

---

# Towards Machines that Trust: AI Agents Learn to Trust in the Trust Game

---

**Ardavan S. Nobandegani**  
Mila – Quebec AI Institute  
Department of Psychology, McGill University  
Montreal, QC, Canada  
ardavan.salehinobandegani@mcgill.ca

**Irina Rish**  
Mila – Quebec AI Institute  
Montreal, QC, Canada  
irina.rish@mila.quebec

**Thomas R. Shultz**  
School of Computer Science, McGill University  
Department of Psychology, McGill University  
Montreal, QC, Canada  
thomas.shultz@mcgill.ca

## Abstract

Widely considered a cornerstone of human morality, trust shapes many aspects of human social interactions. In this work, we present a theoretical analysis of the *trust game*, the canonical task for studying trust in behavioral and brain sciences, along with simulation results supporting our analysis. Specifically, leveraging reinforcement learning (RL) to train our AI agents, we systematically investigate learning trust under various parameterizations of this task. Our theoretical analysis, corroborated by the simulations results presented, provides a mathematical basis for the emergence of trust in the trust game.

## 1 Introduction

Widely viewed as a bedrock of human morality (Mitkidis et al., 2017), trust proves to be essential for virtually all forms of human interactions, from love and friendship to economic growth and the emergence of large-scale organizations (e.g., Uysal et al., 2012; Slovic, 1993; Mayer et al., 1995; Gächter & Fehr, 1998; Hetherington, 1998; Fehr & Rockenbach, 2003; Campbell & Stanton, 2019).

In this work, we present a theoretical analysis of the *trust game* (Berg et al., 1995), the canonical task for studying trust in behavioral and brain sciences (e.g., Camerer & Weigelt, 1988; Fehr, 2009; Tzieropoulos, 2013; Johnson & Mislin, 2011; Mitkidis et al., 2017; Alós-Ferrer & Farolfi, 2019). Additionally, leveraging reinforcement learning (RL) to train our AI agents, we systematically investigate learning trust under various parameterizations of this task. As we show, our simulation results support our theoretical analysis.

**The trust game (TG):** Two players, Trustor and Trustee, are anonymously paired. Trustor is given a monetary endowment  $T$  and should choose what fraction  $r \in [0, 1]$  of it will be sent to Trustee, as an indication of trust. The transferred amount  $rT$  is then multiplied by a factor  $K > 0$  and received by Trustee. Finally, Trustee should decide what fraction  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  of their endowment  $KrT$  they are willing to return to Trustor.

## 2 Theoretical Analysis

Here we present a theoretical analysis of TG, providing a mathematical basis for the emergence of trust in that game.

**Theorem 1.** *Assuming that Trustee returns  $\alpha(r) \in [0, 1]$  fraction of their endowment to Trustor with probability  $p(r) \in [0, 1]$  and returns nothing otherwise, the optimal fraction  $r^* \in [0, 1]$  (in the sense of maximizing Trustor’s expected reward) that Trustor should transfer to Trustee is given by:*

$$r^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{r \in [0, 1]} (\alpha(r)p(r)K - 1)r. \quad (1)$$

Note that the optimal fraction may not be unique, in which case  $\operatorname{argmax}$  in (1) returns a set.

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $\alpha_0, p_0 \in [0, 1]$  and  $m, n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ . Assuming that Trustee returns  $\alpha(r) = \alpha_0 r^m$  fraction of their endowment to Trustor with probability  $p(r) = p_0 r^n$  and returns nothing otherwise, the optimal fraction  $r^*$  (in the sense of maximizing Trustor’s expected reward) that Trustor should transfer to Trustee is given by:*

$$r^* = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \alpha_0 p_0 K > 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } \alpha_0 p_0 K < 1. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

According to Proposition 1, if  $\alpha_0 p_0 K > 1$ , Trustor should show complete trust by transferring their whole monetary endowment  $T$  to Trustee. Conversely, if  $\alpha_0 p_0 K < 1$ , Trustor should exhibit no trust by transferring nothing to Trustee.

## 3 RL Trustor Learns to Trust

Here we leverage RL to train Trustor under the broad assumptions of Theorem 1. Concretely, we have RL Trustor learn about trust by interacting with a TG Trustee that behaves in accord with the assumptions of Theorem 1.

To train RL Trustor, we adopt Thompson Sampling (Thompson, 1933), a well-established method that enjoys near-optimality guarantees (Agrawal & Goyal, 2012, 2013). The RL Trustor should decide what fraction of their total endowment  $T$  they are willing to transfer to TG Trustee. For ease of analysis, here we assume that RL Trustor chooses between a finite set of actions (fractions):  $\mathcal{A} = \{0, 0.1, 0.2, \dots, 0.9, 1\}$ ; see Algorithm 1.

---

### Algorithm 1 Thompson Sampling for RL Trustor

---

**Initialize.**  $\forall r \in \mathcal{A}: S_r = 0$  and  $F_r = 0$   
1: **for**  $i = 1, \dots, N$   
2:    $\forall r \in \mathcal{A}$  compute:  
    $s_r = (T - rT + KrT\alpha(r))\beta_r + (T - rT)(1 - \beta_r)$ , where  $\beta_r \sim \text{Beta}(S_r + 1, F_r + 1)$   
3:    $r^* = \operatorname{argmax}_r s_r$  and  $u \sim U[0, 1]$   
4:   **if**  $u < p(r^*)$  **then**  
5:      $S_{r^*} = S_{r^*} + 1$   
6:   **else**  
7:      $F_{r^*} = F_{r^*} + 1$   
8:   **end if**  
10: **end for**

---

In Algorithm 1,  $S_r$  denotes the number of times Trustee has returned a positive amount upon Trustor transferring a fraction  $r \in \mathcal{A}$  of their endowment, and  $F_r$  denotes the number of times Trustee has returned a zero amount upon Trustor transferring a fraction  $r$  of their endowment. Also,  $U[0, 1]$  denotes a uniform distribution with support  $[0, 1]$  and  $\text{Beta}(\cdot, \cdot)$  is the Beta distribution.

Algorithm 1 can be described in simple terms as follows. Recall that Trustor transfers  $rT$ ,  $r \in [0, 1]$ , to Trustee who, with probability  $1 - p(r)$ , returns a zero amount, and, with probability  $p(r)$ , returns  $KrT\alpha(r)$  to Trustor. At the start, i.e., prior to any learning,  $S_r$  and  $F_r$  are both set to zero. In




Figure 1: Mean frequency of RL Trustor’s transfers, with  $\alpha(r) = \alpha_0 r^m$  and  $p(r) = p_0 r^n$ ; see Proposition 1. (top row) Simulating the  $\alpha_0 p_0 K < 1$  condition ( $\alpha_0 = 0.5, p_0 = 0.5, K = 3$ ) when  $\alpha(r)$  and  $p(r)$  are: (left) constant ( $m = n = 0$ ), (middle) linear ( $m = n = 1$ ), or (right) quadratic ( $m = n = 2$ ). (bottom row) Simulating the  $\alpha_0 p_0 K > 1$  condition ( $\alpha_0 = 1, p_0 = 0.5, K = 3$ ) when  $\alpha(r)$  and  $p(r)$  are: (left) constant ( $m = n = 0$ ), (middle) linear ( $m = n = 1$ ), or (right) quadratic ( $m = n = 2$ ). As a visual aid, the dynamics for the first 200 trials are provided in a smaller plot, located at the center of each subplot. Note that these simulation results are fully consistent with Proposition 1, supporting our mathematical analysis.

each trial (for a total of  $N$  trials), an estimate of expected reward for each transferred fraction  $r \in \mathcal{A}$  is computed by sampling from the corresponding distribution (Line 2), and the fraction currently yielding the highest expected reward estimate  $r^*$  is then chosen by RL Trustor to be transferred to TG Trustee (Line 3). Upon this transfer, TG Trustee either returns a positive amount to Trustor, in which case  $S_{r^*}$  is incremented by one (Line 5), or returns a zero amount to Trustor, in which case  $F_{r^*}$  is incremented by one (Line 7). Note that the former happens with probability  $p(r^*)$  and the latter with probability  $1 - p(r^*)$ .

In Figure 1, we simulate 10 RL Trustors and report the mean frequency of a fraction being transferred to TG Trustee over the past trials, for a total of  $N = 20,000$  trials. Note that the simulation results reported in Figure 1 support our mathematical analysis in Proposition 1. As Proposition 1 indicates, if  $\alpha_0 p_0 K < 1$ , the optimal strategy for Trustor is to transfer nothing to Trustee (i.e.,  $r^* = 0$ ); Figure 1(top row) is consistent with this result: as Figure 1(top row) shows, the RL Trustor eventually arrives at the decision that they should transfer nothing to Trustee. Also, according to Proposition 1, if  $\alpha_0 p_0 K > 1$ , the optimal strategy for Trustor is to transfer all of their endowment (i.e.,  $r^* = 1$ ); Figure 1(bottom row) is consistent with this result: as Figure 1(bottom row) shows, the RL Trustor eventually arrives at the decision that they should transfer all of their endowment to Trustee.

## 4 Conclusion

Trust is a backbone of human morality. In this work, we presented a theoretical analysis of the *trust game* (Berg et al., 1995), the canonical task for studying trust in behavioral and brain sciences (Mitkidis et al., 2017; Alós-Ferrer & Farolfi, 2019). Also, leveraging reinforcement learning (RL), we systematically investigated learning trust under various parameterizations of this task. Our simulation results fully support our mathematical analysis. Extending our recent work (Nobandegani et al., 2023), the work presented here shows that using models of interacting agents (here, TG Trustee) makes the training process safer, cheaper, and faster (here, RL Trustor training).

## References

- Agrawal, S., & Goyal, N. (2012). Analysis of Thompson Sampling for the multi-armed bandit problem. In *Conference on Learning Theory (CoLT)* (pp. 1–39).
- Agrawal, S., & Goyal, N. (2013). Further optimal regret bounds for Thompson Sampling. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)* (pp. 99–107).
- Alós-Ferrer, C., & Farolfi, F. (2019). Trust games and beyond. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 887.
- Berg, J., Dickhaut, J., & McCabe, K. (1995). Trust, reciprocity, and social history. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 10(1), 122–142.
- Camerer, C., & Weigelt, K. (1988). Experimental tests of a sequential equilibrium reputation model. *Econometrica*, 1–36.
- Campbell, L., & Stanton, S. C. (2019). Adult attachment and trust in romantic relationships. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 25, 148–151.
- Fehr, E. (2009). On the economics and biology of trust. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 7(2-3), 235–266.
- Fehr, E., & Rockenbach, B. (2003). Detrimental effects of sanctions on human altruism. *Nature*, 422(6928), 137–140.
- Gächter, S., & Fehr, E. (1998). How effective are trust-and reciprocity-based incentives? In *Economics, Values, and Organization*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hetherington, M. J. (1998). The political relevance of political trust. *American Political Science Review*, 92(4), 791–808.
- Johnson, N. D., & Mislin, A. A. (2011). Trust games: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 32(5), 865–889.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709–734.
- Mitkidis, P., Porubanova, M., & Roepstorff, A. (2017). Trust: The limits of human moral. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 178.
- Nobandegani, A. S., Shultz, T. R., & Rish, I. (2023). Cognitive models as simulators: Using cognitive models to tap into implicit human feedback. In *ILHF Workshop at International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 1–9.
- Slovic, P. (1993). Perceived risk, trust, and democracy. *Risk Analysis*, 13(6), 675–682.
- Thompson, W. R. (1933). On the likelihood that one unknown probability exceeds another in view of the evidence of two samples. *Biometrika*, 25(3/4), 285–294.
- Tzieropoulos, H. (2013). The trust game in neuroscience: a short review. *Social Neuroscience*, 8(5), 407–416.
- Uysal, A., Lin, H. L., & Bush, A. L. (2012). The reciprocal cycle of self-concealment and trust in romantic relationships. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 42(7), 844–851.