When Rational Decisions Lead to Irrational Outcomes: The Mathematics of Game Theory

Lydia Suggett

Introduction: The Problem of Strategic Decisions

Many important decisions are made not in isolation but depend on the choices made by others. Firms deciding how to price their products, countries negotiating trade agreements, and investors reacting to market movements must all consider how other participants will act. In such situations, the outcome of a decision is not determined solely by an individuals own strategy, but by the interactions of other decision makers. This creates what mathematicians and economists describe as a strategic decision problem.

Traditional models of rational decision making assume that individuals will make decisions that maximises their utility and overall satisfaction. This leads individuals to prioritise maximising their own utility when making decisions. However, when multiple rational individuals interact, their choices can sometimes lead to outcomes that can appear collectively irrational. Situations can arise in which every participant acts logically, and within their own interest, yet the final result leaves everyone worse off.

To understand these interactions, mathematicians developed game theory, a framework that models strategic decisions using mathematical structures such as payoff matrices and equilibrium analysis. One of the most famous examples of such interactions, is the prisoners dilemma. This situation demonstrates how individually rational decisions can paradoxically produce inefficient outcomes. By examining this model and its implications, game theory reveals how mathematicians can explain the tension between cooperation, competition and rational behaviour.

Game Theory: A Mathematical Framwork for Strategic Interaction

Game theory is a brand of mathematics that studies situations in which the outcome of a decision depends not only on one individuals actions, but also on the actions of others. Unlike traditional optimisation problems, where a single decision maker attempts to maximise a value, game theory considers strategic interaction between multiple participants. Each participant must make decisions while anticipating how others might behave.

In mathematical models of game theory, decision makers are referred to as players. Each player has a set of possible strategies, representing the actions they can choose. The outcome of the interaction depends on the combination of strategies chosen by all players. These outcomes are represented using payoffs, which assign a numerical value to each possible result. The payoffs do not necessarily represent money; instead they reflect the relative benefit or utility that each layer receives.

One common way to represent these strategic interactions mathematically is through a payoff matrix. A payoff matrix displays the possible strategies available to each player and the resulting payoffs for every possible combination of decisions. By analysing these matrices, mathematicians can identify patterns in rational decision making and predict how individuals may behave when faced with strategic choices.

Through this structured approach, game theory provides a mathematical way of analysing competition, cooperation and conflict. These models reveal that even when each particupant acts rationally to maximise their own payoff, the resulting outcome is not always the most efficient for the group as a whole.

The Prisoners Dilemma: Modelling Rational Choice

One of the most well known examples of game theory is the Prisoner's Dilemma, a model that illustrates how rational decision making can lead to inefficient outcomes. The scenario involves two individuals who are arrested and questioned seperately. Each prisoner has two possible strategies: to cooperate with the other by remaining silent, or to defect by betraying the other.

The outcomes of their decisions can be determined by a payoff matrix, as shown in Figure 1.

	B Cooperates	**B Defects**
A Cooperates	(3,3)	(0,5)
A Defects	(5,0)	(1,1)

Figure 1: Payoff matrix for the Prisoner's Dilemma

In this matrix, the numbers represent the payoffs received by each prisoner depending on their choices. For example, if both prisoners cooperate, they each receive a payoff of (3,3), representing a relatively favourable outcome for both. However, if one defects while the other cooperates, the defector receives a higher payoff of 5 while the other receives 0.

To determine the optimal strategy, each prisoner must consider the possible actions of the other. If prisoner B chooses to cooperate, Prisoner A receives a higher payoff by defecting (5 instead of 3). Similarly, if prisoner B defects, Prisoner A still receives a higher payoff by defecting (1 instead of 0). Therefore, regardless of the other prisoners decision, defecting always creates a better outcome for the individual.

This makes defection a dominant strategy for both prisoners. As a result, both prisoners will rationally choose to defect, leading to the outcome (1,1). However, this outcome is worse for both individuals compared to mutual cooperation, which would have resulted in (3,3).

This outcome represents a Nash equilibrium, where neither player can improve their payoff by changing their strategy alone. Although mutual cooperation would lead to a better outcome for both players, neither has an incentive to deviate from defection once the other's decision is fixed.

This creates a paradox at the heart of game theory. Although each player acts rationally, in attempting to maximise their own payoff, the final outcome is inefficient from a collective perspective. The Prisoners Dilemma therefore demonstrates how mathematical models can reveal situations in which rational individual behaviour leads to suboptimal outcomes for all participants.

The Behavioural Paradox: Limits of Rational Models

While the Prisoner's Dilemma suggests that rational individuals will always choose to defect, real world behaviour often does not follow this prediction. In many situations, individuals choose to cooperate, even when defection would maximise their immediate payoff. This highlights a key limitation of purely mathematical models, as they assume that individuals act entirely rationally and independently.

In reality, decision making is influenced by a range of behavioural factors. Concepts such as trust, fairness and reputation can play a significant role in shaping choices. For example, in repeated interactions, individuals may choose to cooperate in order to maintain long term relationships or achieve mutual benefit over time. This contrasts with the one time scenario presented in the Prisoner's Dilemma, where long term consequences are not considered.

This introduces a paradox: while the mathematical model predicts defection as the optimal strategy, human behaviour often deviates from this outcome. Therefore, while game theory provides a powerful framework for analysing strategic decisions, it does not always fully capture the complexity of real world behaviour.

Real World Applications of Game Theory

The concepts illustrated by the Prisoner's Dilemma can be applied to a wide range of real world economic situations. One key example is the competition between firms within a market. Firms must decide whether to cooperate, for instance by maintaining higher prices, or to compete by lowering prices in order to gain a larger market share. While cooperation would allow all firms to achieve higher profits, the incentive to undercut competitors often leads to price competition, reducing profits for all.

Similar dynamics can be observed in international contexts. Countries negotiating trade agreements or environmental policies face similar strategic decisions, where cooperation would lead to collective benefits, yet individual incentives may encourage non-cooperative behavior. For example, in addressing climate change, countries may benefit from reducing emissions collectively, but each may be tempted to avoid the economic costs associated with doing so.

These examples demonstrate how game theory provides a mathematical framework for understanding strategic decision making beyond theoretical models. It allows complex real world interactions to be simplified into structured forms, helping to explain patters of competition, cooperation and conflict within economic systems.

Conclusion: The Power and Limitations of Mathematical Models

In conclusion, game theory offers a valuable mathematical framework for understanding strategic decision making. Through models such as the Prisoner's Dilemma, it reveals how rational individual choices can lead to inefficient collective outcomes. By representing decisions through payoff matrices and structured analysis, game theory simplifies complex interactions into clear and logical models.

However, as demonstrated, real world behaviour does not always align with these predictions. Human decision making is influenced by behavioural and social factors that extend beyond purely rational calculations. As a result, while mathematical models provide important insight into strategic interactions, they must be considered alongside the complexities of human behaviour.

Overall, the study of game theory highlights both the power and the limitations of mathematics in explaining real world decision making.