi, Qikai Cheng, and Wei Lu. Let’s learn step by step: Enhancing in-context learning ability with curriculum learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10738*, 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.10738v2>.
- Yao Lu, Max Bartolo, Alastair Moore, Sebastian Riedel, and Pontus Stenetorp. Fantastically ordered prompts and where to find them: Overcoming few-shot prompt order sensitivity. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 8086–8098, 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2104.08786v2>.
- P. Malo, A. Sinha, P. Korhonen, J. Wallenius, and P. Takala. Good debt or bad debt: Detecting semantic orientations in economic texts. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 65, 2014. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1307.5336v2>.
- Costas Mavromatis, Balasubramaniam Srinivasan, Zhengyuan Shen, Jiani Zhang, Huzefa Rangwala, Christos Faloutsos, and George Karypis. Which examples to annotate for in-context learning? towards effective and efficient selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.20046*, 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2310.20046v1>.
- Sewon Min, Mike Lewis, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Noisy channel language model prompting for few-shot text classification. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 5316–5330, 2022a. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2108.04106v3>.
- Sewon Min, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Metaicl: Learning to learn in context. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pp. 2791–2809, 2022b. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.naacl-main.201.pdf>.
- Sewon Min, Xixi Lyu, Ari Holtzman, Mikel Artetxe, Mike Lewis, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Rethinking the role of demonstrations: What makes in-context learning work? In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 11048–11064, 2022c. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.emnlp-main.759.pdf>.
- Saif Mohammad, Felipe Bravo-Marquez, Mohammad Salameh, and Svetlana Kiritchenko. SemEval-2018 task 1: Affect in tweets. In Marianna Apidianaki, Saif M. Mohammad, Jonathan May, Ekaterina Shutova, Steven Bethard, and Marine Carpuat (eds.), *Proceedings of the 12th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pp. 1–17, New Orleans, Louisiana, June 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/S18-1001. URL <https://aclanthology.org/S18-1001/>.
- Mahdi Pakdaman Naeini, Gregory Cooper, and Milos Hauskrecht. Obtaining well calibrated probabilities using bayesian binning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 29, 2015. URL <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/download/9602/9461>.
- Catherine Olsson, Nelson Elhage, Neel Nanda, Nicholas Joseph, Nova DasSarma, Tom Henighan, Ben Mann, Amanda Askell, Yuntao Bai, Anna Chen, et al. In-context learning and induction heads. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.11895*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.11895>.
- Jane Pan, Tianyu Gao, Howard Chen, and Danqi Chen. What in-context learning" learns" in-context: Disentangling task recognition and task learning. In *The 61st Annual Meeting Of The Association For Computational Linguistics*, 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/pdf/2305.09731>.

-
- Bo Pang and Lillian Lee. Seeing stars: Exploiting class relationships for sentiment categorization with respect to rating scales. In *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL'05)*, pp. 115–124, 2005. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/cs/0506075v1>.
- Krishna Pillutla, Swabha Swayamdipta, Rowan Zellers, John Thickstun, Sean Welleck, Yejin Choi, and Zaid Harchaoui. Mauve: Measuring the gap between neural text and human text using divergence frontiers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:4816–4828, 2021. URL <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/8484fdb56e4690927dc0191ede11c2d24bc5e2ef>.
- Chengwei Qin, Aston Zhang, Anirudh Dagar, and Wenming Ye. In-context learning with iterative demonstration selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.09881*, 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2310.09881v4>.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019. URL <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/9405cc0d6169988371b2755e573cc28650d14dfe>.
- Rylan Schaeffer, Brando Miranda, and Sanmi Koyejo. Are emergent abilities of large language models a mirage? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2304.15004v2>.
- Weijia Shi, Sewon Min, Maria Lomeli, Chunting Zhou, Margaret Li, Xi Victoria Lin, Noah A. Smith, Luke Zettlemoyer, Wen tau Yih, and Mike Lewis. In-context pretraining: Language modeling beyond document boundaries. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024a. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=LXVswInH0o>.
- Zhenmei Shi, Junyi Wei, Zhuoyan Xu, and Yingyu Liang. Why larger language models do in-context learning differently? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.19592*, 2024b. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2405.19592v1>.
- Richard Socher, Alex Perelygin, Jean Wu, Jason Chuang, Christopher D. Manning, Andrew Ng, and Christopher Potts. Recursive deep models for semantic compositionality over a sentiment treebank. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 1631–1642, Seattle, Washington, USA, October 2013. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/D13-1170>.
- Aarohi Srivastava, Abhinav Rastogi, Abhishek Rao, Abu Awal Shoeb, Abubakar Abid, Adam Fisch, Adam R Brown, Adam Santoro, Aditya Gupta, Adri Garriga-Alonso, et al. Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. *Transactions on machine learning research*, 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2206.04615v3>.
- Hongjin SU, Jungo Kasai, Chen Henry Wu, Weijia Shi, Tianlu Wang, Jiayi Xin, Rui Zhang, Mari Ostendorf, Luke Zettlemoyer, Noah A. Smith, and Tao Yu. Selective annotation makes language models better few-shot learners. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=qY1hlv7gwg>.
- Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Scales, Nathanael Schärli, Sebastian Gehrmann, Yi Tay, Hyung Won Chung, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, Denny Zhou, et al. Challenging big-bench tasks and whether chain-of-thought can solve them. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pp. 13003–13051, 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2210.09261v1>.
- Genichi Taguchi and Seiso Konishi. *Taguchi methods: orthogonal arrays and linear graphs; tools for quality engineering*. ASI press, 1987.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2307.09288v2>.
- Minh-Hao Van, Xintao Wu, et al. In-context learning demonstration selection via influence analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11750*, 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.11750v2>.

-
- Anton Voronov, Lena Wolf, and Max Ryabinin. Mind your format: Towards consistent evaluation of in-context learning improvements. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06766*, 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2401.06766v3>.
- Alex Wang, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel R Bowman. Glue: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019*, 2019. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W18-5446.pdf>.
- Ben Wang and Aran Komatsuzaki. Gpt-j-6b: A 6 billion parameter autoregressive language model, 2021. URL <https://huggingface.co/EleutherAI/gpt-j-6b>.
- Lean Wang, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Deli Chen, Hao Zhou, Fandong Meng, Jie Zhou, and Xu Sun. Label words are anchors: An information flow perspective for understanding in-context learning. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 9840–9855, 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.14160v4>.
- Sida Wang and Christopher D. Manning. Baselines and bigrams: simple, good sentiment and topic classification. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Short Papers - Volume 2*, ACL '12, pp. 90–94, USA, 2012. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/5e9fa46f231c59e6573f9a116f77f53703347659>.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V Le. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=gEzrGCozdqR>.
- Jerry Wei, Le Hou, Andrew Lampinen, Xiangning Chen, Da Huang, Yi Tay, Xinyun Chen, Yifeng Lu, Denny Zhou, Tengyu Ma, et al. Symbol tuning improves in-context learning in language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 968–979, 2023a. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.08298v2>.
- Jerry Wei, Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Dustin Tran, Albert Webson, Yifeng Lu, Xinyun Chen, Hanxiao Liu, Da Huang, Denny Zhou, et al. Larger language models do in-context learning differently. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.03846*, 2023b. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2303.03846v2>.
- Noam Wies, Yoav Levine, and Amnon Shashua. The learnability of in-context learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2303.07895v1>.
- Zhiyong Wu, Yaoxiang Wang, Jiacheng Ye, and Lingpeng Kong. Self-adaptive in-context learning: An information compression perspective for in-context example selection and ordering. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 1423–1436, 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2212.10375v2>.
- Benfeng Xu, Quan Wang, Zhendong Mao, Yajuan Lyu, Qiaoqiao She, and Yongdong Zhang. \$k\$NN prompting: Beyond-context learning with calibration-free nearest neighbor inference. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=fe2S7736sNS>.
- Kang Min Yoo, Junyeob Kim, Hyuhng Joon Kim, Hyunsoo Cho, Hwiyeol Jo, Sang-Woo Lee, Sang-goo Lee, and Taeuk Kim. Ground-truth labels matter: A deeper look into input-label demonstrations. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 2422–2437, 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2205.12685v2>.
- Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuhui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, et al. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.01068>.

-
- Xiang Zhang, Junbo Jake Zhao, and Yann LeCun. Character-level convolutional networks for text classification. In *NIPS*, 2015. URL <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/51a55df1f023571a7e07e338ee45a3e3d66ef73e>.
- Yufeng Zhao, Yoshihiro Sakai, and Naoya Inoue. Noisyicl: A little noise in model parameters calibrates in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05515*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.05515>.
- Zihao Zhao, Eric Wallace, Shi Feng, Dan Klein, and Sameer Singh. Calibrate before use: Improving few-shot performance of language models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 12697–12706. PMLR, 2021. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2102.09690v2>.
- Han Zhou, Xingchen Wan, Lev Prolev, Diana Mincu, Jilin Chen, Katherine A Heller, and Subhrajit Roy. Batch calibration: Rethinking calibration for in-context learning and prompt engineering. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=L3FHM0KZcS>.

A Models, Datasets, and Inference Methods

Models GPT2 (137M, M: 380M, L: 812M, XL: 1.61B) (Radford et al., 2019), Pythia (Biderman et al., 2023) (14M~6.9B), OPT (Zhang et al., 2022) (1.3B, 2.7B, 6.7B), GPT-J (Wang & Komatsuzaki, 2021) (6B), GPT-NEO (125M, 1.3B, 2.7B) (Black et al., 2021), FALCON (7B, 7B instruction-tuned) (Almazrouei et al., 2023), Qwen (7B) (Bai et al., 2023), QWen2 (7B, 7B instruction-tuned, 72B instruction-tuned) (qwe, 2024), Llama2 (7B, 13B, 34B) (Touvron et al., 2023), and Llama3 (Grattafiori et al., 2024). In this paper, models larger than 10B are quantified by **Activation-aware Weight Quantization** (AWQ) (Lin et al., 2024).

Datasets In STAICC, we utilize the following datasets: SST-2 (Socher et al., 2013), MR (Pang & Lee, 2005), Financial Phrasebank (Malo et al., 2014), SST-5 (Socher et al., 2013), TREC (Li & Roth, 2002; Hovy et al., 2001), AGNews (Zhang et al., 2015), Subjective (Wang & Manning, 2012), Tweet Eval Emotion (Mohammad et al., 2018), Tweet Eval Hate (Basile et al., 2019), Hate Speech 18 (de Gibert et al., 2018). Also, we refer to additional datasets in this paper, mainly in Table 1, they are: RTE (Dagan et al., 2005; Haim et al., 2006; Giampiccolo et al., 2007; Bentivogli et al., 2009), DBPedia (Auer et al., 2007), MRPC (Dolan & Brockett, 2005), CommitmentBank (De Marneffe et al., 2019), and WNLI (Levesque et al., 2012).

Inference methods and their settings. In this paper, especially Table 2, we investigate these inference methods (i.e., ICL-improving methods): Noisy channel (Min et al., 2022a), Contextual calibration (Zhao et al., 2021), Domain calibration (Fei et al., 2023), Batch calibration (Zhou et al., 2024), PPL-ICL (Gonen et al., 2023), TopK (Liu et al., 2022), SA-ICL (Wu et al., 2023), k -NN (Xu et al., 2023), and Hidden Calibration (Cho et al., 2024).

B Implementation Details

B.1 Default StaICC Settings

Prompt templates. We substitute the default attributes shown in Table 4 into the meta-template (Fig. 3) for the default prompt templates.

Raw dataset divisions. We divide the raw dataset into trisection with specifications shown in Table 5.

Candidate template for the template sensitivity evaluation. For the attribute “Instruction”, “ x prefix”, “ y prefix”, and “ y affix”, for each dataset, we provide 2 more alternative options, as shown in Table 6. Then, we apply a $L9(3^4)$ Taguchi’s orthogonal array (Taguchi & Konishi, 1987) to sample a combination of attributes to substitute into the meta-template as the candidate templates.

B.2 Experiment Details

Experiment on the variables’ influence (Fig. 2). We test the Macro F1 results of Falcon-7B-Instruct on SST-2, with: (1) 8 prompt templates with the same label space for the **Connector** experiment, (2) 8 prompt templates with only label space changed for the **Verbalizer** experiment, (3) 8 random seed for rearranging the input order for the **Order** experiment, and (4) 8 random seed for split the data into demonstration set and test set for the **Data Split** experiment.

Implementation of calibration methods. For methods that require additional ICL inference processing (Contextual Calibration, Domain Calibration, k -NN, Hidden Calibration), we provide 128 additional samples for the additional inference. For Domain Calibration, we fix the sample length to 64. For Batch Calibration, we fix the batch size to 128. For k -NN, we use the centroid form of k -NN to accelerate the inference.

The unbiasedness of data sampling. We evaluate sampling unbiasedness using two approaches: (1) We calculate the unbiasedness of the trisection by measuring the MAUVE (Pillutla et al., 2021) score averaged across tuples within the trisection set. The resulting score of 0.9802 indicates a close distribution among these trisections. (2) We assess the unbiasedness of the sampled data from each subset by comparing it against the remaining data. Using the MAUVE score between the sampled and remaining data, we obtain a result of 0.9808, further demonstrating minimal distributional deviation.

Table 4: Default prompt template for each dataset under the meta-template.

Dataset	Attribute	Value	Dataset	Attribute	Value
SST-2	Instruction	-	MR	Instruction	-
	x prefix	“sentence: ”		x prefix	“reviews: ”
	x affix	“ ”		x affix	“ ”
	y prefix	“sentiment: ”		y prefix	“sentiment: ”
	y affix	“\n”		y affix	“\n”
	Query prefix	-		Query prefix	-
	Label space	[“positive”, “negative”]		Label space	[“positive”, “negative”]
Financial Phrasebank	Instruction	-	SST-5	Instruction	-
	x prefix	“sentence: ”		x prefix	“sentence: ”
	x affix	“ ”		x affix	“ ”
	y prefix	“sentiment: ”		y prefix	“sentiment: ”
	y affix	“\n”		y affix	“\n”
	Query prefix	-		Query prefix	-
	Label space	[“positive”, “neutral”, “negative”]		Label space	[“poor”, “bad”, “neutral”, “good”, “great”]
TREC	Instruction	-	AGNews	Instruction	-
	x prefix	“question: ”		x prefix	“news: ”
	x affix	“ ”		x affix	“ ”
	y prefix	“target: ”		y prefix	“topic: ”
	y affix	“\n”		y affix	“\n”
	Query prefix	-		Query prefix	-
	Label space	[“short”, “entity”, “description”, “person”, “location”, “number”]		Label space	[“world”, “sports”, “business”, “science”]
Subjective	Instruction	-	Tweet Eval Emotion	Instruction	-
	x prefix	“review: ”		x prefix	“tweet: ”
	x affix	“ ”		x affix	“ ”
	y prefix	“subjectiveness: ”		y prefix	“emotion: ”
	y affix	“\n”		y affix	“\n”
	Query prefix	-		Query prefix	-
	Label space	[“objective”, “subjective”]		Label space	[“anger”, “joy”, “positive”, “sad”]
Tweet Eval Hate	Instruction	-	Hate Speech 18	Instruction	-
	x prefix	“tweet: ”		x prefix	“tweet: ”
	x affix	“ ”		x affix	“ ”
	y prefix	“hate speech: ”		y prefix	“hate speech: ”
	y affix	“\n”		y affix	“\n”
	Query prefix	-		Query prefix	-
	Label space	[“normal”, “hate”]		Label space	[“normal”, “hate”, “skip”, “relation”]

Table 5: Raw dataset division size for each sub-dataset.

	SST ₂	MR	FP	SST ₅	TREC	AGN	Subj.	TEE	TEH	HS18
Calibration Set	1024	1024	1024	1024	1024	1024	1024	1024	1024	1024
Demonstration Set	4096	4096	512	4096	4096	4096	4096	4096	3192	4096
Test Set	512	512	512	512	512	512	512	512	512	512

C Experiment Result Details

The augmented results of STAICC-NORMAL in Table 2 for all models and metrics are shown in Table 8.

The augmented results of STAICC-DIAG in Table 3 for all models and metrics are shown in Table 7.

Table 6: Alternative attributes under the meta-template for each dataset.

Dataset	Index	Alternative Instruction	x prefix	y prefix	y affix
SST-2	0	-	"sentence: "	"sentiment: "	"\n"
	1	"How would you describe the overall feeling of the movie based on this sentence? "	"text: "	"label: "	" "
	2	"Please classify the sentiment of the following sentence. "	"review: "	"Label: "	"\t"
MR	0	-	"review: "	"sentiment: "	"\n"
	1	"How would you describe the overall feeling of the movie based on this sentence? "	"text: "	"label: "	" "
	2	"Please classify the sentiment of the following sentence. "	"sentence: "	"Label: "	"\t"
Financial Phrasebank	0	-	"sentence: "	"sentiment: "	"\n"
	1	"What is the attitude towards the financial news in this sentence? "	"text: "	"label: "	" "
	2	"What is the emotional response to the financial news in this sentence? "	"news: "	"Label: "	"\t"
SST-5	0	-	"sentence: "	"sentiment: "	"\n"
	1	"How would you describe the overall feeling of the movie based on this sentence? "	"text: "	"label: "	" "
	2	"What mood does this sentence convey about the movie? "	"review: "	"Label: "	"\t"
TREC	0	-	"question: "	"target: "	"\n"
	1	"What is the topic of the question? "	"text: "	"label: "	" "
	2	"What is the primary focus of this question? "	"sentence: "	"Label: "	"\t"
AGNews	0	-	"news: "	"topic: "	"\n"
	1	"What is the topic of the news? "	"text: "	"label: "	" "
	2	"What is the news focused on? "	"sentence: "	"Label: "	"\t"
Subjective	0	-	"review: "	"subjectiveness: "	"\n"
	1	"Does this sentence reflect a personal opinion? "	"text: "	"label: "	" "
	2	"Is this sentence expressing a personal opinion or stating a fact? "	"sentence: "	"Label: "	"\t"
Tweet Eval Emotion	0	-	"review: "	"subjectiveness: "	"\n"
	1	"What feeling does this sentence convey? "	"text: "	"label: "	" "
	2	"What emotion does this sentence express? "	"sentence: "	"Label: "	"\t"
Tweet Eval Hate	0	-	"tweet: "	"hate speech: "	"\n"
	1	"Does this sentence contain hate speech? "	"text: "	"label: "	" "
	2	"Is this sentence an example of hate speech? "	"sentence: "	"Label: "	"\t"
Hate Speech 18	0	-	"tweet: "	"hate speech: "	"\n"
	1	"Does this sentence contain hate speech? "	"text: "	"label: "	" "
	2	"Is this sentence an example of hate speech? "	"sentence: "	"Label: "	"\t"

Table 7: Augmented results of Table 2.

Models	GPT2	Llama2	GPT2	GPT2	GPT2	Pythia	Pythia	Pythia	Pythia	Pythia	Pythia	Pythia	Pythia	OPT	OPT
Para. # / B	0.137	6.74	0.38	0.812	1.61	0.014	0.07	0.16	0.41	1.08	1.52	2.91	6.9	2.7	1.3
Contextual Bias	-0.8458	-0.9717	-0.9482	-0.8281	-0.9109	-0.7927	-0.7998	-0.7722	-0.7451	-0.7519	-0.7059	-0.8645	-0.7152	-0.9050	-0.9201
Domain Bias	-0.7737	-0.9468	-0.8516	-0.7911	-0.8749	-0.7069	-0.8072	-0.7728	-0.7497	-0.7286	-0.7027	-0.8785	-0.6922	-0.8241	-0.8834
Empirical Bias	0.4302	0.1271	0.2123	0.3113	0.1214	0.4229	0.3322	0.2299	0.2629	0.2971	0.3395	0.2302	0.2905	0.1512	0.1505
Template Robust.	0.8702	0.8380	0.8046	0.8852	0.8052	0.8558	0.8823	0.8440	0.8878	0.9043	0.9084	0.9062	0.9134	0.8873	0.8753
Sample Robust.	0.8720	0.7594	0.8851	0.8851	0.8165	0.8558	0.7945	0.7428	0.7827	0.8266	0.8258	0.7924	0.8448	0.8094	0.7350
GLER	0.0127	0.0653	0.0317	0.0397	0.0403	0.0131	0.0244	0.0315	0.0448	0.0372	0.0426	0.0548	0.0413	0.0471	0.0595
Models	OPT	GPT-J	NEO	NEO	NEO	Falcon	Falcon*	Qwen2	Qwen	Qwen2	Llama2	Llama2	Qwen2*	Llama3	
Para. # / B	6.7	6.05	1.3	2.7	0.125	7.22	7.22	7.6	7.7	7.6	13	34	72	8	
Contextual Bias	-0.9187	-0.8878	-0.9416	-0.8719	-0.8978	-0.7992	-0.9065	-0.7429	-0.7182	-0.7747	-0.9611	-0.9743	-0.7071	-0.7771	
Domain Bias	-0.9134	-0.8269	-0.7754	-0.7140	-0.7601	-0.7679	-0.9088	-0.7557	-0.6303	-0.7602	-0.9246	-0.9222	-0.6930	-0.7730	
Empirical Bias	0.0848	0.1773	0.1489	0.3234	0.1371	0.2062	0.0513	0.1512	0.3439	0.2498	0.0921	0.0663	0.1143	0.1401	
Template Robust.	0.8519	0.8648	0.8849	0.9051	0.8419	0.8746	0.8626	0.8741	0.9023	0.8973	0.8871	0.8243	0.8771	0.8850	
Sample Robust.	0.7906	0.8019	0.7710	0.8253	0.6973	0.8795	0.8100	0.8763	0.9018	0.9278	0.8277	0.8010	0.9302	0.8415	
GLER	0.0615	0.0239	0.0346	0.0331	0.0368	0.0406	0.0488	0.0725	0.0546	0.0630	0.0552	0.0689	0.0986	0.0848	

Table 8: Augmented results of Table 2.

Method	Model Para. # / B	GPT2 0.137	Llama2 6.74	GPT2 0.38	GPT2 0.812	GPT2 1.61	Pythia 0.014	Pythia 0.07	Pythia 0.16	Pythia 0.41	Pythia 1.08	Pythia 1.52	Pythia 2.91	Pythia 6.9	OPT 2.7	OPT 1.3
Vanilla ICL	Accuracy	0.4024	0.5732	0.4610	0.4583	0.5031	0.4045	0.3812	0.4490	0.4832	0.4507	0.4730	0.5065	0.5179	0.5148	0.5021
	ATL	0.3836	0.5360	0.4343	0.4478	0.4813	0.3923	0.3791	0.4313	0.4569	0.4412	0.4611	0.4865	0.5050	0.4993	0.4790
	F1	0.2863	0.5034	0.3503	0.3013	0.3411	0.2726	0.2747	0.3437	0.3493	0.3127	0.3416	0.3720	0.3426	0.3647	0.3756
	ECE-1	0.3353	0.1509	0.2267	0.3218	0.2411	0.2597	0.3337	0.2679	0.2650	0.3142	0.3082	0.2394	0.2866	0.2546	0.2594
Noisy Channel	Accuracy	0.4797	0.6135	0.4891	0.5304	0.5212	0.4285	0.4391	0.4499	0.4779	0.5240	0.5518	0.5669	0.5758	0.5678	0.5449
	ATL	0.3481	0.3484	0.3477	0.3484	0.3480	0.3473	0.3476	0.3475	0.3475	0.3482	0.3482	0.3480	0.3484	0.3483	0.3481
	F1	0.3983	0.5375	0.4096	0.4394	0.4345	0.3416	0.3559	0.3780	0.4130	0.4340	0.4610	0.4895	0.4866	0.4699	0.4473
	ECE-1	0.1281	0.2631	0.1383	0.1791	0.1705	0.0907	0.0955	0.1034	0.1385	0.1730	0.2010	0.2167	0.2252	0.2171	0.1942
Contextual Calibration	Accuracy	0.3973	0.5200	0.3905	0.3814	0.4227	0.3586	0.3823	0.4573	0.4488	0.4335	0.4912	0.5056	0.4937	0.4343	0.4410
	ATL	0.3615	0.4675	0.3672	0.3603	0.3801	0.3399	0.3638	0.4242	0.3911	0.3880	0.4181	0.4309	0.4167	0.4002	0.4021
	F1	0.3421	0.5136	0.3485	0.3525	0.3956	0.2963	0.3459	0.3491	0.3856	0.3976	0.4125	0.4609	0.4445	0.3798	0.3891
	ECE-1	0.2366	0.2228	0.2321	0.2956	0.2607	0.1907	0.2685	0.2375	0.2274	0.1820	0.2189	0.1712	0.2189	0.2340	0.2487
Domain Calibration	Accuracy	0.4589	0.5977	0.4411	0.4520	0.4799	0.4257	0.4248	0.4726	0.4612	0.4817	0.4996	0.5457	0.5579	0.5446	0.5022
	ATL	0.4084	0.5087	0.3902	0.3948	0.4112	0.3915	0.4031	0.4423	0.3991	0.4103	0.4263	0.4532	0.4392	0.4369	0.4248
	F1	0.3904	0.5606	0.4059	0.4082	0.4189	0.3369	0.3661	0.3657	0.3951	0.4125	0.4211	0.4784	0.4667	0.4738	0.4320
	ECE-1	0.1277	0.1519	0.1594	0.1885	0.1918	0.1655	0.2021	0.2106	0.2172	0.1997	0.2022	0.1772	0.1992	0.2265	0.2507
Batch Calibration	Accuracy	0.4347	0.6057	0.4564	0.4748	0.5108	0.3912	0.4146	0.4351	0.4641	0.4642	0.4909	0.5345	0.5443	0.5334	0.5034
	ATL	0.3531	0.3954	0.3558	0.3575	0.3597	0.3461	0.3517	0.3534	0.3563	0.3550	0.3602	0.3674	0.3639	0.3643	0.3626
	F1	0.3896	0.5594	0.3968	0.4126	0.4468	0.3309	0.3708	0.3657	0.3903	0.3922	0.4066	0.4684	0.4469	0.4616	0.4246
	ECE-1	0.0678	0.2072	0.0928	0.0987	0.1427	0.0599	0.0677	0.0780	0.0855	0.0943	0.1049	0.1480	0.1753	0.1644	0.1396
PPL-ICL	Accuracy	0.4030	0.5834	0.4654	0.4609	0.5113	0.3973	0.3766	0.4547	0.4821	0.4521	0.4909	0.5045	0.5284	0.5173	0.5004
	ATL	0.3839	0.5412	0.4345	0.4457	0.4854	0.3800	0.3749	0.4357	0.4596	0.4455	0.4702	0.4884	0.5170	0.4989	0.4736
	F1	0.2898	0.5226	0.3513	0.3119	0.3581	0.2704	0.2704	0.3446	0.3447	0.3084	0.3627	0.3635	0.3551	0.3727	0.3765
	ECE-1	0.3198	0.1432	0.2146	0.3079	0.2247	0.2685	0.3354	0.2584	0.2721	0.3087	0.2898	0.2449	0.2853	0.2412	0.2595
TopK	Accuracy	0.4389	0.6660	0.5162	0.5730	0.6273	0.4391	0.5098	0.5381	0.5994	0.5777	0.6174	0.6430	0.6309	0.6701	0.6883
	ATL	0.4203	0.6053	0.4742	0.5511	0.5902	0.4170	0.4761	0.5054	0.5619	0.5459	0.5759	0.5969	0.5954	0.6410	0.6475
	F1	0.3358	0.6134	0.3963	0.4403	0.4869	0.3039	0.3975	0.4565	0.4777	0.4802	0.4957	0.5213	0.4876	0.5715	0.5716
	ECE-1	0.3191	0.1161	0.1990	0.2237	0.1914	0.2422	0.2613	0.2039	0.1968	0.2195	0.2026	0.1795	0.2239	0.1715	0.1575
SA-ICL	Accuracy	0.4385	0.6818	-	-	0.6328	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.6924	0.6945
	ATL	0.4256	0.6337	-	-	0.6095	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.6690	0.6714
	F1	0.3344	0.6131	-	-	0.4934	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.5808	0.5883
	ECE-1	0.3707	0.1551	-	-	0.2525	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2129	0.2230
k-NN	Accuracy	0.3598	0.5642	0.4072	0.5609	0.5917	0.3782	0.3783	0.4096	0.5931	0.6035	0.6589	0.6998	0.7188	0.5534	0.5192
	ATL	0.3655	0.5567	0.4031	0.5519	0.5842	0.3714	0.3762	0.4075	0.5841	0.5908	0.6545	0.6895	0.7102	0.5496	0.5155
	F1	0.3138	0.5012	0.3278	0.4736	0.5110	0.3276	0.3189	0.3392	0.5121	0.5237	0.5702	0.6252	0.6436	0.4791	0.4426
	ECE-1	0.1633	0.2650	0.0847	0.3467	0.3445	0.1904	0.1185	0.0279	0.3374	0.3115	0.2849	0.2292	0.2211	0.3812	0.4041
Hidden Calibration	Accuracy	0.3842	0.6774	0.4087	0.6095	0.6339	0.4749	0.5121	0.4630	0.6132	0.6387	0.6709	0.7081	0.7179	0.6319	0.5953
	ATL	0.3782	0.6532	0.4066	0.4799	0.4971	0.4221	0.4524	0.4375	0.5581	0.5607	0.6100	0.6351	0.6608	0.5527	0.5161
	F1	0.3445	0.6101	0.3303	0.5119	0.5467	0.4279	0.4608	0.3931	0.5276	0.5576	0.5807	0.6305	0.6453	0.5478	0.5113
	ECE-1	0.4040	0.2084	0.4390	0.0924	0.1028	0.1194	0.1028	0.2905	0.1111	0.0618	0.0981	0.0647	0.0793	0.0768	0.1042
Method	Model Para. # / B	OPT 6.7	GPT-J 6.05	NEO 1.3	NEO 2.7	NEO 0.125	Falcon 7.22	Falcon* 7.22	Qwen2 7.6	Qwen2 7.7	Qwen2 7.6	Llama2 13	Llama2 34	Qwen2* 72	Llama3 8	
Vanilla ICL	Accuracy	0.5992	0.5341	0.4840	0.4435	0.4477	0.5691	0.6204	0.6687	0.5796	0.6119	0.6347	0.6683	0.7236	0.6442	
	ATL	0.5355	0.4994	0.4654	0.4415	0.4294	0.5219	0.5522	0.6254	0.5596	0.5590	0.5722	0.6099	0.7000	0.5872	
	F1	0.4756	0.4039	0.3457	0.3245	0.3487	0.4382	0.5240	0.5570	0.4537	0.4689	0.5263	0.5950	0.6360	0.5309	
	ECE-1	0.1725	0.2467	0.2462	0.3425	0.2889	0.2025	0.1076	0.1461	0.2897	0.2245	0.1661	0.1237	0.1585	0.1650	
Noisy Channel	Accuracy	0.5731	0.5897	0.5449	0.5678	0.4586	0.6069	0.6111	0.6376	0.5709	0.6371	0.6496	0.6111	0.6872	0.6647	
	ATL	0.3484	0.3485	0.3481	0.3483	0.3477	0.3483	0.3485	0.3502	0.3487	0.3488	0.3490	0.3496	0.3512	0.3494	
	F1	0.4844	0.5149	0.4473	0.4699	0.3832	0.5317	0.5201	0.5589	0.4792	0.5574	0.5718	0.5390	0.6175	0.5867	
	ECE-1	0.2234	0.2391	0.1942	0.2171	0.1129	0.2569	0.2607	0.2853	0.2205	0.2867	0.2988	0.2592	0.3341	0.3136	
Contextual Calibration	Accuracy	0.5304	0.5487	0.4701	0.4343	0.3837	0.5019	0.5485	0.6404	0.5588	0.5923	0.5707	0.6280	0.7143	0.5544	
	ATL	0.4519	0.4634	0.4186	0.4002	0.3579	0.4398	0.4748	0.5533	0.4939	0.5055	0.4880	0.5458	0.6039	0.4825	
	F1	0.4812	0.4657	0.3808	0.3798	0.3555	0.4906	0.5395	0.6089	0.5277	0.5527	0.5330	0.5808	0.6730	0.5214	
	ECE-1	0.2087	0.1761	0.1935	0.2340	0.3329	0.2067	0.2258	0.2122	0.1829	0.2029	0.2013	0.1418	0.1854	0.2692	
Domain Calibration	Accuracy	0.5525	0.5528	0.4635	0.4783	0.4450	0.5457	0.5725	0.6558	0.6171	0.6190	0.6238	0.6657	0.7148	0.6240	
	ATL	0.4585	0.4588	0.4199	0.4260	0.4135	0.4698	0.4877	0.5531	0.5177	0.5161	0.5175	0.5692	0.6048	0.5149	
	F1	0.4945	0.4921	0.3912	0.4375	0.3888	0.5327	0.5204	0.6283	0.5543	0.5788	0.5877	0.6219	0.6692	0.5595	
	ECE-1	0.2117	0.1640	0.2107	0.1963	0.2640	0.1919	0.2044	0.1599	0.1891	0.1524	0.1615	0.1461	0.1810	0.1635	
Batch Calibration	Accuracy	0.5861	0.5554	0.4734	0.5011	0.4340	0.6084	0.6229	0.6952	0.6418	0.6590	0.6280	0.6663	0.7345	0.6589	
	ATL	0.3802	0.3732	0.3586	0.3607	0.3555	0.3831	0.3902	0.4132	0.3978	0.3946	0.4014	0.4182	0.4424	0.3959	
	F1	0.5133	0.4954	0.4088	0.4533	0.3790	0.5569	0.5668	0.6288	0.5665	0.5946	0.5726	0.6142	0.6687	0.5733	
	ECE-1	0.1829	0.1680	0.0890	0.1413	0.0719	0.2182	0.2298	0.2596	0.2306	0.2527	0.2168	0.2081	0.2608	0.2419	
PPL-ICL	Accuracy	0.6036	0.5438	0.4738	0.4241	0.4538	0.5642	0.6331	0.6973	0.5865	0.6559	0.6240	0.6921	0.7581	0.6625	
	ATL	0.5403	0.4932	0.4541	0.4209	0.4337	0.5160	0.5665	0.6603	0.5614	0.5851	0.5666	0.6326	0.7388	0.5944	
	F1	0.4811	0.4279	0.3358	0.3128	0.3431	0.4314	0.5484	0.6086	0						