

# Mind Your Theory: Theory of Mind Goes Deeper Than Reasoning

Eitan Wagner<sup>\*1</sup> Nitay Alon<sup>\*1,2</sup> Joseph M. Barnby<sup>3</sup> Omri Abend<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hebrew University of Jerusalem <sup>2</sup> MPI for Biological Cybernetics

<sup>3</sup> Royal Holloway University of London

{eitan.wagner, nitay.alon}@mail.huji.ac.il

## Abstract

Theory of Mind (ToM) capabilities in LLMs have recently become a central object of investigation. Cognitive science distinguishes between two steps required for ToM tasks: 1) determine whether to invoke ToM, which includes the appropriate Depth of Mentalizing (DoM), or level of recursion required to complete a task; and 2) applying the correct inference given the DoM. In this position paper, we first identify several lines of work in different communities in AI, including LLM benchmarking, ToM add-ons, ToM probing, and formal models for ToM. We argue that recent work in AI tends to focus exclusively on the second step which are typically framed as static logic problems. We conclude with suggestions for improved evaluation of ToM capabilities inspired by dynamic environments used in cognitive tasks.

## 1 Introduction

The ability of Large Language Models (LLMs) to efficiently integrate social information is essential for ensuring AI trust and safety. This capability relies on inferring and representing the beliefs, desires, and intentions of other synthetic and biological agents, also known as mentalizing, or Theory of Mind (ToM) (Premack and Woodruff, 1978).

LLMs have been recently regarded as general-purpose reasoning models (Brown et al., 2020), and their ToM capabilities have come under scrutiny, particularly as to whether social cognition can emerge purely from associations principles (Sap et al., 2022). Notably, Kosinski (2023) claimed that ToM capabilities emerge in post-GPT3 models, like ToM in children (Astington and Jenkins, 1995). This claim sparked debates as to the correct interpretation of these results (Ullman, 2023; Pi et al., 2024).

ToM capabilities involve two steps: (1) determine the depth of mentalization to use, which

<sup>\*</sup>Equal contribution.




Figure 1: Overview of ToM error types. Existing benchmarks deal with cases of clear ToM intention and do not distinguish between Type B and Type C errors. In contrast, the question of invoking ToM should address Type A and Type B errors.

specifically includes the decision of whether to model the agents separately (self-other divide); and (2) apply correct inference for each agent’s mental state, given the depth. Failure in any of the steps leads to an incorrect conclusion (Fig. 1).

Existing benchmarks for ToM primarily concentrate on whether agents hold correct beliefs about others, however as we will show, very little attention is paid to whether LLMs can distinctly model self-other states. Nevertheless determining this is critical in three ways: 1) it ignores a critical theoretical component of ToM which has been well defined in humans, 2) it confounds errors with poor or fuzzy social logic (Pi et al., 2024), and 3) the act of mentalizing has a price, both in resources

and performance (Rilling et al., 2004; Keysar et al., 2003; Devaine et al., 2014), and more precisely understanding moment-to-moment ToM in LLMs may improve compute efficiency at equivalent parameter sizes.

In this paper, we first discuss contemporary approaches to ToM in AI research. This includes LLM benchmarks, ToM injection for LLMs, Probing LLMs for ToM, and agent-focused ToM models. We identify that the focal point of this research is the correct attribution of mental states. We then turn to cognitive science. We identify a discrepancy between the science behind biological and synthetic agents, as the former focuses on the act of mentalizing as well as correct inference. We finally identify ways to improve AI science, inspired by work in biological agents.

Our contributions are: (1) Synthesis of ToM across fields (2) Identification of gaps between the cognitive and AI science literature; and (3) We provide a road map for appropriate evaluation of ToM invocation inspired by cognitive science and biological agents.

## 2 ToM in AI research

Here we synthesize the various approaches and challenges used to assess ToM in the AI community.

### 2.1 ToM Benchmarking

Evaluation of LLMs on ToM benchmarks is an active line of research. A dominant component in these tests is variations of the Sally-Anne (SA) test (Wimmer and Perner, 1983; Baron-Cohen et al., 1985). In the SA test, participants are tested on their ability to identify false beliefs, by recognizing that Anne has moved a ball, but that Sally is not exposed to this event and therefore maintains the belief that the ball did not move.

Variations of the SA task have been used as a gold-standard benchmark for ToM in LLMs (Grant et al., 2017; Nematzadeh et al., 2018; Gandhi et al., 2023). Other works improve these datasets to control for spurious correlations and provide more natural settings. This includes: ToMi Le et al. (2019), OpenToM (Xu et al., 2024) Rather than vignette-based tasks, some benchmarks use a language-based conversational setting to assess ToM reasoning, such as Mindcraft (Bara et al., 2021), FanTom (Kim et al., 2023), and NegotiationToM (Chan et al., 2024). Some benchmarks extend the SA

task to more complex objectives. This includes higher-order ToM, as in HiToM (Wu et al., 2023); additional perception inference, as in Percept-ToMi and Percept-FANToM (Jung et al., 2024); and epistemic logic conclusions, as in (Sileo and Lerno, 2023). Additional extensions derive questions from common ground annotations, as in CommonToM (Soubki et al., 2024) or from other modalities, as in MMToM-QA (Jin et al., 2024).

The utility of these tasks in assessing ToM in LLMs is still a matter of debate. GPT3 showed difficulties engaging with ToMi Sap et al. (2022), whereas more complex models have been argued to show more success Kosinski (2023); Gandhi et al. (2023). Nevertheless, slight alterations to task structure can break these effects (Ullman, 2023; Shapira et al., 2024; Ma et al., 2023a; Chen et al., 2024; Nickel et al., 2024), and this is typically interpreted as a failure in reasoning complexity (Pi et al., 2024). Other criticisms of current benchmarks are the lack of transparency in the training set used to compare LLMs with human-like performance (Ma et al., 2023b; Shapira et al., 2024).

Notably, all these benchmarks are static, in the sense that they deal with pure observation rather than moment-to-moment model evolution during interaction (Ma et al., 2023b).

### 2.2 ToM Add-ons

We describe methods to improve ToM as *ToM Add-ons*. We note that these components do not attempt to evaluate LLMs' ToM capabilities on their own but rather attempt to complement LLMs with external modules.

Prompting techniques refinement have shown improved scores on classic tasks (Tan et al., 2024; Jung et al., 2024; Huang et al., 2024; Wilf et al., 2024). Explicit symbolic modules can also be updated based on the input and improve repeated accuracy (Qiu et al., 2024; Hou et al., 2024). Others add post-model decoding methods (Sclar et al., 2023) or symbolic planners (Jin et al., 2024) to boost performance.

### 2.3 Linear Probing for ToM

Linear probing (Alain and Bengio, 2018) is a method for investigating internal representations of neural models by training linear classifiers on intermediate layers to predict some variable of interest. Representations that can be used for linear predictions of some target variable are assumed to encode it to some extent.

Following the popularity of these ideas, [Zhu et al. \(2024\)](#) and [Bortoletto et al. \(2024\)](#) apply probing to representations of mind states (e.g., for Sally-Anne tests, by testing whether the correct location can be predicted with a linear classifier).

## 2.4 Formal Architectures of ToM

Inspired by Reinforcement Learning (RL), ToM has been modeled as an inferential process by which an observer infers the goals of an agent from the agent’s actions ([Baker et al., 2011](#); [Jara-Ettinger, 2019](#); [Jara-Ettinger et al., 2016](#)). This approach is similar to Inverse-RL ([Ng and Russell, 2000](#)). This concept has also been instantiated as neural network process [Rabinowitz et al. \(2018\)](#). This model can be categorized as an inferring agent that learns an association between actions and unobserved variables such as goals or future actions.

While useful for observational tasks (e.g., Sally-Anne tasks), they are limited to observation, also known as zero-level Depth of Mentalizing (DoM) – DoM(0) ([Barnby et al., 2023](#); [Alon et al., 2024](#)). This means the inferring agent does not allow for recursive beliefs (“I think that you think that I think”). Instead, it is limited to shallower mentalizing – “I think that that you think” (Fig. 2). Including recursive structure may allow the acting agent to infer and predict how another agent perceives them, and act to influence the behavior by manipulating this image. Implicitly a shallow architecture also assumes a benign observer, whose decisions do not affect the observed agent.

More complex models are used to solve this issue. Predominantly, the Interactive-POMDP (IPOMDP; [Gmytrasiewicz and Doshi, 2005](#)) allows other agents as part of the world model. We refer the reader to [Alon et al. \(2023\)](#) for a full introduction of the model and its applications in multi-agent environments. While allowing for recursive ToM, the IPOMDP has two major pitfalls. First, it assumes that an agent’s DoM level is fixed (for example a DoM( $k$ )) and that the agent views other agents as having a fixed DoM( $k - 1$ ) level. This assumption limits the model and is contradicted by empirical evidence (see next section). Second, this model (and those similar) is computationally demanding and intractable in many cases, thus restricting IPOMDP models to simple tasks with tractable nested beliefs.

There has been an attempt to integrate recursive formulations into LLMs. However, due to the black-box nature of LLMs this is difficult to capture




Figure 2: Hierarchical Theory of Mind (ToM). Depth of Mentalizing (DoM) indicates how much an agent (blue) recursively nests beliefs about their partner (orange). At DoM(-1) the agent only considers their own policy ( $\pi$ ). DoM(0) beliefs consider  $\pi$  and a partner’s  $\pi$ . DoM(1) beliefs consider DoM(0) and the beliefs of the partner about the agent’s  $\pi$ .

([Zhang et al., 2023](#); [Hu and Shu, 2023](#)).

## 3 What Can We Learn From Cognitive and Social Science?

Cognitive science, Economics, and Neuroscience have explored ToM for decades. We believe that principles from these fields can inspire more transparent and efficient architecture in LLMs and AI in general.

Given a problem (=prompt)  $X$  and a variable of interest  $Y$  (e.g., the correct location of the object in a Sally-Anne test), the general goal is to infer the top class based on  $P(Y|X)$ . We formalize the process (see Fig. 1) as two steps – first the meta-decision of whether to invoke ToM or not, and then the reasoning process of correctly attributing states to agents given the ToM invoking decision. In terms of *do*-calculus ([Pearl, 2012](#)), the second step can consist of inference *without* ToM, based on  $P_{\text{DoM}(-1)}(Y|X) := P(Y|do(\text{DoM}(-1)), X)$ , or inference *with* ToM, based on  $P_{\text{DoM}(k \geq 0)}(Y|X) := P(Y|do(\text{DoM}(k \geq 0)), X)$ .

### 3.1 Invoking DoM

Several theoretical and empirical cognitive works identify the common principles for social interaction. Biological agents performing cooperative tasks can afford very shallow mentalizing ([Devaine et al., 2014](#)) and instead rely on a common policy (e.g., social norms or prosocial goals). As soon as competition is introduced hierarchical mentalizing is beneficial to avoid duplicitous action ([Alon et al., 2023](#)). However, moving from a shallow to a hierarchical level of mentalizing is more expen-

sive, requiring additional time and energy to compute, and biological agents have limited resources (Sweller, 1988; Bossaerts and Murawski, 2017). This limits the ability to perform ToM-demanding tasks for a long time Rilling et al. (2004), and can lead to failures in social reasoning when neural architecture has developed inefficiently (Barnby et al., 2022). LLMs do not have the same energy demands as humans, and may not be limited by the same energy-conserving principles that enforce cooperation. Failures to appropriately capture the degree to which LLMs can move into competitive modes of mentalizing may hinder human-AI alignment.

### 3.2 Inference Failure

Even with adaptively invoked ToM, an agent may still be incorrect. For example, being fixed at shallow-DoM may miss malicious intent from other agents (Sarkadi et al., 2019). On the other hand, invoking hierarchical DoM during a cooperative problem can induce false beliefs of harm (Alon et al., 2024). How can LLMs auto-tune their ToM level without explicit instructions to do so? Without a specific architecture to measure and instill this, it is difficult to build an LLM that can adapt on the fly.

### 3.3 Revisiting Existing Work

**What do the ToM benchmarks benchmark?** With current vignette-based reasoning tasks, current benchmarks practically address  $P_{DoM(k,k \geq 0)}(Y|X)$ . More challenging benchmarks are constantly introduced but still focus on non-interactive presentations. This precludes the need to use ToM or even reason about self vs. other distinctions.

We note that even if  $DoM$  is not given, as long as we test the prediction for  $Y|X$ , we cannot determine whether performance on the test reflects a ToM ability. If the model was incorrect, we do not know if the failure was due to undermentalizing (Type B error) or due to failed reasoning (Type C error). If the model was correct but ToM is unnecessary, then we don't know if the success was based on the correct ToM (Type A error) (Kim et al., 2023). Only if ToM is necessary and the model succeeded, can we conclude that ToM was used and correctly so (with the caveat of spurious correlations).

**What do ToM Add-ons Add?** Similarly, typical NLP works on ToM add-ons propose methods while assuming  $DoM(k \geq 0)$  is necessary. The decision about the required DoM level is unaddressed (Type A and B errors).

**What do linear probes probe?** A linear probe for ToM representations is trained to predict an agent's mental state. These works typically have the same issues as benchmarks – the premise and questions are usually such that it is clearly intended for ToM to be invoked. The probe does not distinguish between failure based on incorrect ToM levels (Type B error) and failure for other reasons (Type C error).

**What do formal models model?** Typical works on inverse RL propose models that inherently assume  $DoM(0)$ . While these models are beneficial for learning at this level, they do not address the step of invoking DoM (Type A and B errors). Some exceptions are the work of Alon et al. (2023) and Hula et al. (2015), which we use as inspiration for DoM. Nonetheless, even these works assume a fixed, immutable DoM level – they assume that ToM is needed and invoked for inference within a given task. A comprehensive model that examines all the steps proposed in Fig 1 is, to the best of our knowledge, missing from this literature.

## 4 Discussion and Conclusion

In this work, we approached ToM in LLMs as an interdisciplinary topic. We argue that NLP benchmarks and AI works typically address non-interactive logic problems. While many of the benchmarks are valuable as reasoning tests and may provide insights into the performance of LLMs, they do not address the core issue of ToM in LLMs, interaction and adaptive mentalizing.

We argue that a better understanding of ToM requires (1) benchmarks that test whether ToM is correctly invoked or not, (2) evaluation for ToM in interactive settings where the model is an active agent, and (3) evaluation for the appropriate degree of DoM, given a social context (cooperative vs competitive).

Some works introduce ToM tasks for LLMs in interactive domains (Sclar et al., 2022; Li et al., 2023), albeit with a simplified context. These serve as important steps for the evaluation of LLMs' ToM capabilities.



## Limitations

In this work we point to limitations in existing ToM works for LLMs. Many of our suggestions are empirical questions and will need to be supported by data.

Our work focuses on attributed beliefs, which are a single component of ToM. Previous work has pointed out that true evaluation of ToM must include many other factors, such as emotions and desires (Ma et al., 2023b). Despite this limitation, we note that belief attribution remains a critical component in ToM evaluation.

We also note that the ToM literature in cognitive science is vast and often conflicting. The components of ToM are actively debated and thus our recommendations must be held in light of this

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by the Israel Science Foundation (grant no. 2424/21)(EW, OA) and from the Max Planck Society (NA)

## References

- Guillaume Alain and Yoshua Bengio. 2018. [Understanding intermediate layers using linear classifier probes](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1610.01644.
- Nitay Alon, Lion Schulz, Vaughan Bell, Michael Moutoussis, Peter Dayan, and Joseph M Barnby. 2024. (mal) adaptive mentalizing in the cognitive hierarchy, and its link to paranoia. *Computational Psychiatry*, 8(1):159.
- Nitay Alon, Lion Schulz, Jeffrey S. Rosenschein, and Peter Dayan. 2023. [A \(dis-\)information theory of revealed and unrevealed preferences: Emerging deception and skepticism via theory of mind](#). *Open Mind*, 7:608–624.
- Janet Wilde Astington and Jennifer M Jenkins. 1995. Theory of mind development and social understanding. *Cognition & Emotion*, 9(2-3):151–165.
- Chris Baker, Rebecca Saxe, and Joshua Tenenbaum. 2011. Bayesian theory of mind: Modeling joint belief-desire attribution. In *Proceedings of the annual meeting of the cognitive science society*, volume 33.
- Cristian-Paul Bara, Sky CH-Wang, and Joyce Chai. 2021. [MindCraft: Theory of mind modeling for situated dialogue in collaborative tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1112–1125, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Joseph M Barnby, Peter Dayan, and Vaughan Bell. 2023. Formalising social representation to explain psychiatric symptoms. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 27(3):317–332.
- Joseph M Barnby, Ryan J Dean, Henry Burgess, Jeffrey Kim, Alessa K Teunisse, Lisa Mackenzie, Gail A Robinson, Peter Dayan, and Linda J Richards. 2022. Increased persuadability and credulity in people with corpus callosum dysgenesis. *Cortex*, 155:251–263.
- Simon Baron-Cohen, Alan M Leslie, and Uta Frith. 1985. Does the autistic child have a “theory of mind”? *Cognition*, 21(1):37–46.
- Matteo Bortoletto, Constantin Ruhdorfer, Lei Shi, and Andreas Bulling. 2024. [Benchmarking mental state representations in language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2406.17513.
- Peter Bossaerts and Carsten Murawski. 2017. Computational complexity and human decision-making. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 21(12):917–929.
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2005.14165.
- Chunkit Chan, Cheng Jiayang, Yauwai Yim, Zheyang Deng, Wei Fan, Haoran Li, Xin Liu, Hongming Zhang, Weiqi Wang, and Yangqiu Song. 2024. [NegotiationToM: A benchmark for stress-testing machine theory of mind on negotiation surrounding](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 4211–4241, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhuang Chen, Jincenzi Wu, Jinfeng Zhou, Bosi Wen, Guanqun Bi, Gongyao Jiang, Yaru Cao, Mengting Hu, Yunghwei Lai, Zexuan Xiong, and Minlie Huang. 2024. [ToMBench: Benchmarking theory of mind in large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15959–15983, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Marie Devaine, Guillaume Hollard, and Jean Daunizeau. 2014. Theory of mind: did evolution fool us? *PLoS One*, 9(2):e87619.
- Kanishk Gandhi, Jan-Philipp Fränken, Tobias Gerstenberg, and Noah D. Goodman. 2023. [Understanding social reasoning in language models with language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2306.15448.

- Piotr J Gmytrasiewicz and Prashant Doshi. 2005. A framework for sequential planning in multi-agent settings. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 24:49–79.
- Erin Grant, Aida Nematzadeh, and Thomas L Griffiths. 2017. How can memory-augmented neural networks pass a false-belief task? In *CogSci*.
- Guiyang Hou, Wenqi Zhang, Yongliang Shen, Linjuan Wu, and Weiming Lu. 2024. [TimeToM: Temporal space is the key to unlocking the door of large language models’ theory-of-mind](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 11532–11547, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhiting Hu and Tianmin Shu. 2023. [Language models, agent models, and world models: The law for machine reasoning and planning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2312.05230.
- X. Angelo Huang, Emanuele La Malfa, Samuele Marro, Andrea Asperti, Anthony G. Cohn, and Michael J. Wooldridge. 2024. [A notion of complexity for theory of mind via discrete world models](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 2964–2983, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Andreas Hula, P Read Montague, and Peter Dayan. 2015. Monte carlo planning method estimates planning horizons during interactive social exchange. *PLoS computational biology*, 11(6):e1004254.
- Julian Jara-Ettinger. 2019. Theory of mind as inverse reinforcement learning. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 29:105–110.
- Julian Jara-Ettinger, Hyowon Gweon, Laura E Schulz, and Joshua B Tenenbaum. 2016. The naïve utility calculus: Computational principles underlying commonsense psychology. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 20(8):589–604.
- Chuangyang Jin, Yutong Wu, Jing Cao, Jiannan Xiang, Yen-Ling Kuo, Zhiting Hu, Tomer Ullman, Antonio Torralba, Joshua Tenenbaum, and Tianmin Shu. 2024. [MMToM-QA: Multimodal theory of mind question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 16077–16102, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chani Jung, Dongkwan Kim, Jiho Jin, Jiseon Kim, Yeon Seonwoo, Yejin Choi, Alice Oh, and Hyunwoo Kim. 2024. [Perceptions to beliefs: Exploring precursory inferences for theory of mind in large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 19794–19809, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Boaz Keysar, Shuhong Lin, and Dale J Barr. 2003. Limits on theory of mind use in adults. *Cognition*, 89(1):25–41.
- Hyunwoo Kim, Melanie Sclar, Xuhui Zhou, Ronan Bras, Gunhee Kim, Yejin Choi, and Maarten Sap. 2023. [FANToM: A benchmark for stress-testing machine theory of mind in interactions](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 14397–14413, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Michal Kosinski. 2023. Theory of mind may have spontaneously emerged in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.02083*, 4:169.
- Matthew Le, Y-Lan Boureau, and Maximilian Nickel. 2019. [Revisiting the evaluation of theory of mind through question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 5872–5877, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Huaoli Li, Yu Chong, Simon Stepputtis, Joseph Campbell, Dana Hughes, Charles Lewis, and Katia Sycara. 2023. [Theory of mind for multi-agent collaboration via large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 180–192, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xiaomeng Ma, Lingyu Gao, and Qihui Xu. 2023a. [ToM-Challenges: A principle-guided dataset and diverse evaluation tasks for exploring theory of mind](#). In *Proceedings of the 27th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL)*, pages 15–26, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ziqiao Ma, Jacob Sansom, Run Peng, and Joyce Chai. 2023b. [Towards a holistic landscape of situated theory of mind in large language models](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 1011–1031, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aida Nematzadeh, Kaylee Burns, Erin Grant, Alison Gopnik, and Tom Griffiths. 2018. [Evaluating theory of mind in question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2392–2400, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Andrew Ng and Stuart Russell. 2000. Algorithms for inverse reinforcement learning. *ICML ’00 Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Christian Nickel, Laura Schrewe, and Lucie Flek. 2024. [Probing the robustness of theory of mind in large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2410.06271.
- Judea Pearl. 2012. The do-calculus revisited. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1210.4852*.
- Zhiqiang Pi, Annapurna Vadaparty, Benjamin K. Bergen, and Cameron R. Jones. 2024. [Dissecting the Ullman variations with a scalpel: Why do llms fail at](#)

- trivial alterations to the false belief task? *Preprint*, arXiv:2406.14737.
- David Premack and Guy Woodruff. 1978. Does the chimpanzee have a theory of mind? *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 1(4):515–526.
- Shuwen Qiu, Mingdian Liu, Hengli Li, Song-Chun Zhu, and Zilong Zheng. 2024. **MindDial: Enhancing conversational agents with theory-of-mind for common ground alignment and negotiation**. In *Proceedings of the 25th Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 746–759, Kyoto, Japan. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Neil Rabinowitz, Frank Perbet, Francis Song, Chiyuan Zhang, SM Ali Eslami, and Matthew Botvinick. 2018. Machine theory of mind. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4218–4227. PMLR.
- James K Rilling, Alan G Sanfey, Jessica A Aronson, Leigh E Nystrom, and Jonathan D Cohen. 2004. The neural correlates of theory of mind within interpersonal interactions. *Neuroimage*, 22(4):1694–1703.
- Maarten Sap, Ronan Le Bras, Daniel Fried, and Yejin Choi. 2022. **Neural theory-of-mind? on the limits of social intelligence in large LMs**. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3762–3780, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ştefan Sarkadi, Alison R Panisson, Rafael H Bordini, Peter McBurney, Simon Parsons, and Martin Chapman. 2019. Modelling deception using theory of mind in multi-agent systems. *AI Communications*, 32(4):287–302.
- Melanie Sclar, Sachin Kumar, Peter West, Alane Suhr, Yejin Choi, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2023. **Minding language models’ (lack of) theory of mind: A plug-and-play multi-character belief tracker**. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 13960–13980, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Melanie Sclar, Graham Neubig, and Yonatan Bisk. 2022. Symmetric machine theory of mind. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 19450–19466. PMLR.
- Natalie Shapira, Mosh Levy, Seyed Hossein Alavi, Xuhui Zhou, Yejin Choi, Yoav Goldberg, Maarten Sap, and Vered Shwartz. 2024. **Clever hans or neural theory of mind? stress testing social reasoning in large language models**. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2257–2273, St. Julian’s, Malta. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Damien Sileo and Antoine Lerno. 2023. **MindGames: Targeting theory of mind in large language models with dynamic epistemic modal logic**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 4570–4577, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Adil Soubki, John Murzaku, Arash Yousefi Jordehi, Peter Zeng, Magdalena Markowska, Seyed Abolghasem Mirroshandel, and Owen Rambow. 2024. **Views are my own, but also yours: Benchmarking theory of mind using common ground**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 14815–14823, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- John Sweller. 1988. Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive science*, 12(2):257–285.
- Fiona Anting Tan, Gerard Christopher Yeo, Kokil Jaidka, Fanyou Wu, Weijie Xu, Vinija Jain, Aman Chadha, Yang Liu, and See-Kiong Ng. 2024. **Phantom: Persona-based prompting has an effect on theory-of-mind reasoning in large language models**. *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.02246.
- Tomer Ullman. 2023. **Large language models fail on trivial alterations to theory-of-mind tasks**. *Preprint*, arXiv:2302.08399.
- Alex Wilf, Sihyun Lee, Paul Pu Liang, and Louis-Philippe Morency. 2024. **Think twice: Perspective-taking improves large language models’ theory-of-mind capabilities**. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8292–8308, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Heinz Wimmer and Josef Perner. 1983. Beliefs about beliefs: Representation and constraining function of wrong beliefs in young children’s understanding of deception. *Cognition*, 13(1):103–128.
- Yufan Wu, Yinghui He, Yilin Jia, Rada Mihalcea, Yulong Chen, and Naihao Deng. 2023. **Hi-ToM: A benchmark for evaluating higher-order theory of mind reasoning in large language models**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 10691–10706, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hainiu Xu, Runcong Zhao, Lixing Zhu, Jinhua Du, and Yulan He. 2024. **OpenToM: A comprehensive benchmark for evaluating theory-of-mind reasoning capabilities of large language models**. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8593–8623, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hongxin Zhang, Weihua Du, Jiaming Shan, Qinzhong Zhou, Yilun Du, Joshua B Tenenbaum, Tianmin Shu, and Chuang Gan. 2023. Building cooperative embodied agents modularly with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.02485*.

Wentao Zhu, Zhining Zhang, and Yizhou Wang. 2024.  
[Language models represent beliefs of self and others.](#)  
*Preprint*, arXiv:2402.18496.