IOSR Journal of Computer Engineering (IOSR-JCE)
e-ISSN: 2278-0661, p-ISSN: 2278-8727, Volume 27, Issue 5, Ser. 4 (Sept. – Oct. 2025), PP 10-20
www.iosrjournals.org

The Invisible Game: A Game-Theoretic Analysis Of Strategic Interaction In Everyday Human Decision-Making

Srihaan Poddar

Abstract
Human life is inherently social and, therefore, the majority of the individual decisions are not made in a vacuum but they are made within a network where various choices are interdependent on each other. The formal study of strategic decision-making Game theory has a potent analytical power that can be utilized to analyze these interactions, but it has not been significantly applied to the low-stakes, everyday strategic choices that make up our daily lives. This gap has been filled in this paper whereby a systematic application of game-theoretic models has been used to study the logic of ordinary human behavior. The study utilizes a conceptual approach and builds and solves mathematical models of typical strategic situations to simulate the effects and experiment the effectiveness of various strategies. The core analysis concentrates on the three classic games as a metaphor of everyday interactions: the Prisoner Dilemma as an example of the ongoing conflict between individual self-interest and collective cooperation (e.g., collaborative work, social etiquette); the Rock-Paper-Scissors as an example of the zero-sum competition situation that requires the lack of predictability (e.g., minor negotiations, competitive hobbies); resource-sharing games, such as the Tragedy of the Commons and the Ultimatum Game, as a tool to analyse decisions on communal goods (e The paper has shown through mathematical modeling and simulation that although the predictions of classical game theory under the assumption of pure rationality can give a very important baseline, in many cases, they fail to explain observed behavior. It is found that human decision-making is a complicated interaction between rational computations and cognitive shortcuts and emotional reactions and strongly held social conventions such as justness and return. The results indicate that Tit-for-Tat in repeated cooperative games and mixed strategies in competitive ones have better performance. The paper concludes that behavioral economic insights are necessary to have a more subtle and precise game-theoretic analysis of everyday life, and it is possible to see the constraints of the hyper-rational agent and suggest a more psychologically-based model of strategic decision-making.

Date of Submission: 01-10-2025 Date of Acceptance: 11-10-2025

I. Introduction

History: The Ubiquity of Strategic Interaction.

People live in a world of choices that is complicated on a daily basis. Majority of these decisions, including whether to allow a car to pass in a traffic congestion, how to balance a restaurant bill with friends, among others, are apparently minor. However, these two are deeply intertwined in one strong feature: the consequences of these phenomena do not depend on our behavior but the decisions made by other people. This is the state of strategic interaction, which is interdependent decision-making. The choice of the driver to be nice is determined by the reaction that the other driver will have; the offer to share a bill is determined by how they think the other will react to it. It is these infinite, frequently unconscious, calculations which constitute the invisible structure of social life. In a sense we are all engaged in a sequence of overlapping interlocking games in which the players, game rules and calculus are determined by social background and mental temperament. The rationality of such interactions is the key to understanding the human behavior itself.

The Emergence of Game Theory

Game theory is the formal study of the concept of strategic interaction, whose intellectual history can be traced back to the ancient Greek period, but whose modern version was developed by John von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern, Theory of Games and Economic Behavior (1944).2 The most general purpose of game theory was to develop a mathematical account of conflict and cooperation between rational decision-makers. Nash Equilibrium This concept by John Nash further revolutionized the field as it offered a general solution concept to non-cooperative games: a stable point where no player can further improve his/her result by altering his/her strategy, assuming the strategies of the other players (Nash, 1951).5 Game theory has become an inseparable part of the economic analysis of market competition, of the political science of international relations and voting, and

of the evolutionary biology of the evolution of cooperative and competitive behavior by species (Myerson, 1991).

Research Problem and Gap

Although it has been heavily applied in these high-stakes fields, the systematic study of game theory applied to the finer, lower stakes, and arguably more emotionally colored choices of daily life has not been as thoroughly studied. Although the game theory has been employed as an analogy in popular science to define the social interactions, a serious examination is required to address the gap between the abstract mathematical models and the complex reality of the human decision-making process. The homo economicus (perfectly rational, self-interested agent) in the classical game-theoretic assumption is often violated in actual practice, and it is often assumed that it possesses unlimited computational power. Emotions drive people, social norms are their guides, cognitive shortcomings (bounded rationality) restrain decision making, and people tend to have fairness over basic material acquisition (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979). This inconsistency leaves a very serious research gap: absence of a common framework to study the everyday decisions using the two prisms of classical game theory and its behavioral critiques. The main issue at hand is to answer the question of how far can formal game models predict and explain the common human behavior and to which areas should the models be extended by the psychological realism in order to be really informative.

Purpose and Objectives

This research paper is essentially aimed at giving a detailed game-theoretic examination of strategic decision-making in ordinary, everyday situations. This paper will attempt to bridge the gap between the mathematical beauty of game theory and the psychological depth of human action, to provide a systematic comprehension of the invisible games which we are all engaged in. The following are the detailed objectives:

To revise the principles of the game theory, it is important to define the required notions of the players, strategies, payoffs, and equilibrium.

To use classical models of games systematically, that is, the Prisoner Dilemma, Rock-Paper-Scissors, and resource-sharing games in representing and analyzing everyday social and economic situations.

To model and simulate the results of these games mathematically, it is necessary to test the theoretical performance of different strategies (e.g. pure vs. mixed strategies, cooperation vs. defection).

To critically compare the assumptions of the rational choice theory with the well-documented empirical data of the behavioral economics and psychology, to point out the areas of fundamental deviation.

To look at implications of this analysis in terms of enhancing interpersonal interactions, creating cooperation and how social norms and cognitive biases can be used in strategic environment.

Structure of the Paper

In order to meet these goals, this paper will be divided into various sections. Part 2 provides a Literature Review, which includes the main principles of game theory, the mechanics of the chosen classic games and the behavioral criticisms that give rise to the notion of bounded rationality. Section 3 presents the Methodology, which is founded on a conceptual analysis and mathematical modelling of daily situations. Section 4 gives the Main Analysis of the paper, in which the game models chosen are used on particular examples, the results are modeled, and the theoretical forecast of the behavior is checked against human behavior. Part 5 provides a more Discussion of the findings, discussing the weaknesses of the purely rational models and practical implications of a behaviorally-based game-theoretic model. Lastly, there is a Section 6, where a Conclusion will be presented, summarizing the most important insights as well as providing research directions in the future.

II. Literature Review

This research paper is essentially aimed at giving a detailed game-theoretic examination of strategic decision-making in ordinary, everyday situations. This paper will attempt to bridge the gap between the mathematical beauty of game theory and the psychological depth of human action, to provide a systematic comprehension of the invisible games which we are all engaged in. The following are the detailed objectives:

To revise the principles of the game theory, it is important to define the required notions of the players, strategies, payoffs, and equilibrium.

To use classical models of games systematically, that is, the Prisoner Dilemma, Rock-Paper-Scissors, and resource-sharing games in representing and analyzing everyday social and economic situations.

To model and simulate the results of these games mathematically, it is necessary to test the theoretical performance of different strategies (e.g. pure vs. mixed strategies, cooperation vs. defection).

To critically compare the assumptions of the rational choice theory with the well-documented empirical data of the behavioral economics and psychology, to point out the areas of fundamental deviation.

To look at implications of this analysis in terms of enhancing interpersonal interactions, creating cooperation and how social norms and cognitive biases can be used in strategic environment.

Structure of the Paper

In order to meet these goals, this paper will be divided into various sections. Part 2 provides a Literature Review, which includes the main principles of game theory, the mechanics of the chosen classic games and the behavioral criticisms that give rise to the notion of bounded rationality. Section 3 presents the Methodology, which is founded on a conceptual analysis and mathematical modelling of daily situations. Section 4 gives the Main Analysis of the paper, in which the game models chosen are used on particular examples, the results are modeled, and the theoretical forecast of the behavior is checked against human behavior. Part 5 provides a more Discussion of the findings, discussing the weaknesses of the purely rational models and practical implications of a behaviorally-based game-theoretic model. Lastly, there is a Section 6, where a Conclusion will be presented, summarizing the most important insights as well as providing research directions in the future.

Classic Game Models and Their Implications

Some games have become a stereotypical of the literature by being able to simulate basic features of social and economic interaction.

The Prisoner's Dilemma

The most studied game in the entire social science is probably the Prisoner Dilemma which was initially formalized by Albert Tucker. In the traditional version one sets up two accomplices of a crime, and they are arrested and confined in different cells, where they can not communicate.17 The prosecutor then proposes to each of them the same package:

In case you betray your partner (Defect) and they do not say anything (Cooperate), you are free and they are sentenced to 10 years.

In case of betraying one another (Defect), you both get 5 years.

In case of silence on your part (Cooperate), your both serve 1 year on a lesser charge.

This dilemma comes in since in personal terms, defection will always be the most dominant strategy. In case the other party is cooperative, then defecting would give a superior result (0 years as compared to 1). In case of a defection by the other player, it is still better to defect (5 years vs. 10). Therefore the two rational players will defect completely resulting in a suboptimal solution (5 years Apiece) in which each would have been better off having cooperated (1 year Apiece). The Nash Equilibrium is (Defect, Defect). This game is a graceful representation of the clash between individual and collective rationality.18

Robert Axelrod (1984) demonstrated in the course of the work related to the game of the Iterated Prisoner Dilemma (when one plays repeatedly) that cooperation could appear.19 The simple strategy of Tit-for-Tat (cooperate in the first move, and imitate the move of the opponent) proved to be surprisingly strong and effective in his famous computer tournaments. That proved that the shadow of the future, the possibility of future interaction, can be an effective stimulus to cooperation.

Rock-Paper-Scissors

Rock-Paper-Scissors (RPS) is a classic example of a zero-sum game that has no pure strategy Nash Equilibrium.20 A deterministic strategy can be easily exploited (by playing Paper). The mixed strategy, in which each player selects his or her option with a given probability, is the theoretical solution to this problem, as suggested by von Neumann (22 in a symmetric game such as RPS, the Nash Equilibrium is unique since both parties play Rock, Paper, and Scissors with the identical probability (1/3 each) (Von Neumann and Morgenstern, 1944). This renders the moves of the player to be totally random and they cannot be exploited. RPS is an effective and basic model when it is necessary to out guesst an opponent and it is a losing game to create a predictable pattern.

Resource Sharing: Ultimatum Game and The Tragedy of the Commons.

The essay The Tragedy of the Commons by Garrett Hardin (1968) is a well-known example of such a scenario; people follow their own selfish interests, which leads to the exhaustion of a limited and joint resource, even when it is obvious that it is not in their long-term interests.23 The essay can be modeled as a N-player Prisoner dilemma. The decision-making approach that is individually rational is to get the maximum of personal utilization of the common resource, but the aggregate outcome of such actions is the disintegration of a resource.

In the simplified version, the Ultimatum Game, the Proposer has sum of money and he has to divide it with a Responder and cannot give less than nothing, which would result in the Responder would get nothing.26 In the simplified version, all that the Proposer has is better than nothing, and the Responder must take whatever he is offered regardless of the consequences. This game plays a critical role in putting the limits of the self-serving rationality.

Behavioral Game Theory and Bounded Rationality

Some games have become a stereotypical of the literature by being able to simulate basic features of social and economic interaction.

The Prisoner's Dilemma

The most studied game in the entire social science is probably the Prisoner Dilemma which was initially formalized by Albert Tucker. In the traditional version one sets up two accomplices of a crime, and they are arrested and confined in different cells, where they can not communicate.17 The prosecutor then proposes to each of them the same package:

In case you betray your partner (Defect) and they do not say anything (Cooperate), you are free and they are sentenced to 10 years.

In case of betraying one another (Defect), you both get 5 years.

In case of silence on your part (Cooperate), your both serve 1 year on a lesser charge.

This dilemma comes in since in personal terms, defection will always be the most dominant strategy. In case the other party is cooperative, then defecting would give a superior result (0 years as compared to 1). In case of a defection by the other player, it is still better to defect (5 years vs. 10). Therefore the two rational players will defect completely resulting in a suboptimal solution (5 years Apiece) in which each would have been better off having cooperated (1 year Apiece). The Nash Equilibrium is (Defect, Defect). This game is a graceful representation of the clash between individual and collective rationality.18

Robert Axelrod (1984) demonstrated in the course of the work related to the game of the Iterated Prisoner Dilemma (when one plays repeatedly) that cooperation could appear.19 The simple strategy of Tit-for-Tat (cooperate in the first move, and imitate the move of the opponent) proved to be surprisingly strong and effective in his famous computer tournaments. That proved that the shadow of the future, the possibility of future interaction, can be an effective stimulus to cooperation.

Rock-Paper-Scissors

Rock-Paper-Scissors (RPS) is a classic example of a zero-sum game that has no pure strategy Nash Equilibrium.20 A deterministic strategy can be easily exploited (by playing Paper). The mixed strategy, in which each player selects his or her option with a given probability, is the theoretical solution to this problem, as suggested by von Neumann (22 in a symmetric game such as RPS, the Nash Equilibrium is unique since both parties play Rock, Paper, and Scissors with the identical probability (1/3 each) (Von Neumann and Morgenstern, 1944). This renders the moves of the player to be totally random and they cannot be exploited. RPS is an effective and basic model when it is necessary to out guesst an opponent and it is a losing game to create a predictable pattern.

Resource Sharing: Ultimatum Game and The Tragedy of the Commons.

The essay The Tragedy of the Commons by Garrett Hardin (1968) is a well-known example of such a scenario; people follow their own selfish interests, which leads to the exhaustion of a limited and joint resource, even when it is obvious that it is not in their long-term interests.23 The essay can be modeled as a N-player Prisoner dilemma. The decision-making approach that is individually rational is to get the maximum of personal utilization of the common resource, but the aggregate outcome of such actions is the disintegration of a resource.

In the simplified version, the Ultimatum Game, the Proposer has sum of money and he has to divide it with a Responder and cannot give less than nothing, which would result in the Responder would get nothing.26 In the simplified version, all that the Proposer has is better than nothing, and the Responder must take whatever he is offered regardless of the consequences. This game plays a critical role in putting the limits of the self-serving rationality.

III. Methodology: A Conceptual Framework Approach

The study used in this article is based on the qualitative research methodology, which focuses on a conceptual analysis and mathematical modeling. This is the most appropriate method to the aim of the study because the study is not aimed at creating new empirical evidence but to synthesize and analyze the existing theoretical frameworks in relation to the daily human behavior. The approach would be to return to common social circumstances and formalize them as game models and then apply these models to obtain an insight, simulate and critically analyze the explanatory power of game theory.

Research Design

The research design is a systematic conceptual research, which occurs in four consecutive steps:

Scenario Identification and Abstraction: This step entails the determination of shared and repeated strategic interactions in everyday life. Such situations are selected because they are simple and general (e.g., making a

decision about the intensity of work in a collective project, sharing a common good, or slightly negotiating). Such real world scenarios are then modeled into formal game models by identifying the players and the available strategies and the probable payoff.

Model Formalization and Equilibrium Analysis: The second stage is game theory formalization in which the abstracted scenarios are formalized in the mathematical language of game theory. This is carried out by building the payoff matrices to show the utility of each player at each of the possible outcomes and then utilizing the standard techniques in analysis to find the equilibrium points of the game and mostly to determine the Nash Equilibrium as predicted by classical theory.

Strategy Simulation and Comparison: The third step is simulating the result of these games especially when it is in an iterated setting. This enables us to compare the performance of the various strategies with the period of time. To illustrate this, in an iterated Prisoner dilemma, the payoff functions of strategies such as Always Cooperate, Always Defect and Tit-for-Tat are determined by calculating, comparing and determining which strategies are stronger and which are evolutionarily stable.

Behavioral Critique and Synthesis: The last step compares the predictions made using the rational models and the known results in the areas of behavioral economics and psychology. This entails the investigation of the reasons and the manner in which human behavior does not conform to the Nash Equilibrium. It serves to combine the knowledge of both the classical and behavioral game theory in order to come up with a more refined and precise model of the understanding of daily choices.

Chosen Game Models to be analyzed.

In order to have a detailed but narrow analysis, the present paper will focus on a collection of canonical games that are effective metaphors to various forms of social interaction:

The Dilemma of the Prisoner: this model is chosen due to its unsurpassed possibility to reflect the most basic conflict of the self-interest of a person and the possibility of mutual benefit in the case of cooperation.34 It will be applied to the analysis of such situations as teamwork, compliance with the norms of society, and environmental protection.

Rock-Paper-Scissors: The game is selected as an example of zero-sum, competitive interaction in which uncertainty is the best strategy.35 It would be applied to model the situation of competitive hobbies, simple negotiations, and any other situation in which one is exploited due to predictability.

The Ultimatum Game and the Tragedy of the Commons: These are the models chosen to investigate the resource distribution and equitable nature. The Tragedy of the Commons is a model of the difficulty of sharing a common resource among self-interested individuals in a controlled, dyadic fashion (like household chores or workplace facilities).36 The Ultimatum Game offers a controlled, dyadic, model to isolate and study the human preference of fairness which is essential in negotiations and social interactions.37

Mathematical and Simulation Approach

The analytical component of this paper is grounded in basic mathematical modeling. Payoff matrices will be represented as matrices for two-player games. For a generic two-player game, a payoff matrix for Player 1 (Row) and Player 2 (Column) with strategies (S1, S2) is:

	P2: S1	P2: S2
P1: S1	(P1_Payoff, P2_Payसाना)	(P1_Payoff, P2_Payoff)
P1: S2	(P1_Payoff, P2_Payoff)	(P1_Payoff, P2_Payoff)

The Nash Equilibrium is reached by determining the cells in which the incentive of each player to breach does not exist.

In the case of Rock-Paper-Scissor, the mixed strategy equilibrium will be computed by equating the average scores of the two pure strategies so that the other opponent does not care what he or she does. Let denotes the probability of playing Rock, Paper, and Scissors. The balance is reached by solving the set of equations where.

The simulation, especially of the Iterated Prisoner Dilemma, will be conceptual, as opposed to being computational. They will entail the computation of the cumulative payoffs of various strategy arrangements in a known number of rounds to show the sustainability of cooperative strategies in the long run.

Scope and Delimitations

This paper is specifically limited to the theoretical examination of simple, mundane strategic interactions. It is not intended to give an all-purpose model of human behavior. The key delimitations are:

The models studied are simplified and stylized (e.g., two-player games with discrete strategies). Real life scenarios are even more complex.

Payoffs are supposed and attributed depending on the possible psychological reasons (e.g., the inclination to leisure, the wish to be fair). There is no empirical measurement of individual utility functions in the study.

The study is a synthesis of the existing theoretical and empirical literature and does not presuppose the gathering of new primary data.

Through this approach, the paper seeks to offer both an intensively and an informative analysis which is not only based on formal theory, but also applicable to the actualities of the human interaction.

IV. Analysis And Framework Expansion

In this part, the conceptual framework that was presented in the methodology is applied to the analysis of daily strategies interactions. The sub-sections recreate each of the common situations with a classical game, calculates the rational solution, and calculates the strategic alternative options and compares the theoretical prediction with human behavior.

Modelling Social Cooperation: The Dilemma of Everyday Prisoners.

The Prisoner Dilemma structure is omnipresent in everyday life, and it manifests itself at any time when personal self-interest is in opposition to a more advantageous overall result.38

Briefing: Collaborative Work Project.

Take the example of two colleagues, Alex and Ben, who are working in a joint project which is critical. There are two strategies, Work Hard (Cooperate) or Shirk (Defect). The success of the project and their own effort are what determines their payoffs.

Should both of them work hard, then it means the project is an enormous success and both get a decent amount of praise and a bonus. Payoff: (10, 10).

In case Alex Works Hard and Ben Shirks, the project is mediocre. Alex is overworked and receives minimal appreciation, whereas Ben spent his free time. Payoff: (-5, 15).

The same is the opposite case of Ben Work Hard and Alex Shirks. Payoff: (15, -5).

In case both Shirk, the project fails, and they both are negatively punished by the manager. Payoff: (0, 0).

The payoff matrix is:

	Ben: Work Hard (C)	Ben: Shirk (D)
Alex: Work Hard (C)	(10, 10)	(-5, 15)
Alex: Shirk (D)	(15, -5)	(0, 0)

Mathematical Analysis and Rational Prediction

In the case of Alex, Shirking (15) beats Working Hard (10) in case Ben Work Hard. Would still be better than Working Hard (-5) Ben Shirks, Shirking (0). Therefore, the main strategy that Alex uses is Shirking. Shirking is also the dominant strategy that Ben has since the game is symmetrical. The Nash Equilibrium that is unique is (Shirk, Shirk) and has the payoff (0, 0). Rationality causes them to reach a state of mutual failure but mutual cooperation would have created an outcome much better (10, 10). This is the reason that in the absence of trust and supervision, joint projects are likely to decline to mediocrity.

The Strategy Simulation and Repeat Scenario.

Now suppose that this is not a single isolated project, but a continuing working relationship (a Iterated Prisoner Dilemma). This shadow of the future makes a difference in the strategic landscape. We shall model the result of a 5 round interaction of the various strategies.

Always defect AD vs Tit-for-Tat TFT:

Round 1: AD defects, TFT cooperates. Payoff: (TFT: -5, AD: 15).

Round 2: AD defects, TFT retaliates (defects). Payoff: (TFT: 0, AD: 0).

Rounds 3, 4, 5: Same as Round 2.

Total Payoff: TFT = -5, AD = 15.
Always Cooperate (AC) and Always Defect (AD):
All rounds, AC cooperates, AD defects.
Total Payoff: AC = -25 (-5 x 5), AD = 75 (15 x 5). This demonstrates the perils of gullible collaboration.
Tit-for-Tat (TFT) and Tit-for-Tat (TFT):
Round 1: Both cooperate. Payoff: (10, 10).
As no one of them defects, they do not stop cooperating.
Total Payoff: TFT1 = 50, TFT2 = 50.

The simulation shows the strength of conditional cooperation. Although, in the short run, AD defeats one TFT player, a TFT player population score maximally. The success of TFT, as demonstrated by Axelrod (1984), is because it is nice (it never defects first), retaliatory (it punishes defections directly), forgiving (it goes back to cooperation once it punishes defections) and clear (their strategy is straightforward to follow). That is why reputation and reciprocity is so critical in ensuring continuation of cooperation in continuing professional and social relationship.

Zero-Sum Conflicts: The Rock-Paper-Scissors Metaphor.

Most of the situations that occur in our day-to-day life are competitive, and one person must win, and another loses. This is not necessarily as direct as RPS but the rationale behind having to be unpredictable works.

Setting: The Checkout Line Choice.

Suppose that there are two individuals called Chloe and David heading to two equally long checkout lines in a supermarket. They are going to arrive at the same time. They both desire to take the path of the faster line. This may be regarded as one of the RPS. Let "Line 1" be Rock, "Line 2" be Paper. When both decide to go on the same line, they receive a payoff of neutral (0) since they do not act in their favor. When they select other lines, one will be faster by chance, which will provide the individual in that line with a favorable payoff (+1), and the other with an unfavorable payoff (-1).

The main essence of the issue is that any foreseeable decision can be abused. Assuming Chloe will always go to Line 1, David can train to do the same, and be sure never to be behind her.

Mathematical Derivation of Mixed Strategy Equilibrium

In order to be unexploitable, Chloe has to make a random selection of line. The mixed strategy is optimal when it involves picking every alternative with the same probability in a symmetric game. Here in this two-line problem, she has a probability of 0.5 and 0.5 in Line 1 and Line 2 respectively.

We will now generalize to the RPS game. The strategy of a player is defined as a series of probabilities. Player 2 plays. The payoff of the first player playing Rock is expected to be. Similarly, and. To have the indifference between her strategies, Player 1 must be willing to mix them:

The solution to this system of equations and is unique and we get: The only means of really being unexploitable is to be absolutely random.

Bridging to Human Behavior.

Although Nash Equilibrium dictates that perfect randomness is adopted, empirical research indicates that humans are poor randomizers. Gamers have predictable behavior, e.g., the win-stay, lose-shift heuristic: when a player has won the previous game, they will tend to use the same option; when they lost, they will tend to use the option that would have beaten the one their opponent just played (Wang, Xu, and Zhou, 2014).39 A more intelligent opponent can learn this behavior and use it against them. This shows one of the main findings: when there is competition in a zero-sum game, human behavior tends to replace complex and probabilistic computations with simple intuitions, which leaves a weakness that is not game-theoretically optimal.

Sharing and Equity in Resources: Ultimatum Game Substratum.

This game is a simulation of one-shot negotiations, resource allocation that is a usual occurrence in personal or professional life.

Scenario: Splitting a Bonus

An employee, Emily, is also given a bonus of 1000 dollars to share with her junior, Frank, in a successful project. Emily (the Proposer) will be required to give a share to Frank (the Responder). Frank has the option to take the offer and in turn turn it down in which case their corporate policy will add that the bonus will be lost and none will receive anything.

Rational Foresight vs. Real World.
Game-Theoretic Prediction: Emily is a perfectly rational, self-centered individual who aims at maximizing her portion. She is aware that Frank is also an economic man who will take any price that is higher than zero. Thus, Emily is supposed to give Frank as little as possible, which is 1. Since, to Frank, there is a difference between the value of $1 and the value of 0, then he should accept. The forecasted split is a (999, 1) split.

Empirical Reality: Years of experimental work has demonstrated that this prediction is spectacularly incorrect (Guth et al., 1982; Camerer, 2003). Bids which are less than 20 per cent of the entire amount are accepted approximately 50 per cent. of the time. The modal offer is normally a 50/50 split. Individuals do not act under the pretext of naked self-interest. Frank will probably feel that a proposal of a dollar is very unfair and degrading. He will decline it to penalize the greed of Emily, who he is willing to lose a dollar to make sure that she does not receive 999. This is a study behavior commonly referred to as altruistic punishment and this phenomenon shows that a sense of fairness is a strong motivating power.

Fairness in Utility Functions Modeling.

To cover this, economists have put forward utility functions which include social preferences. Indicatively, the utility of a player may be based on his or her payoff (xi) and that of the other player (xj). According to the Fehr-Schmidt model of inequality aversion (Fehr and Schmidt, 1999), such utility function is as follows:
Ui (x)=xi [?]ai max (xj [?]xi ,0) [?] bi max (xi [?]xj ,0)

In this case, has a disutility of the disadvantageous inequality (envy), and equals the disutility of the advantageous inequality (guilt).42 A large means a very low offer () generates large negative utility to the total utility of accepting it to the Responder Frank. He would hence decline the offer, because. This institutionalizes the fact that fairness is actually an element of the payoff, as to why the purely rational strategy does not actually work.

Tragedy of the Commons in Everyday Life.
Setting: The Shared Office Kitchen.

Take the case of an office that shares kitchen and Coffeemaker. Every N employees will be using two strategies of the final cup of coffee: Brew a New Pot (Cooperate) or Leave it Empty (Defect).

Defecting Payoff: The employee receives the last cup of coffee right away (high benefit, say +5) and does not bother with making a new pot of coffee (no cost). Total: +5.

Cooperation Payoff: The employee wastes time and effort preparing a new pot (cost, -2 say) but provides coffee to others and other people in the future.

The issue is that cost (-2) is on the individual, whereas the gain of full pot is among all the N employees. To the person, the direct gain of brewing is minor, whereas the gain of the last cup is immense. The prevalent approach of every employee is to Leave it Empty (Defect). Assuming that everyone adheres to such rational self interest, then the kitchen will always have no coffee, the gimmick of a Tragedy of the Commons. The resource (conveniently accessible coffee) is ruined, although everybody would like to have a condition when it is constantly preserved. That is why small social vices are perpetuated in communal areas. Similar to the case of the Prisoner Dilemma, cooperation may be maintained by repetition (reputation- nobody prefers to be called the one who never makes coffee), social norms, and explicit and enforced rules (e.g., a sign that indicates that should you empty the pot, you need to make another one).

V. Discussion

The discussion above indicates that the topic of a formal logic of game theory and the reality of human behavior is interrelated is rather complex and intriguing. The models are not just the academic exercises; they give a basic grammar of understanding the social interaction. Nevertheless, this pattern of dissimilarity between theoretical expectations and real decisions makes the existence of a wider discussion of the boundaries of rationality and strong impact of psychological and social forces mandatory.

The Limits and the Predictive Power of the Rational Choice.

In its classical form, game theory provides a strong and frequently accurate first order approximation of human behaviour. In many anonymous, non-repeated interactions, the Nash Equilibrium in the one-shot Prisoner's Dilemma, the mutual defection, is accurate. It is a way to understand why two rival firms may enter into a price war which is bad to them both, or why nations may take an arms race to a new level. It gives a reference point of behavior in the event of lack of trust, communication and the possibility of future interaction.

Nevertheless, the Ultimatum Games and the Prisoners Dilemma example illustrate the critical shortcomings of the principle of homo economicus.43 It is not only that social preferences are so ingrained, as

illustrated by the prevalent refusals to accept the propositions as unfair and the conclusion of cooperation through the so-called Tit-for-Tats. Humans are conditional cooperators and altruistic punishers (Fehr and Gachter, 2002).45 The utility processes of humans are multifaceted, which includes personal profits as well as values of fairness, reciprocity, and reputation. Thus, game-theoretic models are not the most powerful as a literal model of our cognitive processes, but as an as-if model. They characterize an underlying strategic structure of a situation and demonstrate the reasoning that a purely rational agent would take. The breach of this reason is in which the most curious discoveries of human psychology can be discovered.

The Bounded Rationality and Heuristics Role.

In most of the cases that people face daily, the cognitive cost of calculating the complete game-theoretic analysis is very large in comparison with the stakes. Individuals do not build payoffs and solve mixed strategy equilibriums in determining which queue to enter. In their place, according to the postulation of Simon (1955) and the illustration of Kahneman and Tversky (1979), they use heuristics, or mental shortcuts.

The win-stay, lose-shift win-lose strategy of Rock-Paper-Scissors is the best example.46 It is a low-effort rule that is intuitively simple. Although it is not optimal in response to a perfectly rational player, it can be successful in the world where other heuristic players are. This implies that human strategies have become ecologically rational or in other words, they are well adapted to the common social context in which they are applied even though they are not mathematically optimal in any theoretical sense (Gigerenzer and Selten, 2002). These heuristics are important to understand because they predict how people will behave when there is a high rate of play and there are low stakes.

Implications for Social and Economic Life

The knowledge gained with the help of this analysis has great practical implications to change the direction of interpersonal and societal results.

Creating Cooperation: The discussion of the Dilemma of the Iterated Prisoner shows that the shadow of the future is important in creating cooperation in business, community, and personal relationships.47 To promote long-term interaction, the systems must be made to encourage cooperation in business, community, and personal relations. This gives confidence and enables reputation based systems such as Tit for Tat to succeed. By decomposing large, unidentified groups down into smaller, more stable groups, it is possible to convert a one-shot game into an iterated game and cooperation is now the more rational.

The Tragedy of the Commons model The model of Managing Common Resources demonstrates that the appeal to pure altruism is not always enough to secure common resources. In the footsteps of Elinor Ostrom (1990), who has earned a Nobel Prize because of her work on the economic governance, the commons can be kept in order with the cooperation, which is to be rewarded with self-interest as the payoffs of the game are changed by the rules, the monitoring system and the gradual measures aimed at the non-compliance.

The Ultimatum Game: How to Improve Negotiation is a critical lesson to be learned during any negotiation: fairness counts. When a proposal is seen to be unfair it will be rejected in a vindictive manner even when it seems economically sound. Effective negotiators also realize that they are not merely cutting a pie, they are dealing with the social and emotional expectation of someone they are communicating with. It is not uncommon to recognise that the opposing party needs a fair result in order to prevent standoff.

Limitations of the Analysis

It is important to note the shortcomings of this conceptual study. The world is not a game that is well-defined.

Unclear Payoffs: In most interactions, players fail to realize what they get back, and certainly not what other players get back. Utility is subjective, variable and contextual.49

Ambiguous Rules: Social games have unwritten rules that are often social norms that are quite ambiguous and have different interpretations among various individuals.50

Multiple Simultaneous Games: These people are playing several games with various individuals simultaneously. The behavior in one game (such as being uncooperative with a colleague) may influence the reputation and payoffs in other games (such as relations with the rest of the team members).

Poor perception of the Game: A gamer can be totally unaware that they are in a strategic situation, or they will be operating on a basic or grossly incorrect perception of what the game they are playing is all about, which can result in unpredictable and apparently irrational decisions.

Irrespective of these weaknesses, the game-theoretic approach is invaluable. It offers a systematic approach to thinking about strategic interactions, to finding the fundamental tensions at work, and to knowing why some behaviors are enduring even though they appear to be counterproductive.

VI. Conclusion

The knowledge gained with the help of this analysis has great practical implications to change the direction of interpersonal and societal results.

Creating Cooperation: The discussion of the Dilemma of the Iterated Prisoner shows that the shadow of the future is important in creating cooperation in business, community, and personal relationships.47 To promote long-term interaction, the systems must be made to encourage cooperation in business, community, and personal relations. This gives confidence and enables reputation-based systems such as Tit for Tat to succeed. By decomposing large, unidentified groups down into smaller, more stable groups, it is possible to convert a one-shot game into an iterated game and cooperation is now the more rational.

The Tragedy of the Commons model The model of Managing Common Resources demonstrates that the appeal to pure altruism is not always enough to secure common resources. In the footsteps of Elinor Ostrom (1990), who has earned a Nobel Prize because of her work on the economic governance, the commons can be kept in order with the cooperation, which is to be rewarded with self-interest as the payoffs of the game are changed by the rules, the monitoring system and the gradual measures aimed at the non-compliance.

The Ultimatum Game: How to Improve Negotiation is a critical lesson to be learned during any negotiation: fairness counts. When a proposal is seen to be unfair it will be rejected in a vindictive manner even when it seems economically sound. Effective negotiators also realize that they are not merely cutting a pie, they are dealing with the social and emotional expectation of someone they are communicating with. It is not uncommon to recognise that the opposing party needs a fair result in order to prevent standoff.

Limitations of the Analysis

It is important to note the shortcomings of this conceptual study. The world is not a game that is well-defined.
Unclear Payoffs: In most interactions, players fail to realize what they get back, and certainly not what other players get back. Utility is subjective, variable and contextual.49

Ambiguous Rules: Social games have unwritten rules that are often social norms that are quite ambiguous and have different interpretations among various individuals.50

Multiple Simultaneous Games: These people are playing several games with various individuals simultaneously. The behavior in one game (such as being uncooperative with a colleague) may influence the reputation and payoffs in other games (such as relations with the rest of the team members).

Poor perception of the Game: A gamer can be totally unaware that they are in a strategic situation, or they will be operating on a basic or grossly incorrect perception of what the game they are playing is all about, which can result in unpredictable and apparently irrational decisions.

Irrespective of these weaknesses, the game-theoretic approach is invaluable. It offers a systematic approach to thinking about strategic interactions, to finding the fundamental tensions at work, and to knowing why some behaviors are enduring even though they appear to be counterproductive.

This research paper was initiated to identify the strategic environment of ordinary human decision making using the game theory as an analytical tool. This paper has avoided the difficult landscape between the beautiful predictions of rational choice theory and the frequently inexplicable actualities of human behavior by breaking down familiar social and economic interactions into formal game models the Prisoner Dilemma, Rock-Paper-Scissors, resource-sharing games. It is found out that we are not the hyper-rational agent of classical theory, but our actions are not random, but rather controlled by an elaborate, though not necessarily conscious, strategy.

Summary of Findings

The main conclusion of the paper is that game theory offers an essential but insufficient framework to the daily life. The classical models are tremendously successful in detailing the underlying framework of the social dilemmas and forecasting the behavior in anonymous and non-repeated settings where self-interest is the most dominant force. But our analysis again proved that human behaviour always falls away upon these rational baselines in predictable manners.51

The Dilemma of the Iterated Prisoner had been analyzed and demonstrated that cooperation is not a last minute event but a logical thing to do in the situation when interactions are continuous which emphasized the strength of the reciprocity and reputation. The study of Rock-Paper-Scissors revealed the difference between the ideal state of perfect randomness and the heuristic based pattern-driven policies that humans adopt in reality. Most importantly, the Ultimatum Game has given solid evidence that social preferences, especially a strong dislike of unfairness, are a part of human utility functions and can dominate material self-interest.52 The reasoning behind the Tragedy of the Commons continues to play out in how we manage shared spaces in our daily lives and we

have to acknowledge that social norms and straightforward rules are necessary to avoid the deterioration of the common good.

Contribution to Knowledge

In this paper, I am making a holistic synthesis that makes a linkage between the abstract mathematics of game theory and the actual, lived decision-making experience. It also provides a single perspective that acknowledges the wisdom of both because it does not limit itself to a purely mathematical or purely psychological standpoint. It points out that the conflict between classical and behavioural game theory is not a weakness, but a deep insight. The inefficiencies of human judgment, in what might be considered as a purely rational perspective, are commonly extensions of a highly social environment in which long-term correlation, social conventions, and justice are the key to survival and prosperity. This study offers us a systematic account, which aids in answering the question why we cooperate when we may cheat, why we take action against unfairness at our own expense and why we find it difficult to manage common resources.

Future Research Directions

The issues and complications that are observed in this analysis are indicative of some of the interesting areas of future research that can further reconcile the gap between the theory and the reality.

Forming More Complex Behavioral Models: Future studies ought to be aimed at developing more elaborate mathematical models which explicitly include the factors of limited rationality, social feelings (such as guilt and vengeance), and the social norms. It may be helpful to incorporate these factors directly into the utility functions, which will help to obtain more accurate predictive models.

Empirical Tests in Naturalistic Fields: Although lab experiments have proved invaluable, there is a call to have more empirical studies that should research strategic decision-making in natural and field-based settings. Applications to large-scale digital information using computational social science tools may expose the mechanisms through which these game mechanisms are realized in online communities, collaborative app development platforms and social networks.

Neuro-economic Investigations: The neural basis of strategic choice is a fertile area of investigation. The neuro-economic experiments, through the aid of technologies, such as fMRI, are able to detect the brain areas connected with the calculation of payoffs, evaluation of fairness, and the punishment of defectors, which gives a biological ground to the actions that are witnessed in experiments related to game theory.53

Cross-Cultural Analysis: The effects of social norms on strategic behavior indicate that expectations in game theory might not be the same in different cultures. More cross-cultural studies are required to determine how individualism, collectivism and hierarchy cultural values influence the manner in which individuals play these basic social games.

Finally, life is not a game in the trivial sense, but it is organised on the game logic. It is the web of conflict, cooperation, and negotiation that we all make as we integrate the strict structures of the game theory, with the subtle social science of psychology, and maybe find a way to be better players.

References

[1]. Axelrod, R. (1984). The Evolution Of Cooperation. Basic Books.
[2]. Camerer, C. F. (2003). Behavioral Game Theory: Experiments In Strategic Interaction. Princeton University Press.
[3]. Fehr, E., & Gächter, S. (2002). Altruistic Punishment In Humans. Nature, 415(6868), 137–140.
[4]. Fehr, E., & Schmidt, K. M. (1999). A Theory Of Fairness, Competition, And Cooperation. The Quarterly Journal Of Economics, 114(3), 817–868.
[5]. Gigerenzer, G., & Selten, R. (Eds.). (2002). Bounded Rationality: The Adaptive Toolbox. MIT Press.
[6]. Güth, W., Schmittberger, R., & Schwarze, B. (1982). An Experimental Analysis Of Ultimatum Bargaining. Journal Of Economic Behavior & Organization, 3(4), 367–388.
[7]. Hardin, G. (1968). The Tragedy Of The Commons. Science, 162(3859), 1243–1248.
[8]. Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect Theory: An Analysis Of Decision Under Risk. Econometrica, 47(2), 263–291.
[9]. Myerson, R. B. (1991). Game Theory: Analysis Of Conflict. Harvard University Press.
[10]. Nash, J. F. (1951). Non-Cooperative Games. Annals Of Mathematics, 54(2), 286–295.
[11]. Ostrom, E. (1990). Governing The Commons: The Evolution Of Institutions For Collective Action. Cambridge University Press.
[12]. Osborne, M. J., & Rubinstein, A. (1994).[55] A Course In Game Theory. MIT Press.
[13]. Simon, H. A. (1955). A Behavioral Model Of Rational Choice. The Quarterly Journal Of Economics, 69(1), 99–118.
[14]. Von Neumann, J., & Morgenstern, O. (1944). Theory Of Games And Economic Behavior. Princeton University Press.
[15]. Wang, Z., Xu, B., & Zhou, H. J. (2014). Social Cycling And Conditional Responses In The Rock-Paper-Scissors Game. Scientific Reports, 4(1), 5830.