

# The Inductive Bottleneck: Data-Driven Emergence of Representational Sparsity in Vision Transformers

Kanishk Awadhiya

Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi

kanishk.awadhiya@gmail.com

## Abstract

Vision Transformers (ViTs) lack the hierarchical inductive biases inherent to Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs), theoretically allowing them to maintain high-dimensional representations throughout all layers. However, recent observations suggest ViTs often spontaneously manifest a “U-shaped” entropy profile—compressing information in middle layers before expanding it for the final classification. In this work, we demonstrate that this “Inductive Bottleneck” is not an architectural artifact, but a data-dependent adaptation. By analyzing the layer-wise Effective Encoding Dimension (EED) of DINO-trained ViTs across datasets of varying compositional complexity (UC Merced, Tiny ImageNet, and CIFAR-100), we show that the depth of the bottleneck correlates strongly with the semantic abstraction required by the task. We find that while texture-heavy datasets preserve high-rank representations throughout, object-centric datasets drive the network to dampen high-frequency information in middle layers, effectively “learning” a bottleneck to isolate semantic features.

## 1 Introduction

The shift from Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) (He et al., 2016; LeCun et al., 2015) to Vision Transformers (ViTs) (Dosovitskiy et al., 2020) represents a fundamental paradigm shift in computer vision: moving from hard-coded inductive biases (locality, translation invariance) to learned biases. While a CNN forces a hierarchical reduction of spatial dimensions via pooling layers, a standard ViT maintains a constant patch number and embedding dimension from input to output. Theoretically, a ViT could maintain maximum information density (rank) across its entire depth (Raghu et al., 2021), leading to the assumption that ViTs are “isotropic” architectures.

However, this isotropic assumption is challenged by recent empirical anomalies. Analysis of self-supervised ViTs often reveals a peculiar phenomenon where the feature rank does not stay constant but instead collapses in the middle layers, only to recover in the deeper layers. We term this phenomenon the **Inductive Bottleneck**. This U-shaped profile suggests that despite having the *capacity* to maintain high-dimensional representations, the network *chooses* to compress information mid-computation.

The central question of this paper is: *Is this bottleneck an inherent property of the Self-Attention mechanism, or is it a dynamic reaction to the statistical properties of the training data?*

To answer this, we train ViT-Small architectures using the DINO objective (Caron et al., 2021) on three datasets representing a spectrum of “compositional complexity”:

- **UC Merced:** Texture-dominant satellite imagery (Yang & Newsam, 2010).
- **Tiny ImageNet:** Moderately object-centric data ( $64 \times 64$ ) (Krizhevsky et al., 2009).
- **CIFAR-100:** Highly semantic/object-centric data ( $32 \times 32$ ) (Krizhevsky et al., 2009).

We utilize the Effective Encoding Dimension (EED) (Roy et al., 2020) to quantify the information capacity of representations at each layer. Our results demonstrate that the bottleneck is not universal but adaptive.

## 2 Theoretical Framework

### 2.1 Effective Dimensionality in Deep Learning

To quantify the “true” degrees of freedom utilized by the model, we adopt the concept of **Effective Dimensionality** ( $N_{eff}$ ). In Bayesian deep learning, this metric is often derived from the eigenvalues of the Hessian to measure parameter well-determinedness. We extend this concept to the activation space to quantify representational capacity.

Let  $H^{(l)} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D}$  be the matrix of token embeddings at layer  $l$ , and  $\Sigma^{(l)}$  be its empirical covariance matrix. We define the normalized spectral distribution  $p^{(l)}$  based on the eigenvalues  $\Lambda^{(l)} = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_D\}$ :

$$p_k^{(l)} = \frac{\lambda_k^{(l)}}{\sum_{j=1}^D \lambda_j^{(l)}} \quad (1)$$

The **Effective Encoding Dimension (EED)** is defined as the exponential of the Shannon entropy of this distribution:

$$N_{eff}^{(l)} = \exp \left( - \sum_{k=1}^D p_k^{(l)} \log p_k^{(l)} \right) \quad (2)$$

This metric provides a robust, continuous measure of rank. An isotropic representation (white noise) yields  $N_{eff} \approx D$ , while a representation collapsed to a single feature yields  $N_{eff} \approx 1$ .

### 2.2 Theoretical Motivation: Generalization via Effective Dimensionality

The “Inductive Bottleneck”—characterized by the spontaneous reduction of effective dimensionality in intermediate layers—aligns closely with established theories on generalization. We interpret this phenomenon through the lens of the Information Bottleneck (IB) principle (Tishby et al., 2000). From this perspective, optimizing a deep network is a balancing act between two competing goals: the internal representation  $T$  must be rich enough to predict the target  $Y$  (maximizing mutual information  $I(T; Y)$ ), yet compact enough to ignore irrelevant variations in the input  $X$  (minimizing mutual information  $I(T; X)$ ).

The generalization gap ( $\mathcal{G}$ ), defined as the difference between training and test error, is theoretically bounded by the complexity of the internal representation relative to the number of training samples  $M$ . For a representation  $T$ , this bound scales as:

$$\mathcal{G} \lesssim \mathcal{O} \left( \sqrt{\frac{2I(T; X)}{M}} \right) \quad (3)$$

Crucially, in the linear regime of our covariance analysis (assuming Gaussian codebooks), the mutual information  $I(T; X)$  is upper-bounded by the effective dimensionality of the representation. Specifically,  $I(T; X) \approx \frac{1}{2} \log \det(I + \Sigma)$ , which is proportional to our Effective Encoding Dimension (EED) metric,  $N_{eff}^{(l)}$ . Therefore, we propose that the layer-wise generalization bound is controlled by the effective dimension:

$$\epsilon_{gen} \propto \sqrt{\frac{N_{eff}^{(l)}}{M}} \quad (4)$$

This relationship offers a mechanistic explanation for the “U-shaped” profile observed in our results. By aggressively suppressing  $N_{eff}$  in layers  $L_1 - L_4$  (e.g., reducing  $N_{eff}$  to  $\sim 30\%$  of physical capacity in ViT-Small), the network explicitly tightens the bound in Equation 4. We hypothesize that the network utilizes “Phantom Dimensions”—physical dimensions with non-zero but spectrally negligible eigenvalues—to facilitate optimization during early training, pruning them as convergence approaches to satisfy this generalization constraint.

### 2.3 Spectral Entropy as a Measure of Collapse

Measuring Mutual Information  $I(X; T)$  in high-dimensional spaces is computationally intractable. Instead, we use **Spectral Entropy** as a proxy for the volume of the effective state space. For a layer  $l$ , let  $H^{(l)} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D}$  be the matrix of token embeddings. The covariance matrix  $\Sigma^{(l)} = \frac{1}{N}(H^{(l)})^\top H^{(l)}$  captures the second-order statistics of the feature space. The eigenvalues  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_D$  of  $\Sigma^{(l)}$  represent the variance along the principal components. If the representation has "collapsed" to a subspace, many eigenvalues will be close to zero. The Shannon entropy of the normalized eigenvalue distribution  $p_k = \lambda_k / \sum \lambda_j$  provides a continuous measure of this rank:

$$S(\Sigma^{(l)}) = - \sum_{k=1}^D p_k \log p_k \quad (5)$$

This entropy is maximized when the spectrum is flat (isotropy) and minimized when the spectrum is sparse (anisotropy/collapse).

## 3 Methodology

### 3.1 Architecture

We utilize a **ViT-Small** backbone.

- **Patch Size:**  $16 \times 16$  (adapted to  $4 \times 4$  for CIFAR/TinyImageNet to maintain sequence length).
- **Embedding Dimension ( $D$ ):** 384.
- **Heads:** 6.
- **Layers ( $L$ ):** 12.
- **MLP Ratio:** 4.

The choice of ViT-Small is deliberate; it provides enough capacity ( $D = 384$ ) to observe non-trivial compression dynamics, unlike Tiny ( $D = 192$ ) where the dimensions might be fully utilized simply due to lack of capacity.

### 3.2 Training Objective: DINO

We employ DINO (Self-distillation with NO labels) (Caron et al., 2021), a self-supervised method. DINO avoids the "collapse" (trivial solution) problem of self-supervision by using centering and sharpening of the teacher outputs. The loss function is the cross-entropy between the student output probability  $P_s$  and the teacher output probability  $P_t$ :

$$\mathcal{L}_{DINO} = \sum_{x \in \{g_1, g_2\}} \sum_{\substack{x' \in V \\ x' \neq x}} -P_t(x') \log P_s(x) \quad (6)$$

where  $V$  is the set of global and local crops. The teacher weights are an exponential moving average (EMA) of the student weights. DINO is critical for this study because it has been shown to produce attention maps that segment foreground objects (Caron et al., 2021) without supervision. This implies the network structurally isolates "objects" from "background," a process we hypothesize is mechanically implemented via the Inductive Bottleneck.

### 3.3 Effective Encoding Dimension (EED)

The EED metric  $N_{eff}$  is calculated as:

$$N_{eff}^{(l)} = \exp \left( S(\Sigma^{(l)}) \right) \quad (7)$$

We normalize this by the embedding dimension  $D$  to get a percentage score:  $EED\% = (N_{eff}/D) \times 100$ .




Figure 1: Layer-wise Effective Encoding Dimension (EED) for ViT-Small on Tiny ImageNet. The profile clearly shows the "Inductive Bottleneck" structure: high rank at input, compression in the middle ( $L_2$ ), and expansion at output ( $L_{11}$ ).

## 4 Results: The Emergence of the Bottleneck

We analyze the EED profiles of the converged models (100 epochs) across the three datasets.

### 4.1 Quantitative Analysis

#### 4.1.1 The General Extractor (Early Layers)

Across all three datasets, the initial layers ( $L_0 - L_1$ ) maintain relatively high EED. For example, in our Tiny ImageNet experiments (Figure 1),  $L_0$  simplifies only to **58.1%**. This suggests the early layers act as general-purpose feature extractors, akin to the Gabor filters in early CNN layers, preserving most of the input variance including texture and high-frequency noise.

#### 4.1.2 The Bottleneck (Middle Layers)

This is where the datasets diverge significantly, illustrating our core finding. Table 1 summarizes the minimum EED reached by the models.

Table 1: Comparison of Minimum EED (Bottleneck Depth) across datasets.

Dataset	Compositional Type	Image Size	Min EED ( $L_{2-4}$ )
CIFAR-100	Object-Centric (High)	$32 \times 32$	$\sim 23.0\%$
Tiny ImageNet	Object-Centric (Med)	$64 \times 64$	<b>30.5%</b>
UC Merced	Texture-Centric	$256 \times 256$	$\sim 95.0\%$

- **CIFAR-100:** The model aggressively filters information, reaching lows of  $\sim 23\%$ . To classify low-resolution objects, the model must discard almost all background noise.
- **Tiny ImageNet:** The bottleneck is distinct but wider (**30.5%**). The higher resolution allows for more texture information to be relevant to the class identity.
- **UC Merced:** The EED curve remains flat/linear, maintaining  $> 90\%$  rank throughout. In satellite imagery, "texture" is the signal, not noise. The model learns *not* to compress.

#### 4.1.3 The Reconstruction (Late Layers)

In the object-centric datasets, the EED rises sharply in the final layers ( $L_9 - L_{11}$ ). In our Tiny ImageNet run, Layer 11 recovers to **92.5%** EED. This suggests the model “expands” the compressed semantic features back into the full dimensional space. This contradicts the "Neural Collapse" theory for intermediate layers; collapse happens *before* the final layer in self-supervised ViTs, while the final layer is actually high-dimensional to accommodate the projection head’s contrastive requirements.

### 4.2 Qualitative Implication of the Bottleneck

The drop in EED at  $L_2$  corresponds structurally to the mixing of tokens via Self-Attention. A low EED implies that the token embeddings have become highly correlated. In terms of attention maps, this likely corresponds to the phase where the [CLS] token attends broadly to the global image context, or where patch tokens attending to the same object synchronize their representations. The "Bottleneck" is the computational moment where the visual field is segmented into coherent semantic regions, discarding the independent variance of individual pixels.

## 5 Discussion

### 5.1 The Complexity Hypothesis

Our results strongly support the “**Complexity Hypothesis.**” The depth of the Inductive Bottleneck is inversely proportional to the importance of texture.

- **Texture Tasks:** High EED. The model needs to perform "matching" of high-frequency patterns. Memory capacity is key.
- **Object Tasks:** Low EED (Bottleneck). The model needs to perform "abstraction" of shape and concept. Compression is key.

### 5.2 Comparative Architectural Analysis

Conventional wisdom suggests that hierarchical architectures like Swin Transformers (Liu et al., 2021) perform better on vision tasks because they enforce a bottleneck via merging interacting windows. Our work shows that vanilla ViTs **emulate** this hierarchy. However, the vanilla ViT is more flexible. A Swin Transformer *must* compress at fixed stages. A ViT *can* compress at  $L_2$ , or  $L_6$ , or not at all (as seen in UC Merced), depending on the data. This "Soft Inductive Bias" might explain the universality of the ViT architecture across modalities (Image, Audio, Point Clouds) compared to the rigid CNN/Swin hierarchies.

### 5.3 Implications: Active Compression

The bottleneck is an **active compression** mechanism: the model “decides” that reducing dimensionality is the optimal strategy for the data. This mirrors the saddle point optimization dynamics described by Dauphin et al. (2014), where the network navigates a complex landscape by temporarily simplifying the problem space.

---

## 6 Limitations and Future Work

**Scale:** Our experiments were limited to ViT-Small. It remains to be seen if ViT-Large or ViT-Huge exhibit the same relative percentages (e.g., 30%) or if they simply add more "Phantom Dimensions" as hypothesized in earlier iterations of this work. **Task Specificity:** We focused on Classification/DINO. It is unclear if Dense Prediction tasks (Segmentation, Detection) would prevent the formation of a bottleneck to preserve spatial fidelity. **Causal Intervention:** While we observe the bottleneck, we have not casually intervened (e.g., by forcing the rank low) to see if it improves performance. Future work should explore "Spectral Pruning" during training.

## 7 Conclusion

We have identified and analyzed the "Inductive Bottleneck"—a data-driven emergence of representational sparsity in Vision Transformers. We demonstrated that this phenomenon is not an artifact of the architecture, but a learned strategy to deal with compositional complexity.

1. For object-centric data (CIFAR, TinyImageNet), ViTs learn a U-shaped rank profile, compressing information to  $\sim 30\%$  of capacity in middle layers.
2. For texture-centric data (UC Merced), ViTs maintain high rank, operating as maximum-entropy feature banks.

This adaptability explains the success of ViTs: they are not just "isotropic" networks; they are "dynamic hierarchy" networks that build their own bottlenecks on demand.

## References

- Mathilde Caron, Hugo Touvron, Ishan Misra, Hervé Jégou, Julien Mairal, Piotr Bojanowski, and Armand Joulin. Emerging properties in self-supervised vision transformers. *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pp. 9650–9660, 2021.
- Yann N Dauphin, Razvan Pascanu, Caglar Gulcehre, Kyunghyun Cho, Surya Ganguli, and Yoshua Bengio. Identifying and attacking the saddle point problem in high-dimensional non-convex optimization. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 27, 2014.
- Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.
- Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 770–778, 2016.
- Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009.
- Yann LeCun, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey Hinton. Deep learning. *nature*, 521(7553):436–444, 2015.
- Ze Liu, Yutong Lin, Yue Cao, Han Hu, Yixuan Wei, Zheng Zhang, Stephen Lin, and Baining Guo. Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pp. 10012–10022, 2021.
- Maithra Raghu, Thomas Unterthiner, Simon Kornblith, Chiyuan Zhang, and Alexey Dosovitskiy. Do vision transformers see like convolutional neural networks? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:12116–12128, 2021.
- Subhrajit Roy, A Unmesh, and Vinay P Namboodiri. Bayesian active learning for production, a systematic study and a novel approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.05723*, 2020.

---

Naftali Tishby, Fernando C Pereira, and William Bialek. The information bottleneck method. *arXiv preprint physics/0004057*, 2000.

Yi Yang and Shawn Newsam. Bag-of-visual-words and spatial extensions for land-use classification. *Proceedings of the 18th SIGSPATIAL international conference on advances in geographic information systems*, pp. 270–279, 2010.