

# Course Overview

CMPUT 654:  
Modelling Human Strategic Behaviour

# Strategic Modelling

This course is about modelling human strategic behaviour:

- **Modelling:** Constructing formal, predictive models of action
- **Strategic:** Outcomes that an agent cares about depend on:
  1. Agent's **own** actions
  2. Actions of **other** agents, with **independent** goals and priorities
- **Human:** Primarily concerned with modelling behaviour by **people**, not by algorithms (e.g., border gateway protocol)
  - Actual, **empirical** behaviour, not **ideal** behaviour

# Part 1: Game Theory

- **Mathematical** framework for modelling interactions between **rational agents**
- Format:
  - First six weeks
  - Lecture format
  - Two assignments

# Part 2:

# Behavioural Game Theory

- **Inductive** models, not just implications of assumptions
- Models are typically cognitively inspired
- Less conceptually unified than standard game theory
- Format:
  - Second four weeks
  - Student presentations of readings
  - Summaries of readings

# Part 3: Research Survey

- Survey of literature of sub-area we did not cover in class
  - Could be an **application** area, **subset** of an area we covered
  - Ideally: Propose direction for **new research** (especially if you are considering working with me)
  - Novel research results **NOT REQUIRED** for full marks
- Presentations in final three weeks

# Prerequisites

- Prior knowledge of game theory is **NOT REQUIRED**
- Need to be able to follow/construct formal **proofs** and **mathematical arguments**
- Basic knowledge of **probability** (random variables, expectations, conditional probability, Bayes' rule)

# Lecture Outline

1. Overview
2. Course Topics
3. Logistics

# Utility Theory: Reward Hypothesis

**Reward hypothesis** [Sutton & Barto 2018]:

That all of what we mean by goals and purposes can be well thought of as the maximization of the **expected value** of the cumulative sum of a received **scalar signal** (called reward).

1. Why should we believe that an agent's preferences can be adequately represented by a **single number**?
2. Why should agents maximize **expected value** rather than some other criterion?



# Utility Theory: Representation Theorem

- Utility theory deals with **preference relations**  $\succeq$  over final outcomes  $o \in O$ 
  - i.e..  $a \succeq b$  means " $a$  is (weakly) preferred to  $b$ "
- von Neuman & Morgenstern's **representation theorem** says that if a preference relation  $\succeq$  satisfies certain axioms, then there exists a utility function  $u : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that:
  1.  $o_1 \succeq o_2 \iff u(o_1) \geq u(o_2)$ , and
  2.  $u([p_1 : o_1, \dots, p_k : o_k]) = \sum_{i=1}^k p_i u(o_i) = \mathbb{E}[u(o)]$

# Game Theory: Normal Form Games

- In a multiagent setting, what are the consequences of assuming that agents are **expected utility maximizers**?
- Normal form games:
  - Each agent picks an action simultaneously
  - **Profile** of utilities specified for each profile of actions
- **Question:** What *strategy* maximizes utility for the row agent?
  - **Solution concepts:** Outcomes that are consistent with the expected-utility maximization assumption

	L	R
T	4, 3	0, 0
B	1, -1	2, 8

# Game Theory: Special Cases

- **Repeated games:** What happens when the same game is played between the **same agents multiple times**?
- **Extensive form games:** Explicitly represent **sequential action**
- **Bayesian games:** Explicitly represent **private information**

# Game Theory: Social Choice & Mechanism Design

- **Social choice:** Combining the preferences of multiple agents
- **Mechanism design:** "Game theory in reverse"
  - Design the **game itself** such that expected utility maximizers will reach the **socially optimal outcome**
  - ... even if you don't know their utilities
  - *Example:* allocating a valuable item

# Behavioural Game Theory

- People aren't actually expected utility maximizers!
- **Behavioural game theory:** Accurate models of **human behaviour** in game theoretic settings
  - Demonstrate failures of standard game theory
  - Relaxing assumptions: expected utility maximization, common knowledge
  - Heuristic rules for interactions
  - Cognitive bounds

# Survey Topics Examples

The ideal project is a **proposal** for novel work and a survey of the relevant **related work**

## 1. Predictive Models

- Feedback and Dynamic Behaviour
- Interpretability
- Nonstrategic Factors in Behaviour

## 2. Agent Design

- Game Play
- Optimal Behaviour Discovery / Learning
- Behavioural Finance

## 3. Mechanism Design

- Peer Grading Platforms
- Misinformation in Social Networks
- Topic Selection in Election Coverage

# Course Essentials

[jrwright.info/bgtpcourse/](http://jrwright.info/bgtpcourse/)

- This is the **main source** for information about the class
- Slides, readings, assignments, deadlines

# Contacting Me

- **Discussion board:** [piazza.com/ualberta.ca/fall2019/cmput654/](https://piazza.com/ualberta.ca/fall2019/cmput654/) for **public** questions about assignments, lecture material, etc.
- **Email:** [james.wright@ualberta.ca](mailto:james.wright@ualberta.ca) for **private** questions (health problems, inquiries about grades)
- **Office hours:** After every lecture, or by appointment



# Evaluation

- Assignments: 30%
- Reading presentation: 15%
- Reading summaries: 15%
- Research survey
  - Outline: 5%
  - Presentation: 15%
  - Writeup: 20%

# Missed / Late Assignments

## Late assignments

- 20% deducted per day

## Missed assignments

- **Provide a note** from doctor, academic advisor, etc.
- Assignments score will be **reweighted** to exclude excused missed assignments

# Assignments

There will be **two** assignments (not necessarily weighted equally)

You are **encouraged to discuss** assignment questions with other students:

1. You **may not** share or look at each other's **written work**
2. You must **write up** your solutions individually
3. You must **list** everyone you talked with about the assignment.

# Academic Conduct

- Submitting someone else's work as your own is **plagiarism**.
- So is helping someone else to submit your work as their own.
- I report **all cases** of academic misconduct to the university.
- The university takes academic misconduct **very seriously**.  
Possible consequences:
  - Zero on the assignment (virtually guaranteed)
  - Zero for the course
  - Permanent notation on transcript
  - Suspension or expulsion from the university

# Readings

## **For Part 1 (Game theory)**

- Yoav Shoham and Kevin Leyton-Brown,  
Multiagent Systems: Algorithmic, Game-Theoretic, and Logical Foundations

## **For Part 2 (Behavioural game theory):**

- Original papers from the literature

## **For Part 3 (Research surveys):**

- Self-directed readings from the literature
  - But feel free to ask me for pointers!

# Enrollment

**How many people present today are:**

- Enrolled?
- Auditing with the hope of enrolling?
- Auditing without intending to enrol?

# ABGT Reading Group

**What:** Topics related to algorithmic and behavioural game theory

**When:** Mondays at 3:00pm - 4:30pm

**Where:** ATH 3-32

**Next meeting:** September 9, 2019

**Webpage:** [jrwright.info/abgt.html](http://jrwright.info/abgt.html)

**Announcements:** [abgt slack channel](#) (see website for link)

# AI Seminar

**What:** Great talks on cutting-edge AI research  
(Also free pizza!)

**When:** Fridays at noon

**Where:** CSC 3-33

**Calendar:** [www.cs.ualberta.ca/~ai/cal/](http://www.cs.ualberta.ca/~ai/cal/)

**Announcements:** Sign up for **ai-seminar**  
[www.mailman.srv.ualberta.ca/](http://www.mailman.srv.ualberta.ca/)



# Summary

- **Course webpage:** [jrwright.info/bgtcourse/](http://jrwright.info/bgtcourse/)
- Data-driven behavioural modelling using lens of **game theory**
- Grading:
  - Two assignments
  - One reading presentation
  - Research survey
- Reading group: [jrwright.info/abgt.html](http://jrwright.info/abgt.html)