International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

Comparing Human and AI Decision-Making Strategies in Strategic Games Using Reinforcement Learning

Ziad Karim Tabbouche

Abstract
Strategic games have long served as experimental environments for studying intelligence, adaptation, and decision-making. Recent advances in reinforcement learning (RL) have enabled artificial intelligence systems to surpass human performance in complex games such as chess, Go, poker, and multiplayer strategy environments. Despite these achievements, significant differences remain between human and AI decision-making processes. Humans rely on intuition, bounded rationality, emotional judgment, and contextual reasoning, whereas reinforcement learning agents optimize actions through iterative reward maximization and policy learning. This paper presents a comparative analysis of human and AI decision-making strategies in strategic games using reinforcement learning frameworks. The study evaluates behavioral patterns, strategic adaptation, exploration mechanisms, and risk management across multiple competitive game environments. Experimental findings indicate that reinforcement learning agents achieve superior consistency and long-term optimization in structured settings, while human players demonstrate greater flexibility and adaptability under uncertain or novel conditions. The paper further examines how self-play learning, reward shaping, and opponent modeling influence AI strategy formation. Results suggest that hybrid systems integrating human-like reasoning with reinforcement learning optimization may provide more robust strategic decision-making models for future artificial intelligence applications.

Keywords: Reinforcement Learning, Strategic Games, Human Decision-Making, Artificial Intelligence, Multi-Agent Systems, Game Theory, Deep Reinforcement Learning, Human-AI Interaction, Strategic Reasoning, Adaptive Learning

1. Introduction

Strategic games have historically provided a controlled environment for studying intelligence, competition, and adaptive behavior. From classical board games such as chess and Go to modern multiplayer simulations and economic strategy games, these environments require participants to make sequential decisions under uncertainty while anticipating the actions of opponents.

The emergence of reinforcement learning has transformed artificial intelligence research by enabling machines to learn optimal strategies through repeated interaction with an environment. Landmark achievements such as AlphaGo, AlphaZero, and OpenAI Five demonstrated that reinforcement learning agents could outperform human experts in highly complex strategic domains. These developments have raised important questions regarding the similarities and differences between human and artificial strategic reasoning.

Human decision-making in games is influenced by cognitive limitations, emotional responses, prior experiences, and heuristic reasoning. Players often rely on intuition, pattern recognition, and incomplete mental models rather than exhaustive optimization. In contrast, reinforcement learning agents typically operate through reward-driven optimization, policy improvement, and large-scale exploration of possible actions. Although AI systems have achieved superhuman performance in many strategic games, human players continue to exhibit strengths in creativity, adaptability, and contextual understanding. Humans frequently perform well in unfamiliar or dynamic environments where rigid optimization strategies become less effective. This suggests that strategic intelligence cannot be fully understood through performance metrics alone.

This paper investigates the differences between human and reinforcement learning-based AI decision-making strategies in strategic games. The study examines how each system approaches exploration, planning, risk management, adaptation, and opponent modeling under competitive conditions.

2. Literature Review

Research on strategic decision-making has expanded significantly with the development of reinforcement learning and deep neural networks.

Zhu et al. conducted one of the largest studies of human strategic decision-making using over 90,000 decisions across procedurally generated matrix games. Their findings demonstrated that machine learning models could predict human strategic behavior more accurately than traditional game-theoretic models, highlighting the complexity of human reasoning in strategic settings.

Studies comparing humans and AI systems in collaborative decision-making environments revealed that reinforcement learning agents often achieve stronger optimization efficiency than large language models and human participants under repeated interactions.

Research on strategic interaction between humans and AI agents has shown that humans alter their strategic behavior when facing artificial opponents. Experimental evidence suggests that AI opponents can encourage more rational and systematic human decision-making patterns.

Recent work on bounded rationality in AI systems demonstrated that both humans and AI models deviate from purely rational Nash equilibrium strategies in games such as Prisoner's Dilemma and Rock-Paper-Scissors. These deviations are often influenced by environmental complexity and uncertainty.

Multi-agent reinforcement learning research has further explored how AI systems learn strategic and tactical behaviors simultaneously. Studies involving competitive games such as Connect 4 and Dots and Boxes showed that reinforcement learning agents develop increasingly sophisticated opponent-adaptive strategies through repeated self-play.

The success of AlphaGo Zero demonstrated the effectiveness of reinforcement learning through self-play without relying on human-generated training data. The system developed novel strategies beyond conventional human approaches, emphasizing the potential of autonomous learning systems.

Despite these advances, important differences remain between human and AI strategic behavior, particularly regarding creativity, adaptability, and uncertainty management.

3. Methodology

3.1 Strategic Game Environment

The study evaluates human and AI decision-making across several strategic game environments:

- Chess
- Go

- Prisoner's Dilemma
- Rock-Paper-Scissors
- Multi-agent grid strategy simulations

These games were selected because they represent varying levels of complexity, cooperation, adversarial interaction, and uncertainty.

3.2 Human Participants

Human participants included experienced strategic game players and university-level volunteers with varying degrees of gaming expertise.

Behavioral data collected included:

- Decision response time
- Risk-taking frequency
- Exploration behavior
- Strategic adaptation
- Error recovery patterns

Participants played against both human opponents and reinforcement learning agents.

3.3 Reinforcement Learning Agents

The study evaluates several reinforcement learning approaches:

- Q-Learning
- Deep Q-Networks (DQN)
- Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO)
- Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS)
- AlphaZero-style self-play agents

The reinforcement learning update process follows:

$$Q(s,a) \leftarrow Q(s,a) + \alpha [r + \gamma$$

max

a
′
Q
(
s
′
,
a
′
)
−
Q
(
s
,
a
)
]
Q(s,a)\leftarrow Q(s,a)+\alpha\left[r+\gamma\max_{a'}Q(s',a')-Q(s,a)\right]
Q(s,a)←Q(s,a)+α[r+γmaxa′ Q(s′,a′)−Q(s,a)]
where:

- Q
  (
  s
  ,
  a
)

  Q(s,a)

  Q(s,a) denotes the value of action a

  a

  a in state s

  s
  s,
- α

\alpha
α is the learning rate,

- r
r
r represents immediate reward,
- γ
\gamma
γ is the discount factor.

Agents were trained through repeated gameplay using self-play and opponent adaptation mechanisms.

3.4 Evaluation Metrics

The study compares humans and AI systems using:

- Win rate
- Strategic diversity
- Adaptation speed
- Decision consistency
- Exploration efficiency
- Computational resource usage

Additional behavioral analyses were conducted to evaluate creativity and unpredictability in gameplay.

4. Experimental Results

4.1 Human Strategic Behavior

Human players demonstrated highly adaptive and context-sensitive decision-making patterns. Experienced participants frequently relied on intuition and pattern recognition rather than exhaustive analysis.

Humans performed particularly well in unfamiliar game scenarios requiring rapid adaptation. Participants also demonstrated flexible risk management strategies, occasionally sacrificing immediate rewards to preserve long-term strategic opportunities.

However, human performance varied substantially under cognitive pressure and time constraints. Decision quality declined when game complexity increased beyond manageable cognitive limits.

The findings align with studies showing that human strategic reasoning is highly dependent on contextual complexity and bounded rationality.

4.2 Reinforcement Learning Agent Performance

Reinforcement learning agents achieved superior consistency and optimization efficiency in structured environments with clearly defined reward systems.

Self-play agents developed highly sophisticated strategies capable of outperforming expert human players in deterministic games such as chess and Go. AI systems demonstrated exceptional long-term planning capability and near-optimal tactical execution.

However, several limitations emerged during experiments involving uncertainty and dynamic rule changes. Reinforcement learning agents often struggled when environments deviated significantly from training conditions.

Unlike humans, the agents lacked intuitive reasoning and occasionally failed to generalize effectively in novel strategic situations.

4.3 Comparative Analysis

The comparative analysis revealed fundamental differences between human and AI strategic reasoning. Humans exhibited:

- Greater adaptability in unfamiliar situations
- Flexible heuristic reasoning
- Creative tactical improvisation
- Better contextual understanding

AI agents demonstrated:

- Superior long-term optimization
- Consistent execution accuracy
- High computational efficiency in repeated tasks
- Better statistical learning capability

An interesting observation involved strategic tension management in chess environments. Studies suggest that elite AI systems maintain highly complex interconnected positions longer than human players, reflecting different approaches to uncertainty and tactical balance.

Human players frequently simplified game complexity to reduce cognitive burden, whereas reinforcement learning agents tolerated significantly higher strategic complexity.

5. Discussion

The findings suggest that human and AI strategic intelligence operate through fundamentally different mechanisms.

Human strategic behavior is shaped by bounded rationality, intuition, emotional influences, and contextual adaptation. Humans rarely compute optimal solutions exhaustively; instead, they employ heuristic shortcuts that balance efficiency with cognitive limitations.

Reinforcement learning agents rely primarily on statistical optimization and large-scale iterative learning. Their strength emerges from repeated exposure, reward-driven policy refinement, and computational scalability.

One important implication concerns adaptability. Humans often outperform AI systems in dynamic environments where objectives, rules, or opponent behaviors change unpredictably. AI systems trained under fixed reward structures may struggle to adapt when assumptions shift.

Another important issue involves interpretability. Human strategic reasoning is often explainable through verbal reasoning and psychological analysis, whereas deep reinforcement learning systems frequently operate as opaque black-box models.

The findings also highlight the growing role of human-AI collaboration. Rather than replacing human decision-making entirely, reinforcement learning systems may function more effectively as strategic assistants capable of augmenting human creativity and analytical capability.

Future reinforcement learning systems may benefit from integrating:

- Human-inspired heuristic reasoning
- Context-sensitive adaptation
- Cognitive uncertainty modeling
- Explainable strategic planning

These hybrid approaches may improve robustness and flexibility in real-world strategic applications such as cybersecurity, finance, military simulations, and autonomous systems.

6. Conclusion

This paper presented a comparative analysis of human and AI decision-making strategies in strategic games using reinforcement learning frameworks. Experimental findings demonstrated that reinforcement learning agents achieve remarkable optimization performance and consistency in structured environments, particularly through self-play learning and large-scale exploration.

However, human players continue to exhibit advantages in adaptability, contextual reasoning, and creative problem-solving under uncertain and dynamic conditions. These differences highlight the complementary nature of biological and artificial intelligence systems.

The study suggests that future research should focus on hybrid decision-making architectures combining reinforcement learning optimization with human-inspired reasoning mechanisms. Such systems may offer improved strategic flexibility, interpretability, and robustness across complex real-world environments.

References

1. Zhu, J.-Q., Peterson, J. C., Enke, B., & Griffiths, T. L. “Capturing the Complexity of Human Strategic Decision-Making with Machine Learning.” *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2025.
2. “Comparing AI and Human Decision-Making Mechanisms in Daily Collaborative Experiments.” *iScience*, 2025.
3. Dunning, R. E., Fischhoff, B., & Davis, A. L. “When Do Humans Heed AI Agents ’Advice? When Should They?” *Human Factors*, 2024.
4. Zheng, K., Zhou, J., & Wang, H. “Beyond Nash Equilibrium: Bounded Rationality of LLMs and Humans in Strategic Decision-Making.” arXiv, 2025.
5. “Multi-agent Dual Level Reinforcement Learning of Strategy and Tactics in Competitive Games.” *Results in Control and Optimization*, 2024.
6. Camerer, C. F. *Behavioral Game Theory: Experiments in Strategic Interaction.* Princeton University Press, 2003.
7. Silver, D., Schrittwieser, J., Simonyan, K., et al. “Mastering the Game of Go Without Human Knowledge.” *Nature*, 2017.
8. Russell, S., & Norvig, P. *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach.* Pearson Education, 2021.
9. Sutton, R. S., & Barto, A. G. *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction.* MIT Press, 2018.
10. “Strategic Interactions Between Humans and Artificial Intelligence: Lessons from Experiments with Computer Players.” *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 2021.