Instruction Tuning with Human Curriculum

Anonymous ACL submission

Abstract

In building instruction-tuned large language models (LLMs), the importance of a deep understanding of human knowledge can be often overlooked by the importance of instruction diversification. This research proposes a novel approach to instruction tuning by integrating a structured cognitive learning methodology that takes inspiration from the systematic progression and cognitively stimulating nature of human education through two key steps. First, our synthetic instruction data generation pipeline, designed with some references to human educational frameworks, is enriched with meta-data detailing topics and cognitive rigor for each instruction. Specifically, our generation framework is infused with questions of varying levels of rigorousness, inspired by Bloom's Taxonomy, a classic educational model for structured curriculum learning. Second, during instruction tuning, we curate instructions such that questions are presented in an increasingly complex manner utilizing the information on question complexity and cognitive rigorousness produced by our data generation pipeline. Our human-inspired curriculum learning yields significant performance enhancements compared to uniform sampling or round-robin, improving MMLU by 3.06 on LLaMA 2. We conduct extensive experiments and find that the benefits of our approach are consistently observed in eight other benchmarks. We hope that our work will shed light on the post-training learning process of LLMs and its similarity with their human counterpart.

1 Introduction

In contemporary times, state-of-the-art instruction-following models like ChatGPT and GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023) have drawn attention owing to their unparalleled proficiency and versatility. A notable advancement over previous generation large language models (LLMs), like GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020), is their impressive capability to adeptly comprehend and act upon human instructions, where this *alignment* is attributed to the additional instruction tuning process (Wei et al., 2021). As these models continue to display progress, numerous research studies have offered many intriguing insights on instruction tuning through their endeavors to make models follow more complex instructions and enhance performance across a broad spectrum of tasks. For instance, various studies emphasize the significant influence of instruction data quality (Touvron et al., 2023; Zhou et al., 2023) and the incorporation of diverse instruction formats (Wang et al., 2023b; Xu et al., 2023) on overall performance. Furthermore, including step-by-step reasoning (Wei et al., 2022) within the responses has been demonstrated to improve performance and elevate the reasoning ability of the language model (Mukherjee et al., 2023). While recent research has offered valuable insights into optimizing data formats to a better form, exploring how to curate and train such data in a more grounded, trackable manner remains elusive, often relying on randomized or undirected diversity as the prevailing norm. Ensuring efficiency in the instruction tuning process is important as extended instruction tuning undermines the inherent capability of the LLM.

Dataset	Training Scheme (Curriculum)	World Knowledge	Commons. Reasoning
CORGI	**Human Curriculum**	**+4.06**	**+2.30**
CORGI	Random Shuffle	+0.81	+0.57
Vicuna	Random Shuffle	+2.17	+0.37
WizardLM	Random Shuffle	+0.11	+0.46
LLaMA 2 13B (Base LLM)		52.45	63.37

Table 1: Human curriculum-inspired strategies (which we name interleaved curriculum) boost macroscopic LLM performance. The numbers are averages of performance improvements on LLaMA 2 13B after instruction tuning with respective datasets. World Knowledge: MMLU, TruthfulQA, TriviaQA, Commonsense Reasoning: OpenBookQA, ARC, PIQA, CommonsenseQA.

Meanwhile, since the architectures of neural network innately emulates the human brain (Han et al.,



Figure 1: Overview of our educational framework. We create a dataset based on a continuum from secondary school to grad school, extracting multiple concepts from each course. For every concept, we formulate 19 questions of varied cognitive levels using Bloom's taxonomy.

2021), adopting a learning process analogous to human education — a highly organized approach, progressively refined and empirically proven effective over centuries — constitutes a logically coherent and methodologically robust learning strategy for the machine as well (Bengio et al., 2009). While many studies within the realm of curriculum learning have demonstrated the efficacy of this hypothesis in reaching faster convergence and finding better local minima, these investigations have predominantly offered a nuanced *micro view*, mostly confined to a specific task. To draw an educational analogy, such studies are akin to observing how students behave when learning a particular subject within the vast curricula.

Venturing beyond the niche perspective, our study aims to explore a comprehensive, holistic viewpoint on curriculum learning in the knowledge domain. Specifically, we conceptualize the language model as a high school student about to progressively acquire intellectual knowledge from educational institutions such as schools and universities over the coming decades. And attempt to guide the student by the fundamental principle of learning *from simple to complex* (Sweller, 1988; Bloom et al., 1956) based on two primary distinct dimensions: (1) Educational Stage: sequentially mastering elementary to intricate concepts and (2) Cognitive Hierarchy: gradually deepening the understanding of each concept. For instance, in mathematics, humans initiate the learning process with the fundamental concept of addition, gradually progressing to more complex concepts like subtraction and multiplication by exploiting previously learned concepts to ease the learning (Bengio et al., 2009). Furthermore, when humans learn multiplication, the initial stage usually involves rote memorization of the *times tables*, progressively deepening the comprehension of the concept to the extent where we expand its application to real-world situations. This cognitive process enables the human intellect to traverse diverse fields, aligning *massively multi-domain knowledge*.

To systematically explore the potential merits of the interplay between educational curriculum and human cognitive process, we curated a massive synthetic knowledge instruction dataset and its training method called CORGI (Cognitively rigorous instructions). As illustrated in Figure 2, we initially establish a continuous progression across educational stages by integrating concrete educational frameworks provided by international secondary education curricula (i.e., Cambridge IGCSE) and a combination of several university catalogs. Subsequently, using a teacher model like ChatGPT, we extracted various topics covered in every course at each educational level. Based on the learning objectives in Bloom's taxonomy (Bloom et al., 1956), we crafted a comprehensive set of questions for each topic, with varying degrees of cognitive level. A standout feature of our dataset is its rich meta-information for each data point, facilitating the generation of coherent and contextually meaningful training data sequences.

We found compelling empirical evidence from CORGI that our cognitive progressive training inspired by the human curriculum yields significant advantages over randomized training. Notably,



Figure 2: Overview of our proposed curriculum dataset construction steps, which preserves the progressive metadata of the concept difficulty and instruction-format difficulty. These characteristics allow the application of pedagogically motivated curriculum learning strategies, which we discuss further in Sections 2.2 and 3.3.

when CORGI is subjected to random training, its performance is comparable to other instruction datasets such as WizardLM (Xu et al., 2023) and Vicuna (Chiang et al., 2023). However, by simply optimizing the sequence of learning data, we observed a roughly 3 points improvement in the knowledge benchmark (i.e., MMLU), surpassing both WizardLM and Vicuna with a considerably smaller dataset size (66K). Moreover, this improvement is not limited to the knowledge domain and extends beyond the broader benchmarks, including +1.73 in commonsense reasoning benchmarks (i.e., OpenBookQA, ARC, PIQA, CommonsenseQA) and +2.37 in language understanding (i.e., HellaSwag, Lambada).

2 CORGI

CORGI is a structured educational model that mimics the educational journey of a student. In this section, we delve into the detailed process of constructing our dataset and efficient training method inspired by the human knowledge acquisition process.

2.1 Dataset Construction

The primary objectives of our dataset are: (1) to encompass the full coverage of knowledge students acquire through their curriculum and (2) to store detailed meta information for each data, enabling the formation of meaningful order. However, constructing such a broad scope of knowledge dataset from scratch can be prohibitively costly or nearly impossible. To overcome this hurdle, we propose an automatic approach to generate synthetic data by utilizing a teacher language model (i.e., ChatGPT). Furthermore, we also utilize real-world educational curricula, such as university catalogs and the Cambridge IGCSE curriculum (refer to Appendix C for more information), as a foundational source when generating synthetic datasets. These curricula cover 45 distinct subjects and provide rich metadata, including educational stage (i.e., secondary, undergraduate, or graduate), subject (e.g., biology, math, etc.), course, and syllabus (i.e., course description), ensuring a broad spectrum of knowledge coverage as well. At a high level, the process of constructing our instruction dataset consists of three steps. (See Appendix B for a graphical illustration with examples.)

2.1.1 Step 1. Extract Concepts from Educational Curricula

This step aims to extract multiple essential academic concepts for each course based on its syllabus. However, the initial syllabus often contains unnecessary details, such as administrative jargon and scheduling, with limited content about the actual coverage of the course. Accordingly, we employ a specialized refinement prompt to convert these descriptions into more substantive, textbook-like variants. Using these enriched versions as a source, we extract fine-grained academically meaningful concepts through a concept-generation prompt (specific prompts are stipulated



Figure 3: A comparison of two training sequences. Small blocks (e.g., H1, M1) stand for fine-grained concepts per subject. *Blocking* naively stacks hierarchical blocks per subject, while *interleaving* cyclically revisits each subject, adhering to the cognitive hierarchy from Bloom's taxonomy.

in Appendix E). To achieve maximal diversity and distinction among the selected concepts, we harvested an extensive array of fine-grained concepts and subsequently eliminated any redundancies. Specifically, we employed semantic deduplication utilizing a cosine similarity threshold of 0.67 using the sentence-transformers library (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019) model *all-MiniLM-L12-v2*. As a result, we amassed a total of 5.6K fine-grained concepts in 1.8K courses in 45 subjects.

2.1.2 Step 2. Generate Synthetic Instructions

On top of previously collected concepts, we generate actual instruction data based on a systematic educational learning object called Bloom's taxonomy (Bloom et al., 1956; Krathwohl, 2002), which serves as a seminal guide for many educators. This taxonomy is a hierarchical arrangement of six cognitive processes that can be visualized as a pyramid. The lower-order layers consist of relatively simple thinking skills (i.e., Remember, Understand, and Apply), and the upper layers represent more complex cognitive processes (i.e., Analyze, Evaluate, and Create). The progression ensures that learners gather information and learn how to use, analyze, and even create original knowledge.

Exploiting this concept, we produce diverse data for a single concept by giving a detailed object from each cognitive level as instructions to a teacher language model during data generation. Namely, we first build a pre-defined 19 plug-and-play templates leveraging the definition and objectives of the three lower cognitive hierarchies: Remember, Understand, and Apply, as outlined in the original paper (Bloom et al., 1956). (Appendix D summarizes the actual templates with corresponding original definitions.) We focus solely on these three levels because the higher cognitive levels often produce questions with no clear answers and contain biased or subjective content. Utilizing these modular templates and 5.6K concepts from the previous step, we produce 107K cognitive hierarchy datasets. Each query incorporates a random system message (see Appendix E) to elicit comprehensive explanations or rationale for the answer following previous work (Mukherjee et al., 2023).

2.1.3 Step 3. Filter Unclear Instructions

It is important to note that our dataset is synthetic and relies heavily on the teacher language model. This innate dependence occasionally results in inconsistency in the question-answer pairs, which could drastically degrade the performance (Touvron et al., 2023; Zhou et al., 2023). To ensure the quality of our dataset, we employ a third-party tool, Contriever (Izacard et al., 2022), to filter out low-quality data. For each data instance, we gather three distinct passages sourced from Wikipedia, comprising a precise span of 256 words. We then assess the relevance between excerpts and a question using a retrieval-checking prompt, and only those that meet the relevance criteria are included in the final dataset. We also applied some basic string-match rules to remove refusal data containing particular text sequences, like 'As an AI ...'.

2.2 Curriculum Instruction Tuning

In sync with our richly annotated dataset, which embodies meta-details such as subject, course, concept, and cognitive hierarchy, we introduce a rigorous cognitive training method to inject knowledge from the dataset efficiently. The primary philosophy of our training paradigm is to gradually step towards a genuine understanding of various concepts by following the hierarchical progression in Bloom's taxonomy. When only a single concept is to be learned, one can linearly follow this hierarchy. Yet, as the breadth of knowledge increases, as in our case, there are numerous design choices in determining how to assort these multiple concepts

Model	# Data	MMLU	ARC	PIQA	CSQA	OBQA	HellaSwag†
		General Knowledge	Sci. Exams - Hard Set	Physical Objects	Real-World Concepts	Science Textbooks	Real-World Activities
		5-shot	25-shot	10-shot	10-shot	5-shot	10-shot
CORGI†	66K	**57.74**	**58.70**	**81.99**	**70.19**	**51.80**	**82.98**
CORGI- Blocking		55.63	56.57	80.20	69.53	48.60	81.89
Vicuna v1.5	125K	56.50	55.80	81.56	**70.19**	47.40	80.21
WizardLM v1.2	250K	55.26	55.97	81.45	68.30	49.60	80.91
LLaMA 2 13B	-	54.99	56.31	80.85	68.30	48.00	80.80

† The default CORGI model uses an interleaved sorting approach as described in Section 2.2.

Table 2: Performances of LLaMA 2 13B based models on 6 different benchmarks.

efficiently.

One straightforward way is blocking, which stacks each hierarchical block for each subject. (See Figure 3.) However, numerous studies suggest that interleaving practice, a strategy of mixing different topics, is more helpful to students to incorporate existing knowledge and skills with new ones. Specifically, interleaving helps mitigate the risk of cognitive decay (Luo et al., 2023b), a notable drawback of blocking where previously learned concepts are set aside for long periods. Intriguingly, this phenomenon is also the case in machine learning and is commonly known as catastrophic forgetting (McCloskey and Cohen, 1989). To make the best of the two worlds, our training curriculum traverses a global progression of the cognitive load from Bloom's taxonomy while interleaving different subjects to reinforce retention and understanding. As discussed in the subsequent sections, the proposed arrangement displays superiority on various benchmarks compared to other alternatives, revealing tendencies similar to reference experiments on humans (Taylor and Rohrer, 2010).

3 Experiments

3.1 Setup

This section assesses the performance of CORGI with other open-sourced models across various knowledge-related benchmarks closely aligned with our data domain. Here, we highlight the most important components of our experimental setup.

Baselines. We adopt LLaMA 2 13B models as the primary backbone in the following main experiment. We subsequently instruction-tuned 5 epochs on our dataset, both curriculum-based and non-curriculum-based (naive stacking - blocking) approaches, to take a closer analysis of our framework on two dimensions: the data-centric and curriculum-centric aspects. We selected Vicuna v1.5 (Chiang et al., 2023) and WizardLM v1.2 (Xu et al., 2023) for other competing baselines. These models are also instruction-tuned on LLaMA 2 with different data collection paradigms. Specifically, Vicuna sources a diverse array of real-world user queries from a publicly accessible ChatGPT prompt-sharing platform, while WizardLM utilizes an innovative method termed *Evol-Instruct*, which generates synthetic instructions by formulating progressively challenging questions.

Benchmarks. We evaluated the aforementioned baselines across six different benchmarks: MMLU, ARC, PIQA, CommonsenseQA, OpenbookQA, and HellaSwag[1]. Among these benchmarks, MMLU is closely aligned with our data since MMLU assesses the extensive coverage of educational content, spanning from secondary school to graduate levels, across diverse subjects.

3.2 Results

Table 2 reports the performance of CORGI and other competing methods on 6 benchmarks, where CORGI generally outperforms others with considerably smaller dataset size. Our observations indicate that interleaving, which involves a global progression of cognitive difficulty while revisiting diverse subjects, consistently outperforms blocking, which simply stacks subjects on top of one another in a straightforward manner. Overall, the order in which one presents learning material during instruction tuning can make a big difference in the final performance. When one employs a suitable curriculum, it can improve performance on most major benchmarks, including knowledge, commonsense reasoning, and language understanding (this is further evidenced in Figure 5). In our experiments, CORGI demonstrated notable improve-

[1]The detailed descriptions and references of each dataset are stipulated in Appendix A.



Figure 4: (Continued from Figure 2) **More examples of local progressions**. A comparison of clustering and spiral training sequences. The *clustering* stacks hierarchical blocks for each concept, while the *spiral* cyclically revisits each concept and alternates cognitive difficulty from Bloom's taxonomy.



Figure 5: **Local curriculum diminishes performance improvement.** The figure shows a macroscopic, averaged performance comparison of several benchmark improvements with respect to the base model (LLaMA 2 13B) performance. *World Knowledge:* MMLU, TruthfulQA, TriviaQA, *Commonsense Reasoning:* OpenBookQA, ARC, PIQA, CommonsenseQA, *Language Understanding:* HellaSwag, and Lambada. A full breakdown of this chart is given in the Appendix H.

ments when subjected to our interleaved curriculum training (ΔMMLU $+0.64 \xrightarrow{\text{intrlvng.}} +2.75$, ΔARC $+0.26 \xrightarrow{\text{intrlvng.}} +2.39$, ΔPIQA $-0.65 \xrightarrow{\text{intrlvng.}} +1.14$, ΔOpenbookQA $+0.60 \xrightarrow{\text{intrlvng.}} +3.8$) compared to naive stacking of concepts. The results demonstrate a notable enhancement, as both interleaving and blocking employ the identical dataset and training configuration, with the only difference being the sequence in which the data is presented.

The reasonable conjecture for such improvements is multifaceted. One salient factor is that instruction tuning is usually done with a limited training time budget compared to pre-training since extensive training can exacerbate drawbacks, potentially diminishing the language model's generalization capabilities. Curriculum learning is a likely solution to this dilemma, which is known to reach convergence faster than random training (Soviany et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2021). Another possible advantage of curriculum learning is its robustness under noisy datasets (Wu et al., 2020). As mentioned earlier, CORGI dataset is innately synthetic and noisy since it is gathered from a teacher model ChatGPT. In Section 3.4, we will provide a comprehensive examination of the adverse effects associated with the presence of noisy data and its relationship with the curriculum.

3.3 Analysis on Curriculum

When training towards multi-domain knowledge, there is more than one way to give structure to the overall instruction tuning process. In this section, we conduct a comparative analysis of various curricula with additional training strategies. From our experiments, we verified two intriguing observations: **1. Not all curricula guarantee transferability to machine training** and **2. Global curricula give large benefits, while local curricula can mislead.**

We separate various curricula into two branches: global curriculum and local curriculum, based on their progression of conceptual and cognitive complexity. To illustrate, the **interleaving** strategy *globally* steps the cognitive load according to Bloom's taxonomy, whereas the **blocking** strategy *locally* advances from lower to higher cognitive loads, emphasizing the internal organization of concepts within a subject (Gibbons, 2002; Vygotsky, 1978). Incorporating the previously introduced strategies, Figure 4 represents two additional alternative sorting strategies also motivated by educational paradigms: **Clustering** is similar to blocking but is different in that it facilitates the "deep learning" (Warburton, 2003) of a concept while ignoring the intra-subject dependency of concepts.



Figure 6: **Interleaved training is more stable than random shuffling** in learning multi-domain concepts. The figure reports the MMLU subject group score improvements on LLaMA 2 13B by learning strategies.



Figure 7: **High-quality filtered data and data curation enable data-efficient performance improvements**. This figure shows tuning results on LLaMA 1 13B. Data sizes are in brackets.

Spiral is designed to revisit subjects and concepts at fluctuating cognitive load levels in a repetitive manner (Masters and Gibbs, 2007).

In Figure 5, we further establish that the final performance of an LLM can be significantly impacted by the order in which one presents instruction tuning data. However, this does not mean that any educational science-inspired structured learning paradigm benefits instruction tuning. Depending on the global batch size, the number of difficulty levels available per concept, and the number of concepts per subject (or any other large semantic category), we theorize that most local progressions or structures are destroyed when employing a larger global batch size. This results in a biased training batch. This assertion is substantiated by Figure 6, which shows how a global curriculum, which maintains structure under most larger batch sizes while ensuring that all subjects are covered in every training batch, successfully pushes performance above the random shuffling baseline.

Another noteworthy observation is that the impact of curriculum extends beyond our target domain (i.e., knowledge), and often improves reasoning ability. Recent studies have demonstrated that models trained with specific datasets often experience performance degradation when extrapolated beyond that domain. Specifically, (Wang et al., 2023b) reports that many recent instruction tuning datasets like Supernatural Instructions (Wang et al., 2022) seem to show a trade-off performance relationship between benchmarks, such as MMLU and ARC, of which the latter additionally requires reasoning ability to derive correct answers. While we observe a similar tendency in Vicuna, WizardLM, and random trained CORGI — all show mixed results on MMLU, ARC, OpenBookQA, or HellaSwag — our curriculum-based CORGI notably stands apart and does not suffer from this trade-off.

3.4 Ablation study on LLaMA 1

In this section, we conduct ablation experiments on LLaMA 1 to analyze the impact of specific components. As displayed in Figure 7, our dataset demonstrates scalability, showing better performance with more data quantity. Moreover, our data filtering scheme yields superior performance with a smaller volume of data, which aligns with previous research (Zhou et al., 2023; Touvron et al., 2023) emphasizing the significance of data quality.

Another key observation is that the **negative impacts of this noisy data become more pronounced as the performance gap between the teacher and student models narrows**. For instance, in Figure 7, we can clearly see that models like Vicuna, WizardLM, and CORGI consistently show significant performance improvements across various benchmarks when trained with randomized data from LLaMA 1. However, the situation changes when we move to LLaMA 2, even with additional training on a larger dataset. The gains start to diminish and, in some cases, reverse.

Recent literature has proposed data filtering as a viable solution to mitigate this phenomenon, as demonstrated by studies such as Alpagasus (Chen et al., 2023b), TEGIT (Chen et al., 2023c), and InstructionGPT-4 (Wei et al., 2023a). Our observations align with this trend as well. Filtering out poor-quality data points yields significant benefits across different data sizes in LLaMA 1 (e.g., Δ MMLU +1.7: 107K $\xrightarrow{\text{filter}}$ 66K; Δ MMLU +1.9: 60K $\xrightarrow{\text{filter}}$ 37K; Δ MMLU +1.7: 30K $\xrightarrow{\text{filter}}$ 15K).

However, our research suggests that employing a curriculum-based training approach can be a promising solution. This approach demonstrates robust and resilient benefits over randomized training when dealing with noisy training datasets (Wu et al., 2020). More specifically, we observe that several benchmarks, which initially show decreased performance after random shuffled instruction tuning, exhibit substantial performance improvements after curriculum-based instruction tuning (ΔMMLU $-0.31 \xrightarrow{\text{intrlvg.}} +2.75$, ΔPIQA $-0.55 \xrightarrow{\text{intrlvg.}} +1.14$, ΔHellaSwag $-1.49 \xrightarrow{\text{intrlvg.}} +2.18$).

4 Background

Cognitively understanding human learning processes. "Where do we begin to improve human thinking?" (Houghton, 1997). Among diverse learning theories, Bloom's Taxonomy (Bloom et al., 1956) is a well-cited approach, categorizing learning processes into six hierarchical stages, ranging from simple to complex and concrete to abstract: Remembering, Understanding, Applying, Analyzing, Evaluating, and Creating (Krathwohl, 2002). Its effectiveness spans diverse subjects, from Math to Political Sciences (Shorser, 1999; Dickie, 1994; Su et al., 2004; Mulcare and Shwedel, 2017).

Cognitive Load Theory underscores the significance of managing mental exertion during learning. The theory served as a major theory for classroom instructional design (Paas et al., 2003; Sweller et al., 1998). With the rise of e-learning in the 2000s, the theory was again widely applied to designing effective instructional strategies (Kirschner et al., 2009; Kalyuga, 2007; Grunwald and Corsbie-Massay, 2006). A major effort was devoted to finding strategies for a remote setup where learners communicate with teachers through pre-made instructions.

Benefiting neural networks with human learning processes. Machine learning can benefit from adopting human-centric approaches. Curriculum learning, for instance, stands as a research area that arranges training data in a meaningful sequence, showcasing its potential to expedite convergence while enhancing generalization (Bengio et al., 2009; Saglietti et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2021; Xu et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2019; Shi et al., 2015; Krueger and Dayan, 2009; Elman, 1993) — an attribute of great value to fine-tuning LLM. This synthesis of human cognition and machine algorithms remains a compelling topic (Han et al., 2021; Shiffrin and Mitchell, 2023; Dasgupta et al., 2022).

Instruction tuning on LLMs. This refers to optimizing pre-trained models to handle diverse natural language inquiries (Shi et al., 2023b; Wang et al., 2023b). Methods often involve supervised learning from instruction-response pairs (Taori et al., 2023; Longpre et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023e; Chen et al., 2023b; Li et al., 2023c). Consequently, the methodology for generating or collecting this instruction data plays a significant role in the LLM's final performance (Lu et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023a; Wan et al., 2023a; Mo et al., 2023; Song et al., 2023). While some research focused on enhancing general performances like reasoning or knowledge (Mukherjee et al., 2023; Lee et al., 2023a; Wei et al., 2023b; Ghosal et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023b,a; Kung et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023a; Lee et al., 2023b; Li et al., 2023b; Wan et al., 2023b), others focused on instruction tuning for domain-specific use cases (Qin et al., 2023; Xie et al., 2023; Muennighoff et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023d; Luo et al., 2023a; Tran et al., 2023; Shi et al., 2023a). Though instruction-tuning research made remarkable progress, it is rather challenging to find cognitively motivated work (Itzhak et al., 2023; Yu et al., 2023; Gao et al., 2023b; Aw et al., 2023; van Duijn et al., 2023; Gao et al., 2023a).

5 Conclusion

In this work, we introduced CORGI, a novel methodology for instruction tuning in large language models that employ a structured pedagogy-inspired dataset. Our methodology not only surpasses existing benchmarks in both reasoning and knowledge-based tasks but also achieves this efficiency without escalating computational demands. Moreover, the observed efficacy of interleaved sorting and two-tier filtering underlines the crucial role of structured, high-quality data in model performance. Collectively, these findings illuminate the potential of leveraging educational paradigms to elevate the capabilities of machine learning models.

6 Limitations

As for the limitations of our study, there is a degree of subjectivity in assigning difficulty to instructions. That is, even though we base the classification on the rigorously explored educational framework of Bloom's Taxonomy, it is not completely clear as to how the difficulty *perceived* by an LLM and a human student can differ. Past research like Wu et al. (2020) offers a more machine-focused difficulty classification when learning image data, reaching a similar observation to ours where curriculum helps learn faster and better with noisy or a limited set of data points. However, since our research was more focused on identifying if LLM instruction tuning would benefit from a human-like curriculum, we decided to stay within the scope.

A more impending discussion, we believe, pertains to the model size. Due to the limited computational resources, we could not comprehensively confirm if training data order matters when instruction tuning larger, quantized models. Internally, we do have pilot study results indicating the usefulness of our `Corgi` dataset and curriculum in comparison to random shuffling (i.e., interleaved curriculum reliably improves MMLU performance more than random shuffling on 60∼70B models). But the results are exploratory, and we choose not to disclose yet. However, as the model sizes and/or the total number of training steps increase, we believe the impact of the curriculum can be diminished (Wu et al., 2020; Xu et al., 2020). We leave the confirmation of this postulation as an avenue for future research.

References

Khai Loong Aw, Syrielle Montariol, Badr AlKhamissi, Martin Schrimpf, and Antoine Bosselut. 2023. Instruction-tuning aligns llms to the human brain.

Yoshua Bengio, Jérôme Louradour, Ronan Collobert, and Jason Weston. 2009. Curriculum learning. In *Proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on machine learning*, pages 41–48.

Yonatan Bisk, Rowan Zellers, Jianfeng Gao, Yejin Choi, et al. 2020. Piqa: Reasoning about physical commonsense in natural language. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 7432–7439.

Benjamin S Bloom, Max D Engelhart, Edward J Furst, Walker H Hill, and David R Krathwohl. 1956. *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook 1: Cognitive domain*. McKay New York.

Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.

Lichang Chen, Jiuhai Chen, Tom Goldstein, Heng Huang, and Tianyi Zhou. 2023a. Instructzero: Efficient instruction optimization for black-box large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.03082*.

Lichang Chen, Shiyang Li, Jun Yan, Hai Wang, Kalpa Gunaratna, Vikas Yadav, Zheng Tang, Vijay Srinivasan, Tianyi Zhou, Heng Huang, and Hongxia Jin. 2023b. Alpagasus: Training a better alpaca with fewer data.

Yongrui Chen, Haiyun Jiang, Xinting Huang, Shuming Shi, and Guilin Qi. 2023c. Tegit: Generating high-quality instruction-tuning data with text-grounded task design. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05447*.

Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. 2023. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality.

Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Eric Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, et al. 2022. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.11416*.

Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. 2018. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05457*.

Ishita Dasgupta, Andrew K Lampinen, Stephanie CY Chan, Antonia Creswell, Dharshan Kumaran, James L McClelland, and Felix Hill. 2022. Language models show human-like content effects on reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.07051*.

Leslie Dickie. 1994. *Approach to Learning and Assessment in Physics.* ERIC.

Jeffrey L Elman. 1993. Learning and development in neural networks: The importance of starting small. *Cognition*, 48(1):71–99.

Changjiang Gao, Shujian Huang, Jixing Li, and Jiajun Chen. 2023a. Roles of scaling and instruction tuning in language perception: Model vs. human attention.

Shen Gao, Zhengliang Shi, Minghang Zhu, Bowen Fang, Xin Xin, Pengjie Ren, Zhumin Chen, and Jun Ma. 2023b. Confucius: Iterative tool learning from introspection feedback by easy-to-difficult curriculum.

Deepanway Ghosal, Yew Ken Chia, Navonil Majumder, and Soujanya Poria. 2023. Flacuna: Unleashing the problem solving power of vicuna using flan fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.02053*.

Pauline Gibbons. 2002. *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning*. Heinemann Portsmouth, NH.

Tiffany Grunwald and Charisse Corsbie-Massay. 2006. Guidelines for cognitively efficient multimedia learning tools: educational strategies, cognitive load, and interface design. *Academic medicine*, 81(3):213–223.

Xu Han, Zhengyan Zhang, Ning Ding, Yuxian Gu, Xiao Liu, Yuqi Huo, Jiezhong Qiu, Yuan Yao, Ao Zhang, Liang Zhang, et al. 2021. Pre-trained models: Past, present and future. *AI Open*, 2:225–250.

Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2020. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Or Honovich, Thomas Scialom, Omer Levy, and Timo Schick. 2022. Unnatural instructions: Tuning language models with (almost) no human labor. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09689*.

Robert S Houghton. 1997. Crop: Communities resolving our problems-community design for 21st century learning. In *Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference*, pages 474–477. Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).

Itay Itzhak, Gabriel Stanovsky, Nir Rosenfeld, and Yonatan Belinkov. 2023. Instructed to bias: Instruction-tuned language models exhibit emergent cognitive bias. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.00225*.

Gautier Izacard, Mathilde Caron, Lucas Hosseini, Sebastian Riedel, Piotr Bojanowski, Armand Joulin, and Edouard Grave. 2022. Unsupervised dense information retrieval with contrastive learning. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.

Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel S Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. Triviaqa: A large scale distantly supervised challenge dataset for reading comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1601–1611.

Slava Kalyuga. 2007. Enhancing instructional efficiency of interactive e-learning environments: A cognitive load perspective. *Educational psychology review*, 19:387–399.

Femke Kirschner, Fred Paas, and Paul A Kirschner. 2009. A cognitive load approach to collaborative learning: United brains for complex tasks. *Educational psychology review*, 21:31–42.

David R Krathwohl. 2002. A revision of bloom's taxonomy: An overview. *Theory into practice*, 41(4):212–218.

Kai A Krueger and Peter Dayan. 2009. Flexible shaping: How learning in small steps helps. *Cognition*, 110(3):380–394.

Po-Nien Kung, Fan Yin, Di Wu, Kai-Wei Chang, and Nanyun Peng. 2023. Active instruction tuning: Improving cross-task generalization by training on prompt sensitive tasks.

Ariel N. Lee, Cole J. Hunter, and Nataniel Ruiz. 2023a. Platypus: Quick, cheap, and powerful refinement of llms.

Young-Suk Lee, Md Arafat Sultan, Yousef El-Kurdi, Tahira Naseem Asim Munawar, Radu Florian, Salim Roukos, and Ramón Fernandez Astudillo. 2023b. Ensemble-instruct: Generating instruction-tuning data with a heterogeneous mixture of lms.

Haoran Li, Yiran Liu, Xingxing Zhang, Wei Lu, and Furu Wei. 2023a. Tuna: Instruction tuning using feedback from large language models.

Ming Li, Lichang Chen, Jiuhai Chen, Shwai He, Heng Huang, Jiuxiang Gu, and Tianyi Zhou. 2023b. Reflection-tuning: Data recycling improves llm instruction-tuning.

Xian Li, Ping Yu, Chunting Zhou, Timo Schick, Luke Zettlemoyer, Omer Levy, Jason Weston, and Mike Lewis. 2023c. Self-alignment with instruction backtranslation.

Yangning Li, Shirong Ma, Xiaobin Wang, Shen Huang, Chengyue Jiang, Hai-Tao Zheng, Pengjun Xie, Fei Huang, and Yong Jiang. 2023d. Ecomgpt: Instruction-tuning large language model with chain-of-task tasks for e-commerce.

Zekun Li, Baolin Peng, Pengcheng He, and Xifeng Yan. 2023e. Do you really follow me? adversarial instructions for evaluating the robustness of large language models.

Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. 2022. Truthfulqa: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3214–3252.

Shayne Longpre, Le Hou, Tu Vu, Albert Webson, Hyung Won Chung, Yi Tay, Denny Zhou, Quoc V Le, Barret Zoph, Jason Wei, et al. 2023. The flan collection: Designing data and methods for effective instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13688*.

Keming Lu, Hongyi Yuan, Zheng Yuan, Runji Lin, Junyang Lin, Chuanqi Tan, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. Instag: Instruction tagging for analyzing supervised fine-tuning of large language models.

Haipeng Luo, Qingfeng Sun, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Jianguang Lou, Chongyang Tao, Xiubo Geng, Qingwei Lin, Shifeng Chen, and Dongmei Zhang. 2023a. Wizardmath: Empowering mathematical reasoning for large language models via reinforced evol-instruct.

Yun Luo, Zhen Yang, Fandong Meng, Yafu Li, Jie Zhou, and Yue Zhang. 2023b. An empirical study of catastrophic forgetting in large language models during continual fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08747*.

Kenneth Masters and Trevor Gibbs. 2007. The spiral curriculum: implications for online learning. *BMC medical education*, 7:1–10.

Michael McCloskey and Neal J Cohen. 1989. Catastrophic interference in connectionist networks: The sequential learning problem. In *Psychology of learning and motivation*, volume 24, pages 109–165. Elsevier.

Lingbo Mo, Boshi Wang, Muhao Chen, and Huan Sun. 2023. How trustworthy are open-source llms? an assessment under malicious demonstrations shows their vulnerabilities.

MosaicML. 2023. Llm evaluation scores.

Niklas Muennighoff, Qian Liu, Armel Zebaze, Qinkai Zheng, Binyuan Hui, Terry Yue Zhuo, Swayam Singh, Xiangru Tang, Leandro von Werra, and Shayne Longpre. 2023. Octopack: Instruction tuning code large language models.

Subhabrata Mukherjee, Arindam Mitra, Ganesh Jawahar, Sahaj Agarwal, Hamid Palangi, and Ahmed Awadallah. 2023. Orca: Progressive learning from complex explanation traces of gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02707*.

Daniel M Mulcare and Allan Shwedel. 2017. Transforming bloom's taxonomy into classroom practice: a practical yet comprehensive approach to promote critical reading and student participation. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 13(2):121–137.

OpenAI. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *ArXiv*, abs/2303.08774.

Fred Paas, Alexander Renkl, and John Sweller. 2003. Cognitive load theory and instructional design: Recent developments. *Educational psychologist*, 38(1):1–4.

Denis Paperno, German David Kruszewski Martel, Angeliki Lazaridou, Ngoc Pham Quan, Raffaella Bernardi, Sandro Pezzelle, Marco Baroni, Gemma Boleda Torrent, Fernández Raquel, et al. 2016. The lambada dataset: Word prediction requiring a broad discourse context. In *The 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics Proceedings of the Conference: Vol. 1 Long Papers*, volume 3, pages 1525–1534. ACL.

Yujia Qin, Shihao Liang, Yining Ye, Kunlun Zhu, Lan Yan, Yaxi Lu, Yankai Lin, Xin Cong, Xiangru Tang, Bill Qian, Sihan Zhao, Runchu Tian, Ruobing Xie, Jie Zhou, Mark Gerstein, Dahai Li, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2023. Toolllm: Facilitating large language models to master 16000+ real-world apis.

Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Luca Saglietti, Stefano Mannelli, and Andrew Saxe. 2022. An analytical theory of curriculum learning in teacher-student networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:21113–21127.

Chufan Shi, Yixuan Su, Cheng Yang, Yujiu Yang, and Deng Cai. 2023a. Specialist or generalist? instruction tuning for specific nlp tasks.

Taiwei Shi, Kai Chen, and Jieyu Zhao. 2023b. Safer-instruct: Aligning language models with automated preference data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08685*.

Yangyang Shi, Martha Larson, and Catholijn M Jonker. 2015. Recurrent neural network language model adaptation with curriculum learning. *Computer Speech & Language*, 33(1):136–154.

Richard Shiffrin and Melanie Mitchell. 2023. Probing the psychology of ai models. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(10):e2300963120.

Lindsey Shorser. 1999. Bloom's taxonomy interpreted for mathematics. *Greater Victoria: University of Victoria*.

Chiyu Song, Zhanchao Zhou, Jianhao Yan, Yuejiao Fei, Zhenzhong Lan, and Yue Zhang. 2023. Dynamics of instruction tuning: Each ability of large language models has its own growth pace.

Petru Soviany, Radu Tudor Ionescu, Paolo Rota, and Nicu Sebe. 2022. Curriculum learning: A survey. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 130(6):1526–1565.

Whei Ming Su, Paul J Osisek, and Beth Starnes. 2004. Applying the revised bloom's taxonomy to a medical-surgical nursing lesson. *Nurse Educator*, 29(3):116–120.

John Sweller. 1988. Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive science*, 12(2):257–285.

John Sweller, Jeroen JG Van Merrienboer, and Fred GWC Paas. 1998. Cognitive architecture and instructional design. *Educational psychology review*, 10:251–296.

Alon Talmor, Jonathan Herzig, Nicholas Lourie, and Jonathan Berant. 2019. CommonsenseQA: A question answering challenge targeting commonsense

knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4149–4158, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2023. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model. https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca.

Kelli Taylor and Doug Rohrer. 2010. The effects of interleaved practice. *Applied cognitive psychology*, 24(6):837–848.

Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.

Hieu Tran, Zhichao Yang, Zonghai Yao, and Hong Yu. 2023. Bioinstruct: Instruction tuning of large language models for biomedical natural language processing.

Max J. van Duijn, Bram M. A. van Dijk, Tom Kouwenhoven, Werner de Valk, Marco R. Spruit, and Peter van der Putten. 2023. Theory of mind in large language models: Examining performance of 11 state-of-the-art models vs. children aged 7-10 on advanced tests.

Lev S Vygotsky. 1978. Mind in society: The development of higher mental processes (e. rice, ed. & trans.).

Alexander Wan, Eric Wallace, Sheng Shen, and Dan Klein. 2023a. Poisoning language models during instruction tuning.

Fanqi Wan, Xinting Huang, Tao Yang, Xiaojun Quan, Wei Bi, and Shuming Shi. 2023b. Explore-instruct: Enhancing domain-specific instruction coverage through active exploration.

Xin Wang, Yudong Chen, and Wenwu Zhu. 2021. A survey on curriculum learning. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 44(9):4555–4576.

Yidong Wang, Zhuohao Yu, Zhengran Zeng, Linyi Yang, Cunxiang Wang, Hao Chen, Chaoya Jiang, Rui Xie, Jindong Wang, Xing Xie, Wei Ye, Shikun Zhang, and Yue Zhang. 2023a. Pandalm: An automatic evaluation benchmark for llm instruction tuning optimization.

Yizhong Wang, Hamish Ivison, Pradeep Dasigi, Jack Hessel, Tushar Khot, Khyathi Raghavi Chandu, David Wadden, Kelsey MacMillan, Noah A Smith, Iz Beltagy, et al. 2023b. How far can camels go? exploring the state of instruction tuning on open resources. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04751*.

Yizhong Wang, Swaroop Mishra, Pegah Alipoormolabashi, Yeganeh Kordi, Amirreza Mirzaei, Atharva Naik, Arjun Ashok, Arut Selvan Dhanasekaran, Anjana Arunkumar, David Stap, et al. 2022. Super-naturalinstructions: Generalization via declarative instructions on 1600+ nlp tasks. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5085–5109.

Kevin Warburton. 2003. Deep learning and education for sustainability. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 4(1):44–56.

Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2021. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01652*.

Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24824–24837.

Lai Wei, Zihao Jiang, Weiran Huang, and Lichao Sun. 2023a. Instructiongpt-4: A 200-instruction paradigm for fine-tuning minigpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12067*.

Xiangpeng Wei, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Tianhao Li, Pei Zhang, Xingzhang Ren, Mei Li, Yu Wan, Zhiwei Cao, Binbin Xie, Tianxiang Hu, Shangjie Li, Binyuan Hui, Bowen Yu, Dayiheng Liu, Baosong Yang, Fei Huang, and Jun Xie. 2023b. Polylm: An open source polyglot large language model.

Xiaoxia Wu, Ethan Dyer, and Behnam Neyshabur. 2020. When do curricula work? In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Tong Xie, Yuwei Wan, Wei Huang, Zhenyu Yin, Yixuan Liu, Shaozhou Wang, Qingyuan Linghu, Chunyu Kit, Clara Grazian, Wenjie Zhang, Imran Razzak, and Bram Hoex. 2023. Darwin series: Domain specific large language models for natural science.

Benfeng Xu, Licheng Zhang, Zhendong Mao, Quan Wang, Hongtao Xie, and Yongdong Zhang. 2020. Curriculum learning for natural language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 6095–6104.

Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Kai Zheng, Xiubo Geng, Pu Zhao, Jiazhan Feng, Chongyang Tao, and Daxin Jiang. 2023. Wizardlm: Empowering large language models to follow complex instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12244*.

Min Yang, Qingnan Jiang, Ying Shen, Qingyao Wu, Zhou Zhao, and Wei Zhou. 2019. Hierarchical human-like strategy for aspect-level sentiment classification with sentiment linguistic knowledge and reinforcement learning. *Neural Networks*, 117:240–248.

Jifan Yu, Xiaozhi Wang, Shangqing Tu, Shulin Cao, Daniel Zhang-Li, Xin Lv, Hao Peng, Zijun Yao, Xiaohan Zhang, Hanming Li, et al. 2023. Kola: Carefully benchmarking world knowledge of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09296*.

Rowan Zellers, Ari Holtzman, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. 2019. Hellaswag: Can a machine really finish your sentence? In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4791–4800.

Hanning Zhang, Shizhe Diao, Yong Lin, Yi R. Fung, Qing Lian, Xingyao Wang, Yangyi Chen, Heng Ji, and Tong Zhang. 2023a. R-tuning: Teaching large language models to refuse unknown questions.

Tianshu Zhang, Xiang Yue, Yifei Li, and Huan Sun. 2023b. Tablellama: Towards open large generalist models for tables. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09206*.

Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al. 2023. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05685*.

Chunting Zhou, Pengfei Liu, Puxin Xu, Srini Iyer, Jiao Sun, Yuning Mao, Xuezhe Ma, Avia Efrat, Ping Yu, Lili Yu, et al. 2023. Lima: Less is more for alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11206*.

A Evaluation Details

Table 3: Performances of respective datasets on LLaMA 2 13B on three different categories of tasks. This table is a breakdown of Figure 5

Curriculum	MMLU	TriviaQA	TruthfulQA	ARC	CSQA	OBQA	PIQA	HellaSwag	Lambada
	World Knowledge			Commonsense Reasoning				Language Understanding	
	5-shot	64-shot	0-shot	25-shot	10-shot	5-shot	10-shot	10-shot	0-shot
Interleaving	**57.74**	**64.34**	**47.44**	**58.70**	**70.19**	**51.80**	**82.0**	**83.0**	**76.1**
Blocking	55.63	61.95	43.27	56.57	69.53	48.60	80.20	81.89	75.99
Clustering	55.24	58.75	42.12	57.42	67.65	49.00	80.31	81.89	75.65
Spiral	54.46	61.92	41.25	56.66	68.96	49.00	80.52	81.89	76.13
Random Shuffle	54.76	62.44	42.57	57.42	68.63	49.40	80.3	79.31	75.0
LLaMA 2 13B	54.99	62.44	39.91	56.31	68.30	48.00	80.85	80.80	76.56

We demonstrate the effectiveness of `Corgi`-style instruction tuning on world knowledge, commonsense reasoning, and language understanding tasks. Specifically, we use **(1) MMLU** ***[5-shot, world knowledge]*** (Hendrycks et al., 2020) to test for multi-domain knowledge through exam questions from 57 subjects such as mathematics, history, law, and medicine; **(2) HellaSwag** ***[10-shot, language understanding]*** (Zellers et al., 2019) for adversarial commonsense natural language inference; **(3) ARC** ***[25-shot, commonsense reasoning]*** (Clark et al., 2018) for challenging scientific reasoning on grade-school questions; **(4) TruthfulQA** ***[0-shot, world knowledge]*** (Lin et al., 2022) for adversarial facts, **(5) PIQA** ***[10-shot, commonsense reasoning]*** (Bisk et al., 2020) for physical commonsense reasoning on atypical situations; **(6) TriviaQA** ***[64-shot, world knowledge]*** (Joshi et al., 2017) for granular factoid-based tests; **(7) CommonsenseQA** ***[10-shot, commonsense reasoning]*** (Talmor et al., 2019) for commonsense reasoning abilities on real-world concepts; **(8) OpenbookQA** ***[5-shot, commonsense reasoning]*** (Talmor et al., 2019) for scientific commonsense reasoning abilities. Lastly, we use **(9) Lambada** ***[0-shot, language understanding]*** (Paperno et al., 2016) to test comprehensive reasoning performance from BooksCorpus, where a missing target word is predicted in the last sentence of each passage. For all benchmarks, we only evaluate the ability to predict the answer via direct prompting. We choose benchmarks and k-shot (k = 64, 25, 10, 5, 0) setups in broad alignment with other recent reports (Chen et al., 2023a; Longpre et al., 2023; Honovich et al., 2022; Chung et al., 2022) and a public leaderboard. Additionally, we use MosaicML's LLM Gauntlet framework to fasten our evaluations (MosaicML, 2023).

B Dataset Construction: Step-by-Step Exemplars

In this section, we provided exemplars for each data construction step outlined in Figure 8 to give a better understanding of each step.



Figure 8: A visual description of the dataset construction steps.



Figure 9: A hierarchical description and example of CORGI dataset.

—

`Original Course Description`

> Many important problems in a wide range of disciplines within computer science and throughout science are solved using techniques from linear algebra. This course will introduce students to some of the most widely used algorithms and illustrate how they are actually used. Some specific topics: the solution of systems of linear equations by Gaussian elimination, dimension of a linear space, inner product, cross product, change of basis, affine and rigid motions, eigenvalues and eigenvectors, diagonalization of both symmetric and non-symmetric matrices, quadratic polynomials, and least squares optimization. Applications will include the use of matrix computations for computer graphics, the use of the discrete Fourier transform and related techniques in digital signal processing,

the analysis of systems of linear differential equations, and singular value decompositions with application to principal component analysis. The ideas and tools provided by this course will be useful to students who intend to tackle higher-level courses in digital signal processing, computer vision, robotics, and computer graphics.

—

`Refined Course Description`

This course on computational linear algebra delves into the fundamental mathematical concepts and techniques used to solve a variety of complex problems within computer science and various scientific disciplines. Building upon prior knowledge of linear algebra, students will explore essential algorithms and gain practical experience in applying them to real-world scenarios.

The course begins with a focus on solving systems of linear equations using Gaussian elimination, a widely utilized algorithm in computational mathematics. Students will learn how to manipulate matrices and vectors to determine the solutions of these equations, enabling them to tackle intricate computational problems effectively.

Additionally, the dimension of a linear space will be explored, providing students with a deep understanding of vector spaces and their inherent properties. This concept will be crucial for comprehending other topics covered in the course and for solving problems involving higher-dimensional spaces.

The course also delves into inner product and cross-product operations, which play a vital role in various applications, such as computer graphics, physics, and engineering. Students will learn how to compute these operations, understand their geometric interpretations, and employ them effectively in relevant problem-solving contexts.

Change of basis is another key concept covered in this course. Students will explore the transformation of vectors and matrices between different bases, gaining fluency in manipulating coordinates and understanding the geometric implications of such transformations.

Affine and rigid motions will be introduced, drawing connections between linear algebra and computer graphics, robotics, and computer vision. Students will learn how to describe and compute these types of transformations using linear algebra techniques.

Eigenvalues and eigenvectors will also be explored in detail. Students will examine the characteristic equation of a matrix and learn how to determine eigenvalues and corresponding eigenvectors. This pivotal concept enables the understanding and analysis of dynamic systems, stability analysis, and principal component analysis.

Diagonalization of both symmetric and non-symmetric matrices will be thoroughly studied, equipping students with the ability to transform matrices into diagonal form using eigenvectors. This technique finds applications in areas such as finding powers of matrices and solving systems of linear differential equations.

Furthermore, quadratic polynomials will be investigated, focusing on matrix representations and optimization techniques using quadratic forms. Students will gain proficiency in solving optimization problems and understanding their connection to quadratic polynomials.

Lastly, the course explores least squares optimization. Students will learn how to determine the best-fitting line or model for data that does not conform exactly to linear equations, allowing them to accurately estimate unknown parameters and minimize errors.

Throughout the course, practical applications will be highlighted, demonstrating the relevance and usefulness of matrix computations. Areas such as computer graphics, digital signal processing using the discrete Fourier transform, analysis of linear differential equations, and singular value decomposition for principal component analysis will be explored to provide tangible examples of computational linear algebra's real-world applications.

By the end of this course, students will possess the essential tools and concepts required to excel in

higher-level courses such as digital signal processing, computer vision, robotics, and computer graphics. The mastery of computational linear algebra will enable them to tackle complex problems within these fields and contribute to the advancement of computer science and various scientific disciplines.

—

`Fine-Grained Concepts`

Concept 1 → Dimension in Linear Spaces: The dimension of a linear space signifies the minimum number of linearly independent vectors essential to cover the entire space. Dimension within the context of linear spaces represents a fundamental property, denoting the smallest set of linearly independent vectors necessary to span the entirety of the space. Beyond a mere measure of size, it offers profound insights into the structural complexity and intrinsic characteristics of a vector space. Mastery of this concept is pivotal when tackling intricate problems in multi-dimensional spaces while also serving as a cornerstone for comprehending an array of subjects in computational linear algebra. A firm grasp of dimension enriches the analytical toolkit, enabling the exploration of diverse mathematical landscapes and facilitating the navigation of intricate algebraic transformations.
Concept 2 → Applications of Linear Spaces...
Concept 3 → ...
...

—

`Question Template`

(See Appendix C)

—

`Question`

Explain the concept of dimension in the context of a linear space and provide an example of a linear space with dimension 2.

—

`Answer`

In the context of a linear space, dimension refers to the number of linearly independent vectors needed to span the entire space. It represents the maximum number of independent directions in which we can move within the space.
To provide an example of a linear space with dimension 2, let's consider the Cartesian coordinate system in two dimensions, often denoted as R^2. This linear space consists of all ordered pairs (x, y), where x and y can be any real numbers.
To determine the dimension of R^2, we need to find the number of linearly independent vectors required to span the entire space. In this case, we can take two linearly independent vectors, $i = (1, 0)$ and $j = (0, 1)$.
1. Step 1: Vector $i = (1, 0)$ - This vector represents movement in the x-axis direction, with a magnitude of 1 unit and no movement in the y-axis direction.
2. Step 2: Vector $j = (0, 1)$ - This vector represents movement in the y-axis direction, with a magnitude of 1 unit and no movement in the x-axis direction.

Using only these two vectors, we can span the entire space of R^2 by scaling and combining them in various ways. By scaling i and j, we can reach any point in R^2. Therefore, R^2 has dimension 2. To justify this, we can consider the definition of linear independence. Two vectors are linearly independent if no linear combination of them (except the trivial one) can give the zero vector. In this case, i and j are linearly independent because no scalar multiples of i and j can cancel each other out to give the zero vector. Thus, we have exactly two linearly independent vectors in R^2, indicating that the dimension of R^2 is 2.

—

`Retrieved Wiki Passages`

Dimension (vector space)
... with dimension 0 is 0, the vector space consisting only of its zero element. If "W" is a linear subspace of "V", then dim("W") $\leq$ dim("V"). To show that two finite-dimensional vector spaces are equal, one often uses the following criterion: if "V" is a finite-dimensional vector space and "W" is a linear subspace of "V" with dim("W") = dim("V"), then "W" = "V". R has the standard basis e, ..., e, where e is the "i"-th column of the corresponding identity matrix. Therefore, R has dimension "n". Any two vector spaces over "F" having the same dimension are isomorphic. ...
Dimension (vector space)
... Any bijective map between their bases can be uniquely extended to a bijective linear map between the vector spaces. If "B" is some set, a vector space with dimension |"B"| over "F" can be constructed as follows: take the set "F" of all functions "f" : "B" $\rightarrow$ "F" such that "f"("b") = 0 for all but finitely many "b" in "B". These functions can be added and multiplied with elements of "F", and we obtain the desired "F"-vector space. An important result about dimensions is given by the rank–nullity theorem for linear maps. If "F"/"K" is a field ...
Linear map
... of the target space. For finite dimensions, this means that the dimension of the quotient space "W"/"f"("V") is the dimension of the target space minus the dimension of the image. As a simple example, consider the map "f": R $\rightarrow$ R, given by "f"("x", "y") = (0, "y"). Then for an equation "f"("x", "y") = ("a", "b") to have a solution, we must have "a" = 0 (one constraint), and in that case the solution space is ("x", "b") or equivalently stated, (0, "b") + ("x", 0), (one degree of freedom). The kernel may be expressed as the subspace ("x",", ...

C Full Subject List and Sources

Table 4: The full list of subject categories in CORGI dataset.

Subject	Source
Higher Education - Accounting	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/acct/
Higher Education - Anatomy	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/anat/
Higher Education - Ancient History	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/anch/
Higher Education - Astronomy	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/astr/
Higher Education - Biology	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/biol/
Higher Education - Chemistry	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/chem/
Higher Education - Computer and Info Science	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/cis/
Higher Education - Earth and Environmental Science	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/eesc/
Higher Education - Economics	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/econ/
Higher Education - Ethics	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/ethc/
Higher Education - Gender, Sexuality, Women's Study	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/gsws/
Higher Education - Global Studies	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/glbs/
Higher Education - Health & Societies	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/hsoc/
Higher Education - History	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/hist/
Higher Education - Law	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/law/
Higher Education - Legal & Business Ethics	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/lgst/
Higher Education - Management	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/mgmt/
Higher Education - Marketing	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/mktg/
Higher Education - Mathematics	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/math/
Higher Education - Philosophy	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/phil/
Higher Education - Physics	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/phys/
Higher Education - Political Science	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/psci/
Higher Education - Psychology	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/psyc/
Higher Education - Religious Studies	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/rels/
Higher Education - Sociology	catalog.upenn.edu/courses/soci/
Secondary Education - Accounting	
Secondary Education - Agriculture	
Secondary Education - American History (US)	
Secondary Education - Biology	
Secondary Education - Business Studies	
Secondary Education - Chemistry	
Secondary Education - Co-ordinated Sciences	
Secondary Education - Computer Science	
Secondary Education - Economics	cambridgeinternational.org/pro
Secondary Education - Enterprise	grammes-and-qualifications/ca
Secondary Education - Environmental Management	mbridge-upper-secondary/ca
Secondary Education - Food & Nutrition	mbridge-igcse/subjects/
Secondary Education - Maldives Marine Science	
Secondary Education - Geography	
Secondary Education - History	
Secondary Education - Info and Communication Tech	
Secondary Education - Physical Science	
Secondary Education - Physics	
Secondary Education - Religious Studies	
Secondary Education - Sociology	

D Question Generation Templates

Table 5: CORGI question generation template - cognitive categories

Cognitive Categories				
Index	**Process**	**Subprocess**	**Load**	**Definition**
1	remembering	recognizing	easy	locate knowledge in long-term memory that is consistent with presented material (e.g., Recognize the dates of important events in U.S. history)
2	remembering	recognizing	easy	locate knowledge in long-term memory that is consistent with presented material (e.g., Recognize the dates of important events in U.S. history)
3	remembering	recalling	easy	retrieve relevant knowledge from long-term memory (e.g., Recall the dates of important events in U.S. history)
4	remembering	recalling	easy	retrieve relevant knowledge from long-term memory (e.g., Recall the dates of important events in U.S. history)
5	understanding	interpreting	medium	change from one form of representation (e.g., numerical) to another (e.g., verbal) (e.g., Paraphrase important speeches and documents)
6	understanding	exemplifying	medium	find a specific example or illustration of a concept or principle (e.g., Give examples of various artistic painting styles)
7	understanding	classifying	medium	determine that something belongs to a category (e.g., concept or principle) (e.g., Classify observed or described cases of mental disorders)
8	understanding	classifying	medium	determine that something belongs to a category (e.g., concept or principle) (e.g., Classify observed or described cases of mental disorders)
9	understanding	summarizing	medium	abstract a general theme or major point(s) (e.g., Write a short summary of the events portrayed on a videotape)
10	understanding	inferring	medium	draw a logical conclusion from presented information (e.g., In learning a foreign language, infer grammatical principles from examples)
11	understanding	inferring	medium	draw a logical conclusion from presented information (e.g., In learning a foreign language, infer grammatical principles from examples)
12	understanding	inferring	medium	draw a logical conclusion from presented information (e.g., In learning a foreign language, infer grammatical principles from examples)
13	understanding	comparing	medium	detect correspondences between two ideas, objects, and the like (e.g., Compare historical events to contemporary situations)
14	understanding	explaining	medium	construct a cause-and-effect model of a system (e.g., Explain the causes of important 18th-century events in France)
15	understanding	explaining	medium	construct a cause-and-effect model of a system (e.g., Explain the causes of important 18th-century events in France)
16	understanding	explaining	medium	construct a cause-and-effect model of a system (e.g., Explain the causes of important 18th-century events in France)
17	understanding	explaining	medium	construct a cause-and-effect model of a system (e.g., Explain the causes of important 18th-century events in France)
18	applying	executing	hard	apply a procedure to a familiar task (e.g., Divide one whole number by another whole number, both with multiple digits)
19	applying	using	hard	apply a procedure to an unfamiliar task (e.g., Use Newton's Second Law in situations in which it is appropriate)

The question type and format for each matching index are shown on the next page. One cognitive category can have multiple question formats from Bloom et al. (1956).

Table 6: CORGI question generation template - question formats for each cognitive category

Index	Type	Format
1	verification	a verification task, where some information is given and one must choose whether or not it is correct
2	matching	a matching task, where two lists are presented and one must choose how each item in one list corresponds to an item in the other list. But not MCQ
3	constructed response	a constructed response question where one is not given any hints or related information (such as "What is a meter?")
4	fill-in-the-blank	a fill-in-the-blank where several hints are given (such as "In the metric system a meter is a measure of _____.")
5	constructed response	a constructed response question where information is presented in one form and one is asked to construct the same information in a different form (such as "Write an equation that corresponds to the following statement using T for total cost and P for number of pounds. The total cost of mailing a package is $2.00 for the first pound plus $1.50 for each additional pound.")
6	constructed response	a constructed response question where one must create an example (such as "Locate an inorganic compound and tell why it is inorganic")
7	constructed response	a constructed response question where one is given an instance and must produce its related concept or principle from a list
8	sorted response	a sorted response question where one is given a set of instances and must determine which ones belong in a specified category and which ones do not, or must place each instance into one of multiple categories
9	constructed response	a constructed response question involving either themes or summaries. Generally speaking, themes are more abstract than summaries. For example, in a constructed response task, the student may be asked to read an untitled passage on the California Gold Rush and then write an appropriate title.
10	completion	a completion task where one is given a series of items and must determine what will come next, as in the number series example above (such as describing the relationship as an equation involving x and y for situations in which if x is 1, then y is 0; if x is 2, then y is 3; and if x is 3, then y is 8).
11	analogy	an analogy task where one is given an analogy of the form A is to B as C is to D such as "nation" is to "president" as "state" is to _____. In the example the student's task is to produce or select a term that fits in the blank and completes the analogy (such as "governor").
12	oddity	an oddity task where one is given three or more items and must determine which does not belong (such as three physics problems, two involving one principle and another involving a different principle). question should not be in MCQ form
13	mapping	a mapping task where one must show how each part of one object, idea, problem, or situation corresponds to (or maps onto) each part of another (such as asking to detail how the battery, wire, and resistor in an electrical circuit are like the pump, pipes, and pipe constructions in a water flow system, respectively.)
14	reasoning	a reasoning task where one is asked to offer a reason for a given event (such as "Why does air enter a bicycle tire pump when you pull up on the handle?")
15	troubleshooting	a troubleshooting task where one is asked to diagnose what could have gone wrong in a malfunctioning system (such as "Suppose you pull up and press down on the handle of a bicycle tire pump several times but no air comes out. What's wrong?")
16	redesigning	a redesigning task where one is asked to change the system to accomplish some goal (such as "How could you improve a bicycle tire pump so that it would be more efficient?")
17	predicting	a predicting task one is asked how a change in one part of a system will effect a change in another part of the system (such as "What would happen if you increased the diameter of the cylinder in a bicycle tire pump?")
18	execution	an execution task where one is given a familiar task that can be performed using a well-known procedure (such as "Solve for x: x^2 + 2x - 3 = 0 using the technique of completing the square.")
19	implementation	an implementation task where one is given an unfamiliar problem that must be solved. Thus, begin with specification of the problem. Then, one is asked to determine the procedure needed to solve the problem, solve the problem using the selected procedure (making modifications as necessary), or usually both.

E CORGI Prompt Templates and Example Results

We also present all prompting templates to make our dataset collection process as replicable and understandable as possible. The following sections discuss the prompts used in each dataset collection step. For each prompt, we share the 1. prompting template, 2. prompt example with filled-in slots, and 3. example response from gpt-turbo-3.5. The filled-in slots in example prompts are expressed in `this font`.

E.1 Course Description Refinement Prompt

`Prompt Template`

> Subject: {subject}
> Course Title: {course_title}
> Course Description: {course_description}
> Extend the course description and make it more technically descriptive. Only discuss the core {subject} concepts in the course, not administrative matters like exam schedules.
> Extended Course Description: ...

—

`Example prompt`

> Subject: `Higher Education - Astronomy`
> Course Title: `A Survey of the Universe`
> Course Description: `A general survey, designed for the non-major, of the facts and theories of the astronomical universe, from the solar system to stars to galaxies and cosmology. Topics include planets, satellites, small objects in the solar system, and extraterrestrial life; stars, their evolution, and their final state as white dwarfs, neutron stars, or black holes; galaxies, quasars, large structures, background radiation, and big bang cosmology. Elementary algebra and geometry will be used. This course is not recommended for physical science majors or engineering students. Engineering students receive no credit for this course. Fulfills quantitative data analysis requirements.`
> Extend the course description and make it more technically descriptive. Only discuss the core `Higher Education - Astronomy` concepts in the course, not administrative matters like exam schedules.
> Extended Course Description: ...

—

`Example response from gpt-turbo-3.5`

> This course, "A Survey of the Universe," offers a comprehensive exploration of core concepts in astronomy for non-majors. Through a blend of theoretical knowledge and observational techniques, students will delve into various aspects of the astronomical universe.
> The course begins with an examination of our solar system, encompassing an in-depth study of planets, satellites, and smaller celestial objects. Students will explore the geological formations, atmospheres, and potential for extraterrestrial life on these planetary bodies.
> Moving beyond the solar system, the course then delves into the captivating world of stars. Students will investigate the life cycle of stars, from their formation within stellar nurseries to their ultimate fates as white dwarfs, neutron stars, or black holes. Concepts such as stellar evolution, nuclear fusion, and the interplay between gravity and gas dynamics will be explored in detail.
> Expanding further, the course transitions to the realm of galaxies. Students will gain insight into the structure and formation of galaxies, as well as their intriguing subclasses including quasars.

The exploration of large-scale structures and the cosmic web will provide a deeper understanding of the organization and distribution of matter throughout the universe.
Investigating the origins of the universe, the course culminates in the study of cosmology. Students will engage with fundamental theories such as the Big Bang model and cosmic microwave background radiation. Concepts such as dark matter, dark energy, and the expanding universe will be examined, shedding light on the current understanding of the cosmos.
Throughout the course, mathematical tools such as elementary algebra and geometry will be employed, enabling students to analyze and interpret astronomical data. These quantitative data analysis skills will enhance learners' ability to comprehend and evaluate scientific information within the field of astronomy.
Please note that this course is not recommended for physical science majors or engineering students, and it does not count for credit toward engineering programs. However, it does fulfill the quantitative data analysis requirement, providing students with valuable skills applicable to various fields of study.
By the end of this course, students will have gained a firm foundation in the principles and theories that underpin the vast and captivating field of astronomy. They will have acquired a broad understanding of the solar system, stars, galaxies, and cosmology, equipping them with the knowledge to appreciate and further explore the wonders of the universe.

—

E.2 Concept Generation Prompt

`Prompt Template`

You are an academic AI assistant teaching the following course with a {subject} professor:
Course Title: {course_title}
Course Description: {course_description}
Instruction
- Make a list of the core {subject} concepts, all concepts from the course description above, in numbered and ordered style. For each list item, add detailed Wikipedia-style explanation from {subject} textbook
- List concepts that are important to a student trying to learn basic {subject} topics.
- Don't list administrative matters like exams.
- Don't list skill-based stuff like communication or ethical skills (e.g., writing, presentation).
- Only academic {subject} concepts in factuality, knowledge dimensions like theories and cases.
- CONFIRM EACH CONCEPT DO APPEAR IN {subject} TEXTBOOK
- List concepts in order of importance.
List
1. concept: explanation
2. concept: explanation

—

Example Prompt

You are an academic AI assistant teaching the following course with a Higher Education - Astronomy professor:
Course Title: A Survey of the Universe
Course Description: This course, "A Survey of the Universe," offers a comprehensive exploration of core concepts in astronomy for non-majors. Through a blend of theoretical knowledge and observational techniques, students will delve into various aspects of the astronomical universe.
The course begins with an examination of our solar system, encompassing an in-depth study of planets, satellites, and smaller celestial objects. Students will explore the geological formations, atmospheres, and potential for extraterrestrial life on these planetary bodies.
Moving beyond the solar system, the course then delves into the captivating world of stars. Students will investigate the life cycle of stars, from their formation within stellar nurseries to their ultimate fates as white dwarfs, neutron stars, or black holes. Concepts such as stellar evolution, nuclear fusion, and the interplay between gravity and gas dynamics will be explored in detail.
Expanding further, the course transitions to the realm of galaxies. Students will gain insight into the structure and formation of galaxies, as well as their intriguing subclasses including quasars. The exploration of large-scale structures and the cosmic web will provide a deeper understanding of the organization and distribution of matter throughout the universe.
Investigating the origins of the universe, the course culminates in the study of cosmology. Students will engage with fundamental theories such as the Big Bang model and cosmic microwave background radiation. Concepts such as dark matter, dark energy, and the expanding universe will be examined, shedding light on the current understanding of the cosmos.
Throughout the course, mathematical tools such as elementary algebra and geometry will be employed, enabling students to analyze and interpret astronomical data. These quantitative data analysis skills will enhance learners' ability to comprehend and evaluate scientific information within the field of astronomy.
Please note that this course is not recommended for physical science majors or engineering students, and it does not count for credit toward engineering programs. However, it does fulfill the quantitative data analysis requirement, providing students with valuable skills applicable to various fields of study.
By the end of this course, students will have gained a firm foundation in the principles and theories that underpin the vast and captivating field of astronomy. They will have acquired a broad understanding of the solar system, stars, galaxies, and cosmology, equipping them with the knowledge to appreciate and further explore the wonders of the universe.
Instruction
- Make a list of the core Higher Education - Astronomy concepts, all concepts from the course description above, in numbered and ordered style. For each list item, add a detailed Wikipedia-style explanation from the Higher Education - Astronomy textbook
- List concepts that are important to a student trying to learn basic Higher Education - Astronomy topics.
- Don't list administrative matters like exams.

- Don't list skill-based stuff like communication or ethical skills (e.g., writing, presentation).
- Only academic `Higher Education - Astronomy` concepts in factuality, knowledge dimensions like theories and cases.
- CONFIRM EACH CONCEPT DO APPEAR IN `Higher Education - Astronomy` TEXTBOOK
- List concepts in order of importance.
List
1. concept: explanation
2. concept: explanation

—

`Example response from gpt-turbo-3.5`

1. Solar System: The solar system refers to the collection of celestial bodies, including the sun, planets, satellites, asteroids, comets, and other smaller objects that are bound together by gravitational forces. This concept involves the study of the formation, characteristics, and dynamics of these objects within the system, as well as their interactions with each other.
2. Planetary Bodies: Planetary bodies are the objects within the solar system that are characterized by their orbits around the sun. This includes the eight planets, their moons or satellites, dwarf planets like Pluto, and other smaller celestial bodies such as asteroids and comets. The study of these bodies involves understanding their physical properties, geological formations, atmospheres, and potential for hosting life.
3. Stars: Stars are luminous spheres of plasma held together by their own gravity. They are the fundamental building blocks of galaxies and play a crucial role in the universe. The study of stars encompasses their formation, life cycles, characteristics, and classifications based on their spectral features. Concepts such as stellar evolution, nuclear fusion, and the interplay between gravity and gas dynamics are explored to understand the behavior and dynamics of stars.
4. Galaxies: Galaxies are large systems of stars, gas, dust, and other celestial objects bound together by gravitational forces. Studying galaxies involves understanding their shapes, sizes, structures, and formation mechanisms. Different types of galaxies, such as spiral, elliptical, and irregular, exhibit unique characteristics and contribute to our understanding of the universe. Investigating the distribution and organization of matter within galaxies also provides insights into the large-scale structure of the universe.
5. Cosmology: Cosmology is the branch of astronomy that deals with the study of the origins, evolution, and structure of the universe as a whole. It encompasses theories and observations that provide insights into the fundamental nature of the universe, including the Big Bang model, cosmic microwave background radiation, dark matter, dark energy, and the expanding universe. Understanding cosmological concepts helps unravel the mysteries of the universe's beginning and its current state.

E.3 Question Generation Prompt

`Prompt Template`

You are a {subject} professor teaching "{subject}, {course_title}, {concept}"
You are making questions for a test that questions student's various levels of thinking. The current question tests students on {cognitive_process} ({cognitive_load}), out of remembering (easy), understanding (medium), and applying (hard).
Come up with an exam question to assess student's ability to {cognitive_process_definition}
Question Format:
- {question_format}
Test Constraints:

- All questions should be self-contained (answerable using the provided information)
- All questions must have a clear, defined answer
- All questions must not use graphics
- Follow Question Format!
- Print only question only!! (Don't print the answer)
- equations in plain text
- no MCQ, don't provide options
- make questions have as high educational value as possible
- do NOT duplicate your previous question
Previous Question:
- {previous_question}
Question
Question: ...

—

Example Prompt

You are a Higher Education - Astronomy professor teaching "Higher Education - Astronomy, A Survey of the Universe, Solar System: The solar system refers to the collection of celestial bodies, including the sun, planets, satellites, asteroids, comets, and other smaller objects that are bound together by gravitational forces. This concept involves the study of the formation, characteristics, and dynamics of these objects within the system, as well as their interactions with each other."
You are making questions for a test that questions student's various levels of thinking. The current question tests students on understanding (medium), out of remembering (easy), understanding (medium), and applying (hard).
Come up with an exam question to assess student's ability to construct a cause-and-effect model of a system (e.g., Explain the causes of important 18th-century events in France)
Question Format:
- a redesigning task where one is asked to change the system to accomplish some goal (such as, "How could you improve a bicycle tire pump so that it would be more efficient?")
Test Constraints:
- All questions should be self-contained (answerable using the provided information)
- All questions must have a clear, defined answer
- All questions must not use graphics
- Follow Question Format!
- Print only question only!! (Don't print the answer)
- equations in plain text
- no MCQ, don't provide options
- make questions have as high educational value as possible
- do NOT duplicate your previous question
Previous Question:
- Suppose you are studying the solar system, and you observe that a comet is moving in a highly elliptical orbit around the Sun. Construct a cause-and-effect model to explain the factors that could have influenced the comet's orbit.
Question
Question: ...

—

Example response from gpt-turbo-3.5

In the context of the solar system, consider the following scenario: A spacecraft has been sent on a mission to explore the outer planets of our solar system, specifically Jupiter and Saturn. As the spacecraft approaches these planets, it is observed that its velocity increases. Construct a cause-and-effect model to explain this phenomenon, taking into account the fundamental principles of physics and the characteristics of these giant planets.

—

E.4 Retrieval Checking Prompt

Prompt Template

QUESTION: {question}
PASSAGE: {retrieved_passage_title}, {retrieved_passage}
Is the PASSAGE relevant to the QUESTION?
A) Yes
B) No

—

Example Prompt

QUESTION: Suppose you are studying the solar system, and you observe that a comet is moving in a highly elliptical orbit around the Sun. Construct a cause-and-effect model to explain the factors that could have influenced the comet's orbit.
PASSAGE: Solar System, the case of the four giant planets, by planetary rings, thin bands of tiny particles that orbit them in unison. Most of the largest natural satellites are in synchronous rotation, with one face permanently turned toward their parent. Kepler's laws of planetary motion describe the orbits of objects about the Sun. Following Kepler's laws, each object travels along an ellipse with the Sun at one focus. Objects closer to the Sun (with smaller semi-major axes) travel more quickly because they are more affected by the Sun's gravity. On an elliptical orbit, a body's distance from the Sun varies over the
Is the PASSAGE relevant to the QUESTION?
A) Yes
B) No

—

`Example response from gpt-turbo-3.5`

A) Yes

—

F System Messages

We randomly choose one system message before collecting *gpt-turbo-3.5* responses, depending on the question's cognitive load. We believe that this classification of using different sets of system messages depending on the cognitive load is not very meaningful, but we report them as-is to accurately report our experiment procedures.
If cognitive load = easy,
‘’
‘You are a helpful assistant, who always provide explanation.’
‘You are an AI assistant. Provide a detailed answer so user don’t need to search outside to understand the answer.’
‘You are a smart AI assistant that follows instruction extremely well. Help as much as you can.’
‘You are an AI assistant. User will you give you a task. Your goal is to complete the task as faithfully as you can. While performing the task think step-by-step and justify your steps.’
‘Explain how you used the definition to come up with the correct answer.’
‘User will you give you a task with some instruction. Your job is follow the instructions as faithfully as you can. While answering think step-by-step and justify your answer.’
‘You are a factual AI assistant that helps people find information.’
‘You are an AI assistant that helps people find information. Provide a detailed answer so user don’t need to search outside to understand the answer.’

If cognitive load = medium or hard,

‘’
‘You are a teacher. Given a task, you explain in simple steps what the task is asking, any guidelines it provides and how to use those guidelines to find the answer.’
‘User will you give you a task with some instruction. Your job is follow the instructions as faithfully as you can. While answering think step-by-step and justify your answer.’
‘You are a factual AI assistant. User will you give you a task. Your goal is to complete the task as faithfully as you can. While performing the task think step-by-step and justify your steps.’
‘You should describe the task and explain your answer.’
‘You are a factually correct AI assistant. Generate concise answers with clear step-by-step reasoning.’

G Rule-based Filtering

Read data from the input JSONL file
Initialize an empty list *filtered_rows*
Initialize a list *exclusion_keywords* containing specific exclusion keywords
for each *line* **in** *file* **do**
    Parse *data* from *line*
    Extract *question* and *answer* fields, convert to lowercase
    if the *question* does not contain *exclusion_keywords* **and** has more than 2 words **then**
        if the *answer* does not contain *exclusion_keywords* **and** has more than 2 words **then**
            Append *data* to *filtered_rows*
        end if
    end if
end for
Write the contents of *filtered_rows* to a new JSONL file

exclusion keywords are “ai assistant”, “ai language model”, “sorry, ”, “sorry but ”, “sorry for the confusion ”, “i’m unable to ”, “without further ”, “apologize”, “i cannot”

H Training Details

We use Vicuna’s (Zheng et al., 2023; Chiang et al., 2023) training script, FastChat, to train `Corgi` on LLaMA 2 13B under bf16 precision. Specifically, we use the global batch size of 256, 1 batch per GPU, 16 gradient accumulations, 16 x A100 GPUs, 2e-5 learning rate, and 2048 sequence length for five epochs. A single training run took less than one day.