

PREDICTING HUMAN DECISION MAKING IN PSYCHOLOGICAL TASKS WITH RECURRENT NEURAL NETWORKS

Baihan Lin¹, Djallel Bouneffouf², Guillermo A. Cecchi²

¹ Columbia University, New York, USA

² IBM Research, Yorktown Heights, USA

baihan.lin@columbia.edu, djallel.bouneffouf@ibm.com, gcecchi@us.ibm.com

ABSTRACT

Unlike traditional time series, the action sequences of human decision making usually involve many cognitive processes such as beliefs, desires, intentions and theory of mind, i.e. what others are thinking. This makes predicting human decision making challenging to be treated agnostically to the underlying psychological mechanisms. We propose to use a recurrent neural network architecture based on long short-term memory networks (LSTM) to predict the time series of the actions taken by the human subjects at each step of their decision making, the first application of such methods in this research domain. We trained our prediction networks on the behavioral data from several published psychological experiments of human decision making, and demonstrated a clear advantage over the state-of-the-art methods in predicting human decision making trajectories in both single-agent scenarios such as Iowa Gambling Task and multi-agent scenarios such as Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma. ¹

Index Terms— Behavioral Modeling, LSTM, Recurrent Neural Network, Time Series Forecasting

1. INTRODUCTION

The challenge of predicting human decision is important for many application domains like economy, marketing and artificial intelligence. But the domain where the human behavior modeling is especially crucial is psychology, where the goal is to describe, explain and predict these behaviors. Within this domain, creating agents that effectively mimic human decision making is particularly important. There are many behavioral tasks and analytical methods developed to simulate the process of human decision making in real situations. As a commonly used experience-based task, the Iowa Gambling Task [1] has been modeled as a synthesis of various psychological processes and cognitive elements [2, 3].

While useful for the researchers to breakdown neuropsychologically interpretable variables, these analyses only provide very constrained predictive guidelines, and fall short to

modeling more complicated real-world decision making scenarios such as social dilemmas. As a popular framework to expose tensions between cooperation and defection, the Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma [4] has been studied by computer scientists, economists, and psychologists with different approaches. Beyond cognitive modeling of the effects of game settings and past experiences on the overall tendency to cooperate (or invest in the monetary games) [5, 6], [7] proposed a logistic regression model to directly predict individual actions during the Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma with different settings. This logistic regression model is also the state-of-the-art in predicting action sequences in this task. Another active line of research is to clone and simulate behavioral trajectories with reinforcement learning models that incorporate learning-related parameters inspired by the neurobiological priors of the human brain [8, 9, 10]. While offering discriminative and interpretable features in characterizing the human decision making process, these reinforcement learning models exhibit limited capability to predict the human action sequences in complicated decision making scenarios such as Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma [11].

To date, we can say that the existing approaches suggested to generally describe human decision behavior are based on linear models. However, it is known that human behavior is nonlinear, and the nonlinear models are performing well in many machine learning tasks. Thus, we propose in this paper to study human behavior decision making based on the well known long short-term memory networks (LSTM) to forecast the human decision making on psychological tasks like Iowa gambling task and Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study that applies recurrent neural networks to directly predict sequences of human decision making process. We believe this work can facilitate the understanding of how human behave in online game setting.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. Iowa Gambling Task (IGT)

The original Iowa Gambling Task (IGT) studies decision making where the participant needs to choose one out of four

¹The data and codes to reproduce the empirical results can be accessed at <https://github.com/doi1bh/HumanLSTM>

card decks (named A, B, C, and D), and can win or lose money with each card when choosing a deck to draw from [1], over around 100 actions. In each round, the participants receives feedback about the win (the money he/she wins), the loss (the money he/she loses), and the combined gain (win minus lose). In the MDP setup, from initial state I, the player select one of the four deck to go to state A, B, C, or D, and reveals positive reward r^+ (the win), negative reward r^- (the loss) and combined reward $r = r^+ + r^-$ simultaneously. Decks A and B by default is set to have an expected payout (-25) lower than the better decks, C and D (+25). For base-lines, the combined reward r is used to update the agents. There are two major payoff schemes in IGT. In the traditional payoff scheme, the net outcome of every 10 cards from the bad decks (i.e., decks A and B) is -250, and +250 in the case of the good decks (i.e., decks C and D). There are two decks with frequent losses (decks A and C), and two decks with infrequent losses (decks B and D). All decks have consistent wins (A and B to have +100, while C and D to have +50) and variable losses (summarized in Table 1, where scheme 1 [12] has a more variable losses for deck C than scheme 2 [13]).

2.2. Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma (IPD)

The Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma (IPD) can be defined as a matrix game $G = [N, \{A_i\}_{i \in N}, \{R_i\}_{i \in N}]$, where N is the set of agents, A_i is the set of actions available to agent i with \mathcal{A} being the joint action space $A_1 \times \dots \times A_n$, and R_i is the reward function for agent i . A special case of this generic multi-agent IPD is the classical two-agent case (Table 2). In this game, each agent has two actions: cooperate (C) and defect (D), and can receive one of the four possible rewards: R (Reward), P (Penalty), S (Sucker), and T (Temptation). In the multi-agent setting, if all agents Cooperates (C), they all receive Reward (R); if all agents defects (D), they all receive Penalty (P); if some agents Cooperate (C) and some Defect (D), cooperators receive Sucker (S) and defector receive Temptation (T). The four payoffs satisfy the following inequalities: $T > R > P > S$ and $2R > T + S$. The PD is a one round game, but is commonly studied in a manner where the prior outcomes matter to understand the evolution of cooperative behaviour from complex dynamics [14].

3. PREDICTION WITH RECURRENT NETWORKS

The prediction framework of the recurrent neural networks is illustrated in Figure 3: at each time step, the historical action from the last time step is fed into the recurrent neural networks as input, and the network outputs a predicted action for the following time step. In the single-agent setting (i.e. the human subject makes his or her decision without interactions with other players), the input and output of the recurrent neural networks both consist of the player’s action. In the multi-agent setting (i.e. the human subject makes his or her decision




Fig. 1. Prediction Framework with a Recurrent Network: at each time step t , the historical action from the last time step x_t is fed into the recurrent neural networks as input, and the network outputs a predicted action x_{t+1} for the following time step and updates its hidden state h_t .

based on not only his own prior actions and rewards, but also the actions performed by other participants of the game), the input features consist of the actions performed by all participants in the game in the last time step. In both scenarios, we code the actions into a multi-dimensional one-hot representation before serving to the prediction network.

4. EMPIRICAL EVALUATION

4.1. Modeling Iowa Gambling Task

Dataset. The raw data and descriptions of Iowa Gambling Task can be downloaded at [15]. It consists of the behavioral trajectories of 617 healthy human subjects performing the Iowa Gambling Task. The data set consists of original experimental results from 10 different studies, administrated with different lengths of trials (95, 100 and 150 actions). We pool all the subjects together and truncated all the actions to be 617 trajectories of 95 actions.

Baseline and benchmark. We compare our LSTM model with the standard vector autoregression model [16]. The autocorrelation is trained on all available sequences in the training set. Same as our LSTM network, autoregression model takes a multi-dimensional one-hot-based feature tensor (of the previous time steps) as its observation window, and then outputs the next predicted action. For empirical evaluation, we chose our prediction network to be a two-layer LSTM network with 10 neurons at each layers. This is to showcase the effectiveness of our recurrent neural networks even if the parameter set is very small. We randomly split the dataset by 80/20 as the training set and the test set, and evaluated it with randomized crossvalidation.

Population prediction. As in the payoff schemes from Table 1, the Iowa Gambling Task has two actions that are more preferable (giving more rewards) than the other two. In psychology and neuroscience literature of Iowa Gambling Task, the percentage of choosing these two “better” actions is usually reported as a function of time, and used to character-

Table 1. Schemes of Iowa Gambling Task

Decks	win per card	loss per card	expected value	scheme
A (bad)	+100	Frequent: -150 (p=0.1), -200 (p=0.1), -250 (p=0.1), -300 (p=0.1), -350 (p=0.1)	-25	1
B (bad)	+100	Infrequent: -1250 (p=0.1)	-25	1
C (good)	+50	Frequent: -25 (p=0.1), -75 (p=0.1), -50 (p=0.3)	+25	1
D (good)	+50	Infrequent: -250 (p=0.1)	+25	1
A (bad)	+100	Frequent: -150 (p=0.1), -200 (p=0.1), -250 (p=0.1), -300 (p=0.1), -350 (p=0.1)	-25	2
B (bad)	+100	Infrequent: -1250 (p=0.1)	-25	2
C (good)	+50	Infrequent: -50 (p=0.5)	+25	2
D (good)	+50	Infrequent: -250 (p=0.1)	+25	2

Table 2. IPD Payoff

	C	D
C	R,R	S,T
D	T,S	P,P

ize the learning progress of the human subjects. We record this metric to evaluate how well the behavioral trajectory predicted by a model captures the ground truth of the human decision making sequence. As shown in Figure 2, both the LSTM and the autoregression model capture the learning dynamics of the human subjects well.

Individual prediction. Despite a comparable performance in predicting the overall trend of the learning progress. The capability of a prediction model to capture the action strategy during each individual game is a more challenging objective. For instance, it is possible for a bad prediction model to forecast every individual trajectories incorrectly given their corresponding heterogeneous prior history, while maintaining a perfect prediction for the composition of actions in the population sense. Therefore, we report the mean squared error (MSE) between the predicted sequences and the ground truth in order to understand the performance of the models in the individual sense. As shown in Figure 3, the overall MSE drops as the observation window increases (i.e. the model has seen more historical time series). The LSTM predicts the individual trajectories better, with the lowest average MSE of 0.015 across all prediction time steps, beating the MSE by autoregression, 0.020, by a significant amount since the first few prediction time steps.

4.2. Modeling Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma

Dataset. We collated the human data comprising 168,386 individual decisions from many human subjects experiments [17, 18, 19, 6, 5, 20, 21, 22] that used real financial incentives and transparently conveyed the rules of the game to the subjects. As a standard procedure in experimental economics, subjects anonymously interact with each other and their decisions to cooperate or defect at each time period of each interaction are recorded. They receive payoffs proportional to the outcomes in the same or similar payoff as the one we used in




Fig. 2. Learning Curve: Both the LSTM and autoregression model capture the learning dynamics of the human subjects in IGT as measure by the evolution of the rate of selection of the better actions.




Fig. 3. Individual Trajectories: Prediction MSE in IGT.

Table 2. Following the similar preprocessing steps as [7], we were able to construct the comprehensive collection of game structures and individual decisions from the description of the experiments in the published papers and the publicly available data sets. This comprehensive dataset consists of behavioral trajectories of different time horizons, ranging from 2 to 30 rounds, but most of these experimental data only host full historical information of at most past 9 actions. We further selected only those trajectories with these full historical information, which comprised 8,257 behavioral trajectories of 9 actions each for both players.

Baseline and benchmark. We compare with two baselines. The first baseline is a logistic regression taking into




Fig. 4. Cooperation Rate: The LSTM model characterizes human cooperation much better than the baselines in IPD.




Fig. 5. Individual Trajectories: Prediction MSE in IPD

account a group of handcrafted features such as the game settings and historical actions [7]. It is reported as the state-of-the-art in the task of predicting human decision making in the task of Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma. Similar to the Iowa Gambling Task prediction, we include the standard vector autoregression model [16] as our second baseline. Similar to the empirical evaluation in Iowa Gambling Task, here we still chose our prediction network to be a two-layer LSTM network with 10 neurons at each layers for the Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma prediction. We randomly split the dataset by 80/20 as the training set and the test set, and evaluated it with randomized cross-validation.

Population prediction. The tendency to cooperation is an important subject of interest in Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma, because it characterizes the core trade-off between self-interest and social benefit. The cooperation rate is also the metric used by the state-of-the-art paper in predicting Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma sequences [7]. We record the cooperation rate to evaluate how close the behavioral trajectory predicted by a model captures the ground truth of the human decision making sequence. As shown in Figure 4, the autoregression model overestimates the cooperation rate of human decision making by a significant amount. The state-of-the-art model in this task, the logistic regression model [7] performs a better job than the autoregression model, but still falls short at capturing the subtle dynamics of human cooperation over

time. Unlike the baselines, our LSTM model perfectly predicts the cooperation rate, although it is only trained to predict the individual actions instead of the cooperation rate.

Individual prediction. Given the same intuition from the Iowa Gambling Task, a model that predicts the cooperation rate well doesn’t guarantee it captures the correct action strategies used by each individual trajectories. As shown in Figure 5, LSTM has a lower average MSE of 0.12 across all prediction time steps, beating the two baselines, autoregression (0.18) and logistic regression (0.75), by a significant amount. In addition, the prediction error by the three models offers several surprising observations:

- (1) Unlike Iowa Gambling Task, the information asymmetry caused by the unknown human opponent complicates the prediction task, such that the prediction error doesn’t follow a monotonic decrease when the observation window increases;
- (2) although the logistic regression model (the state-of-the-art) predicts the population-wise cooperation rate, it fails heavily at predicting individual actions;
- (3) Despite the significant overestimation of population cooperation rate, the autoregression model maintained a relatively low prediction error with a similar trend as the best model, our LSTM model;
- (4) During the intermediate phase (the 4th or the 5th round) of the Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma game, the prediction error appears to be the largest for the logistic regression model, but the smallest for the autoregression and LSTM models.

We believe that predicting the Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma is a much more difficult task than predicting the Iowa Gambling Task due to its additional complications from the multi-agent and social dilemma settings. The clear advantage of the LSTM model over the baseline in this task, demonstrated the merit that the recurrent neural network better captures realistic human decision making and offers reliable prediction of individualized human behaviors.

5. CONCLUSION

We introduced an LSTM network to predict the action sequences of human decision making process in Iowa Gambling Task and Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma. As the first attempt to utilize recurrent neural networks to directly predict human action sequences in these behavioral tasks, our approach matches existing baselines in predicting both the population trends and the individual strategies, in the IGT task, and then outperforms in the IPD task. We find the latter particularly noteworthy given that IPD is a cognitively more complex task, as it involves multiple agents trying to predict each other’s behavior. Next steps include extending our evaluations to human behavioral trajectories in other sequential decision making environments with more complicated and mixed incentive structure, such as Diplomacy, Poker and chess playing, as well as efforts to implement alternative recurrent models more readily amenable to interpretation from the neuroscientific and psychological perspectives.

6. REFERENCES

- [1] Antoine Bechara, Antonio R Damasio, Hanna Damasio, and Steven W Anderson, “Insensitivity to future consequences following damage to human prefrontal cortex,” *Cognition*, vol. 50, no. 1-3, pp. 7–15, 1994.
- [2] Jerome R Busemeyer and Julie C Stout, “A contribution of cognitive decision models to clinical assessment: decomposing performance on the bechara gambling task,” *Psychological assessment*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 253, 2002.
- [3] Woo-Young Ahn, Jerome R Busemeyer, Eric-Jan Wagenmakers, and Julie C Stout, “Comparison of decision learning models using the generalization criterion method,” *Cognitive science*, vol. 32, no. 8, pp. 1376–1402, 2008.
- [4] Robert Axelrod, “Effective choice in the prisoner’s dilemma,” *Journal of conflict resolution*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 3–25, 1980.
- [5] Howard Kunreuther, Gabriel Silvasi, Eric Bradlow, Dylan Small, et al., “Bayesian analysis of deterministic and stochastic prisoner’s dilemma games,” *Judgment and Decision Making*, vol. 4, no. 5, pp. 363, 2009.
- [6] John Duffy, Jack Ochs, et al., “Cooperative behavior and the frequency of social interaction,” *Games and Economic Behavior*, vol. 66, no. 2, pp. 785–812, 2009.
- [7] John J Nay and Yevgeniy Vorobeychik, “Predicting human cooperation,” *PloS one*, vol. 11, no. 5, 2016.
- [8] Baihan Lin, Djallel Bouneffouf, and Guillermo Cecchi, “Unified models of human behavioral agents in bandits, contextual bandits, and rl,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.04544*, 2020.
- [9] Baihan Lin, Djallel Bouneffouf, Jenna Reinen, Irina Rish, and Guillermo Cecchi, “A story of two streams: Reinforcement learning models from human behavior and neuropsychiatry,” in *Proceedings of the Nineteenth International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems, AAMAS-20*. 5 2020, pp. 744–752, International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems.
- [10] Baihan Lin, Djallel Bouneffouf, and Guillermo Cecchi, “Split q learning: reinforcement learning with two-stream rewards,” in *Proceedings of the 28th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. AAAI Press, 2019, pp. 6448–6449.
- [11] Baihan Lin, Djallel Bouneffouf, and Guillermo Cecchi, “Online learning in iterated prisoner’s dilemma to mimic human behavior,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.06580*, 2020.
- [12] Daniel J Fridberg, Sarah Queller, Woo-Young Ahn, Woojae Kim, Anthony J Bishara, Jerome R Busemeyer, Linda Porrino, and Julie C Stout, “Cognitive mechanisms underlying risky decision-making in chronic cannabis users,” *Journal of mathematical psychology*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 28–38, 2010.
- [13] Annette Horstmann, Arno Villringer, and Jane Neumann, “Iowa gambling task: There is more to consider than long-term outcome. using a linear equation model to disentangle the impact of outcome and frequency of gains and losses,” *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, vol. 6, pp. 61, 2012.
- [14] Robert Axelrod and William Donald Hamilton, “The evolution of cooperation,” *science*, vol. 211, no. 4489, pp. 1390–1396, 1981.
- [15] Helen Steingroever, Daniel J Fridberg, Annette Horstmann, Kimberly L Kjome, Veena Kumari, Scott D Lane, Tiago V Maia, James L McClelland, Thorsten Pachur, Preethi Premkumar, et al., “Data from 617 healthy participants performing the iowa gambling task: A” many labs” collaboration,” *Journal of Open Psychology Data*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 340–353, 2015.
- [16] Helmut Lütkepohl, *New introduction to multiple time series analysis*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2005.
- [17] James Andreoni and John H Miller, “Rational cooperation in the finitely repeated prisoner’s dilemma: Experimental evidence,” *The economic journal*, vol. 103, no. 418, pp. 570–585, 1993.
- [18] Pedro Dal Bó, “Cooperation under the shadow of the future: experimental evidence from infinitely repeated games,” *American economic review*, vol. 95, no. 5, pp. 1591–1604, 2005.
- [19] Yoella Bereby-Meyer and Alvin E Roth, “The speed of learning in noisy games: Partial reinforcement and the sustainability of cooperation,” *American Economic Review*, vol. 96, no. 4, pp. 1029–1042, 2006.
- [20] Pedro Dal Bó and Guillaume R Fréchette, “The evolution of cooperation in infinitely repeated games: Experimental evidence,” *American Economic Review*, vol. 101, no. 1, pp. 411–29, 2011.
- [21] Daniel Friedman and Ryan Oprea, “A continuous dilemma,” *American Economic Review*, vol. 102, no. 1, pp. 337–63, 2012.
- [22] Drew Fudenberg, David G Rand, and Anna Dreber, “Slow to anger and fast to forgive: Cooperation in an uncertain world,” *American Economic Review*, vol. 102, no. 2, pp. 720–49, 2012.