

Quantum Decision Theory

V.I. Yukalov^{1,2} and D. Sornette¹

¹*Department of Management, Technology and Economics,
ETH Zürich, Zürich CH-8032, Switzerland,*

²*Bogolubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics,
Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna 141980, Russia*

Abstract

We present a “quantum decision theory” (QDT) of decision making based on the mathematical theory of separable Hilbert spaces on the continuous field of complex numbers. This mathematical structure captures the effect of superposition of composite prospects, including many incorporated intentions, which allows us to describe a variety of interesting fallacies and anomalies that have been reported to characterize the decision making characteristics of real human beings. QDT characterizes entangled decision making, non-commutativity of subsequent decisions, and intention interference. These features, although being quantum in their description, have natural and concrete transparent interpretations. We demonstrate how the violation of Savage’s sure-thing principle (disjunction effect) can be explained quantitatively as a result of the interference of intentions, when making decisions under uncertainty. The sign and amplitude of the disjunction effects in experiments are accurately predicted using a theorem of interference alternation that we derive, which connects aversion-to-uncertainty to the appearance of negative interference terms suppressing the probability of actions. The conjunction fallacy is also explained by the presence of the interference terms. A series of experiments are analysed and shown to be in perfect agreement with a priori evaluation of interference effects, without adjustable parameter: we predict that, on average, the classical probability estimations for actions are reduced by 0.25 in the presence of competition between different intentions and in the presence of uncertainty. This quasi-universal “interference-quarter law” is found in remarkable agreement with the available experiments on the disjunction and conjunction effects. The conjunction fallacy is also shown to be a sufficient condition for the disjunction effect and novel experiments testing the combined interplay between the two effects are suggested.

Keywords: Decision making; Entangled decisions; Intention interference; Interference alternation; Disjunction effect; Conjunction fallacy; Uncertainty aversion; Decision noncommutativity

1 Introduction

Decision theory is concerned with identifying what are the optimal decisions and how to reach them. Traditionally, it is a part of discrete mathematics. Most of decision theory is normative and prescriptive, and assumes that people are fully-informed and rational. These assumptions have been questioned early on with the evidence provided by the Allais paradox (Allais, 1953) and many other behavioral paradoxes (Camerer et al., 2003), showing that humans often seem to deviate from the prescription of rational decision theory due to cognitive and emotion biases. The theories of bounded rationality (Simon, 1957) of behavioral economics and of behavioral finance have attempted to account for these deviations. As reviewed by Machina (2008), alternative models of preferences over objectively or subjectively uncertain prospects have attempted to accommodate these systematic departures from the expected utility model while retaining as much of its analytical power as possible. In particular, non-additive nonlinear probability models have been developed to account for the deviations from objective to subjective probabilities observed in human agents (Quiggin, 1982; Gilboa and Schmeidler, 1989; Cohen and Tallon, 2000). However, many paradoxes remain unexplained or are sometimes rationalized on an ad hoc basis, which does not provide much predictive power.

Here, we propose a “quantum” decision theory (QDT), developed as a part of the mathematical theory of Hilbert spaces (Dieudonné, 2006). Specifically, we consider decision making as a projection operating in a complex separable Hilbert space of intention representations. Our QDT can be thought of as the mathematically simplest and most natural extension of objective probabilities into nonlinear subjective probabilities. The proposed formalism allows us to explain quantitatively the disjunction and conjunction effects. The disjunction effect is the failure of humans to obey the sure-thing theorem of classical probability theory. The conjunction effect is a logical fallacy that occurs when people assume that specific conditions are more probable than a single general one. Our QDT unearths a deep relationship between the conjunction and the disjunction effects, the former being sufficient for the later to exist.

QDT uses the same underlying mathematical structure as the one developed to establish a rigorous formulation of quantum mechanics, the theory of waves and particles, developed with extraordinary success in physics during the first-half of the twentieth century. Based on the mathematical theory of separable Hilbert spaces on the continuous field of complex numbers, quantum mechanics showed how to reconcile and combine the continuous wave description of energy with the fact that waves are organized in discrete energy packets (called quanta) that behave in a manner similar to particles. Similarly, in our framework, the qualifier “quantum” emphasizes the fact that a decision is a discrete selection from a large set of entangled options. Our key idea is to provide the simplest generalization of the classical probability theory underlying decision theory, so as to account for the complex dynamics of the many nonlocal hidden variables that may be involved in the cognitive and decision making processes of the brain. The mathematical theory of complex separable Hilbert spaces provides the simplest direct way to avoid dealing with the unknown hidden variables, and at the same time reflecting the complexity of nature (Yukalov, 1975). In decision making, the hidden variables can be the many unknown states of nature, the emotions, and the subconscious processes.

Before presenting our QDT, it is useful to briefly summarize previous studies of decision making and of the associated cognitive processes of the brain which, superficially, could be considered as related to our approach. This exposition will allow us to underline the originality and uniqueness of our approach. We do not touch here purely physiological aspects of the problem, which are studied in medicine and the cognitive sciences. Concerning the functional aspects of the brain, we focus our efforts towards its mathematical modeling.

A first class of approaches is based on the theory of neural networks and of dynamical systems (see, e.g. Hopfield, 1982; Amit, 1989; Hopfield, 1999; Haken, 2008). These bottom-up approaches suffer from the obvious difficulties of modeling the emergence of upper mental faculties from a microscopic constructive neuron-based description.

Two main classes of theories invoke the qualifier “quantum.” In the first class, one finds investigations which attempt to represent the brain as a quantum or quantum-like object (Penrose, 1989; Lockwood, 1989; Satinover, 2001), for which several mechanisms have been suggested (Fröhlich, 1968; Stuart et al., 1978, 1979; Beck and Eccles, 1992; Vitiello, 1995; Hagan et al., 2002; Pessa and Vitiello, 2003). The existence of genuine quantum effects and the operation of any of these mechanisms in the brain remain however controversial and have been criticized by Tegmark (2000) as being unrealistic. Another approach in this first class appeals to the mind-matter duality, treating mind and matter as complementary aspects and considering consciousness as a separate fundamental entity (Chalmers, 1996; Atmanspacher et al., 2002; Primas, 2003; Atmanspacher, 2003). This allows one, without insisting on the quantum nature of the brain processes, if any, to ascribe quantum properties solely to the consciousness itself, as has been advocated by Stapp (1993, 1999). Actually, the basic idea that mental processes are similar to quantum-mechanical phenomena goes back to the founder of the old quantum mechanics, Niels Bohr himself. One of the first publications on this analogy is his paper (Bohr, 1929). Later on, he returned many times to the similarity between quantum mechanics and the function of the brain, for instance in Bohr (1933, 1937, 1961). This analogy proposes that mental processes could be modeled by a quantum-mechanical wave function, whose evolution would be characterized by a dynamical equation, like the Schrödinger equation. The possibility of representing mental states by means of quantum-mechanical wave functions has been revisited in several recent papers (Khrennikov, 2006; Busemeyer et al., 2006; Mogiliansky et al., 2006; Franco, 2007; Khrennikov and Haven, 2007).

The second class of theories do not necessarily assume quantum properties of the brain or that consciousness is a separate entity with quantum characteristics. Rather, these approaches use quantum techniques, as a convenient language to generalize classical probability theory. An example is provided by so-called quantum games (Meyer, 1999; Goldenberg et al., 1999; Eisert and Wilkens, 2000; Johnson, 2001; Benjamin and Hayden 2001; Iqbal and Toor, 2001; Li et al., 2001; Du et al., 2001, 2002; Lee and Johnson, 2003; Huberman and Hogg, 2003). According to van Enk and Pike (2002), any quantum game can be reformulated as a classical game rigged with some additional conditions. Another example is the Shor (1997) algorithm, which is purely quantum-mechanical but is solving the classical factoring problem. This shows that there is no contradiction in using quantum techniques to describe classical problems (here “classical” is contrasted with “quantum”, in the sense consecrated by decades of discussions on the interpretation of quantum mechanics). In fact, some people go as far as stating that quantum mechanics is nothing but an effective theory describing

very complicated classical systems. Interpretations of this type have been made, e.g., by de Broglie and Bohm. An extensive literature in this direction can be found in de Broglie (1982) and Bohm (1951). In any case, whether we deal really with a genuinely quantum system or with an extremely complex classical system, the language of quantum theory can be a convenient effective tool for describing such systems (Yukalov, 1975). In the case of decision making performed by real people, the subconscious activity and the underlying emotions, which are difficult to quantify, play the role of the hidden variables appearing in quantum theory.

Our QDT belongs to this second class of theories, i.e., we use the construction of complex separable Hilbert spaces as a *mathematical language* that is convenient for characterizing the processes in the mind associated with decision making. This approach encompasses in a natural way several delicate features of decision making, such as its probabilistic nature, the existence of entangled decisions, the possible non-commutativity of decisions, and the interference between several different decisions. These terms and associated concepts are made operationally clear in the sequel. As a bonus, the QDT provides natural algorithms which could be used in the future in the operation of quantum computers.

Our contribution to the literature on decision making can be summarized as follows.

(1) We develop a general mathematical approach that is applicable to arbitrary situations. In contrast with previous approaches, we do not try to adjust our QDT to fit particular cases; the same theory is used throughout the paper to treat different effects.

(2) We do not characterize the state of mind by a simple wave function, corresponding to a given intended action, but rather by a composite vector, incorporating a great number of intended competing actions.

(3) To connect with utility theory, we define a normalized utility function, which is identified with a subjective conditional probability.

(4) Our QDT allows us to characterize not a single unusual, quantum-like, property of the decision making process, but several of these characteristics, including entangled decisions, non-commutative decisions, and the interference between intentions.

(5) The literature emphasizes that aversion with respect to uncertainty is an important feeling regulating decision making. We formulate this general and ubiquitous feeling under the uncertainty-aversion principle.

(6) We demonstrate the theorem on interference alternation. We show that the interference between several intentions, arising under uncertainty, consists of several terms alternating in sign, some being positive and some being negative. These terms are the source of the different paradoxes and logical fallacies presented by humans making decisions in uncertain contexts.

(7) Uncertainty aversion and interference alternation combined together are the key factors that suppress the probability of acting and, at the same time, enhancing the probability of remaining passive.

(8) We demonstrate that it is not simply the interference between intentions as such, but specifically the interference alternation, together with the uncertainty aversion, which is responsible for the violation of Savage's sure-thing principle at the origin of the disjunction

effect.

(9) The conjunction fallacy is another effect that is caused by the interference of intentions, together with the uncertainty-aversion principle. Without the latter, the conjunction effect cannot be explained. The conjunction fallacy is shown to be a sufficient condition for the disjunction effect to occur, exhibiting a deep link between the two effects.

(10) The general “interference-quarter law” is derived, which provides a quantitative prediction for the amplitude of the interference terms, and thus of the quantitative level by which the sure-thing principle is violated.

(11) Detailed quantitative comparisons with experiments documenting the disjunction effect and the conjunction fallacy confirm the validity of the derived laws.

(12) We demonstrate that subsequent decisions do not commute with each other, by proving a theorem on noncommutativity of decisions.

2 Foundations of quantum decision theory (QDT)

2.1 Utility and probability

Classical utility theory (von Neumann and Morgenstern, 1944) is based on the assumption that each action A from an action set $\mathcal{A} = \{A\}$ can be characterized by its utility function $U(A)$. The action A which is preferable is such that its expected utility function is maximal. In general, any decision process is affected by circumstances affecting it, which can be characterized by a set of variables x , belonging to a family $\mathcal{X} = \{x\}$, representing the states of nature. The variables x , which are not strictly known, are assumed to constitute an ensemble of random variables endowed with the differential probability measure $d\mu(x)$. Specifying the probability measure $d\mu(x)$ presupposes that something is known about the states of nature $\{x\}$, allowing a consideration of a set of states as being admissible with the probability weights determined from $d\mu(x)$. The specification of the states of nature can be done by means of measurements or experiments. Such a decision problem, occurring in the presence of uncertainty about the states of nature, is formalized under the so-called statistical decision theory (Lindgren, 1971; White, 1976; Hastings and Mello, 1978; Rivett, 1980; Buchanan, 1982; Berger, 1985; Mashall and Oliver, 1995; Bather, 2000; French and Insua, 2000; Raiffa and Schlaifer, 2000; Weirich, 2001). The utility function for an action A , taken under the state of nature x , is $U(A, x)$. Strictly speaking, the states of nature are dependent on the actions undertaken in the presence of these states. Therefore, the probability measure of the states of nature should be classified as a joint probability measure $d\mu(x, A)$. As a consequence, the expected utility of an action A is

$$U(A) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} U(A, x) d\mu(x, A) . \quad (1)$$

The measure $d\mu(x, A)$ can be either continuous or discrete with respect to x . In the latter case, the above integral reduces to a sum over x . The set \mathcal{A} of all actions $\{A\}$, taken under the states of nature x from the family \mathcal{X} , and equipped with the probability measure $d\mu(x, A)$, composes the randomized action space $\{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X}, \mu(x, A)\}$. On the basis of these characteristics,

one can introduce the loss function (which is a negative utility), the regret function, and so on.

Representing the measure $d\mu(x, A)$ as

$$d\mu(x, A) = P(A|x) d\mu(x) , \quad (2)$$

it is possible to introduce the conditional probability $P(A|x)$ for an action A under condition x . The usage of this conditional probability is convenient, when the actions and the states of nature can be easily classified (Schall, 2001; Sugrue et al., 2005; Yang and Shadlen, 2007). Then, one can compare a pair of competing actions, say A and B , by means of the log-likelihood ratio

$$L_{AB}(x) \equiv \log \frac{P(A|x)}{P(B|x)} . \quad (3)$$

In this approach, an action A , taken under the state-of-nature condition x , is preferable to an action B , taken under the same condition, if $L_{AB}(x) > 0$.

The analytic study of a decision problem, whether it is based on the notion of utility or on that of the log-likelihood ratio, requires a precise specification in order to obtain a mathematical model of ordering among the various possible consequences resulting from the action under particular states of nature.

However, when trying to implement the decision making procedure based on the above definitions, several major difficulties are encountered.

1. The consequences resulting from the action may not have any scale allowing one to obtain a quantitative measure.
2. Even when there is a scale, for instance monetary, by which the consequences of the action could be evaluated, the chosen scale may not reflect the true value cherished by the decision maker (Berger, 1985).
3. In those cases which do not involve quantifiable material goods as in demand and supply, but which are associated with certain immaterial goods characterizing the mental states and attitudes of individuals, it is not easy, if even possible in principle, to invent a related utility measure (Weidlich, 1991). For example, how could one measure the consequences of such irrational notions as emotional behavior, subjective estimations, innate prejudices and biases, as well as effects of collective opinion pressure?
4. The most insurmountable obstacle in decision making is that the precise mathematical definition of the random states of nature are rarely known. For instance, consider the case of complex systems, which are maybe closer to real life than simple artificial games, for which the huge variety of all possible states of nature are simply not known at all (Zeckhauser, 2006). Hence, no particular probability measure for these stochastic states of nature can be ascribed.

To overcome these difficulties, we suggest the following approach. First, in order to avoid the problem of choosing a scale of utility functions, it is reasonable to introduce a

dimensionless quantity. For this purpose, instead of dealing with a scale-dependent utility function $U(A)$, we define the normalized utility

$$p(A) \equiv \frac{U(A)}{\sum_A U(A)}, \quad (4)$$

which, by definition, is scale independent. The introduced dimensionless quantity $p(A)$ can be interpreted as the subjective probability of an action A , since it both reflects the preference of the decision maker and at the same time satisfies the standard properties associated with a probability measure

$$0 \leq p(A) \leq 1, \quad \sum_A p(A) = 1. \quad (5)$$

This definition relates the utility formalism to the likelihood approach, in the sense that the action which is preferred is associated with the largest probability $p(A)$.

In order to avoid the problem of dealing with unspecified random variables, characterizing unknown states of nature, we propose to define the action probability $p(A)$ as done in quantum mechanics, using the mathematic theory of complex separable Hilbert spaces. This proposition can be justified by invoking the following analogy. The probabilistic features of quantum theory can be interpreted as being due to the existence of the so-called nonlocal hidden variables. The dynamical laws of these nonlocal hidden variables could be not merely extremely cumbersome, but even not known at all, similarly to the unspecified states of nature. The formalism of quantum theory is then formulated in such a way so as to avoid dealing with unknown hidden variables, but at the same time to reflect the complexity of nature (Yukalov, 1975). In decision making, the role of hidden variables is played by unknown states of nature, by emotions, and by subconscious processes, for which quantitative measures are not readily available.

In the following sub-sections, we develop the detailed description of the suggested program, explicitly constructing the action probability in quantum-mechanical terms. The probability of an action is intrinsically subjective, as it must characterize intended actions by human beings. For brevity, we call an intended action an *intention*. And, in compliance with the terminology used in the theories of decision-making, a composite set of intended actions, consisting of several subactions, will be called a *prospect*. An important feature of our approach is that we insist on the necessity of dealing not with separate intended actions, but with composite prospects, including many incorporated intentions. Only then it becomes possible with the frame of one general theory to describe a variety of interesting unusual phenomena that have been reported to characterize the decision making properties of real human beings.

2.2 Main definitions

In order to formulate in precise mathematical terms the process of decision making, it is necessary to introduce several definitions. To better understand these definitions, we shall give some very simple examples, although much more complicated cases can be invented. The entity concerned with the decision making task can be a single human, a group of humans, a society, a computer, or any other system that is able or enables to make decisions. Throughout the paper, we shall employ the Dirac notations widely used in quantum theory (Dirac, 1958).

2.2.1 Intention

An Intention, i.e., an intended action, is a particular thought about doing something. Examples of intentions could be as follows: “I would like to marry” or “I would like to be rich” or “I would like to establish a firm.” There can be a variety of intentions, which we assume to be enumerated by an index $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$

2.2.2 Intention representations

Intention representations are concrete implementations of an intention. For instance, the intention “to marry” can have as representations the following variants: “to marry A ” or “to marry B ”, and so on. The intention “to be rich” can have as representations “to be rich by working hard” or “to be rich by becoming a bandit”. The intention “to establish a firm” can have as representations “to establish a firm producing cars” or “to establish a firm publishing books” and so on. We number all representations of an i -intention by the index $n_i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$. Note that intention representations may include not only positive intention variants “to do something” but also negative variants such as “not to do something.” For example, the Hamlet’s hesitation “to be or not to be” is the intention consisting of two representations, one positive and the other negative.

2.2.3 Representation state

The representation state is denoted as the vector $|n_i\rangle$ corresponding to the n_i -representation of an i -intention. This vector is a member of a linear space to be defined below.

2.2.4 Representation basis

The representation basis $\{|n_i\rangle\}$ is the set of the representation states $|n_i\rangle$ corresponding to those intention representations n_i , which are classified as basic. Here “basic” means the most important and fundamental, in the sense that a linear combination of the vectors $|n_i\rangle$ exhausts the whole set of i -intentions. The members of a representation basis are supposed to be well distinguished from each other and also normalized. This can be formalized as saying that the representation basis is orthonormal, which implies that a form, called scalar product, is defined, such that the scalar product $\langle n_i | n_j \rangle$ yields the Kronecker symbol δ_{ij} :

$$\langle n_i | n_j \rangle = \delta_{ij} \quad (6)$$

2.2.5 Intention space

The intention space is denoted

$$\mathcal{H}_i \equiv \overline{\mathcal{L}}\{|n_i\rangle\} \quad (7)$$

and is defined as the closed linear envelop of the representation basis $\{|n_i\rangle\}$. The intention space is a Hilbert space.

2.2.6 Intention state

The intention state at time t is a function

$$\psi_i(t) = \sum_{n_i} c_{n_i}(t) |n_i \rangle , \quad (8)$$

corresponding to an i -intention, which can be represented as a linear combination of the representation basis $\{|n_i \rangle\}$. The intention state (8) is a member of the intention space (7). Since the intention space has been assumed to be a Hilbert space, the associated scalar product exists and yields

$$\langle \psi_i(t_1) | \psi_i(t_2) \rangle \equiv \sum_{n_i} c_{n_i}^*(t_1) c_{n_i}(t_2) . \quad (9)$$

The norm of the intention state (8) is generated by the scalar product (9) as

$$\|\psi_i(t)\| \equiv \sqrt{\langle \psi_i(t) | \psi_i(t) \rangle} . \quad (10)$$

Without loss of generality, the intention states (8) can be normalized to one, hence

$$\|\psi_i(t)\| = 1 . \quad (11)$$

This, together with Eq. (8), gives

$$\sum_{n_i} |c_{n_i}(t)|^2 = 1 . \quad (12)$$

2.2.7 Prospect

A prospect is a set of several intentions. In reality, an individual is always motivated by a variety of intentions, which are mutually interconnected. Even the realization of a single intention always involves taking into account many other related intentions.

2.2.8 Prospect representation

A prospect representation is a concrete implementation of a prospect and is therefore a family of the intention representations corresponding to the considered prospect. With each intention representation marked by the index n_i , the prospect representation is labelled by the multi-index

$$n \equiv \{n_1, n_2, n_3, \dots\} . \quad (13)$$

2.2.9 Prospect-representation state

A prospect-representation state is a vector

$$|n \rangle \equiv \otimes_i |n_i \rangle \equiv |n_1 n_2 \dots \rangle \quad (14)$$

which is mapped to the prospect representation (13). This vector is the tensor product of the representation states $|n_i \rangle$.

2.2.10 Prospect-representation basis

The prospect-representation basis $\{|n \rangle\}$ is the family of all prospect-representation states (14) corresponding to the prospect representations that are classified as basic or the most important ones. Different states belonging to the prospect-representation basis are assumed to be distinguishable, in the sense of being orthogonal. Since the modulus of each state has no special meaning, these states are also normalized to one. This can be formalized as the orthonormality of the basis, for which there exists a scalar product

$$\langle m|n \rangle = \prod_i \langle m_i|n_i \rangle = \delta_{mn} , \quad (15)$$

where

$$\delta_{mn} \equiv \prod_i \delta_{m_i n_i} \quad (16)$$

is the product of the Kronecker symbols.

2.2.11 Prospect space

The prospect space is defined as the closed linear envelop of the prospect-representation basis $\{|n \rangle\}$:

$$\mathcal{H} \equiv \overline{\mathcal{L}}\{|n \rangle\} = \otimes_i \mathcal{H}_i . \quad (17)$$

This is a Hilbert space, being the direct product of the intention spaces (7), which can be thought of as a possible mathematical representation of the mind.

2.2.12 Dimensionality of mind

The dimensionality of the prospect space (17), which can be termed the *dimensionality of mind*, is

$$d_{\mathcal{H}} \equiv \prod_i R_i , \quad (18)$$

where R_i is the number of representations of the i -intention.

2.2.13 Prospect state

The prospect state (or *State of Mind*) at time t is a function

$$\psi(t) = \sum_n c_n(t) |n \rangle , \quad (19)$$

which is a linear combination of the prospect-representation basis $\{|n \rangle\}$. The coefficients $c_n(t)$ are complex-valued functions of time, whose temporal evolution is associated with the given individual and context. The prospect state (19) belongs to the prospect space (17), a Hilbert state endowed with the scalar product

$$\langle \psi(t_1) | \psi(t_2) \rangle \equiv \sum_n c_n^*(t_1) c_n(t_2) . \quad (20)$$

The norm of the prospect state (19) is generated by the scalar product (20),

$$\|\psi(t)\| \equiv \sqrt{\langle \psi(t) | \psi(t) \rangle} . \quad (21)$$

Since the norms have no specific role, without loss of generality, we normalize the prospect states to unity, such that

$$\|\psi(t)\| = 1 . \quad (22)$$

Then, from the definition of the scalar product (20), we have

$$\sum_n |c_n(t)|^2 = 1 . \quad (23)$$

It is easy to invent a number of examples of different prospects. As a trivial illustration of a prospect, consider the prospect made of just two intentions, say, “to marry and to become rich”.

2.3 Entangled prospects and entangled mind

Prospect states can be of two qualitatively different types.

- A **disentangled prospect state** is a prospect state which is represented as the tensor product of the intention states (8):

$$f(t) = \otimes_i \psi_i(t) , \quad (24)$$

We define the **disentangled mind** as the collection of all admissible disentangled prospect states (24):

$$\mathcal{D} \equiv \{f = \otimes_i \psi_i, \psi_i \in \mathcal{H}_i\} . \quad (25)$$

- An **entangled prospect state** is any prospect state (19) that cannot be reduced to the tensor product form of disentangled prospect states (24). An **entangled mind** is the collection of all those prospect states (19) from the prospect space (17), which do not belong to the disentangled mind (25). The entangled mind is the complement $\mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{D}$ of the disentangled mind \mathcal{D} defined in Eq. (25).

In quantum theory, it is possible to construct various entangled and disentangled states (see, e.g., Yukalov, 2003). For the purpose of developing a theory of decision making, let us illustrate the above definitions by an example of a prospect consisting of two intentions with two representations each. Let us consider the prospect of the following two intentions: “to get married” and “to become rich”. And let us assume that the intention “to get married” consists of two representations, “to marry A ”, with the representation state $|A\rangle$, and “to marry B ”, with the representation state $|B\rangle$. And let the intention “to become rich” be formed by two representations “to become rich by working hard”, with the representation state $|W\rangle$, and “to become rich by being a gangster”, with the representation state $|G\rangle$. Thus, there are two intention states of type (8),

$$\psi_1 = a_1|A\rangle + a_2|B\rangle , \quad \psi_2 = b_1|W\rangle + b_2|G\rangle . \quad (26)$$

The general prospect state (19) has the form

$$\psi = c_{11}|AW \rangle + c_{12}|AG \rangle + c_{21}|BW \rangle + c_{22}|BG \rangle , \quad (27)$$

where the coefficients c_{ij} belong to the field of complex numbers satisfying the normalization (23).

Depending on the values of the coefficients c_{ij} , the prospect state (27) can be either disentangled or entangled. If it is disentangled, it must be of the tensor product type (24), which for the present case reads

$$f = \psi_1 \otimes \psi_2 = a_1 b_1 |AW \rangle + a_1 b_2 |AG \rangle + a_2 b_1 |BW \rangle + a_2 b_2 |BG \rangle . \quad (28)$$

Both states (27) and (28) include four prospect-representations states (14):

1. “to marry A and to work hard”, $|AW \rangle$,
2. “to marry A and become a gangster”, $|AG \rangle$,
3. “to marry B and to work hard”, $|BW \rangle$,
4. “to marry B and become a gangster”, $|BG \rangle$.

However, the structure of states (27) and (28) is different. The prospect state (27) is more general and can be reduced to state (28), but the opposite may not be possible. For instance, the prospect state

$$c_{12}|AG \rangle + c_{21}|BW \rangle , \quad (29)$$

which is a particular example of state (27) cannot be reduced to any of the states (28), provided that both coefficients c_{12} and c_{21} are non-zero. In quantum mechanics, this state would be called the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen state, one of the most famous example of an entangled state (Einstein et al., 1935). Another example is the prospect state

$$c_{11}|AW \rangle + c_{22}|BG \rangle , \quad (30)$$

whose quantum-mechanical analog could be called the Bell state (Bell, 1964). In the case where both c_{11} and c_{22} are non-zero, the Bell state cannot be reduced to any of the states (28) and is thus entangled.

In contrast with the above two examples, the prospect states

$$\begin{aligned} c_{11}|AW \rangle + c_{12}|AG \rangle , & \quad c_{11}|AW \rangle + c_{21}|BW \rangle , \\ c_{12}|AG \rangle + c_{22}|BG \rangle , & \quad c_{21}|BW \rangle + c_{22}|BG \rangle , \end{aligned}$$

are *disentangled*, since all of them can be reduced to the form (28).

Other *entangled* prospect states are

$$\begin{aligned} c_{11}|AW \rangle + c_{12}|AG \rangle + c_{21}|BW \rangle , & \quad c_{11}|AW \rangle + c_{12}|AG \rangle + c_{22}|BG \rangle , \\ c_{11}|AW \rangle + c_{21}|BW \rangle + c_{22}|BG \rangle , & \quad c_{12}|AG \rangle + c_{21}|BW \rangle + c_{22}|BG \rangle , \end{aligned}$$

where all coefficients are assumed to be non-zero.

Since the coefficients $c_{ij} = c_{ij}(t)$ are, in general, functions of time, it may happen that a prospect state at a particular time is entangled, but becomes disentangled at another time or, vice versa, a disentangled prospect state can be transformed into an entangled state with changing time (Yukalov, 2003).

The state of a human being is governed by its physiological characteristics and the available information (Bechara et al., 2000; Dickhaut et al., 2003). These properties are continuously changing in time. Hence the prospect state (19) characterizing a person at a given time may also display temporal evolution, according to different homeostatic processes adjusting the individual to the changing environment (Dawkins, 2006).

2.4 Decision making

2.4.1 Procedure

We describe the process of decision making as an intrinsically probabilistic procedure consisting of three steps.

The first step consists in evaluating consciously and/or subconsciously the probabilities of choosing different actions from the point of view of their usefulness and/or appeal to the choosing agent. The state of mind of the agent at some time t is represented by the prospect state $\psi(t)$. Then, the probability of realizing a prospect representation n with the prospect-representation state $|n\rangle$, under the given prospect state $\psi(t)$ characterizing the agent's state of mind at time t , is the *prospect probability*

$$p_n(t) \equiv |\langle n|\psi(t)\rangle|^2. \quad (31)$$

Given the expression of the prospect state (19), expression (31) is equivalent to

$$p_n(t) \equiv |c_n(t)|^2. \quad (32)$$

The prospect probabilities defined in (31) possess all the standard probability properties

$$0 \leq p_n(t) \leq 1, \quad (33)$$

with the normalization condition

$$\sum_n p_n(t) = 1, \quad (34)$$

following from Eq. (23).

The second step determines which prospect representation is ultimately selected in the decision process. In the traditional theory of decision making based on the utility function, the optimal decision corresponds by definition to the maximal expected utility which is associated with the maximal anticipated usefulness and profit resulting from the chosen action. In section 2.1, we have proposed to interpret the normalized expected utilities as effective (possibly subjective) probabilities of actions according to (4). Hence, maximizing the expected utility amounts to choosing the largest probability of action. Therefore, an intended action, which corresponds to the maximal probability, is the optimal action. Thus, by definition, the optimal decision is the one characterized by the maximal probability. This line of reasoning is close to the likelihood ideology of decision-making (Schall, 2001; Sugrue

et al., 2005; Yang and Shalden, 2007). Therefore, after evaluating the set $\{p_n(t)\}$ of all prospect probabilities given by (31), the decision process amounts to selecting the largest among them, since the largest probability is associated with the goal anticipated by the agent to be the most profitable.

The third step concretizes the decision by selecting the prospect representation corresponding to the maximal probability as the new prospect state characterizing the agent's state of mind following the decision. When a decision D is taken at some time t_0 , the prospect state $\psi(t_0)$ is replaced by the prospect-representation state $|D\rangle$ corresponding to the decision D . In quantum mechanics, such a replacement is called the reduction of the wave function after a realized measurement. For subsequent times $t > t_0$, the prospect state is given by $\psi(t) = \psi(t, D)$ satisfying the initial condition $\psi(t_0, D) = |D\rangle$. The prospect probability (31) that will determine future decisions is defined as

$$p_n(t, D) \equiv |\langle n | \psi(t, D) \rangle|^2. \quad (35)$$

We shall use definition (35), when it is important to emphasize the initial condition of the evolution of a prospect state. Associated with this selection of the new prospect representation at time t_0 , the maximal probability $\sup_n \{p_n(t_0)\}$ is renormalized to 1 since, after an action has been realized, it becomes a certain fact. This double-step procedure of *decision making plus decision realization* can be represented by the process

$$\sup_n \{p_n(t_0)\} \longrightarrow 1. \quad (36)$$

This double-step procedure parallels findings in the neuroscience studying the activity of the central nervous system associated with the process of decision making. Decision making is viewed as part of a homeostatic process, in which the selection of an action among a set of available options corresponds to an adaptive feedback. Taking a decision has been shown to be accompanied by physiological modifications in the decision-maker's nervous system (Sanfey, 2007; Paulus, 2007; Körding, 2007), which we represent mathematically by (36). The projection of the prospect state onto the basis state with maximal probability is also justified by the logic developed by Zurek (2007), which explains why a measurement leaves a quantum system in a state corresponding to one of the eigenvectors of the measurement operator. While it is a postulate of the standard Copenhagen interpretation of quantum theory, it derives according to Zurek as a requirement of consistency of the measurement process. In our context of decision making, the process (36) means that, if one makes a decision twice in rapid succession with the same intention space, one should obtain the same result.

The decision process corresponding to selecting the maximal probability $\sup_n \{p_n(t_0)\}$ is appealing from a behavioral view point, when compared with the expected utility maximization approach of normative decision theory. Indeed, while it is doubtful that people calculate even subconsciously the expectation over complex scenarios of a nonlinear utility function, estimating the most probable prospect, or some neighbor state with similar probability values, seems closer to real human capabilities with bounded rationality: it is relatively easy to construct an estimation of the mode of a given probability distribution compared with calculating the expectation of a complex nonlinear utility function weighted by it. Of course, the decision requires an evaluation of the set of the prospect probabilities.

If the number of representations of an i -intention is R_i , then the total dimensionality of the prospect space (17) is $d_{\mathcal{H}} = \prod_i R_i$. This number can be very large. Evaluating all p_n could take too much time, if it is accomplished sequentially. But the computational time can be drastically shortened if the evaluation of p_n is realized by parallel computation. In addition, if some smoothness property holds, an exact estimation of all probabilities may not be necessary, but only some estimation of reasonably large probabilities, whose state could then be selected. This argument is reminiscent of the theory of satisfaction (Simon, 1957), according to which humans choose not that which might be optimal but which will make them happy enough.

2.4.2 Entangled decision making

As explained in section 2.3, the prospect state $\psi(t)$ given by (19) does not have in general the form of the product (24), which means that it is entangled. Therefore, the prospect probability $p_n(t)$ cannot be reduced to a product:

$$p_n(t) \neq \prod_i |c_{n_i}(t)|^2. \quad (37)$$

In other words, the decision making process is naturally entangled. Here, entanglement is formulated in rigorous mathematical terms. At the same time, it can also be interpreted in terms of conditional probabilities.

Consider the example of Section 2 of the specific prospect state (27) associated with the two intentions “to get married” and “to become rich.” And suppose that A does not like gangsters, so that it is impossible to marry A and at the same time being a gangster. This implies that the prospect-representation AG cannot be realized, hence $c_{12} = 0$. Assume that B dreams of becoming rich as fast as possible, and a gangster spouse is much more luring for B than a dull person working hard, which implies that $c_{21} = 0$. In this situation, the prospect state (27) reduces to the entangled Bell state $c_{11}|AW\rangle + c_{22}|BG\rangle$. A decision performed under these conditions resulting in an entangled state is entangled.

2.4.3 Noncommutativity of subsequent decisions and history dependence

It is a common observation that two distinct decisions, taken sequentially one after the other, do not commute. Within our QDT, this is easily explained as follows. Let us assume that a decision D_1 is taken at time t_1 . At later times $t > t_1$, the prospect state evolves from the initial condition $\psi(t_1, D_1) = |D_1\rangle$ to $\psi(t, D_1)$. The prospect probability $p_n(t, D_1)$ for $t > t_1$ is given by definition (35). Suppose that another decision D_2 , which involves the same set of intentions, is taken at time $t_2 > t_1$. As explained before, this second decision corresponds to choosing the largest among all prospect probabilities $p_n(t_2, D_1)$.

Let us now consider the inverse situation where the decision D_2 is taken first at time t_1 . Hence, for $t > t_1$, the prospect state becomes $\psi(t, D_2)$, with the initial condition $\psi(t_1, D_2) = |D_2\rangle$. The corresponding prospect probabilities $p_n(t, D_2)$ for $t > t_1$ are given again by formula (35). Let us assume that the decision D_1 on the same set of intentions is taken at time $t_2 > t_1$. The decision-making process is now based on the evaluation of the prospect probabilities $p_n(t_2, D_2)$. The prospect states with two different initial conditions $|D_1\rangle$ and

$|D_2\rangle$ are generally different, and therefore so are the prospect probabilities

$$p_n(t_2, D_2) \neq p_n(t_2, D_1) , \quad (38)$$

which symbolizes the non-commutativity of decisions.

There exist numerous real-life examples when decision makers fail to follow their plans and change their mind simply because they experience different outcomes on which their intended plans were based. This change of plans after experiencing particular outcomes is the effect known as dynamic inconsistency (Barkan et al., 2005). In our language, this is a simple consequence of the non-commutativity of subsequent decisions, resulting from entanglement between intention representations and caused by the existence of intention interference. After studying the properties of the latter, we shall give in Section 6 a rigorous mathematical formulation of the non-commutativity of decisions.

3 Intention interference

Interference in decision making arises when one takes a decision involving composite intentions. The corresponding mathematical treatment of these interferences within our QDT is presented in the following subsections.

3.1 Simple illustration of intention interference

As an illustration, let us consider the following situation of two intentions, “to get a friend” and “to become rich”. Let the former intention have two representations “to get the friend A ” and “to get the friend B .” And let the second intention also have two representations, “to become rich by working hard” and “to become rich by being a gangster.” Then, the corresponding prospect state is given by Eq. (27), with the evident notation for the prospect-representation states $|n\rangle$ and the coefficients c_{ij} defined by the identities

$$c_{11} \equiv c_A(W) , \quad c_{12} \equiv c_A(G) , \quad c_{21} \equiv c_B(W) , \quad c_{22} \equiv c_B(G) . \quad (39)$$

Suppose that one does not wish to choose between these two friends in an exclusive manner, but one would like to be a friend to both of them, A as well as B , with the appropriate weights. This means that the intention representations A and B are fixed, while the way of life, either to work hard or to become a gangster, has not yet been decided.

The corresponding composite prospect defines four prospect-representation states as

$$\begin{aligned} |n_{AB}(W, W)\rangle &= \alpha|AW\rangle + \beta|BW\rangle , & |n_{AB}(W, G)\rangle &= \alpha|AW\rangle + \beta|BG\rangle , \\ |n_{AB}(G, W)\rangle &= \alpha|AG\rangle + \beta|BW\rangle , & |n_{AB}(G, G)\rangle &= \alpha|AG\rangle + \beta|BG\rangle . \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

There are four corresponding scalar products

$$\begin{aligned} \langle n_{AB}(W, W)|\psi\rangle &= \alpha^*c_{11} + \beta^*c_{21} , & \langle n_{AB}(W, G)|\psi\rangle &= \alpha^*c_{11} + \beta^*c_{22} , \\ \langle n_{AB}(G, W)|\psi\rangle &= \alpha^*c_{12} + \beta^*c_{21} , & \langle n_{AB}(G, G)|\psi\rangle &= \alpha^*c_{12} + \beta^*c_{22} , \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

which define the prospect probabilities.

In addition, let us assume that both friends, A and B , do not want to deal with gangsters. Hence, the maximization of the probability

$$p_{AB}(x, y) \equiv | \langle n_{AB}(x, y) | \psi \rangle |^2 \quad (42)$$

is realized as

$$\sup_{x, y} p_{AB}(x, y) = p_{AB}(W, W) , \quad (43)$$

which means that, wishing to have A and B as friends, there is no other choice than to work honestly. With the scalar products (41), the probability (43) reads

$$p_{AB}(W, W) = |\alpha^* c_{11} + \beta^* c_{21}|^2 . \quad (44)$$

This can be rewritten as

$$p_{AB}(W, W) = p_A(W) + p_B(W) + p_{AB}^{int}(W, W) , \quad (45)$$

where

$$p_A(W) \equiv |\alpha c_{11}|^2 , \quad p_B(W) \equiv |\beta c_{21}|^2 , \quad (46)$$

and the interference term is

$$p_{AB}^{int}(W, W) \equiv 2\text{Re}(\alpha^* c_{11} \beta c_{21}^*) . \quad (47)$$

The latter, taking into account Eqs. (46), can be rewritten in the form

$$p_{AB}^{int}(W, W) = 2 \sqrt{p_A(W)p_B(W)} \cos \Delta_{AB}(W) \quad (48)$$

in which

$$\Delta_{AB}(W) \equiv \arg(\alpha^* c_{11} \beta c_{21}^*) . \quad (49)$$

Decision making plus decision realization, as in (36), now implies the reduction $c_{11} \rightarrow \alpha$ and $c_{21} \rightarrow \beta$, so that the reduced prospect state is

$$\psi(t_{AB}, D_{AB}) = \alpha |AW \rangle + \beta |BW \rangle , \quad (50)$$

which serves as the initial condition for the evolution of the prospect state $\psi(t, D_{AB})$ for future times $t > t_{AB}$. Generally, the prospect state for times $t > t_{AB}$ again acquires the form (27). Therefore, taking decision at any later time will again involve the appearance of the interference term in the prospect probability.

This example illustrates the observation that the phenomenon of decision interference appears when one considers a composite entangled prospect with several intention representations assumed to be realized simultaneously. Treating a composite prospect as a combination of several sub-prospects, we could consider the global decision as a collection of sub-decisions. Then the arising interference would occur between these sub-decisions. From a mathematical point of view, it appears more convenient to combine several sub-decisions into one global decision and to analyze the interference of different intentions. Thus, we can state that interference in decision making always appears when one tries to realize a composite entangled prospect.

For the above example of decision making in the case of two intentions, “to get a friend” and “to be rich”, the appearance of the interference can be understood as follows. In real life, it is too problematic, and practically impossible, to become a very close friend to several persons simultaneously, since conflict of interests often arises between the friends. For instance, doing a friendly action to one friend may upset or even harm another friend. Any decision making, involving mutual correlations between two persons, necessarily requires taking into account their sometimes conflicting interests. This is, actually, one of the origins of the interference in decision making. Another powerful origin of intention interference is the existence of emotions, as will be discussed in the following sections.

3.2 Conditions for the presence of interference

The situations for which intention interferences cannot appear can be classified into two cases, which are examined below. From this classification, we conclude that the necessary conditions for the appearance of intention interferences are that the dimensionality of mind should be not lower than two and that there is some uncertainty in the considered prospect. These conditions imply that the considered prospect is entangled. Appendix A illustrates the conditions for the appearance of interferences by examining the famous experiment of a particle passing through a screen with two slits, from the perspective of decision making. For this, we take the toy model of a decision maker who is making her mind to marry, given her stimulation by two potential spouses, a continuum of others, and who then selects what is/are the quality(ies) that is/are motivating her choice to marry.

3.2.1 One-dimensional mind

Suppose there are many intentions $\{A_i\}$, enumerated by the index $i = 1, 2, \dots$, whose number can be arbitrary. But each intention possesses only a single representation $|A_i\rangle$. Hence, the dimension of “mind” as defined in section 2.2.11 is $d_{\mathcal{H}} = 1$. Only a single basis vector exists:

$$|A_1 A_2 \dots\rangle = \otimes_i |A_i\rangle . \quad (51)$$

In this one-dimensional mind, all prospect states are disentangled, being of the type

$$\psi = c |A_1 A_2 \dots\rangle \quad (|c| = 1) . \quad (52)$$

Therefore, only one probability exists:

$$p = |\langle A_1 A_2 \dots | \psi \rangle|^2 = 1 . \quad (53)$$

Thus, despite the possible large number of arbitrary intentions, they do not interfere, since each of them has just one representation. There can be no intention interference in one-dimensional mind. These conditions imply that the considered prospect cannot be entangled.

3.2.2 Absence of uncertainty

Another important condition for the appearance of intention interference is the existence of uncertainty. To understand this statement, let us consider a given mind with a large

dimensionality $d_{\mathcal{H}} > 1$, characterized by the state ψ . Let us analyze a certain prospect with the state

$$\psi_n = c_n \psi \quad (|c_n| = 1) . \quad (54)$$

Then, the corresponding prospect probability is

$$p_n = | \langle \psi_n | \psi \rangle |^2 = 1 \quad (55)$$

and no interference can arise.

Thus, the necessary conditions for the intention interference are the existence of uncertainty and the dimensionality of mind not lower than 2.

3.3 Interference alternation

Let us consider two intentions, one composing a set $\{A_i\}$ of R_1 representations and another one forming a set $\{X_j\}$ of R_2 representations. The total family of intention representations is therefore

$$\{A_i, X_j | i = 1, 2, \dots, R_1; j = 1, 2, \dots, R_2\} . \quad (56)$$

The prospect representation basis is the set $\{|A_i X_j \rangle\}$. The state of mind is an expansion over this basis,

$$\psi = \sum_{ij} c_{ij} |A_i X_j \rangle , \quad (57)$$

with the coefficients satisfying the normalization

$$\sum_{ij} |c_{ij}|^2 = 1 . \quad (58)$$

Let us assume that we are mainly interested in the representation set $\{A_i\}$, while the representations from the set $\{X_j\}$ are treated as conditional. A prospect that is formed of a fixed intention representation A_i , and which can be realized under the occurrence of any of the representations X_j , corresponds to the prospect state

$$\psi(A_i) = \sum_j \alpha_{ij} |A_i X_j \rangle , \quad (59)$$

with the coefficients obeying the normalization

$$\sum_j |\alpha_{ij}|^2 = 1 . \quad (60)$$

The probability of realizing the considered intention representation A_i is

$$p(A_i) \equiv | \langle \psi(A_i) | \psi \rangle |^2 , \quad (61)$$

according to definition (31).

Following the above formalism used to describe intention interferences, we use the notation

$$p(A_i X_j) \equiv |\alpha_{ij} c_{ij}|^2 \quad (62)$$

for the joint probability of A_i and X_j ; and we denote the interference term as

$$p_{jk}^{int}(A_i) \equiv 2\text{Re} \left(\alpha_{ij}^* c_{ij} c_{ik}^* \alpha_{ik} \right) . \quad (63)$$

Then, the probability of A_i , given by Eq. (61), becomes

$$p(A_i) = \sum_j p(A_i X_j) + \sum_{j < k} p_{jk}^{int}(A_i) . \quad (64)$$

The interference terms appear due to the existence of uncertainty. Therefore, we may define the *uncertainty factor*

$$\varphi_{jk}(A_i) \equiv \cos \Delta_{jk}(A_i) . \quad (65)$$

Then, the interference term (63) takes the form

$$p_{jk}^{int}(A_i) = 2\varphi_{jk}(A_i) \sqrt{p(A_i X_j) p(A_i X_k)} . \quad (66)$$

It is convenient to define the sum of interference terms

$$p_{int}(A_i) \equiv \sum_{j < k} p_{jk}^{int}(A_i) . \quad (67)$$

This allows us to rewrite probability (64) as

$$p(A_i) = \sum_j p(A_i X_j) + p_{int}(A_i) . \quad (68)$$

The joint and conditional probabilities are related in the standard way

$$p(A_i X_j) = p(A_i | X_j) p(X_j) . \quad (69)$$

We assume that the intention family (56) is such that at least one of the representations from the set $\{A_i\}$ has to be certainly realized, which means that

$$\sum_i p(A_i) = 1 , \quad (70)$$

and that at least one of the representations from the set $\{X_j\}$ also necessarily happens, that is,

$$\sum_j p(X_j) = 1 . \quad (71)$$

Along with these conditions, we keep in mind that at least one of the representations from the set $\{A_i\}$ must be realized for each given X_j , which implies that

$$\sum_i p(A_i | X_j) = 1 . \quad (72)$$

Then the following important statement holds

Theorem on interference alternation: *The process of decision making, associated with probabilities (68) and occurring under conditions (70), (71), and (72), is characterized*

by alternating interference terms, such that the total interference vanishes, which implies the property of interference alternation

$$\sum_i p_{int}(A_i) = 0 . \quad (73)$$

Proof: It follows directly from Eq. (68), taking into account conditions (70), (71), and (72).

Equality (73) shows that, given that at least one of them is non-zero, some of the interference terms are necessarily negative and some are necessarily positive. Therefore, some of the probabilities are depressed, while others are enhanced. This alternation of the interference terms will be shown below to be a pivotal feature providing a clear explanation of the disjunction effect. It is worth emphasizing that the violation of the sure-thing principle, resulting in the disjunction effect, will be shown not to be due simply to the existence of interferences as such, but more precisely to the *interference alternation*.

For instance, the depression of some probabilities can be associated with uncertainty aversion, which makes less probable an action under uncertain conditions. In contrast, the probability of other intentions, containing less or no uncertainty, will be enhanced by positive interference terms.

4 Disjunction effect

The disjunction effect was first specified by Savage (1954) as a violation of the “sure-thing principle,” which can be formulated as follows (Savage, 1954): if the alternative A is preferred to the alternative B , when an event X_1 occurs, and it is also preferred to B , when an event X_2 occurs, then A should be preferred to B , when it is not known which of the events, either X_1 or X_2 , has occurred.

4.1 Sure-thing principle

First of all, let us translate this principle in precise mathematical terms. Then, we show that, in the language of classical probability theory (when there are no interferences as discussed with our QDT), the sure-thing principle is not a “principle” but a theorem.

Let us consider a field of events $\{A, B, X_j | j = 1, 2, \dots\}$ equipped with the classical probability measures (Feller, 1970). We denote the classical probability of an event A by the capital letter $P(A)$ in order to distinguish it from the probability $p(A)$ defined in the previous sections by means of quantum rules. We shall denote, as usual, the conditional probability of A under the knowledge of X by $P(A|X)$ and the joint probability of A and X , by $P(AX)$. We assume that at least one of the events X_j from the set $\{X_j\}$ certainly happens, which is denoted as

$$\sum_j p(X_j) = 1 . \quad (74)$$

The probability of A , when X_j is not specified, that is, when at least one of X_j happens, is denoted by $P(A)$. The same notations are applied to B . Following our approach in Sec. 2 of treating the utility as a probability, we understand the statement “ A is preferred to B ” as meaning $P(A) > P(B)$. Then the following theorem is valid.

Sure-thing theorem: *If for all $j = 1, 2, \dots$, one has*

$$P(A|X_j) > P(B|X_j) , \tag{75}$$

then

$$P(A) > P(B) . \tag{76}$$

The *proof* is straightforward, when one remembers that, under condition (74), one has

$$P(A) = \sum_j P(AX_j) = \sum_j P(A|X_j)P(X_j) \tag{77}$$

and

$$P(B) = \sum_j P(BX_j) = \sum_j P(B|X_j)P(X_j) . \tag{78}$$

From Eqs. (77) and (78), under assumption (75), inequality (76) follows immediately.

4.2 Disjunction-effect examples

Thus, according to the standard classical probability theory which is held by most statisticians as the only rigorous mathematical description of risks, the sure-thing principle should be always valid. However, numerous violations of this principles have been described empirically (Savage, 1954; Tversky and Shafir, 1992; Croson, 1999; Lambdin and Burdsal, 2007; Li et al., 2007). In order to be more specific, let us briefly outline some examples of the violation of the sure-thing principle, referred to as the disjunction effect.

(i) *To gamble or not to gamble?*

A typical setup for illustrating the disjunction effect is a two-step gamble (Tversky and Shafir, 1992). Suppose that a group of people accepted a gamble, in which the player can either win the amount X_1 or lose the amount X_2 . After one gamble, they are invited to gamble a second time, being free to either accept the second gamble (A) or to refuse it (B). Experiments by Tversky and Shafir (1992) showed that the majority of people accept the second gamble when they know the result of the first one, in any case, whether they won or lost in the previous gamble. In the language of conditional probability theory, this translates into the fact that people act as if $P(A|X_1)$ is larger than $P(B|X_1)$ and $P(A|X_2)$ is larger than $P(B|X_2)$ as in Eq. (75). At the same time, it turns out that the majority refuses to gamble the second time when the outcome of the first gamble is not known. The second empirical fact implies that people act as if $P(B)$ overweighs $P(A)$, in blatant contradiction with inequality (76) which should hold according to the sure-thing theorem resulting from (75). Thus, a majority accepted the second gamble after having won or lost in the first gamble, but only a minority accepted the second gamble when the outcome of the first gamble was unknown to them. This provides an unambiguous violation of the Savage sure-thing principle.

(ii) *To buy or not to buy?*

Another example, studied by Tversky and Shafir (1992), had to do with a group of students who reported their preferences about buying a nonrefundable vacation, following a tough university test. They could pass the exam (state X_1) or fail (state X_2). The students

had to decide whether they would go on vacation (A) or abstain (B). It turned out that the majority of students purchased the vacation when they passed the exam as well as when they had failed, so that condition (75) is valid. However, only a minority of participants purchased the vacation when they did not know the results of the examination. Hence, inequality (76) was violated, demonstrating again the disjunction effect.

(iii) *To sell or not to sell?*

The stock market example, analysed by Shafir and Tversky (1992), is a particularly telling one, involving a deliberation taking into account a future event, and not a past one as in the two previous cases. Consider the USA presidential election, when either a Republican wins (X_1) or a Democrat wins (X_2). On the eve of the election, market players can either sell certain stocks from their portfolio (A) or hold them (B). It is known that a majority of people would be inclined to sell their stocks, if they would know who wins, regardless of whether the Republican or Democrat candidate wins the upcoming election. This is because people expect the market to fall after the elections. Hence, condition (75) is again valid. At the same time, a great many people do not sell their stocks before knowing who really won the election, thus contradicting the sure-thing principle and the inequality (76). Thus, investors could have sold their stocks before the election at a higher price but, obeying to the disjunction effect, they were waiting until after the election, thereby selling at a lower price after stocks have fallen. Many market analysts believe that this is precisely what happened after the 1988 presidential election, when George Bush defeated Michael Dukakis.

There are plenty of other more or less complicated examples of the disjunction effect (Savage, 1954; Tversky and Shafir, 1992; Shafir and Tversky, 1992; Shafir et al., 1993; Shafir, 1994; Croson, 1999; Lambdin and Burdsal, 2007). The common necessary conditions for the disjunction effect to arise are as follows. First, there should be several events, each characterized by several alternatives, as in the two-step gambles. Second, there should necessarily exist some uncertainty, whether with respect to the past, as in the examples (i) and (ii), or with respect to the future, as in the example (iii).

Several ways of interpreting the disjunction effect have been analyzed. Here, we do not discuss the interpretations, based on the existence of some biases, such as the gender bias, or which invoke the notion of decision complexity, which have already been convincingly ruled out (Croson, 1999; Kühberger et al., 2001). We describe the reason-based explanation which appears to enjoy a wide-spread following and discuss its limits before turning to the view point offered by QDT.

4.3 Reason-based analysis

The dominant approach for explaining the disjunction effect is the reason-based analysis of decision making (Tversky and Shafir, 1992; Shafir and Tversky, 1992; Shafir et al., 1993; Shafir, 1994; Croson, 1999). This approach explains choice in terms of the balance between reasoning for and against the various alternatives. The basic intuition is that when outcomes are known, a decision maker may easily come up with a definitive reason for choosing an option. However, in case of uncertainty, when the outcomes are not known, people may lack a clear reason for choosing an option and consequently they abstain and make an irrational choice.

From our perspective, the weakness of the reason-based analysis is that the notion of

“reason” is too vague and subjective. Reasons are not only impossible to quantify, but it is difficult, if possible at all, to give a qualitative definition of what they are. Consider example (i) “to gamble or not to gamble?” Suppose you have already won at the first step. Then, you can rationalize that gambling a second time is not very risky: if you now lose, this loss will be balanced by the first win (on which you were not counting anyway, so that you may actually treat it differently from the rest of your wealth, according to the so-called “mental accounting” effect), and if you win again, your profit will be doubled. Thus, you have a “reason” to justify the attractiveness of the second gamble. But, it seems equally justified to consider the alternative “reason:” if you have won once, winning the second time may seem less probable (the so-called gambler’s fallacy), and if you lose, you will keep nothing of your previous gain. This line of reasoning justifies to keep what you already got and to forgo the second gamble. Suppose now you have lost in the first gamble and know it. A first reasoning would be that the second gamble offers a possibility of getting out of the loss, which provides a reason for accepting the second gamble. However, you may also think that the win is not guaranteed, and your situation could actually worsen, if you lose again. Therefore, this makes it more reasonable not to risk so much and to refrain from the new gamble. Consider now the situation where you are kept ignorant of whether you have won or lost in the first gamble. Then, you may think that there is no reason and therefore no motivation for accepting the second gamble, which is the standard reason-based explanation. But, one could argue that it would be even more logical if you would think as follows: Okay, I do not know what has happened in the first gamble. So, why should I care about it? Why don’t I try again my luck? Certainly, there is a clear reason for gambling that could propagate the drive to gamble a second time.

This discussion is not pretending to demonstrate anything other than the reason-based explanation is purely ad-hoc, with no real explanatory power; it can be considered in a sense as a reformulation of the disjunction fallacy. It is possible to multiply the number of examples demonstrating the existence of quite “reasonable” justifications for doing something as well as a reason for just doing the opposite. It seems to us that the notion of “reason” is not well defined and one can always invent in this way a justification for anything. Thus, we propose that the disjunction effect has no direct relation to reasoning. In the following section, we suggest another explanation of this effect based on QDT, specifically the negative interference between the two uncertain outcomes resulting from an aversion for uncertainty (uncertainty-aversion principle), which provides a *quantitative* testable prediction.

4.4 Quantitative analysis within QDT

4.4.1 Application of QDT to the simple examples illustrating the disjunction effect

Let us discuss the two first examples illustrating the disjunction effect, in which the prospect consists of two intentions with two representations each. One intention “to decide about an action” has the representations “to act” (A) and “not to act” (B). The second intention “to know the results” (or “to have information”) has also two representations. One (X_1) can be termed “to learn about the win” (gamble won, exam passed), the other (X_2) can be called “to learn about the loss” (gamble lost, exam failed). Given the numbers of these

representations $R_1 = 2$ and $R_2 = 2$, the dimension of mind as defined in section 2.2.11 is $d_{\mathcal{H}} = R_1 R_2 = 4$.

For the considered cases, the general set of Eqs. (68) reduces to two equations

$$\begin{aligned} p(A) &= p(AX_1) + p(AX_2) + p_{int}(A) , \\ p(B) &= p(BX_1) + p(BX_2) + p_{int}(B) , \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

in which the interference terms are

$$\begin{aligned} p_{int}(A) &= 2\varphi(A) \sqrt{p(AX_1) p(AX_2)} , \\ p_{int}(B) &= 2\varphi(B) \sqrt{p(BX_1) p(BX_2)} . \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

Here $\varphi(A)$ and $\varphi(B)$ are the uncertainty factors defined in (65). The normalizations (70) and (71) become

$$p(A) + p(B) = 1 , \quad p(X_1) + p(X_2) = 1 . \quad (81)$$

The normalization condition (72) gives

$$p(A|X_1) + p(B|X_1) = 1 , \quad p(A|X_2) + p(B|X_2) = 1 . \quad (82)$$

The uncertainty factors can be rewritten as

$$\varphi(A) = \frac{p_{int}(A)}{2\sqrt{p(AX_1)p(AX_2)}} , \quad \varphi(B) = \frac{p_{int}(B)}{2\sqrt{p(BX_1)p(BX_2)}} , \quad (83)$$

with the interference terms being

$$p_{int}(A) = p(A) - p(AX_1) - p(AX_2) , \quad p_{int}(B) = p(B) - p(BX_1) - p(BX_2) . \quad (84)$$

The principal point is the condition of *interference alternation* (73), which now reads

$$p_{int}(A) + p_{int}(B) = 0 . \quad (85)$$

Without this condition (85), the system of equations for the probabilities would be incomplete, and the disjunction effect could not be explained.

In the goal of explaining the disjunction effect, it is not sufficient to merely state that some type of interference is present. It is necessary to determine (quantitatively if possible) why the probability of acting is suppressed, while that of remaining passive is enhanced. Our aim is to evaluate the expected size and sign of the interference terms $p_{int}(A)$ (for acting under uncertainty) and $p_{int}(B)$ (for remaining inactive under uncertainty). Obviously, it is an illusion to search for a universal value that everybody will use. Different experiments with different people have indeed demonstrated a significant heterogeneity among people so that, in the language of QDT, this means that the values of the interference terms can fluctuate from individual to individual. A general statement should here refer to the behavior of a sufficiently large ensemble of people, allowing us to map the observed frequentist distribution of decisions to the predicted QDT probabilities.

4.4.2 Interference-quarter law

The interference terms (80) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} p_{int}(A) &= 2\varphi(A) \sqrt{p(A|X_1)p(X_1)p(A|X_2)p(X_2)} , \\ p_{int}(B) &= 2\varphi(B) \sqrt{p(B|X_1)p(X_1)p(B|X_2)p(X_2)} . \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

The interference-alternation theorem of Sec. 3.3, which leads to (85), implies that

$$|p_{int}(A)| = |p_{int}(B)| , \quad (87)$$

and

$$\text{sign}[\varphi(A)] = -\text{sign}[\varphi(B)] . \quad (88)$$

Hence, in the case where $p(A|X_j) > p(B|X_j)$, which is characteristics of the simple examples illustrating the disjunction effect, one must have the uncertainty factors which exhibit the opposite property, $|\varphi(A)| < |\varphi(B)|$, so as to compensate the former inequality to ensure the validity of the equality (87) of the absolute values of the interference terms.

The next step is to determine the sign of $\varphi(A)$ (and thus of $\varphi(B)$) from (88) and their typical amplitudes $|\varphi(A)|$ and $|\varphi(B)|$.

Signs of the uncertainty factors.

A fundamental well-documented characteristic of human being is their aversion to uncertainty, i.e., the preference for known risks over unknown risks (Epstein, 1999). As a consequence, the propensity/utility (and therefore the probability) to act under larger uncertainty is smaller than under smaller uncertainty. Mechanically, this implies that it is possible to specify the sign of the uncertainty factors, yielding

$$\text{sign}[\varphi(A)] = -\text{sign}[\varphi(B)] < 0 , \quad (89)$$

since A (respectively B) refers to acting (respectively to remaining inactive).

Amplitudes of the uncertainty factors.

As a consequence of (89) and also of their definition (65), the uncertainty factors vary in the intervals

$$-1 \leq \varphi(A) \leq 0 , \quad 0 \leq \varphi(B) \leq 1 . \quad (90)$$

Without any other information, the simplest prior is to assume a uniform distribution of the uncertainty factors in each interval, so that their expected values are respectively

$$\bar{\varphi}(A) = -\frac{1}{2} , \quad \bar{\varphi}(B) = \frac{1}{2} . \quad (91)$$

To complete the calculation of $p_{int}(A)$ and of $p_{int}(B)$ given by (86), we also assume the non-informative uniform prior for all probabilities appearing below the square-roots, so that their expected values are all 1/2 since they vary between 0 and 1. Using these in Eq. (86) results in the interference-quarter law

$$\bar{p}_{int}(A) = -0.25 , \quad \bar{p}_{int}(B) = 0.25 , \quad (92)$$

valid for the four-dimensional mind composed of two intentions with two representations each. Appendix B offers a generalization of this result to minds of arbitrary dimensions.

As a consequence, the probabilities for acting or for remaining inactive under uncertainty given by (79) can be evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned} p(A) &= p(AX_1) + p(AX_2) - 0.25 , \\ p(B) &= p(BX_1) + p(BX_2) + 0.25 . \end{aligned} \tag{93}$$

The influence of intention interference in the presence of uncertainty on the decision making process at the basis of the disjunction effect can thus be estimated a priori. The sign of the effect is controlled by the aversion for uncertainty exhibited by people (uncertainty-aversion principle). The amplitude of the effect can be estimated, as shown above, from simple priors applied to the mathematical structure of the QDT formulation.

4.4.3 Uncertainty-aversion principle

The above calculation implies that the disjunction effect can be interpreted as essentially an emotional reaction associated with the *aversion for uncertainty*. An analogy can make the point: it is widely recognized that uncertainty frightens living beings, whether humans or animals. It is also well documented that fear paralyzes, as in the cartoon of the “rabbit syndrome,” when a rabbit stays immobile in front of an approaching boa instead of running away. There are many circumstantial evidences that uncertainty may frighten people as a boa frightens rabbits. Being afraid of uncertainty, a majority of human beings may be hindered to act. In the presence of uncertainty, they do not want to act, so that they refuse the second gamble, as in example (i), or forgo the purchase of a vacation, as in example (ii), or refrain from selling stocks, as in example (iii). Our analysis suggests that it is the aversion of uncertainty that paralyzes people and causes the disjunction effect.

It has been reported that, if people, when confronting uncertainty paralyzing them against acting, are presented with a detailed explanation of the possible outcomes, they then may change their mind and decide to act, thus reducing the disjunction effect (Tversky and Shafir, 1992; Croson, 1999). Thus, by encouraging people to think by providing them additional explanations, it is possible to change their mind. In such a case, reasoning plays the role of a kind of therapeutic treatment decreasing the aversion for uncertainty. This line of reasoning suggests that it should be possible to decrease the aversion for uncertainty by other means, perhaps by distracting them or by taking food, drink or drug injections. This provides the possibility to test for the dependence of the strength of the disjunction effect with respect to various parameters which may modulate the aversion response of individuals to uncertainty.

We should stress that our explanation departs fundamentally from the standard reason-based rationalization of the disjunction effect summarized in subsection 4.3. Rather than using what we perceive is an hoc explanation, we anchor the disjunction effect on the very fundamental characteristic of living beings, that of the aversion for uncertainty. This allows us to construct a robust and parsimonious explanation. But this explanation arises only within our QDT, because QDT allows us to account for the complex emotional, often subconscious, feelings as well as the many unknown state of nature that underlie decision

making. Such unknown states, analogous to hidden variables in quantum mechanics, are taken into account by the formalism of QDT through the interference alternation effect, capturing mental processes by means of quantum-theory techniques.

It is appropriate here to remember that it was Bohr himself who advocated throughout all his life the idea that mental processes do bear close analogies with quantum processes (see, e.g., Bohr, 1929, 1933, 1937, 1961). Since interference, as is discussed in Sect. 3, is one of the most striking characteristic features of quantum processes, it should arise in mental processes as well. The existence of interference in decision making disturbs the classical additivity of probabilities. Indeed, we take as an evidence of this the nonadditivity of probabilities in psychology which has been repeatedly observed (Tversky and Koehler, 1994; Fox et al., 1996; Rottenstreich and Tversky, 1997), although it has never been connected with interference. The possibility of connecting the violation of the sure-thing principle to the existence of interference in probabilities was recently mentioned (Busemeyer et al., 2006; Khrennikov and Haven, 2007). However, no explicit practical scheme was developed that would allow for the quantitative analysis of the known experiments demonstrating the disjunction effect, as we do here.

4.4.4 Numerical analysis of the examples illustrating the disjunction effect

(i) *To gamble or not to gamble?*

Let us turn to the example presented in subsection 4.2. The statistics reported by Tversky and Shafir (1992) are

$$p(A|X_1) = 0.69, \quad p(A|X_2) = 0.59, \quad p(A) = 0.36.$$

Then Eqs. (81) and (82) give

$$p(B|X_1) = 0.31, \quad p(B|X_2) = 0.41, \quad p(B) = 0.64.$$

Recall that the disjunction effect here is the violation of the sure-thing principle, so that, although $p(A|X_j) > p(B|X_j)$ for $j = 1, 2$, one observes nevertheless that $p(A) < p(B)$. In the experiment reported by Tversky and Shafir (1992), the probabilities for winning or for losing were identical: $p(X_1) = p(X_2) = 0.5$. Then, using relation (69), we obtain

$$p(AX_1) = 0.345, \quad p(AX_2) = 0.295, \quad p(BX_1) = 0.155, \quad p(BX_2) = 0.208.$$

For the interference terms, we find

$$p_{int}(A) = -0.28, \quad p_{int}(B) = 0.28. \quad (94)$$

The uncertainty factors (83) are therefore

$$\varphi(A) = -0.439, \quad \varphi(B) = 0.785.$$

They are of opposite sign, in agreement with the condition (85). The probability $p(A)$ of gambling under uncertainty is suppressed by the negative interference term $p_{int}(A) < 0$. Reciprocally, the probability $p(B)$ of not gambling under uncertainty is enhanced by the positive interference term $p_{int}(B) > 0$. This results in the disjunction effect ($p(A) < p(B)$).

It is interesting to note that the observed amplitudes in (94) are close to our predicted “interference-quarter” law (92).

(ii) *To buy or not to buy?*

For the second example of the disjunction effect described in subsection 4.2, the data taken from Tversky and Shafir (1992) read

$$p(A|X_1) = 0.54, \quad p(A|X_2) = 0.57, \quad p(A) = 0.32.$$

Following the same procedure as above, we get

$$p(B|X_1) = 0.46, \quad p(B|X_2) = 0.43, \quad p(B) = 0.68.$$

Given again that the two alternative outcomes are equi-probable, $p(X_1) = p(X_2) = 0.5$, we find

$$p(AX_1) = 0.270, \quad p(AX_2) = 0.285, \quad p(BX_1) = 0.230, \quad p(BX_2) = 0.215.$$

For the interference terms, we obtain

$$p_{int}(A) = -0.235, \quad p_{int}(B) = 0.235. \quad (95)$$

The uncertainty factors are

$$\varphi(A) = -0.424, \quad \varphi(B) = 0.528.$$

Again, the values obtained in (95) are close to our predicted “interference-quarter” law (92).

Because of the aversion of uncertainty, the probability $p(A)$ of purchasing a vacation is suppressed by the negative interference term $p_{int}(A) < 0$. At the same time, the probability $p(B)$ of not buying a vacation under uncertainty is enhanced by the positive interference term $p_{int}(B) > 0$. This alternation of interferences causes the disjunction effect ($p(A) < p(B)$).

In the same way, our approach can be applied to any other situation related to the disjunction effect associated with the violation of the sure-thing principle. We now turn to another deviation from rational decision making, known under the name of the conjunction fallacy.

5 Conjunction fallacy

The conjunction fallacy constitutes another example revealing that intuitive estimates of probability by human beings do not conform to the standard probability calculus. This effect was first studied by Tversky and Kahneman (1980, 1983) and then analysed in many other works (see, e.g., Morier and Borgida, 1984; Wells, 1985; Yates and Carlson, 1986; Shafir et al., 1990; Tentori et al., 2004). Despite an extensive debate and numerous attempts to interpret this effect, there seems to be no consensus on the origin of the conjunction fallacy (Tentori et al., 2004). Franco (2007) mentioned that the fallacy could be connected with interference effects in a quantum description of decision making. Here, we substantiate this point and show that this is really the case. Our derivation differs from that of Franco in several aspects.

First of all, the mathematics of our approach is principally different from that of Franco. Also we do not invent a special scheme for this particular effect, but we show that it finds a natural explanation in the frame of the general QDT we have developed. In order to claim to explain the conjunction fallacy in terms of an interference effect in a quantum description of probabilities, it is necessary to derive the quantitative values of the interference terms, amplitudes and signs, as we have done above for the examples illustrating the disjunction effect. This was not done before. Our QDT provides the necessary ingredients, in terms of the uncertainty-aversion principle, the theorem on interference alternations, and the interference-quarter law. Only the establishment of these general laws can provide an explanation of the conjunction fallacy, that can be taken as a positive step towards validating QDT, according to the methodology conceptualized in (Sornette et al., 2007). Finally, in our comparison with available experimental data, we analyze a series of experiments and demonstrate that all their data substantiate the validity of the general laws of the theory.

5.1 Conjunction rule

Let us first briefly recall the conjunction rule of standard probability theory. Let us consider an event A that can occur together with another one among several other events X_j , where $j = 1, 2, \dots$. The probability of an event estimated within classical probability theory is again denoted with the capital letter $P(A)$, to distinguish it from the probability $p(A)$ in our quantum approach. According to standard probability theory (Feller, 1970), one has

$$P(A) = \sum_j P(AX_j) . \quad (96)$$

Since all terms in the sum (96) are positive, the conjunction rule tells us that

$$P(A) \geq P(AX_j) , \quad \forall j . \quad (97)$$

That is, the probability for the occurrence of the conjunction of two events is never larger than the probability of occurrence of each separate event.

5.2 Conjunction error

Counterintuitively, humans rather systematically violate the conjunction rule (97), commonly making statements such that

$$p(A) < p(AX_j) , \quad (98)$$

which is termed the *conjunction fallacy* (Tversky and Kahneman, 1980; 1983). The difference

$$\varepsilon(AX_j) \equiv p(AX_j) - p(A) \quad (99)$$

is called the *conjunction error*, which is positive under conditions in which the conjunction fallacy is observed.

A typical situation is when people judge about a person, who can possess a characteristic A and also some other characteristics X_j (which can be “possessing a trait” or “not having

the trait” since not having a trait is also a characteristic), as in the oft-cited example of Tversky and Kahneman (1980): “Linda is 31 years old, single, outspoken, and very bright. She majored in philosophy. As a student, she was deeply concerned with issues of discrimination and social justice, and also participated in anti-nuclear demonstrations. Which is more likely? (i) Linda is a bank teller; (ii) Linda is a bank teller and is active in the feminist movement.” Most people answer (ii) which is an example of the conjunction fallacy (98). Numerous other examples of the fallacy are described in the literature (Tversky and Kahneman, 1980, 1983; Morier and Borgida, 1984; Wells, 1985; Yates and Carlson, 1986; Shafir et al., 1990; Tentori et al., 2004). It is important to stress that this fallacy has been reliably and repeatedly documented, that it cannot be explained by the ambiguity of the word “likely” used in the formulation of the question, and that it appears to involve a failure to coordinate the logical structure of events in the presence of chance (Tentori et al., 2004).

5.3 Conjunction interference

Within our QDT, the conjunction fallacy finds a simple and natural explanation. Let us consider a typical situation of the fallacy, when one judges a person who may have a characteristic A , treated as primary, and who may also possess, or not possess, another characteristic, labelled as secondary. Generally, the person could also be an object, a fact, or anything else, which could combine several features. Translating this situation to the mathematical language of our QDT, this situation involves two intentions. One intention, with just one representation, is “to decide whether the object has the feature A .” The second intention “to decide about the secondary feature” has two representations, when one decides whether “the object has the special characteristic” (X_1) or “the object does not have this characteristic” (X_2).

For these definitions, and following the general scheme, we have

$$p(A) = p(AX_1) + p(AX_2) + p_{int}(A) = p(A|X_1)p(X_1) + p(A|X_2)p(X_2) + p_{int}(A) . \quad (100)$$

This is a typical situation where a decision is taken under uncertainty. The uncertainty-aversion principle imposes that the interference term $p_{int}(A)$ should be negative ($p_{int}(A) < 0$). Taking the perspective of the representation X_1 , definition (99) together with Eq. (100) implies that the conjunction error reads

$$\varepsilon(AX_1) = |p_{int}(A)| - p(AX_2) . \quad (101)$$

The condition for the conjunction fallacy to occur is that the error (101) be positive, which requires that the interference term be sufficiently large, such that the *conjunction-fallacy condition*

$$|p_{int}(A)| > p(AX_2) \quad (102)$$

be satisfied.

The QDT thus predicts that a person will make a decision exhibiting the conjunction fallacy when (i) uncertainty is present and (ii) the interference term, which is negative by the uncertainty-aversion principle, has a sufficiently large amplitude (condition (102)).

5.4 Comparison with experiments

For a quantitative analysis, we take the data from Shafir et al. (1990), who present one of the most carefully accomplished and thoroughly discussed set of experiments. Shafir et al. questioned large groups of students in the following way. The students were provided with booklets each containing a brief description of a person. It was stated that the described person could have a primary characteristic (A) and also another characteristic (X).

In total, there were 28 experiments separated into two groups according to the conjunctive category of the studied characteristics. In 14 cases, the features A and X were compatible with each other, and in the other 14 cases, they were incompatible. The characteristics were treated as compatible, when they were felt as closely related according to some traditional wisdom, for instance, “woman teacher” (A) and “feminist” (X). Another example of compatible features is “chess player” (A) and “professor” (X). Those characteristics that were not related by direct logical connections were considered as incompatible, such as “bird watcher” (A) and “truck driver” (X) or “bicycle racer” (A) and “nurse” (X).

In each of the 28 experiments, the students were asked to evaluate both the typicality and the probability of A and AX . Since normal people usually understand “typicality” just as a synonym of probability, the prediction on typicality were equivalent to estimates of probabilities. This amounts to considering only how the students estimated the probability $p(A)$ that the considered person possesses the stated primary feature and the probability $p(AX)$ that the person has both characteristics A and X .

An important quality of the experiments by Shafir et al. (1990) lies in the large number of tests which were performed. Indeed, a given particular experiment is prone to exhibit a significant amount of variability, randomness or “noise”. Not only the interrogated subjects exhibited significant idiosyncratic differences, with diverse abilities, logic, and experience, but in addition the questions were quite heterogeneous. Even the separation of characteristics into two categories of compatible and incompatible pairs is to a some extent arbitrary. Consequently, no one particular case provides a sufficiently clear-cut conclusion on the existence or absence of the conjunction effect. It is only by realizing a large number of interrogations, with a variety of different questions, and by then averaging the results, that it is possible to make justified conclusions on whether or not the conjunction fallacy exists. The set of experiments performed by Shafir et al. (1990) satisfies these requirements.

For the set of compatible pairs of characteristics, it turned out that the average probabilities were $p(A) = 0.537$ and $p(AX) = 0.567$, with statistical errors of 20%. Hence, within this accuracy, $p(A)$ and $p(AX)$ coincide and no conjunction fallacy arises for compatible characteristics. From the view point of QDT, this is easily interpreted as due to the lack of uncertainty: since the features A and X are similar to each other, one almost certainly yielding the other, there is no uncertainty in deciding, hence, no interference, and, consequently, no conjunction fallacy.

However, for the case of incompatible pairs of characteristics, the situation was found to be drastically different. To analyse the related set of experiments, we follow the general scheme of subsection 5.3, using the same notations. We have the prospect with two intentions, one intention is to evaluate a primary feature (A) of the object, and another intention is to decide whether at the same time the object possesses a secondary feature ($X \equiv X_1$) or does not possess it (X_2). Taking the data for $p(X)$ and $p(AX)$ from Shafir et al. (1990), we

calculate $p_{int}(A)$ for each case separately and then average the results. In the calculations, we take into account that the considered pairs of characteristics are incompatible with each other. The simplest and most natural mathematical embodiment of the property of “incompatibility” is to take the probabilities of possessing A , under the condition of either having or not having X , as equal, that is, $p(A|X_j) = 0.5$. For such a case of incompatible pairs of characteristics, Eq. (100) reduces to

$$p(A) = \frac{1}{2} + p_{int}(A) . \quad (103)$$

The results, documenting the existence of the interference terms underlying the conjunction fallacy, are presented in Table 1, which gives the abbreviated names for the object characteristics, whose detailed description can be found in Shafir et al. (1990).

The average values of the different reported probabilities are

$$p(A) = 0.22 , \quad p(X_1) = 0.692 , \quad p(X_2) = 0.308 , \quad p(AX_1) = 0.346 \quad p(AX_2) = 0.154 . \quad (104)$$

One can observe that the interference terms fluctuate around a mean of -0.28 , with a standard deviation of ± 0.06 :

$$\bar{p}_{int}(A) = -0.28 \pm 0.06 . \quad (105)$$

There is a clear evidence of the conjunction fallacy, with the conjunction error (99) being $\varepsilon(AX_1) = 0.126$.

QDT interprets the conjunction effect as due to the uncertainty underlying the decision, which leads to the appearance of the intention interferences. The interference of intentions is caused by the hesitation whether, under the given primary feature (A), the object possesses the secondary feature (X_1) or does not have it (X_2). $\bar{p}_{int}(A)$ is negative, reflecting the effect of deciding under uncertainty (according to the uncertainty-aversion principle). Quantitatively, we observe that the amplitude $|\bar{p}_{int}(A)|$ is in agreement with the QDT interference-quarter law derived in section 4.4.2.

5.5 Conjunction and disjunction effects

The QDT predicts that setups in which the conjunction fallacy occurs should also be accompanied by the disjunction effect. To see this, let us extend slightly the previous decision problem by allowing for two representations of the first intention. Concretely, this means that the intention, related to the decision about the primary characteristic, has the two representations: (i) “decide about the object or person having or not the primary considered feature” (A), and (ii) “decide to abstain from deciding about this feature” (B). This frames the problem in the context previously analysed in subsection 4.4. The conjunction fallacy occurs when one considers incompatible characteristics (Tversky and Kahneman, 1983; Shafir et al., 1990), such that the probabilities of deciding of having a conjunction (AX_j) or of not guessing about it (BX_j) are close to each other, so that one can set

$$p(A|X_j) = p(B|X_j) . \quad (106)$$

The theorem on interference alternation of subsection 3.3 implies that the interference term for being passive under uncertainty is positive and we have

$$p_{int}(B) = -p_{int}(A) > 0 . \quad (107)$$

Now, the probability $p(B)$ of deciding not to guess under uncertainty is governed by an equation similar to Eq. (100). Combining this equation with (107), we obtain

$$p(B) = p(A) + 2|p_{int}(A)|, \quad (108)$$

which shows that, despite equality (106), the probability of being passive is larger than the probability of acting under uncertainty. This is nothing but a particular case of the disjunction effect.

This example shows that the conjunction fallacy is actually a sufficient condition for the occurrence of the disjunction effect, both resulting from the existence of interferences between probabilities under uncertainty. The reverse does not hold: the disjunction effect does not necessarily yield the conjunction fallacy, because the latter requires not only the existence of interferences, but also that their amplitude should be sufficiently large according to the conjunction-fallacy condition (102).

To our knowledge, experiments or situations when the disjunction and conjunction effects are observed simultaneously have not been investigated. The specific prediction coming from the QDT, that the disjunction effect should be observable as soon as the conjunction effect is present, provides a good test of QDT.

6 Noncommutativity of decisions

In Section 2, it was mentioned that subsequent decisions, in general, do not commute with each other and that the noncommutativity is intimately connected with the presence of interferences between intentions. As is demonstrated in the previous sections, the phenomenon of intention interference is a key and general phenomenon at the basis of the disjunction effect and conjunction fallacy. Within our QDT, we expect it to be generically present in human decision making. We are now in a position to present a rigorous proof that the phenomenon of intention interference is also a crucial ingredient for understanding the noncommutativity of successive decisions.

6.1 Mathematical formulation of the noncommutativity property

To describe in precise mathematical terms the property of noncommutativity, let us consider the case of two intentions. We denote one intention as A . And let the other intention $X \equiv \{X_i \mid i = 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ be composed of several representations X_i , such that the intention A can be certainly realized under one of the intentions X_i from the family X , that is,

$$\sum_i p(X_i|A) = 1. \quad (109)$$

For the joint probability

$$p(AX_i) \equiv p(A|X_i)p(X_i) \quad (110)$$

of two intentions A and X_i the following statement holds.

Theorem on noncommutativity of intentions: *For two intentions A and $X = \{X_i\}$, satisfying conditions (109), the joint probability $p(AX_i)$ equals $p(X_iA)$, for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$,*

if and only if there is no interference between the intention representations from the family X ,

$$p(AX_i) = p(X_iA) , \quad \text{if } p_{int}(A) \equiv 0 , \quad (111)$$

where X_i is any of the $X = \{X_i\}$.

Corollary: For the generic situation in which the interference term $p_{int}(A)$ is nonzero, the intentions A and X_i do not commute,

$$p(AX_i) \neq p(X_iA) , \quad p_{int}(A) \neq 0 . \quad (112)$$

Proof: Let us first assume that there is no interference between the intentions from the family X , i.e., $p_{int}(A) = 0$, so that the rules of classical probability theory are applicable. In particular, the multiplication theorem (see Feller, 1970) is valid,

$$p(A|X_i)p(X_i) = p(X_i|A)p(A) , \quad p_{int}(A) \equiv 0 .$$

Then, from definition (110), it immediately follows that $p(AX_i)$ equals $p(X_iA)$, as in the first equality of Eq. (111).

Conversely, let us assume that the intentions A and X_i are commutative for all X_i from the family X , in the sense that the equality between $p(AX_i)$ and $p(X_iA)$ holds. Then, replacing in the general expression of the probability

$$p(A) = \sum_i p(AX_i) + p_{int}(A)$$

the terms $p(AX_i)$ by $p(X_iA)$ and using notation (110), we have

$$p(A) = \sum_i p(X_i|A)p(A) + p_{int}(A) .$$

In view of normalization (109), this yields $p_{int}(A) \equiv 0$, which concludes the proof.

The noncommutativity of subsequent decisions is reminiscent of the noncommutativity of subsequent measurements in quantum mechanics. However, there is a principal difference between these phenomena. In decision theory, the prospect states and the state of mind are the *internal states* of the same decision maker. In contrast, in quantum mechanics, the measurement is accomplished by an observer, or an apparatus, which are *external* to the measured physical system. The analogy would be closer, if one could imagine a physical system that attempts to measure some parts of itself. Since standard quantum mechanical measurements do not proceed like this, the mathematics of the noncommutativity of subsequent decisions in decision theory and of subsequent measurements in quantum theory are quite different.

6.2 Meaning of simultaneous intentions

As follows from the above theorem, when there are two intentions, say A and B , the joint probability $p(AB)$ is generally different from $p(BA)$. Two intentions do not commute with each other, when at least one of them is composite, consisting of several interfering representations. The intentions commute, if there is no their representation interference. For

example, when the mind is one-dimensional or if there is no uncertainty, as is explained in Sec. 3.2.

Since the order of intentions is important, when writing $p(AB)$, one has to keep in mind that the intention B is to be realized earlier than A . Even when talking about simultaneous intentions, it is implied that the order AB means the possible realization of B infinitesimally earlier than that of A . To be more precise, let us mark the intention A , associated with time t , as A_t . Respectively, B_t is the intention B , associated with time t . Then the joint probability of these two intentions, taken in the order $A_t B_t$, is defined as

$$p(A_t B_t) \equiv \lim_{t' \rightarrow t+0} p(A_{t'} B_t) . \quad (113)$$

Because of the noncommutativity of two intentions, the corresponding decisions also do not commute. Two subsequent decisions, even taken immediately one after another, and under the same circumstances, in general, may lead to different outcomes just as a result of the order of their realization.

6.3 Example of noncommutativity of successive decisions

This section gives an explicit example of the noncommutativity of successive decisions, in the simple case of an individual considering the two intentions “to get married” and “to become rich”. And as in section 2.3, let the intention “to get married” have two representations, “to marry A ” and “to marry B ”. And let the intention “to become rich” also have two representations, “to become rich by working hard” and “to become rich as a gangster”. Thus, the prospect-representation basis $\{|n \rangle\}$ consists of four states

$$\{|n \rangle\} = \{|AW \rangle, |AG \rangle, |BW \rangle, |BG \rangle\}$$

characterizing all four possible combinations of the intention representations. Suppose also that the intention representations “to marry A ” and “to become a gangster” are not compatible, because A does not stand gangsters. No such restriction applies to B . Therefore, the prospect state reduces from the general form (27) to the entangled state

$$\psi = c_{11}|AW \rangle + c_{21}|BW \rangle + c_{22}|BG \rangle , \quad (114)$$

whose coefficients satisfy the normalization condition

$$|c_{11}|^2 + |c_{21}|^2 + |c_{22}|^2 = 1 ,$$

and where, for brevity, we do not show explicitly the time dependence.

Suppose that first the decision to marry is taken. Then there are two prospects: “to marry A ” or “to marry B ”, with the related prospects states

$$\psi_A = |AW \rangle , \quad \psi_B = \alpha_1|BW \rangle + \alpha_2|BG \rangle , \quad (115)$$

where

$$|\alpha_1|^2 + |\alpha_2|^2 = 1 .$$

Therefore, the probability to marry A is

$$p(A) = | \langle \psi_A | \psi \rangle |^2 = |c_{11}|^2 , \quad (116)$$

while the probability to marry B becomes

$$p(B) = | \langle \psi_B | \psi \rangle |^2 = p(BW) + p(BG) + p_{int}(B) , \quad (117)$$

where

$$p(BW) = |\alpha_1 c_{21}|^2 , \quad p(BG) = |\alpha_2 c_{22}|^2 , \quad p_{int} = 2\text{Re}(\alpha_1^* c_{21} \alpha_2 c_{22}^*) .$$

In order to stress that the order of the taken decisions can be the sole reason for different outcomes, we assume that all partial probabilities of either to marry A or to marry B , of working hard or being a gangster, are equal. That is, in view of the given normalization conditions, we have

$$|\alpha_i|^2 = \frac{1}{2} , \quad |c_{ij}|^2 = \frac{1}{3} .$$

The interference term in expression (117) corresponds to taking the decision of marrying B under the uncertainty of which job to choose later, either to be a hard worker or to become a gangster. According to the interference-quarter law, taking a decision under uncertainty results in the interference term $p_{int}(B) = -0.25$. In this way, for the marrying probabilities (116) and (117), we get

$$p(A) = \frac{1}{3} , \quad p(B) = \frac{1}{12} . \quad (118)$$

Since $p(A) > p(B)$, the first decision to marry leads to the choice of A as a spouse. After marrying A , the state of mind reduces to

$$\psi = \psi(t, A) = |AW \rangle , \quad (119)$$

following the decision making procedure described in section 2.4.1. Being married to A , the sole prospect with nonzero probability is $\psi_W = |AW \rangle$, and therefore the sole remaining intention regarding the job choice is to work hard. Hence, the following unique possibility remains, with the probability

$$p(A|W) = | \langle \psi_W | \psi \rangle |^2 = 1 . \quad (120)$$

In summary, when deciding first to marry, one chooses spouse A . And, after marrying A , the sole way of getting rich is to work hard.

But the situation could be drastically different, if one decides, first, to become rich and only then to marry. Choosing the way of how to be rich, one has two possibilities, “to work hard” or “to be a gangster”. The corresponding prospect states are

$$\psi_W = \beta_1 |AW \rangle + \beta_2 |BW \rangle , \quad \psi_G = |BG \rangle , \quad (121)$$

with the normalization

$$|\beta_1|^2 + |\beta_2|^2 = 1 .$$

The probability of working hard is

$$p(W) = | \langle \psi_W | \psi \rangle |^2 = p(WA) + p(WB) + p_{int}(W) , \quad (122)$$

where

$$p(WA) = |\beta_1 c_{11}|^2 , \quad p(WB) = |\beta_2 c_{21}|^2 , \quad p_{int}(W) = 2\text{Re}(\beta_1^* c_{11} \beta_2 c_{21}^*) .$$

Similarly, the probability to become a gangster is

$$p(G) = | \langle \psi_G | \psi \rangle |^2 = |c_{22}|^2 . \quad (123)$$

Again, in order to stress that the sole origin of different outcomes may lie solely in the order of decisions, we take all partial probabilities equal and satisfying the related normalization conditions:

$$|\beta_i|^2 = \frac{1}{2} , \quad |c_{ij}|^2 = \frac{1}{3} .$$

The interference term in expression (122) describes the interference of the intentions, either “to marry *A*” or “to marry *B*”. Under this uncertainty, making the decision to work hard yields the interference term $p_{int}(W) = -0.25$, according to the interference-quarter law. As a result, the probabilities (122) and (123) of choosing a job are

$$p(W) = \frac{1}{12} , \quad p(G) = \frac{1}{3} .$$

Since $p(W) < p(G)$, taking first the decision to become rich leads to the decision of becoming a gangster. After such a choice, the state of mind reduces to

$$\psi = \psi(t, G) = |BG\rangle , \quad (124)$$

that is, one can only marry *B*, as the related probability is

$$p(B|G) = | \langle \psi_B | \psi \rangle |^2 = 1 . \quad (125)$$

We have just demonstrated, in a very simple example, that the change of order of two entangled decisions may lead to a completely different sequence of choices, and a totally different life, a result reminiscent of many circumstantial evidences of the lives of real people. One could say in the present example that marrying first leads to a stabilization of the life of the individual towards a more healthy attitude towards his job. This is due to the strong commitment of spouse *A* to prefer the job type *W*. Within the mindset of a typical decision maker captured fundamentally by the QDT framework, the stronger will of spouse *A* makes her more attractive to the decision maker, all other things being equal. However, the same positive property of the potential spouse *A* gives rise to the inverse perverse result if the decision order is changed: when the decision to marry is delayed in favor of the job decision, the potential spouse *B* with the more understanding and flexible mindset becomes the wife of choice. In other words, the drastically different ways of life (spouses and jobs) resulting for an a priori innocuous change of decision order amplifies the initial differences in the spouses’ preference of the job of their husband. Technically, this variant of dynamic inconsistency results from the existence of the intention interference, complemented by the interference-quarter law.

7 Conclusion

We have presented a quantum theory of decision making. By its nature, it can, of course, be realized by a quantum object, say, by a quantum computer. This, however, is not compulsory. And the developed theory can be applied to non-quantum objects with an equal success. It just turns out that the language of quantum theory is a very convenient tool for describing the process of decision making performed by any decision maker, whether quantum or not. In this language, it is straightforward to characterize such features of decision making as the entangled decision making, non-commutativity of subsequent decisions, and intention interference. These features, although being quantum in their description, at the same time, have natural and transparent interpretations in the simple everyday language and are applicable to the events of the real life.

We have demonstrated the applicability of our approach to the cases when the Savage sure-thing principle is violated, resulting in the disjunction effect. Interference of intentions, arising in decision making under uncertainty, possesses specific features caused by aversion to uncertainty. The theorem of interference alternation that we have derived connects the aversion to uncertainty to the appearance of negative interference terms suppressing the probability of actions. At the same time, the probability of the decision maker not to act is enhanced by positive interference terms. This alternating nature of the intention interference under uncertainty explains the occurrence of the disjunction effect.

We have proposed a calculation of the interference terms, based on considerations using robust assessment of probabilities, which makes it possible to predict their influence in a quantitative way. The estimates are in good agreement with experimental data for the disjunction effect.

The conjunction fallacy is also explained by the presence of the interference terms. A series of experiments are analysed and shown to be in excellent agreement with the a priori evaluation of interference effects. The conjunction fallacy is also shown to be a sufficient condition for the disjunction effect and novel experiments testing the combined interplay between the two effects are suggested.

Finally, we have emphasized that the intention interference results in the noncommutativity of subsequent decisions, which follows from the theorem on noncommutativity of intentions.

Acknowledgement. The authors acknowledge financial support from the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH Zürich). We are very grateful to E.P. Yukalova for many discussions and useful advices and to Y. Malevergne for stimulating feedbacks on the manuscript.

Appendix A: the double-slit passage experiment illustrating quantum interferences of a decision maker

To illustrate the conditions for the appearance of interference, let us examine the famous so-called “double-slit” experiment of a particle passing through a screen with two slits. A detailed description of this experiment, demonstrating quantum properties of particles, can be found in almost any book on quantum mechanics (see, e.g., Feynman and Hibbs, 1965). Consider a particle which is placed to the left of a screen with two slits A and B . The particle moves towards the right and, a priori, can pass through one or the other slit, to be measured on a detection panel placed to the right of the screen. The concrete nature of the particle is of no importance. It can be an electron, neutron, proton, photon, ion, and so on. Any of them demonstrate the same quantum properties in the double-slit experiment.

In the context of our decision making theory, we propose the analogy that the particle corresponds to a decision maker, who wants to achieve a goal. For the sake of concreteness, let us consider again an individual, who is presently single, and who is thinking about marrying. The analogy between the decision problem and the famous double-slit experiment is the following.

1. particle \rightarrow person (decision maker),
2. position to the left of the screen \rightarrow being undecided about marrying,
3. position to the right of the screen \rightarrow being decided about marrying,
4. screen with two slits A and B \rightarrow two possible spouses A and B ,
5. distance of observation between the screen and the recording panel \rightarrow measure of the population size of other potential spouses in addition to the two main candidates A and B , or psychological distance to (or level of accuracy of the memory of the qualities of) the potential spouses A and B ,
6. different positions on the panel behind the screen \rightarrow different qualities motivating the decision to marry.

Following our proposal in the main text, the decision maker follows the “quantum” rules leading to interference and entanglement. One usually reports this experiment in order to demonstrate the arising interferences. But one often forgets that the latter may appear or not, depending on how the problem is posed. In the language of our QDT, the decision maker has to decide whether “to marry,” with two stimulations that may lead to the motivation to marry: “potential spouse A ” and “potential spouse B ,” whose representation states are respectively denoted as $|A\rangle$ and $|B\rangle$. The consequence of being exposed to the two potential spouses (passing through the slits) is to form the decision of marrying, based on the selection of qualities which is modulated by the possible existence of other hidden potential spouses as well as by the interference between the qualities of these two exposed potential spouses.

Detectors on the screen (exposition to just one of only two potential spouses)

In the particle language, let us assume that detectors are attached to the screen, being located just after the slits. In the marriage decision language, this means that the decision maker is exposed only to the two potential candidate spouses A and B and not to any other one. Then, the passage of the particle through one of the slits is immediately registered by a detector just behind that slit. Hence, the probabilities $p(A)$ and $p(B)$ of passing through the slits A or B are directly measurable. Therefore, the total probability of the particle, passing through either slit A or B , is

$$p(A + B) = p(A) + P(B) , \quad (126)$$

which displays no interference. Translated into the marriage decision language, this case corresponds to the absence of uncertainty, described in subsection 3.2.2. The prospect state of passing through one of the slits is

$$|A + B \rangle = c_1|A \rangle + c_2|B \rangle . \quad (127)$$

The probabilities of passing through the slits A or B , separately, is

$$\begin{aligned} p(A) &= | \langle A | A + B \rangle |^2 = |c_1|^2 , \\ p(B) &= | \langle B | A + B \rangle |^2 = |c_2|^2 . \end{aligned} \quad (128)$$

The absence of uncertainty means that the prospect state (127) is defined uniquely up to a factor c of modulus one, $|c| = 1$. Then the total probability for the particle of passing through on of the slits is

$$p(A + B) = | \langle A + B | A + B \rangle |^2 = 1 . \quad (129)$$

With notation (128), this translates into the sum (126), in which there is no interference. This variant of the double-slit experiment without interference is often overlooked in the literature on decision making, though it is well known in physics (Feynman and Hibbs, 1965).

In the marriage decision language, the lack of interference resulting from the absence of uncertainty means that the decision maker is influenced by only either the potential spouse A or the potential spouse B . Hence, she does not vacillate about what qualities are important to make her decision about marrying. She is either influenced solely by the potential spouse A or the other potential spouse B , but not by both of them at the same time, or by any other one.

Detectors on a panel after the screen (exposition to several potential spouses)

The standard variant of the double-slit experiment corresponds to the situation where the detectors are located sufficiently far after the screen. In terms of the marriage decision

language, there are now two stimulations or inspirations A and B , with the two associated representation states $|A\rangle$ and $|B\rangle$. The detection on the recording panel to the right of the two-slit screen corresponds to finding the decision maker in a state of mind where she wants to marry. There are many representations associated with the different qualities that have motivated the decision to marry. We shall denote by $|x_i\rangle$ the representation state of quality x_i . In the usual particle language, $|x_i\rangle$ is the representation of the state of being detected by a detector at the spatial location x_i . We enumerate the qualities by $i = 1, 2, \dots, R_2$, with R_2 being the total number of qualities (detectors) influencing the decision maker. In this case, the dimensionality of mind is

$$d_{\mathcal{H}} = R_1 R_2 = 2R_2. \quad (130)$$

The basis of the total prospect state is

$$\{|Ax_i\rangle, |Bx_i\rangle\} \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, R_2).$$

The state of mind is

$$\psi = \sum_i [c_A(x_i)|Ax_i\rangle + c_B(x_i)|Bx_i\rangle], \quad (131)$$

with the coefficients satisfying the normalization

$$\sum_i [|c_A(x_i)|^2 + |c_B(x_i)|^2] = 1. \quad (132)$$

The probabilities of being influenced by the qualities of A or B and retaining the quality x_j (in the particle language, “of passing through the slit A , or B , and being registered at the point x_j ”) are

$$p(Ax_j) = |\langle Ax_j|\psi\rangle|^2 = |c_A(x_j)|^2, \quad p(Bx_j) = |\langle Bx_j|\psi\rangle|^2 = |c_B(x_j)|^2. \quad (133)$$

Let us now consider the prospect state

$$|A + B, x_j\rangle = \alpha|Ax_j\rangle + \beta|Bx_j\rangle \quad (134)$$

for the decision maker to be influenced by anyone of the two potential spouses to decide to marry on the basis of one specific quality x_j with representation state $|x_j\rangle$ (in the particle language, this is the state of a particle passing through one of the slits and being registered by a detector at the point x_j). The probability of realizing the prospect state (134) is

$$p(A + B, x_j) = |\langle A + B, x_j|\psi\rangle|^2 = |\alpha^*c_A(x_j) + \beta^*c_B(x_j)|^2. \quad (135)$$

Interferences now appear. Introducing the notation

$$p_A(x_j) \equiv |\alpha c_A(x_j)|^2, \quad p_B(x_j) \equiv |\alpha c_B(x_j)|^2 \quad (136)$$

and defining the interference term

$$p_{AB}^{int}(x_j) \equiv 2\text{Re}[\alpha^*c_A(x_j)\beta c_B^*(x_j)], \quad (137)$$

we obtain

$$p(A + B, x_j) = p_A(x_j) + p_B(x_j) + p_{AB}^{int}(x_j). \quad (138)$$

This is completely analogous to the intention interference described in Sec. 3, which emphasizes the similarity between the setup typical of quantum mechanics and the decision making in human life.

Distributions and probabilities

When discussing the double-slit experiment, one usually works in the Schrödinger representation, dealing with wave functions. In the present subsection, we shall make the bridge between the Schrödinger representation and the terminology employed in the previous sections.

The wave function of a particle passing through the slits to reach a spatial point x (the wave function representing the state of mind of the decision maker being exposed to the two potential spouses and reaching a decision to marry based on some quality x) is

$$\psi_{A+B}(x) = \psi_A(x) + \psi_B(x) , \quad (139)$$

where $\psi_A(x)$ and $\psi_B(x)$ are orthogonal to each other. In the marriage decision language, this orthogonality means that both potential spouses A and B are endowed independently of each other with quality x to a degree quantified respectively by $\psi_A(x)$ and $\psi_B(x)$. Taking the modulus squared of Eq. (139) gives

$$|\psi_{A+B}(x)|^2 = |\psi_A(x)|^2 + |\psi_B(x)|^2 + 2\text{Re}[\psi_A^*(x)\psi_B(x)] . \quad (140)$$

It is this formula that one usually mentions in order to illustrate the interference in probabilities occurring in the quantum world. Strictly speaking, this is however not correct. The modulus squared $|\psi|^2$ of a wave function is not a probability, but it is a density distribution, since position is continuous. In the marriage decision language, the qualities considered by the decision maker can form a continuum interpolating like in fuzzy logic (Elkan, 1994) between the discrete cardinal qualities, such as honesty, kindness, humility, intelligence, humor, integrity, spirituality, beauty, grace, charm, health, and so on. Hence, Eq. (140) demonstrates the interference not in probabilities, but in *density distributions*.

To reformulate Eq. (140) into an equation for probabilities, it is necessary to integrate it over the spatial variable x varying in a volume V_j around a detector located at the point x_j (over the spectrum of qualities varying over a continuum interpolating between the discrete cardinal qualities). In that way, we obtain for the left-hand-side of (140) the probability

$$p(A + B, x_j) = \int_{V_j} |\psi_{A+B}(x)|^2 dx . \quad (141)$$

For the right-hand-side of (140), we have the probabilities

$$p_A(x_j) = \int_{V_j} |\psi_A(x)|^2 dx , \quad p_B(x_j) = \int_{V_j} |\psi_B(x)|^2 dx , \quad (142)$$

with the interference term

$$p_{AB}^{int}(x_j) = 2\text{Re} \int_{V_j} \psi_A^*(x)\psi_B(x) dx . \quad (143)$$

As a result, Eq. (140) transforms into Eq.(138). The probabilities (141), (142), and (143) have the same meaning as in the previous subsection.

If one asks the question “what is the probability of a particle passing through one of the slits and being detected by any of the detectors” (“what is the probability of being

exposed to the stimulations exerted by at least one of the two potential spouses as well as the ensemble of those that may follow, that led to a decision to marry based on any possible choice of qualities”), then one has to extend the integration in Eqs. (141), (142), and (143) to the whole spatial volume V , incorporating all detectors (over the whole set of qualities). Therefore, the probability (141) reduces to

$$p(A + B) = \int_V |\psi_{A+B}(x)|^2 dx = 1 , \quad (144)$$

due to the normalization condition. Instead of Eqs. (142), we get

$$p(A) \equiv \int_V |\psi_A(x)|^2 dx , \quad p(B) \equiv \int_V |\psi_B(x)|^2 dx , \quad (145)$$

while the interference term (143) becomes zero, due to the orthogonality of $\psi_A(x)$ and $\psi_B(x)$. This yields back Eqs. (126) and (129) of the first subsection of this Appendix, where there is no interference.

In the context of the marriage decision language, the absence of interferences means that the decision to marry has been taken based on the plain sum of the independent qualities of the two potential spouses, with no complications arising from possible mixtures of qualities emanating from the two potential spouses. In the presence of interferences, the qualities which contribute to the decision to marry may be selected or deselected as a result of the combined influence, positive or negative, of the two potential spouses present in the mind of the decision maker.

Appendix B: derivation of the interference-quarter law for a mind of arbitrary dimension

This appendix complements the derivation of section 4.4.2, which was restricted to the four-dimensional mind.

Consider two intentions, the first one with the set $\{A_i\}$ of R_1 representations, and the second one with the set $\{X_j\}$ of R_2 representations. We take the numbers of the representations R_1 and R_2 as arbitrary, so that the dimension of mind $d_{\mathcal{H}} = R_1 R_2$ is also arbitrary.

We estimate the amplitude of the interference term (67) by first noting that

$$|p_{int}(A_i)| \leq \sum_{j < k} |p_{ik}^{int}(A)| . \quad (146)$$

For the partial interference terms (66), we use similar considerations as in section 4.4.2 to obtain the expected value

$$|\bar{p}_{ik}^{int}(A_i)| = \frac{1}{4} .$$

As a result, Eq. (146) yields the estimate

$$|\bar{p}_{int}(A_i)| \leq \frac{R_2(R_2 - 1)}{8} . \quad (147)$$

Expression (147) shows how the influence of the interference between intentions can be estimated for the case of an arbitrary-dimensional mind. This estimation can then be used for the evaluation of the probability (68). The bound in (147) is useful only for $R_2 \leq 3$, since it is always true that $|\bar{p}_{int}(A_i)| \leq 1$.

References

- Allais, M., 1953. Le comportement de l'homme rationnel devant le risque: critique des postulats et axiomes de l'école Américaine, *Econometrica* 21, 503-546.
- Amit, D., 1989. *Modeling Brain Function*. Cambridge University, Cambridge.
- Atmanspacher, H., 2003. Mind and matter as asymptotically disjoint inequivalent representations with broken time-reversal symmetry. *Biosystems* 68, 19-30.
- Atmanspacher, H., Römer, H., Walach, H., 2002. Weak quantum theory: complementarity and entanglement in physics and beyond. *Found. Phys.* 22, 379-406.
- Bather, J., 2000. *Decision Theory*. Wiley, Chichester.
- Barkan, R., Danziger, S., Ben-Bashat, G., Busemeyer, J.R., 2005. Framing reference points: The effect of integration and segregation on dynamic inconsistency. *J. Behav. Dec. Making* 18, 213-226.
- Baron, J., 1998. *Judgement Misguided: Intuition and Error in Public Decision-Making*. Oxford University, Oxford.
- Bechara, A., Damasio, H., Damasio, A., 2000. Emotion, decision making and the orbitofrontal cortex. *Cerebral Cortex* 10, 295-307.
- Beck, F., Eccles, J., 1992. Quantum aspects of brain activity and the role of consciousness. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 89, 11357-11361.
- Bell, J.S., 1964. On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox, *Physics* 1, 195-200.
- Benjamin, S.C., Hayden, P.M., 2001. Multi-player quantum games. *Phys. Rev. A* 64, 030301-4.
- Berger, J.O., 1985. *Statistical Decision Theory and Bayesian Analysis*. Springer, New York.
- Bohm, D., 1951. *Quantum Theory*. Prentice-Hall, London.
- Bohr, N., 1929. Wirkungsquantum und Naturbeschreibung. *Naturwiss.* 17, 483-486.
- Bohr, N., 1933. Light and life. *Nature* 131, 421-423, 457-459.
- Bohr, N., 1937. Kausalität und Komplementarität. *Erkenntniss.* 6, 293-303.
- Bohr, N., 1961. *La physique atomique et la connaissance humaine*. Gontier, Genève.
- Buchanan, J.T., 1982. *Discrete and Dynamic Decision Analysis*. Wiley, Chichester.
- Busemeyer, J.R., Wang, Z., Townsend, J.T., 2006. Quantum dynamics of human decision-making. *J. Math. Psychology* 50, 220-241.
- Camerer, C. F., Loewenstein, G., Rabin, R. (eds.) 2003. *Advances in Behavioral Economics*. Princeton University, Princeton.
- Chalmers, D., 1996. *The Conscious Mind*. Oxford University, Oxford.
- Cohen, M., Tallon, J.M., 2000. Décision dans le risque et l'incertain: l'apport des modèles non additifs, *Revue d'Economie Politique* 110, 631-681.

- Croson, R.T.A., 1999. The disjunction effect and reason-based choice in games. *Org. Behav. Human Decision Processes* 80, 118-133.
- Dawkins, R., 2006. *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford University, New York.
- De Broglie, L., 1982. *Les incertitudes d'Heisenberg et l'interpretation probabiliste de la mecanique ondulatoire*. Gauthier-Villars, Paris.
- Dickhaut, J., McCabe, K., Nagode, J.C., Rustichini, A., Smith, K., Pardo, J.V., 2003. The impact of the certainty context on the process of choice. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 100, 3536-3541.
- Dieudonné, J., 2006. *Foundations of Modern Analysis*. Hesperides, London.
- Dirac, P.A.M., 1958. *The Principles of Quantum Mechanics*. Clarendon, Oxford.
- Du, J., Li, H., Xu, X., Shi, M., Wu, J., Zhou, X., Han, R., 2002. Experimental realization of quantum games on a quantum computer. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 88, 137902-4.
- Du, J., Xu, X., Li, H., Zhou, X., Han, R., 2001. Entanglement playing a dominating role in quantum games. *Phys. Lett. A* 289, 9-15.
- Einstein A, Podolsky B, Rosen N, 1935. Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete? *Phys. Rev.* 47, 777-780.
- Eisert, J., Wilkens, M., 2000. Quantum games. *J. Mod. Opt.* 47, 2543-2556.
- Elkan, C., 1994. The paradoxical success of fuzzy logic, *IEEE Expert* 9 (4), 3-8.
- Enk, van S.J., Pike, R., 2002. Classical rules in quantum games. *Phys. Rev. A* 66, 024306-2.
- Epstein, L.G., 1999. A definition of uncertainty aversion, *The Review of Economic Studies* 66, 579-608.
- Feller, W., 1970. *Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications*. Wiley, New York.
- Feynman, R.P., Hibbs, A.R., 1965. *Quantum Mechanics and Path Integrals*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Fox C., Rogers, B. Tversky, A., 1996. Option traders exhibit subadditive decision weights. *J. Risk Uncertainty* 13, 5-17.
- Franco, R., 2007. The conjunction fallacy and interference effects. E-print arXiv:0708.3948.
- Franco, R., 2007. Quantum mechanics and rational ignorance. E-print physics/0702163.
- French, S., Insua, D.R., 2000. *Statistical Decision Theory*. Arnold, London.
- Frölich, H., 1968. Bose condensation of strongly excited longitudinal electric modes. *Phys. Lett. A* 26, 402-403.
- Gilboa, I. and D. Schmeidler, 1989. Maxmin expected utility with non-unique prior, *Journal of Mathematical Economics* 18, 141-153.
- Goldenberg, L., Vaidman, L., Wiesner, S., 1999. Quantum gambling. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 82, 3356-3359.

- Hagan, S., Hameroff, S.R., Tuszynski, J.A., 2002. Quantum computation in brain microtubules: decoherence and biological feasibility. *Phys. Rev. E* 65, 061901-11.
- Haken, H., 2008. *Brain Dynamics*, Springer Series in Synergetics, Springer: Complexity, Berlin.
- Hastings, N.A., Mello, J.M., 1978. *Decision Networks*. Wiley, Chichester.
- Hopfield, J.J., 1982. Neural networks and physical systems with emergent collective computational abilities. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 79, 2554-2558.
- Hopfield, J.J., 1999. Brain, neural networks, and computation. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* S71, 431-437.
- Huberman, B.A., Hogg, T., 2003. Quantum solution of coordination problems. E-print quant-ph/0306112.
- Iqbal, A., Toor, A.H., 2001. Evolutionally stable strategies in quantum games. *Phys. Lett. A* 280, 249-256.
- Johnson, N.F., 2001. Playing a quantum game with a corrupted source. *Phys. Rev. A* 63, 020302-4.
- Kahneman, D., Tversky, A., 1979. Prospect theory: an analysis of decisions under risk. *Econometrica* 77, 263-291.
- Kahneman, D., Lovallo, D., 1993. Timid choices and bold forecasts: a cognitive perspective on risk-taking. *Management Science* 39, 17-31.
- Khrennikov, A., 2006. Quantum-like brain: interference of minds. *Biosystems* 84, 225-241.
- Khrennikov, A.Y., Haven, E., 2007. The importance of probability interference in social science: rationale and experiment. E-print arXiv:0709.2802.
- Koechlin, E., Hyafil, A., 2007. Anterior prefrontal function and the limits of human decision-making. *Science* 318, 594-598.
- Körding, K., 2007. Decision theory: What should the nervous system do? *Science* 318, 606-610.
- Kühberger, A., Komunská D., Perner, J., 2001. The disjunction effect: Does it exist for two-step gambles? *Org. Behav. Human Decision Processes* 85, 250-264.
- Lambdin, C., Burdsal, C., 2007. The disjunction effect reexamined: Relevant methodological issues and the fallacy of unspecified percentage comparisons. *Org. Behav. Human Decision Processes* 103, 268-276.
- Lee, C.F., Johnson, N.F., 2003. Efficiency and formalism of quantum games. *Phys. Rev. A* 67, 022311-5.
- Legrenzi, P., Girotto, V., Johnson-Laird, P.N., 1993. Focusing in reasoning and decision making. *Cognition* 49, 36-66.
- Li, C.F., Zhang, Y.S., Huang, Y.F., Guo, G.C., 2001. Quantum strategies of quantum measurements. *Phys. Lett. A* 280, 257-260.

- Li, S., Taplin, J.E., Zhang, Y., 2007. The equate-to-differentiate way of seeing the prisoner's dilemma. *Information Sciences* 177, 1395-1412.
- Lindgren, B.W., 1971. *Elements of Decision Theory*. Macmillan, New York.
- Lockwood, M., 1989. *Mind, Brain and the Quantum*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Machina, M.J., 2008. Non-expected utility theory, *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*, 2nd Edition edited by S.N. Durlauf and L.E. Blume, Macmillan (Basingstoke and New York).
- Marshall, K.T., Oliver, R.M., 1995. *Decision Making and Forecasting*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Meyer, D., 1999. Quantum strategies. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 82, 1052-1055.
- Mogiliansky, A.L., Zamir, S., Zwirn, H., 2006. Type indeterminacy: a model of the Kahneman-Tversky man. E-print physics/0604166.
- Morier, D.M., Borgida, E., 1984. The conjunction fallacy: A task-specific phenomenon? *Personality Social Psychology Bull.* 10, 243-253.
- Neumann, von J., Morgenstern, O., 1944. *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*. Princeton University, Princeton (reprinted in 2007 as the 60th year commemorative edition).
- Paulus, M.P., 2007. Decision-making dysfunctions in psychiatry-altered homeostatic processing? *Science* 318, 602-606.
- Penrose, R., 1989. *The Emperor's New Mind*. Oxford University, Oxford.
- Pessa, E., Vitiello, G., 2003. Quantum noise, entanglement and chaos in the quantum field theory of mind-brain states. *Mind and Matter* 1, 59-79.
- Primas, H., 2003. Time-entanglement between mind and matter. *Mind and Matter* 1, 81-119.
- Quiggin, J., 1982. A theory of anticipated utility, *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 3, 323-343.
- Raiffa, H., Schlaifer, R., 2000. *Applied Statistical Decision Theory*. Wiley, New York.
- Read, D., Loewenstein, G.L., Rabin, M., 1999. Choice bracketing. *J. Risk and Uncertainty* 19, 171-197.
- Rivett, P., 1980. *Model Building for Decision Analysis*. Wiley, Chichester.
- Rottenstreich Y., Tversky, A., 1997. Unpacking, repacking and anchoring: advances in support theory. *Psychological Rev.* 104, 406-415.
- Sanfey, A.G., 2007. Social decision-making: insight from game theory and neuroscience. *Science* 318, 598-602.
- Satinover, J., 2001. *The Quantum Brain*. Wiley, New York.
- Savage, L.J., 1954. *The Foundations of Statistics*. Wiley, New York.
- Schall, J.D., 2001. Neural basis of deciding, choosing and acting. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 2, 33-42.

- Shafir, E.B., Smith, E.E., Osherson, D.N., 1990. Typicality and reasoning fallacies. *Memory and Cognition* 18, 229-239.
- Shafir, E., Tversky, A., 1992. Thinking through uncertainty: Nonconsequential reasoning and choice. *Cognitive Psychology* 24, 449-474.
- Shafir, E., Simonson, I., Tversky, A., 1993. Reason-based choice. *Cognition* 49, 11-36.
- Shafir, E., 1994. Uncertainty and the difficulty of thinking through disjunctions. *Cognition* 50, 403-430.
- Shor, P., 1997. Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer. *SIAM J. Sci. Stat. Comput.* 26, 1484-1494.
- Simon, H., 1957. *Models of Man, Social and Rational: Mathematical Essays on Rational Human Behavior in a Social Setting*. New York: Wiley.
- Sornette, D., A. B. Davis, K. Ide, K. R. Vixie, V. Pisarenko, and J. R. Kamm, 2007. Algorithm for model validation: Theory and applications, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* 104 (16), 6562-6567.
- Stapp, H.P., 1993. *Mind, Matter, and Quantum Mechanics*. Springer, Berlin.
- Stapp, H.P., 1999. Attention, intention, and will in quantum physics. *J. Consc. Stud.* 6, 143-164.
- Stuart, C.I.J., Takahashi, Y., Umezawa, H., 1978. On the stability and non-local properties of memory. *J. Theor. Biol.* 71, 605-618.
- Stuart, C.I.J., Takahashi, Y., Umezawa, H., 1979. Mixed system brain dynamics: neural memory as a macroscopic ordered state. *Found. Phys.* 9, 301-327.
- Sugrue, L.P., Corrado, G.S., Newsome, W.T., 2005. Choosing the greater of two goods: neural currencies for valuation and decision making. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 6, 363-375.
- Tegmark, M., 2000. Importance of quantum decoherence in brain processes. *Phys. Rev. E* 61, 4194-4205.
- Tentori, K., Bonini, N., Osherson, D., 2004. The conjunction fallacy: a misunderstanding about conjunction? *Cognitive Science* 28, 467-477.
- Tversky, A., Kahneman, D., 1973. Availability: a heuristic for judging frequency and probability. *Cognitive Psychology* 5, 207-232.
- Tversky, A., Kahneman, D., 1980. Judgements of and by representativeness. In D. Kahneman, P. Slovic, A. Tversky (Eds.), *Judgements Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases*. Cambridge University, New York, p. 84-98.
- Tversky, A., Kahneman, D., 1983. Extensional versus intuitive reasoning: The conjunction fallacy in probability judgement. *Psychological Rev.* 90, 293-315.
- Tversky, A., Shafir, E., 1992. The disjunction effect in choice under uncertainty. *Psychological Science* 3, 305-309.
- Tversky, A., Koehler, D., 1994. Support theory: a nonexistential representation of subjective probability. *Psychological Rev.* 101, 547-567.

- Vitiello, G., 1995. Dissipation and memory capacity in the quantum brain model. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* 9, 973-989.
- Wells, G.L., 1985. The conjunction error and the representativeness heuristic. *Social Cognition* 3, 266-279.
- Weidlich, W., 1991. Physics and social science - the approach of synergetics. *Phys. Rep.* 204, 1-163.
- Weirich, P., 2001. *Decision Space*. Cambridge University, Cambridge.
- White, D.I., 1976. *Fundamentals of Decision Theory*. Elsevier, New York.
- Yang, T., Shadlen, M.N., 2007. Probabilistic reasoning by neurons. *Nature* 447, 1075-1082.
- Yates, J.F., Carlson, B.W., 1986. Conjunction errors: Evidence for multiple judgement procedures, including signed summation. *Org. Behav. Human Decision Processes* 37, 230-253.
- Yukalov, V.I., 1975. Causality problem in quantum physics. *Philos. Stud.* 18, 145-147.
- Yukalov, V.I., 1991. Phase transitions and heterophase fluctuations. *Phys. Rep.* 208, 395-492.
- Yukalov, V.I., 2003. Quantifying entanglement production of quantum operations. *Phys. Rev. A* 68, 022109-14.
- Yukalov, V.I., 2003. Evolutional entanglement in nonequilibrium processes. *Mod. Phys. Lett. B* 17, 95-103.
- Zeckhauser, R., 2006. Investing in the unknown and unknowable, *Capitalism and Society* 1 (2), article 5, 1-39.
- Zurek, W. H., 2007. Quantum origin of quantum jumps: Breaking of unitary symmetry induced by information transfer in the transition from quantum to classical, *Phys. Rev. A* 76, 052110.

| | characteristics | $p(A)$ | $p(AX)$ | $p_{int}(A)$ |
|---|-----------------------|--------|---------|--------------|
| A | bank teller | 0.241 | 0.401 | -0.259 |
| X | feminist | | | |
| A | bird watcher | 0.173 | 0.274 | -0.327 |
| X | truck driver | | | |
| A | bicycle racer | 0.160 | 0.226 | -0.340 |
| X | nurse | | | |
| A | drum player | 0.266 | 0.367 | -0.234 |
| X | professor | | | |
| A | boxer | 0.202 | 0.269 | -0.298 |
| X | chef | | | |
| A | volleyboller | 0.194 | 0.282 | -0.306 |
| X | engineer | | | |
| A | librarian | 0.152 | 0.377 | -0.348 |
| X | aerobic trainer | | | |
| A | hair dresser | 0.188 | 0.252 | -0.312 |
| X | writer | | | |
| A | floriculturist | 0.310 | 0.471 | -0.190 |
| X | state worker | | | |
| A | bus driver | 0.172 | 0.314 | -0.328 |
| X | painter | | | |
| A | knitter | 0.315 | 0.580 | -0.185 |
| X | correspondent | | | |
| A | construction worker | 0.131 | 0.249 | -0.369 |
| X | labor-union president | | | |
| A | flute player | 0.180 | 0.339 | -0.320 |
| X | car mechanic | | | |
| A | student | 0.392 | 0.439 | -0.108 |
| X | fashion-monger | | | |
| | average | 0.220 | 0.346 | -0.280 |

Table 1. Conjunction fallacy and related interference terms caused by the decision under uncertainty. The average interference term is in good agreement with the interference-quarter law.