

Classical versus quantum probability:  
Comments on the paper “On universality of  
classical probability with contextually labeled  
random variables”  
by E. Dzhafarov and M. Kon

Andrei Khrennikov  
International Center for Mathematical Modeling  
in Physics, Engineering, Economics, and Cognitive Science  
Linnaeus University, Växjö, Sweden

October 30, 2018

**Abstract**

Recently Dzhafarov and Kon published the paper advertising the possibility to use the coupling technique of classical probability theory to model incompatible observables in quantum physics and quantum-like models of psychology. Here I present comments on this paper by stressing advantages and disadvantages.

## 1 Introduction

In a series of papers Dzhafarov and coauthors present applications of the *coupling technique of classical probability* (CP) theory to modeling incompatible observables in quantum physics and psychology (see references in Dzhafarov & Kon, 2018; Dzhafarov & Kujala, 2016; Dzhafarov, Kujala, Cervantes, Zhang, & Jones, 2016; Dzhafarov, Kujala, & Larsson, 2015; Dzhafarov, Zhang, & Kujala, 2015). Coupling is a well developed CP-technique (Lindvall, 1992; Thorisson, 2000) for unifying generally unrelated random variables

on the basis of a common Kolmogorov probability space (Kolmogorov, 1952). We recall that in CP-applications, observables are represented by random variables. The crucial contribution of Dzhafarov and coauthors is the proposal to connect the coupling CP-technique with incompatible observables of quantum physics as well as psychology. Dzhafarov and coauthors called their approach *Contextuality-by-Default* (CbD).

We recall that observables are incompatible if they cannot be measured jointly. In the probabilistic terms it means that their *joint probability distribution* (jpd) does not exist. Instead of the jpd, one has to operate with a family of probability distributions depending on experimental contexts (see the *Växjö model* in Khrennikov, 2010). This is a good place to make a remark about terminology. We do not consider the Växjö model to be a part of CP. Here we operate with a family of Kolmogorov probability spaces labeled by contexts (Kolmogorov, 1956). These probability spaces are consistently coupled with the aid of transition probabilities. In the simplest case of dichotomous observables it is possible to present conditions on transition probabilities implying the possibility to represent the contextual model in the complex Hilbert space (Khrennikov, 2010).

The main advantage of Dzhafarov and coauthors' approach to contextuality is its applicability to statistical data violating the condition known in quantum physics as *no-signaling* (or no-disturbance, parameter invariance, etc. — in CbD it is called “consistent connectedness”). The physical terminology, no-signaling, is quite ambiguous. Mathematically no-signaling means consistency of marginal probabilities for different and generally incompatible contexts.

We also point to a different approach to CP-unification of observables related to generally incompatible contexts, proposed by Khrennikov (2015). It is based on the standard procedure of randomization.

Personally, I am sympathetic to modeling contextual statistics of generally incompatible measurements by using a classical measure-theoretic approach, and I contributed a good deal to such studies (see, e.g., Khrennikov, 2010, 2015). Application of the coupling method is an important step in this direction, especially towards demystification of the use of *quantum probability* (QP) in physics or in modeling cognitive, social and political processes. However, I think that QP is a better mathematical tool for modeling these processes.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>For examples of use of QP in psychology, see monographs Asano, Khrennikov, Ohya,

## 2 Complementarity and the context-dependence of probability

**Bohr’s principle of complementarity.** An output of any observable is composed of the contributions of a system and a measurement device. The whole experimental context has to be taken into account. There is no reason to expect that all experimental contexts can be combined. Therefore one cannot expect that all observables can be measured jointly. There exist incompatible observables. See Plotnitsky (2012) for details.

**Complementarity as contextuality of probability.** The principle of complementarity can be reformulated in probabilistic terms. In short, we can say that *the measurement part of QM is a calculus of context-dependent probabilities*. This viewpoint was presented in a series of works by the author of this comment (e.g., Khrennikov, 2010). We emphasize that QP is a very special contextual probabilistic calculus. *Its specialty consists in using the wave function  $\psi$  to unify generally incompatible contexts*.

In classical statistical physics the contextuality of observations is not emphasized. Here it is assumed that it is possible to introduce a single context-independent probability measure  $P$  and reproduce the probability distributions of all physical observables on the basis of  $P$ .<sup>2</sup>

**Non-existence of the joint probability distribution.** Let  $\mathcal{P} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  be a Kolmogorov probability space (Kolmogorov, 1956). Each random variable  $a : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  determines the probability distribution  $P_a$ . The crucial point is that all these distributions are encoded in the same probability measure  $P : P_a(\alpha) = P(\omega \in \Omega : a(\omega) = \alpha)$ . Thus, *probability distributions*

---

Tanaka, and Yamato (2015), Bagarello (2012). Busemeyer and Bruza (2012), Haven and Khrennikov (2013), Khrennikov (2004a, b, 2010); handbook Haven and Khrennikov (2017); textbook Haven, Khrennikov, and Robinson (2017) and some other representative papers (Aerts, 2009; Asano, Masanori, Tanaka, Basieva, & Khrennikov, 2011; Bagarello, Basieva, Pothos, & Khrennikov, 2018; Basieva, Pothos, Trueblood, Khrennikov, & Busemeyer, 2017; Busemeyer, Wang, & Townsend, 2006; Busemeyer, Wang, & Mogiliansky-Lambert, 2009; Haven & Khrennikov, 2009; Haven & Sozzo, 2016; Khrennikov, 1999; Khrennikova, 2014, 2017; Pothos & Busemeyer, 2009, 2013).

<sup>2</sup> Mathematically the observables are presented by random variables that are functions on the space of *elementary events*  $\Omega$ . Events (representing the outputs of observations) are represented as subsets of  $\Omega$ . The set of events  $\mathcal{F}$  is endowed with the structure of a set  $\sigma$ -algebra, i.e., it is closed with respect to the operations of conjunction, disjunction, and negation. These operations are represented as intersection, union, and complement (Kolmogorov, 1956, but see already Boole, 1862, 1958).

of all observables (represented by random variables) can be consistently unified on the basis of  $P$ . For any pair of random variables  $a, b$ , their jpd  $P_{a,b}$  is defined and the following condition of marginal consistency holds:

$$P_a(\alpha) = \sum_{\beta} P_{a,b}(\alpha, \beta) \quad (1)$$

This condition means that observation of  $a$  jointly with  $b$  does not change the probability distribution of  $a$ . Equality (1) implies that, for any two observables  $b$  and  $c$ ,

$$\sum_{\beta} P_{a,b}(\alpha, \beta) = \sum_{\gamma} P_{a,c}(\alpha, \gamma). \quad (2)$$

In fact, condition (2) is equivalent to (1): by selecting the random variable  $c$  such that  $c(\omega) = 1$  almost everywhere, we see that (2) implies (1). These considerations are easily generalized to a system of  $k$  random variables  $a_1, \dots, a_k$ . Their jpd is well defined,  $P_{a_1, \dots, a_k}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) = P(\omega \in \Omega : a_1(\omega) = \alpha_1, \dots, a_k(\omega) = \alpha_k)$ .

Consider now some system of *experimental observables*  $a_1, \dots, a_k$ . If the experimental design for their joint measurement exists, then it is possible to define their jpd  $P_{a_1, \dots, a_k}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$  (as the relative frequency of their joint outcomes). This probability measure  $P \equiv P_{a_1, \dots, a_k}$  can be used to define the Kolmogorov probability space, i.e., the case of joint measurement can be described by CP.

Now consider the general situation: only some groups of observables can be jointly measured. For example, there are four observables  $a_1, a_2$  and  $b_1, b_2$  and we are able to design measurement procedures only for some pairs of them, say  $(a_i, b_j), i, j = 1, 2$ . In this situation, there is no reason to expect that one can define mathematically the joint probability distribution  $P_{a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2)$  such that the conditions of the marginal consistency for pairs hold:

$$P_{a_1, b_1}(\alpha_1, \beta_1) = \sum_{\alpha_2, \beta_2} P_{a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2), \dots \quad (3)$$

This situation is typical for quantum theory. This is a complex interplay of theory and experiment. Only probability distributions  $P_{a_i, b_j}$  can be experimentally verified. The jpd  $P_{a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2}$  is a *hypothetical mathematical quantity*. However, if it existed, one may expect that there would be some experimental design for joint measurement of the quadruple of observables  $(a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2)$ .

On the other hand, if it does not exist, then it is meaningless even to try to design an experiment for their joint measurement.

**The CHSH inequality.** How can one get to know whether a jpd exists? The answer to this question is given by a theorem (Fine, 1982) concerning one of the Bell-type inequalities (Bell, 1964, 1987), namely, the CHSH inequality (Clauser, Horne, Shimony, & Holt, 1969). Consider covariation of compatible observables  $a_i$  and  $b_j$  given by  $\langle a_i b_j \rangle = E[a_i b_j] = \int \alpha \beta dP_{a_i, b_j}(\alpha, \beta)$ . By Fine's theorem a jpd exists if and only if the CHSH-inequality for these correlations is satisfied, namely, the inequality

$$|\langle a_1 b_1 \rangle - \langle a_1 b_2 \rangle + \langle a_2 b_1 \rangle + \langle a_2 b_2 \rangle| \leq 2. \quad (4)$$

and the three other inequalities corresponding to all possible permutations of indexes  $i = 1, 2$  and  $j = 1, 2$ .

We restrict further considerations to the CHSH-framework, i.e., we shall not consider other types of Bell inequalities.

The above presentation of Fine's result is common for physics' folklore. However, Fine did not consider explicitly the CHSH inequalities presented above, see (4). He introduced four inequalities that are necessary and sufficient for the jpd to exist, but these inequalities are expressed differently to the CHSH inequalities. The CHSH inequalities are derivable from Fine's four inequalities stated in Theorem 3 of his paper.

**Remark.** In quantum physics this very clear and simple meaning of violation of the CHSH-inequality is obscured by the issue of nonlocality. Non-locality is relevant to space separated systems. However, except for perhaps cognitive neuro-science, cognitive psychology does not model space separated systems. We remark that Bell type inequalities were considered already by Boole (1862, 1958) as necessary conditions for existence of a jpd.

The above reasoning has an important consequence. The existence of a jpd implies that the condition of marginal consistency with respect to the jpd should hold not only for the pairwise probability distributions (see (1)), but even for probability distributions of each observable,  $a_i, b_j, i, j = 1, 2$ , i.e.,

$$P_{a_i}(\alpha) = \sum_{\beta} P_{a_i, b_j}(\alpha, \beta), j = 1, 2, P_{b_j}(\beta) = \sum_{\alpha} P_{a_i, b_j}(\alpha, \beta), i = 1, 2. \quad (5)$$

As was pointed out, this condition is known in quantum physics as the *no-signaling condition*. Thus, the Fine theorem presupposed that two conditions of marginal consistency, (3) and (5), jointly hold.

**Signaling in physical and psychological experiments.** By using the quantum calculus of probabilities, it is easy to check whether the no-signaling condition holds for quantum observables, which are represented mathematically by Hermitian operators. Therefore Fine’s theorem is applicable to quantum observables. This theoretical fact played an unfortunate role in hiding from view (5) in experimental research on violation of the CHSH-inequality. Experimenters were focused on observing as high violation of (4) as possible and they ignored the no-signaling condition (5). However, if the latter is violated, then a jpd automatically does not exist, and there is no reason to expect that (4) would be satisfied. The first paper in which the signaling issue in quantum experimental research was highlighted was Adenier and Khrennikov (2007). There it was shown that statistical data collected in the basic experiments (for that time) performed by Aspect (1983) and Weihs (1999) violates the no-signaling condition.<sup>3</sup>

The experiments to check CHSH and other Bell-type inequalities have also been performed for mental observables in the form of questions asked to people. The first such experiment was done by Conte, Khrennikov, Todarello, Federici, Mendolicchio, and Zbilut (2008) and was based on the theoretical paper Khrennikov (2004a). As was found by Dzhafarov, Zhang, and Kujala (2015) all known experiments of this type suffer of signaling. Moreover, in contrast to physics, in psychology there are no theoretical reasons to expect no-signaling. In this situation Fine’s theorem is not applicable. And Dzhafarov and his coauthors were the first who understood the need of adapting the Bell-type inequalities to experimental data exhibiting signaling. Obviously, the interplay of whether or not a jpd exists for quadruple

$$S = (a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2)$$

can’t be considered for signaling data.

**Coupling method (Contextuality-by-Default).** Dzhafarov and his coauthors (see references in the introduction) propose considering, instead of quadruple  $S$ , some octuple  $\mathbf{S}$  generated by doubling each observable and associating  $\mathbf{S}$  with four contexts of measurements of pairs,  $C_{11} = (a_1, b_1)$ ,  $C_{12} =$

---

<sup>3</sup>After this publication experimenters became aware of the signaling issue and started to check it (Giustina et al., 2015, Shalm et al., 2015). However, analysis presented in Adenier and Khrennikov (2016) demonstrated that even statistical data generated in the first loophole-free experiment to violate the CHSH-inequality (Hensen et al., 2015) exhibits very strong signaling. In Section 5 the discussion on signaling in physics and psychology will be continued.

$(a_1, b_2), C_{21} = (a_2, b_1), C_{22} = (a_2, b_2)$ . Thus, the basic object of CbD-theory has the form

$$\mathbf{S} = (A_{11}, B_{11}, A_{12}, B_{21}, A_{21}, B_{12}, A_{22}, B_{22}).$$

It is assumed that this system of observables can be realized by random variables on *the same Kolmogorov probability space*  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{S}} = (\mathbf{\Omega}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{P})$ . (We shall use bold symbols for sample spaces and probabilities realizing the octuple representation of observables by random variables.) For example,  $A_{ij} = A_{ij}(\omega), \omega \in \mathbf{\Omega}$ , is a random variable representing observable  $a_i$  measured jointly with the observable  $b_j$ .

By moving from quadruple  $S$  to octuple  $\mathbf{S}$ , one confronts the problem of identity of an observable which is now represented by two different random variables, e.g., the observable  $a_i$  is represented by the random variables  $A_{ij}(\omega), j = 1, 2$ . In the presence of signaling one cannot expect the equality of two such random variables almost everywhere. Dzhafarov and coauthors (Dzhafarov & Kujala, 2016; Dzhafarov, Kujala, Cervantes, Zhang, & Jones, 2016; Dzhafarov, Kujala, & Larsson, 2015; Dzhafarov, Zhang, & Kujala, 2015) came up with a novel treatment of the observable-identity problem.

It is assumed that averages

$$m_{a;ij} = \langle A_{ij} \rangle, m_{b;ij} = \langle B_{ij} \rangle \quad (6)$$

and covariation

$$C_{ij} = \langle A_{ij} B_{ji} \rangle \quad (7)$$

are fixed. These are measurable quantities. They can be statistically verified by experiment.

Set

$$\delta(a_i) = m_{a;i1} - m_{a;i2} \quad \delta(b_j) = m_{b;j1} - m_{b;j2}, \quad (8)$$

and

$$\Delta_0 = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_i \delta(a_i) + \sum_j \delta(b_j) \right). \quad (9)$$

This is the experimentally verifiable measure of signaling.

We remark that in the coupling representation the joint satisfaction of the CHSH inequalities, i.e., (4) and other inequalities obtained from it via permutations, can be written in the form:

$$\max_{ij} |\langle A_{11} B_{11} \rangle + \langle A_{12} B_{21} \rangle + \langle A_{21} B_{12} \rangle + \langle A_{21} B_{22} \rangle - 2 \langle A_{ij} B_{ji} \rangle| \leq 2. \quad (10)$$

In the signaling-free situation, e.g., in quantum physics, the difference between the left-hand and right-hand sides is considered as the measure of contextuality. Denote (1/2 times) this quantity by  $\Delta_{\text{CHSH}}$ . It is also experimentally verifiable.

Then Dzhafarov and coauthors introduced quantity

$$\Delta(\mathbf{P}) = \sum \Delta_{a_i}(\mathbf{P}) + \sum \Delta_{b_j}(\mathbf{P}), \quad (11)$$

where

$$\Delta_{a_i}(\mathbf{P}) = \mathbf{P}(\omega : A_{i1}(\omega) \neq A_{i2}(\omega)), \Delta_{b_j}(\mathbf{P}) = \mathbf{P}(\omega : B_{j1}(\omega) \neq B_{j2}(\omega)). \quad (12)$$

Here  $\Delta_{a_i}(\mathbf{P})$  characterizes mismatching of representations of observable  $a_i$  by random variables  $A_{i1}$  and  $A_{i2}$  with respect to probability measure  $\mathbf{P}$ ;  $\Delta_{b_j}(\mathbf{P})$  is interpreted in the same way. The problem of the identity of observables is formulated as the mismatching minimization or identity maximization problem

$$\Delta(\mathbf{P}) \rightarrow \min \quad (13)$$

with respect to all octuple probability distributions  $\mathbf{P}$  satisfying constraints (6), (7). And it turns out, that

$$\Delta_{\min} = \min \Delta(\mathbf{P}) = \max[\Delta_0, \Delta_{\text{CHSH}}]. \quad (14)$$

It is natural to consider the solutions of the identity maximization problem (13) as CP-representations for contextual system  $\mathbf{S}$ . The corresponding random variables have the highest possible, in the presence of signaling, degree of identity.

The quantity  $\Delta_{\min} - \Delta_0$  is considered as the measure of “genuine contextuality”. Thus contextuality encoded in  $\Delta_{\text{CHSH}}$  is the sum of “straightforward contextuality” carried via signaling and genuine contextuality. This approach is very useful to study contextuality in the presence of signaling. The key point is the coupling of this measure of contextuality with the problem of the identity of observables measured in different contexts. As was emphasized by Dzhafarov & Kujala (2015)<sup>4</sup>:

“contextuality means that random variables recorded under mutually incompatible conditions cannot be sewn together into a single system of jointly

---

<sup>4</sup>In my opinion this is the best paper about Cbd combining clarity and simplicity with rigorousness of presentation.



distributed random variables, provided one assumes that their identity across different conditions changes as little as possibly allowed by direct cross-influences (equivalently, by observed deviations from marginal selectivity).”

This approach to contextuality can be reformulated in the CHSH-manner by using what we can call Bell-Dzhafarov-Kujala (BDK) inequality.

the BDK-inequality

$$\max_{ij} |\langle A_{11}B_{11} \rangle + \langle A_{12}B_{21} \rangle + \langle A_{21}B_{12} \rangle + \langle A_{21}B_{22} \rangle - 2\langle A_{ij}B_{ji} \rangle| - 2\Delta_0 \leq 2. \quad (15)$$

It was proven that octuple-system  $\mathbf{S}$  exhibits no genuine contextuality, i.e.,

$$\Delta_{\min} = \Delta_0, \quad (16)$$

if and only if the BDK-inequality is satisfied.

**Non-uniqueness.** We point out the following feature of the Cbd-modeling physical and psychological phenomena: *a coupling guaranteeing maximal possible identification of different classical random variables representing the same observable is not unique.* Optimization problem (13) has a non-unique solution with a high degree of degeneration.

*How can one select the “right coupling”?*

It is seems that the “right coupling” does not exist. By using the Cbd-approach we go beyond observational theories such as, for example, quantum theory. Consider probability space  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{S}} = (\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{P})$  for octuple  $\mathbf{S}$ . Elementary events of this space,  $\omega \in \Omega$ , are “hidden variables”. These hidden variables are contextual. It is well known that even in the absence of signaling, e.g., in quantum theory, plenty of contextual hidden variable models matching observational data can be constructed. One explanation of this multitude of models is that real physical (or psychological) contextuality is determined not only by semantically defined observables, but also by apparatuses used for their measurement. The same observable determining context can be measured by a variety of apparatuses. These context-apparatuses are represented by probability spaces generated in the Cbd-approach.

In contrast to the Cbd-theory, *QP does not suffer the non-uniqueness problem. There is one fixed quantum state given by a normalized vector  $\psi$  or generally by a density operator  $\rho$ , and there is the unique representation of observables by Hermitian operators.* The QP-description is the natural generalization of the CP-description based on the single probability measure  $P$ . In particular, by applying QP to cognition and psychology we can identify quantum states with mental states and obtain a consistent model of decision making based on such quantum-like states.

### 3 Classical, contextual, and quantum probability

The main message of Dzhafarov and Kon (2018) is that CP can be used to describe mathematically statistical data collected in all possible experiments in physics and psychology. And they rightly pointed out that some authors have actively claimed that generally CP is inapplicable to some experimental data (see references in Dzhafarov & Kon, 2018). I generally support this critique and agree that often statements about inapplicability of CP were formulated vaguely. At the same time some authors mentioned in Dzhafarov and Kon (2018), including Feynman and myself, understood the interrelation between CP and QP very well.

To clarify their position, one has to recall that by the Copenhagen interpretation quantum mechanics is an observational theory and all its statements have to be formulated for experimentally verifiable data. The corresponding statements about inapplicability of CP are about the impossibility of defining a Kolmogorov probability space which is based solely on experimentally verifiable events. This is the viewpoint of Feynman who pointed out that (in the observational framework) one can describe the two-slit experiment only by violating the additivity of probability. He stressed that this experiment is, in fact, composed of three different experiments: both slits are open and two experiments in which only one of the slits is open. Denote these experimental contexts  $C_{12}, C_1, C_2$ . For each of these contexts, CP works very well. However, it is impossible to represent observables with respect to these contexts in the same Kolmogorov probability space without introducing unobservable events. Then Feynman proposed to employ a generalized probabilistic model with non-additive probabilities. The author of this comment reformulated Feynman's considerations by using conditional probabilities. This approach led to a modification of the formula of total probability: perturbation of the CP-formula by an interference term (Khrennikov, 2004a, b, 2010).

By moving from the purely observational theory (such as quantum mechanics) to, so to say, sub-observational models, we can proceed with CP (see, e.g., Khrennikov, 2014) for so-called *prequantum classical statistical field theory* (PCSFT).

The main problem is that the majority of scientists do not separate the two layers of mathematical modeling of natural and mental phenomena: the-

oretical and observational (see Atmanspacher & Primas, 2005; Boltzmann, 1905; Hertz, 1899; Khrennikov, 2017, 2018). Theoretical and observational models for some phenomena are coupled via some correspondence mapping for states and variables. The CbD and PCSFT models are theoretical. Feynman and I discussed impossibility to proceed with CP at the observational level.

Regarding statements of other authors mentioned in Dzhafarov and Kon (2018) and claiming inapplicability of CP in some situations, it is difficult to say whether their statements were about theoretical or observational models or their mixing. The latter is the most common, since people typically do not explicitly identify the modeling layer.

## 4 Impact of CbD theory

The main impact of the CbD theory is the possibility of introducing a measure of contextuality for statistical data with signaling. Generalization of no-signaling contextuality is done very smoothly with the BDK-inequality playing the role of the CHSH-inequality.<sup>5</sup>

We remark that the CbD approach, i.e., the use of the coupling technique of CP, has a nontrivial impact even in the absence of signaling. It demystifies quantum mechanics by highlighting the role of contextuality, i.e., dependence of observables on the whole “experimental arrangement”, as was emphasized by Bohr (see also Khrennikov, 2004a, b, 2010).

Finally, I would like to point to one very important consequence of the possibility of the CP-description of complexes of contexts, such as in the two-slit or Bell-type experiments. Experimental data is the subject of the statistical analysis. The latter is fundamentally based on CP, in particular, the representation of observables by random variables. Thus, to justify mathematically the statistical significance of a violation the CHSH-inequality, one has to proceed on the basis of some Kolmogorov probability space. The CbD theory provides such a possibility.

---

<sup>5</sup>Note that we restrict our considerations to the measurement scheme related to the CHSH-inequality. Generally the CbD theory is applicable to all known measurement schemes for discrete observables.

## 5 Mental signaling: fundamental or technical?

Dzhafarov, Zhang, and Kujala, (2015) pointed out that statistical data collected in psychological experiments contains statistically significant signaling patterns. One can wonder whether signaling is a fundamental feature of mental observations or a mere technicality, perhaps the consequence of badly designed or/and performed experiments. We recall that in physics signaling patterns were found in all Bell experiments during the first 30 years.

Since quantum theory predicts the absence of signaling, signaling patterns in experimental statistical data were considered to be a technicality.<sup>6</sup> Understanding the technical sources of signaling and finding ways to eliminate it required great efforts of the experimenters. Finally, Giustina et al. (2015) and Shalm et al. (2015) reported that the null hypothesis of signaling can be rejected for the data collected in these experiments.<sup>7</sup>

In psychology the situation is more complicated. There are no theoretical reasons to expect no signaling. Therefore, it is not obvious whether signaling is a technicality or a fundamental feature of cognition. For the moment, only a few experiments have been performed. One cannot exclude that in the future more advanced experiments would generate data without signaling. As the first step towards such experiments, possible experimental sources of mental signaling should be analyzed. However, it may be that mental signaling is really a fundamental feature of cognition.

In any event, it is interesting to attempt to find non-signaling contextual patterns in human behavior. If such patterns were found, then one can try to connect such non-signaling contextuality with some specialty in human psychology.

---

<sup>6</sup>Here “technicality” refers to situations in which technical equipment, experimental design, improper calibration of detectors and so on, influence an experiments results.

<sup>7</sup>Hensen et al. (2015) also claimed that signaling hypothesis can be rejected. However, the independent analysis of their statistical data performed by Adenier and Khrennikov (2016) showed the presence of statistically significant signaling. It is very important to perform a similar independent analysis for the data obtained by Giustina et al. (2015) and Shalm et al. (2015).

## Acknowledgments

I would like to thank E. Dzhafarov for his numerous comments which were helpful to understand correctly his position, I also thankful to I. Basieva and E. Pothos for long and exciting discussions on quantum versus psychological foundations during my sabbatical at City, University of London.

### References

- Adenier, G., & Khrennikov, A. (2007). Is the fair sampling assumption supported by EPR experiments? *Journal of Physics B: Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics*, *40*, 131-141.
- Adenier, G., & Khrennikov, A. (2016). Test of the no-signaling principle in the Hensen loophole-free CHSH experiment. *Fortschritte der Physik (Progress in Physics)*, *65*, 1600096.
- Aerts, D. (2009). Quantum structure in cognition. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, *53*, 314-348.
- Asano, M., Masanori, O., Tanaka, Y., Basieva, I., & Khrennikov, A. (2011). Quantum-like model of brain's functioning: Decision making from decoherence *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, *281*, 56-64.
- Asano, M., Khrennikov, A., Ohya, O., Tanaka, Y., & Yamato, I. (2015). *Quantum adaptivity in biology: from genetics to cognition*. Heidelberg-Berlin-New York: Springer.
- Aspect, A. (1983). *Three experimental tests of Bell inequalities by the measurement of polarization correlations between photons*. Orsay: Orsay Press.
- Atmanspacher, H., & Primas, H. (2005). Epistemic and ontic quantum realities. In G. Adenier & A. Yu. Khrennikov (Eds.), *Foundations of Probability and Physics-3* 750 (pp. 49-62). Melville, NY: AIP.
- Bagarello, F. (2012). *Quantum dynamics for classical systems: with applications of the number operator*. New York: Wiley.
- Bagarello, F., Basieva, I., Pothos, E., & Khrennikov, A. (2018). Quantum like modeling of decision making: Quantifying uncertainty with the aid of Heisenberg-Robertson inequality. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, *84*, 49-56.
- Basieva, I., Pothos, E., Trueblood, J., Khrennikov, A., & Busemeyer, J. (2017). Quantum probability updating from zero prior (by-passing Cromwell's rule). *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, *77*, 58-69.
- Bell, J. (1964). On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox. *Physics*, *1*, 195-200.

Bell J. (1987) *Speakable and unspeakable in quantum mechanics*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Boltzmann, L. (1905). Über die Frage nach der objektiven Existenz der Vorgänge in der unbelebten Natur. In J. A. Barth (Ed.), Leipzig: Populäre Schriften.

Boole, G. (1862). On the theory of probabilities. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, 152, 225-242.

Boole, G. (1958). *An Investigation of the laws of thought*. New York: Dover.

Bussemeyer, J. R., Wang, Z., & Townsend, J. T. (2006). Quantum dynamics of human decision making. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 50, 220-241.

Bussemeyer, J. R., & Bruza, P. D. (2012). *Quantum models of cognition and decision*. Cambridge: Cambridge Press.

Bussemeyer, J. R., Wang, Z., & Lambert-Mogiliansky, A. (2009). Comparison of quantum and Markov models of decision making. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 53, 423-433.

Clauser, J. F., Horne, M. A., Shimony, A., & Holt, R. A. (1969). Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories. *Physics Review Letters*, 23 (15), 880-884.

Conte, E., Khrennikov, A., Todarello, O., Federici, A., Mendolicchio, L., & Zbilut, J. P. (2008). A preliminary experimental verification on the possibility of Bell inequality violation in mental states. *NeuroQuantology*, 6, 214-221.

Dzhafarov, E. N., & Kujala, J. V. (2012). Selectivity in probabilistic causality: Where psychology runs into quantum physics. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 56, 54-63.

Dzhafarov, E. N., Kujala, J. V., & Larsson, J.-A. (2015). Contextuality in three types of quantum-mechanical systems. *Foundations of Physics*, 7, 762-782.

Dzhafarov, E. N., Zhang, R., & Kujala, J.V. (2015). Is there contextuality in behavioral and social systems? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society: A*, 374, 20150099.

Dzhafarov, E. N., & Kujala, J. V. (2015) Probabilistic contextuality in EPR/Bohm-type systems with signaling allowed. In E. Dzhafarov, S. Jordan, R. Zhang, & V. Cervantes (Eds.), *Contextuality from Quantum Physics to Psychology* (pp. 287-308). New Jersey: World Scientific Publishing.

Dzhafarov, E. N., & Kujala, J. V. (2016). Context-content systems of

random variables: The contextuality-by default theory. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 74, 11-33.

Dzhafarov, E. N., Kujala, J. V., Cervantes, V. H., Zhang, R., & Jones, M. (2016). On contextuality in behavioral data. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society: A*, 374, 20150234.

Dzhafarov, E. N., & Kon, M. (2018). On universality of classical probability with contextually labeled random variables. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 85, 17-24.

Fine, A. (1982). Joint distributions, quantum correlations, and commuting observables. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 23, 1306.

Giustina, M., Versteegh, M. A. M., Wengerowsky, S., Handsteiner, J., Hochrainer, A., Phelan, K., Steinlechner, F., Kofler, J., Larsson, J.-A., Abellan, C., Amaya, W., Pruneri, V., Mitchell, M. W., Beyer, J., Gerrits, T., Lita, A.E., Shalm, L.K., Woo Nam, S., Scheidl, T., Ursin, R., Wittmann, B., & Zeilinger, A. (2015). A significant-loophole-free test of Bell's theorem with entangled photons. *Physics Review Letters*, 115, 250401.

Haven, E., & Khrennikov, A. (2009). Quantum mechanics and violation of the sure-thing principle: The use of probability interference and other concepts. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 53, 378-388.

Haven, E., & Khrennikov, A. (2013). *Quantum social science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haven, E., & Khrennikov, A. (Eds.) (2017). *The Palgrave handbook of quantum models in social science. Applications and grand challenges*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Haven, E., Khrennikov, A., & Robinson, T. R. (2017). *Quantum methods in social science: A first course*. Singapore: World Scientific Publishing.

Haven, E., & Sozzo, S. (2016). A generalized probability framework to model economic agents' decisions under uncertainty. *International Review Financial Analysis*, 47, 297-303.

Hensen, B., Bernien, H., Dreau, A. E., Reiserer, A., Kalb, N., Blok, M. S., Ruitenberg, J., Vermeulen, R. F. L., Schouten, R. N., Abellan, C., Amaya, W., Pruneri, V., Mitchell, M. W., Markham, M., Twitchen, D. J., Elkouss, D., Wehner, S., Taminiau, T. H., & Hanson, R. (2015). Experimental loophole-free violation of a Bell inequality using entangled electron spins separated by 1.3 km. *Nature*, 526, 682-686.

Hertz, H. (1899). *The principles of mechanics: presented in a new form*. London: Macmillan.

Khrennikov, A. (1999). Classical and quantum mechanics on information

spaces with applications to cognitive, psychological, social and anomalous phenomena. *Foundations of Physics*, 29, 1065-1098.

Khrennikov, A. (2004a). On quantum-like probabilistic structure of mental information. *Open Systems and Information Dynamics*, 11, 267-275.

Khrennikov, A. (2004b). *Information dynamics in cognitive, psychological and anomalous phenomena*. Berlin-Heidelberg-New York: Springer.

Khrennikov, A. (2010). *Ubiquitous quantum structure: From psychology to finance*. Berlin-Heidelberg-New York: Springer.

Khrennikov, A. (2014). *Beyond quantum*. Pan Stanford Publishing: Singapore.

Khrennikov, A. (2015). CHSH inequality: quantum probabilities as classical conditional probabilities. *Foundations of Physics*, 45, 711-725.

Khrennikov, A. (2017). Quantum epistemology from subquantum ontology: Quantum mechanics from theory of classical random fields. *Annals of Physics*, 377, 147-163.

Khrennikov, A. (2018). Hertz's viewpoint on quantum theory. arXiv:1807.06409 [quant-ph].

Khrennikova, P. (2014). A quantum framework for 'Sour Grapes' in cognitive dissonance. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 8369, 270-280.

Khrennikova, P. (2017). Modeling behavior of decision makers with the aid of algebra of qubit creation-annihilation operators. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 78, 76-85.

Kolmogorov, A. N. (1956). *Foundations of the theory of probability*. New York: Chelsea Publishing Company.

Lindvall, T. (1992). *Lectures on the coupling method*. New York: Wiley.

Plotnitsky, A. (2012). *Niels Bohr and complementarity: An introduction*. Berlin and New York: Springer.

Pothos, E. M. , & Busemeyer, J. R. (2009) A quantum probability explanation for violations of rational decision making *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society: B*, 276, 2171-2178.

Pothos, E. M., & Busemeyer, J. R. (2013). Can quantum probability provide a new direction for cognitive modeling? *Behavioral Brain Science*, 36, 255-327.

Shalm, L.K., Meyer-Scott, E., Christensen, B. G., Bierhorst, P., Wayne, M. A., Stevens, M. J., Gerrits, T., Glancy, S., Hamel, D. R., Allman, M. S., Coakley, K. J., Dyer, S. D., Hodge, C., Lita, A. E., Verma, V. B., Lambrocco, C., Tortorici, E., Migdall, A. L., Zhang, Y., Kumor, D. R., Farr, W. H., Marsili, F., Shaw, M. D., Stern, J. A., Abellan, C., Amaya, W., Pruneri,



W., Jennewein, T., Mitchell, M. W., Kwiat, P. G., Bienfang, J. C., Mirin, R. P., Knill, E., & Woo Nam, S. (2015). A strong loophole-free test of local realism. *Physics Review Letters*, *115*, 250402.

Thorisson, H. (2000). *Coupling, stationarity, and regeneration*. New York: Springer.

Weihs, G. (1999). *Ein Experiment zum Test der Bellschen Ungleichung unter Einsteinscher Lokalität*. Vienna: University of Vienna.