

Stochastic Unrelatedness, Couplings, and Contextuality

Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov*
Purdue University

R. Duncan Luce once mentioned in a private conversation that he did not consider Kolmogorov's probability theory well-constructed because it treats stochastic independence as a "numerical accident," while it should be treated as a fundamental relation, more basic than the assignment of numerical probabilities. I argue here that stochastic independence is indeed a "numerical accident," a special form of stochastic dependence between random variables (most broadly defined). The idea that it is fundamental may owe its attractiveness to the confusion of stochastic independence with stochastic unrelatedness, the situation when two or more random variables have no joint distribution, "have nothing to do with each other." Kolmogorov's probability theory cannot be consistently constructed without allowing for stochastic unrelatedness, in fact making it a default situation: any two random variables recorded under mutually incompatible conditions are stochastically unrelated. However, stochastically unrelated random variables can always be probabilistically coupled, i.e., imposed a joint distribution upon, and this generally can be done in an infinity of ways, independent coupling being merely one of them. The notions of stochastic unrelatedness and all possible couplings play a central role in the foundation of probability theory and, especially, in the theory of probabilistic contextuality.

KEYWORDS: contextuality, coupling, joint distribution, probability, random variable, stochastic relation, stochastic unrelatedness.

I. REMINISCENCES

Almost 15 years ago R. Duncan Luce visited at Purdue to give a talk, and we had a leisurely conversation in my home. Among other things we touched on the oft-discussed at the time fact that randomness of measurement outcomes was not integral part of the representational theory of measurement. To remedy this would not be difficult, Duncan told me; the difficulty is, however, that to do this we have to reformulate Kolmogorov's probability theory (KPT) as a qualitative theory, which it is not. That is, to successfully fuse the algebra of the representational theory of measurement with numerical probabilities, the latter themselves should be derived as representations based on qualitative relations (such as "this event is more probable than that event"). Duncan knew I would not share this view: he and I had had many previous discussions, sometimes heated debates, regarding the difference between quantitative and numerical (Dzhafarov, 1994). As Duncan put it in an overview of the representational theory of measurement, "Despite numerous lengthy conversations and much correspondence, neither of us has persuaded the other of his position" (Luce, 1996, p. 93).

There was, however, one aspect of what he told me that struck my imagination, even though the issue was not entirely new to me. I had known from Chapter 5 of the first volume of Foundations of Measurement (Krantz et al., 1971) that Zoltan Domotor in 1969 axiomatized probability theory treating stochastic independence as a primitive relation. But this treatment, as well the whole chapter, had left me quite unimpressed, unlike Duncan's simple argument that evening. If I roll a die in Irvine, California, Duncan said, and you roll another die on another day in

Lafayette, Indiana, the fact that the two chains of events are independent need not be established by checking the multiplication rule. There was something very unsatisfactory about the definition of stochastic independence in KPT: it should, Duncan insisted, be viewed as a fundamental relation while in KPT it is treated as a "numerical accident."

Several years later I reminded him of this issue when I visited at the Institute of Mathematical Behavioral Sciences at the UC Irvine, of which Duncan was the founding director. We had another leisurely conversation, and I asked him if he would agree that the core of the problem with KPT was in that it did not capture an important difference between independence of random variables and independence of events. The latter, I proposed, was indeed a "numerical accident," and perhaps there was nothing wrong about this, but the independence of two random variables (the relation of "X having nothing to do with Y") could indeed be more fundamental than it is in KPT. I used his example with the dice in Indiana and California: any random variable associated with one of them "has nothing to do" with any random variables associated with the other. Consider, however, two events associated with just one of the dice: A = "the outcome is even" and B = "the outcome exceeds 3." Whether A and B are independent is determined by the exact probability masses associated with individual outcomes: if the die is fair, then they are not independent, but if the distribution is

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{value :} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \\ \text{pr.mass :} \quad 0 \quad \frac{1}{4} \quad \frac{1}{4} \quad \frac{1}{4} \quad \frac{1}{4} \quad 0 \end{array},$$

then A and B are independent. The only way of establishing these facts is to apply the multiplication rule. Duncan's reaction was that ideally the independence of events and independence of random variables should be treated identically.

On and off, I continued to think of this as of an interesting philosophical issue, until around 2010 I realized, having

* E-mail: ehtibar@purdue.edu

greatly benefited from my collaboration with Janne Kujala, that this issue had a direct relevance to a problem I had been studying for many years — the problem of selective influences. Moreover, both this problem and the issue of random variables that “have nothing to do with each other” turned out to be directly related to the problem of contextuality traditionally studied within the framework of quantum physics. I mentioned this to Duncan Luce in 2011, at an annual meeting of the Society for Mathematical Psychology in Boston, at the Tufts University. I and Jerome Busemeyer co-organized there a symposium on foundations of probability, and my talk at this symposium (coauthored with Janne Kujala) was a response to Duncan Luce’s criticism of KPT, his “numerical accident” argument. My points were essentially the same as those I defend below in this paper:

1. random variables that “have nothing to do with each other” are defined on different sample spaces; rather than being independent, they are *stochastically unrelated*, i.e., they possess no joint distribution;
2. KPT is consistent with the idea of a multiple sample spaces; moreover, the idea of a single sample space for all random variables imaginable is mathematically untenable;
3. any given set of pairwise stochastically unrelated random variables can always be coupled, i.e., imposed a joint distribution on, but this can be done in multiple ways;
4. coupling them as independent random variables is always possible; but stochastic independence per se is a “numerical accident” rather than a fundamental relation.

Later, in a brief conversation, Duncan said that he thought the distinction between unrelatedness and independence “could be important,” and that he and I should discuss this in detail by email. We did not. The year following the Tufts University meeting was the last year of Duncan’s life, during which his scientific work focused on his psychophysical theory of joint presentation and transformed ratios (in collaboration with Ragnar Steingrímsson). His scientific communications with me after the Tufts University meeting were confined to his little paper on Stevens’s regression effect that I was asked to review. This was Duncan’s last single-authored paper, published posthumously (Luce, 2013).

II. ON RANDOM VARIABLES, UNRELATEDNESS, AND INDEPENDENCE

II.1. Informal introduction

Stochastic unrelatedness is easy to distinguish from stochastic independence: the latter assumes the existence

of a joint distribution, which means that an empirical procedure exists by which each realization of one random variables can be paired (coupled) with that of another. The most familiar forms of empirical coupling are co-occurrence in the same trial and co-relation to the same person. In the table below,

$$\begin{array}{l} c : 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad \dots \\ X : x_1 \quad x_2 \quad x_3 \quad x_4 \quad x_5 \quad \dots, \\ Y : y_1 \quad y_2 \quad y_3 \quad y_4 \quad y_5 \quad \dots \end{array} \quad (1)$$

the indexing entity c can be the number of a trial (as in repeatedly rolling two marked dice together) or an ID of a person (as in relating heights and weights, or weights before and after dieting). The random variables X and Y here have a joint distribution: one can, e.g., estimate the probability with which X falls within an event E_X and (“simultaneously”) Y falls within an event E_Y ; and if

$$\Pr[X \in E_X \ \& \ Y \in E_Y] = \Pr[X \in E_X] \Pr[Y \in E_Y], \quad (2)$$

for any two such events E_X, E_Y , then X and Y are considered independent.

Suppose, however, that the information about c in (1) is lost, and one is left with some set of values for X and some set of values for Y ; say, a list of weights of people before dieting and a list of weights after dieting, but without knowing which pairs of weights belong to the same person. Clearly, now the “togetherness” of $X \in E_X$ and $Y \in E_Y$ is undefined. Although $\Pr[X \in E_X]$ and $\Pr[Y \in E_Y]$ have the same meaning as before, $\Pr[X \in E_X \ \& \ Y \in E_Y]$ is undefined, and (2) cannot be tested. This is what stochastic unrelatedness is: lack of a joint distribution. A pair of stochastically unrelated random variables are neither independent nor interdependent, these terms simply do not apply.

A question arises: couldn’t one nevertheless treat stochastically unrelated X and Y *as if* they were independent? The answer is affirmative, but so is the answer to the question whether X and Y can be treated *as if* they were not independent. Treating the outcomes of rolling dice in Indiana (X) and in California (Y) as if they were jointly distributed means constructing another pair of random variables, (\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}) , this time a jointly distributed one, such that \tilde{X} and \tilde{Y} taken separately are distributed as X and Y , respectively. Such constructions form the subject of a special branch of probability theory called the *theory of coupling(s)* (Thorisson, 2000).

Let, e.g., both dice be fair. One can always construct (\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}) by assigning probability mass $\frac{1}{36}$ to each of the 36 pairs. This pair (\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}) is the *independent coupling* of X and Y . Its choice corresponds to pairing every realization of X with every realization of Y . There is, however, no reason to single out the independent coupling. One can also make \tilde{X} and \tilde{Y} perfectly correlated or perfectly anticorrelated by assigning the probability masses as, respectively,

$$\text{pr.mass} \left[\tilde{X} = x \ \& \ \tilde{Y} = y \right] = \begin{array}{l} 0 \text{ if } x \neq y \\ \frac{1}{6} \text{ if } x = y \end{array}$$

or

$$\text{pr.mass} \left[\tilde{X} = x \ \& \ \tilde{Y} = y \right] = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x + y \neq 7 \\ \frac{1}{6} & \text{if } x + y = 7 \end{cases},$$

where $x, y \in \{1, \dots, 6\}$. These couplings correspond to pairing each realization of X with only one specific realization of Y . If the dice producing X and Y have outcomes with different distributions, a perfectly correlated or anticorrelated coupling will not be possible, but the independent coupling will still not be the only possible one (unless each of the dice is rigged to roll a single outcome, in which case the only possible coupling can be viewed as independent, perfectly correlated, or perfectly anticorrelated).

Summarizing, a joint distribution for empirically observed X and Y exists only if there is an empirical procedure for coupling their realizations, such as relating them to one and the same value of c in (1). Otherwise X and Y are stochastically unrelated. When they are, one can impose on them a joint distribution by creating a coupling (\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}) for X and Y “on paper.” The individual distributions of stochastically unrelated X and Y do impose some constraints on possible joint distributions of (\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}) , but, except in exotic cases,¹ do not determine it uniquely. The independent coupling is not the only possible coupling of stochastically unrelated random variables.

II.2. Formalizing the “naive” account of random variables

Random variables are defined by their unique names (e.g., “the outcome of the die rolled at this address by this person”) and by their distributions, say probability masses associated with every possible roll. On a more general level, the distribution of a random variable called X is a probability space (S_X, Σ_X, μ_X) , with the standard meaning of the terms: S_X is the set of possible values, Σ_X is a sigma-algebra of subsets of S_X , and μ a probability measure.² For each element E_X of Σ_X (an event),

$$\Pr[X \in E_X] = \mu(E_X). \quad (3)$$

Given another random variable, called Y and distributed as (S_Y, Σ_Y, μ_Y) , we say it is jointly distributed with X if there is a random variable $Z = (X, Y)$ whose name is “ordered pair of X and Y ” and whose distribution is $(S_X \times S_Y, \Sigma_X \otimes \Sigma_Y, \nu)$, subject to

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(E_X \times S_Y) &= \mu_X(E_X), \\ \nu(S_X \times E_Y) &= \mu_Y(E_Y), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

for any events $E_X \in \Sigma_X$ and $E_Y \in \Sigma_Y$. The meaning of $\Sigma_X \otimes \Sigma_Y$ is the smallest sigma-algebra on $S_X \times S_Y$ that contains pairwise products of events in Σ_X and Σ_Y .

If such a $Z = (X, Y)$ exists, then the joint distribution of X and Y is unique. The existence of this random variable, however, is not established by a mathematical derivation from the properties of X and Y , it is determined by the existence of an empirical procedure by which the realizations of X and Y are observed “together.” If $Z = (X, Y)$ does not exist, one can always consider a coupling $\tilde{Z} = (\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y})$ whose distribution is $(S_X \times S_Y, \Sigma_X \otimes \Sigma_Y, \nu)$, subject to (4). The only difference (but a critical one) is that the name of this \tilde{Z} is not “ordered pair of X and Y ” but “ordered pair of \tilde{X} [whose distribution is the same as that of X] and \tilde{Y} [whose distribution is the same as that of Y].” Such a \tilde{Z} can be freely introduced and does not change the X and Y being coupled; in fact, (\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}) is stochastically unrelated to X and to Y .

All of this can be easily generalized to an arbitrary set of random variables (see, e.g., Dzhanfarov and Kujala, in press).

II.3. Random variables and joint distributions in KPT

The formal account just given is not, however, that of the traditional KPT. The latter begins with the notion of a *sample space*, (S, Σ, μ) , and defines a random variables X as a measurable mapping of this space into an *observation space* (S_X, Σ_X) , i.e., a function $X : S \rightarrow S'$ such that $X^{-1}(E_X) \in \Sigma$ for any $E_X \in \Sigma_X$.³ The mapping induces on the observation space (S_X, Σ_X) a probability measure μ_X , by the rule

$$\Pr[X \in E_X] = \mu_X(E_X) = \mu(X^{-1}(E_X)), \quad (5)$$

for any $E_X \in \Sigma_X$. The resulting triple (S_X, Σ_X, μ_X) is called the *distribution of X* . If another measurable mapping Y is defined on the same sample space, mapping it into an observation space (S_Y, Σ_Y) and resulting in the distribution (S_Y, Σ_Y, μ_Y) , then their joint distribution $(S_X \times S_Y, \Sigma_X \otimes \Sigma_Y, \nu)$ is derived from the relation

$$\Pr[X \in E_X \ \& \ Y \in E_Y] = \mu(X^{-1}(E_X) \cap Y^{-1}(E_Y)), \quad (6)$$

for any $E_X \in \Sigma_X$ and $E_Y \in \Sigma_Y$. Note that unlike in the “naive” approach above, the joint distribution of X and Y here is mathematically derived from their individual definitions.

¹ These are the cases when all possible events for either X or Y have probabilities zero or one.

² I could have said “distribution is determined by (S_X, Σ_X, μ_X) ,” but it is simpler to say “distribution is (S_X, Σ_X, μ_X) ,” as we do not have an independent general definition of a distribution.

³ Kolmogorov (1933/1956) only considered the case when S_X is a subset of reals and Σ_X is the Borel sigma-algebra restricted to this subset. In this paper I use the term “random variable” in the broad sense, with no restrictions imposed on (S_X, Σ_X) . Some authors prefer to use the term “random element” or “random entity” to designate random variables in the broad sense.

Clearly, any two random variables defined on the same sample space are jointly distributed. This may create a temptation to assume the existence of a common sample space for *all possible* random variables, so that random variables in any set under consideration possess a joint distribution, and this distribution is unique. Kolmogorov's (1933/1956) book may seem to reinforce this view, as it does not explicitly speak of multiple sample spaces. On the other hand, it ties the notion of a sample space⁴ to "a complex of conditions which allows of any number of repetitions" (§2 of Chapter 1): this can be interpreted as a position very close if not the same as the one argued for below. Whatever the correct interpretation is, however, the notion of a single sample space for all random variables is untenable as it contradicts the common mathematical practice of dealing with random variables. In Dzhaferov and Kujala (2014a) we presented two arguments demonstrating this.

First of all, there is no justification, empirical or mathematical, for limiting the cardinality of the set S_X of all possible values for a random variable X . Thus, for any given choice of S_X one can always introduce a random variable that takes values on the power set of S_X . Arbitrarily large cardinalities of S_X , however, would mean that the basic set S of the hypothetically universal sample space (S, Σ, μ) has unlimited cardinality, which is an impossibility.⁵

Second, even if we confine our attention to very simple random variables with one and the same distribution, there is no justification, empirical or mathematical, for limiting this set in any way. One can always add a new random variable to any given set thereof. Thus, given any set \mathcal{N} of unit-normally distributed random variables, one can introduce a unit-normally distributed $Y_{\mathcal{N}}$ such that its correlation with any $X \in \mathcal{N}$ is zero. If there were a universal sample space (S, Σ, μ) , then there would be a definite set \mathcal{N}^* of all possible unit-normally distributed random variables. But this would mean that our $Y_{\mathcal{N}^*}$ would have to belong to this set, which is impossible, as $Y_{\mathcal{N}^*}$ cannot have zero correlation with itself.

To further appreciate the untenability of a universal sample space, observe that the identity mapping from this space into itself is a random variable, R . The idea of a universal sample space therefore is equivalent to the existence of a random variable R of which all imaginable random variables are functions. This does not add a new formal argument against the idea, but it seems especially demonstrative: what this mysterious "super-variable" R could be?

II.4. A revised (or reinterpreted?) KPT

All these considerations lead us to a different picture of KPT, in which there are different, stochastically unrelated random variables R, R', R'', \dots , corresponding to different, mutually exclusive conditions under which they are observed;⁶ and for each of these random variables one can define various functions of it,

$$\begin{aligned} X &= f(R), Y = g(R), \dots \\ X' &= f(R'), Y' = g(R'), \dots \\ X'' &= f(R''), Y'' = g(R''), \dots \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

so that any two random variables that are functions of one and the same member of the set R, R', R'', \dots possess a joint distribution, while any functions of two different members of this set do not. To preserve Kolmogorov's definition of a random variable, the R, R', R'', \dots can be thought of as identity functions on their separate sample spaces.

This picture is a step in the right direction, but it is still flawed if we think of R, R', R'', \dots as some fixed set comprising all pairwise stochastically unrelated random variables. The reason for this is that if R, R', R'', \dots were a fixed set, with the corresponding sample spaces (which, since they are identity functions, are simultaneously their distributions)

$$(S_R, \Sigma_R, \mu_R), (S_{R'}, \Sigma_{R'}, \mu_{R'}), (S_{R''}, \Sigma_{R''}, \mu_{R''}), \dots \quad (8)$$

then one could form a single random variables R^* of which R, R', R'', \dots (hence also all other random variables imaginable) were functions. This "super-variable" R^* would have the set and sigma-algebra that are products of, respectively, sets and sigma-algebras in (8), and it would have a probability measure ν from which $\mu_R, \mu_{R'}, \mu_{R''}, \dots$ are computed as marginals, e.g.,

$$\mu_R(E_R) = \nu(E_R \times S_{R'} \times S_{R''} \times \dots),$$

for any $E_R \in \Sigma_R$. We have seen already that the idea of such a "super-variable" is untenable.

The only logically consistent way out of this difficulty is to consider R, R', R'', \dots as a *class with uncertain and/or flexible membership*. Indeed, it should be clear from the previous discussion that random variables can be freely introduced, so, e.g., there is no fixed set of random variables with any given distribution. Some random variables we observe have an empirically defined coupling scheme, and then they are jointly distributed. Other sets of random variables we observe are observed under different conditions each and do not have an empirical pairing scheme. Then they can be modeled as stochastically unrelated random variables. However, we then can create "copies" of these random variables and couple them "on paper" in a multitude of ways. This seems to be a consistent view of

⁴ Kolmogorov's terminology is not the same as the modern terminology (or variant thereof) I use in this paper; in particular, he does not speak of a sample space but of a "basic set with an algebra of subsets."

⁵ Kolmogorov (1933/1956) did not have to deal with this issue, as the random variables in this book are confined to real-valued ones.

⁶ The notation R, R', R'', \dots is informal and should not be interpreted as indicating that this set is countable. (As we will see below, this list should not be even thought of as a set.)

random variables. KPT is by no means dismissed in this view, because any distribution (S_X, Σ_X, μ_X) for a random variable X is a probability space subject to Kolmogorov's axioms:

1. μ_X is a function $\Sigma_X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$;
2. $\mu_X(S_X) = 1$;
3. $\mu_X\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_X^{(i)}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_X\left(E_X^{(i)}\right)$ for any sequence of pairwise disjoint $E_X^{(1)}, E_X^{(2)}, \dots$ in Σ_X .

Moreover, insofar as one focuses on a given set of jointly distributed random variables, all of them can be presented as measurable functions on a single sample space (or functions of a single random variable).

II.5. Do we need sample spaces at all?

It seems, however, that even in the restricted sense just mentioned, the notion of a sample space is largely redundant and dispensable. Any variable X can be fully described by its name (identifying label) and its distribution (S_X, Σ_X, μ_X) ; any two jointly distributed random variables are described by the ordered pair of names of the two random variables and their joint distribution $(S_X \times S_Y, \Sigma_X \otimes \Sigma_Y, \nu)$ subject to (4). In general, sample space for a set of random variables can always be presented as the product of the sets and sigma-algebras of their individual observation spaces, with a probability measure from which the individual ones obtain as marginals. It seems therefore that the revised KPT of Section II.4 can be made to coincide with the formalized "naive" view of random variables presented in Section II.2.

Moreover, this "naive" view is precisely how we deal with random variables in all applications of KPT (not surprisingly, otherwise it would not be a "naive" view). When one says " X is a normally distributed error of measurement of the position of this dot on the number line, with the mean m and variance v ," one specifies the name of the random variables (error of measurement of the position of this dot on the number line) and its distribution (normal with the mean m and variance v); there is no mentioning of a sample space, and one would be puzzled if asked to identify it.

My use of the term "name" (identifying label) for random variables is unusual, but it is a small price to pay for dispensing with nebulous sample spaces. Consider, e.g., Luce's example with two dice. One can distinguish the random variables X and Y by saying that X is "the outcome of the die rolled in Indiana" and Y "the outcome of the die rolled in California." The two dice then have the same observation space

$$(S_X, \Sigma_X) = (S_Y, \Sigma_Y) = \left(\{1, \dots, 6\}, 2^{\{1, \dots, 6\}}\right)$$

and they may very well have the same distribution, e.g., be fair dice.

To distinguish X and Y in KPT (revised to accommodate multiple sample spaces) we proceed differently. We need

to present X and Y as functions defined on two disparate sample spaces. For instance, one could present X as a mapping from the sample space with "Indiana numbers" $S_{IN} = \{1_{IN}, \dots, 6_{IN}\}$ into $\{1, \dots, 6\}$, such that i is the image of i_{IN} . Then the sample space

$$\left(S_{IN} = \{1_{IN}, \dots, 6_{IN}\}, \Sigma_{IN} = 2^{\{1_{IN}, \dots, 6_{IN}\}}, \mu\right)$$

would determine the distribution of X

$$\left(S_X = \{1, \dots, 6\}, \Sigma_X = 2^{\{1, \dots, 6\}}, \mu\right).$$

And one could analogously define Y as a mapping from the sample space with "California numbers" $S_{CA} = \{1_{CA}, \dots, 6_{CA}\}$ into $\{1, \dots, 6\}$. The Indiana and California numbers can, of course, be replaced with other sets bijectively related to $\{1, \dots, 6\}$. Whatever the choice, it is easy to see that some form of labeling X and Y in this KPT approach is still "smuggled in," but that this is done in a rather complicated way.

II.6. Radical contextualism

Is there a unique way of determining which random variables are and which are not stochastically interrelated? A general answer to this question is negative: the definition of a jointly distributed set of random variables involves an empirical procedure of coupling their realizations, "observing them together." The meaning of such an empirical procedure may be different for different situation and different observers. From the mathematical point of view, however, the question is about a language that makes the fundamental distinctions between stochastically related and stochastically unrelated random variables. Such a language is proposed in Dzhaferov and Kujala (2014) and in Dzhaferov, Kujala, and Larsson (2015).

It is postulated that every random variable's identity is determined by two types of variables, referred to as *objects* (also properties, entities, etc.) and *contexts* (also conditions, environment, etc.). Intuitively, the random variables are treated as "measurements," the objects answer the question "what is measured?" whereas the contexts answer the question "how is it measured?"

Let Q be the a set of objects and C a set of contexts considered in a given study. The mentioning of "a given study" is essential: in a different study one could choose a different set of objects to measure and a different set of contexts in which to measure them. The measurement R of an object $q \in Q$ in a context $c \in C$ is denoted by R_q^c .

The meaning of a context is that it provides an empirical coupling for the measurements within this context: the random variables R_q^c with different q measured within the same context c are "measured together," i.e., they possess a joint distribution. Denoting by Q_c the subset of objects in Q that are measured in context c ,

$$R^c = \{R_q^c\}_{q \in Q_c} \quad (9)$$

is a random variable (which implies that it has a distribution, and this distribution is a joint distribution of its components). On the other hand, any two random variables R_q^c and $R_{q'}^{c'}$ with $c \neq c'$ are stochastically unrelated, whether q and q' are distinct objects or not. It follows that any random variables R^c and $R^{c'}$ defined as in (9) with $c \neq c'$ are stochastically unrelated.

The idea of such contextual notation and understanding of stochastic unrelatedness have precursors and analogues in the quantum-physical literature: see Khrennikov (2005, 2008, 2009a-b), Simon, Brukner, and Zeilinger (2001), Larsson (2002), Svozil (2012), and Winter (2014). Three aspects of the theory advanced in Dzhafarov and Kujala (2014) and Dzhafarov, Kujala, and Larsson (2015), however, set it aside from this literature:

1. Contextual labeling is universal, and no two random variables recorded in different contexts have a joint distribution.
2. Pairwise stochastically unrelated random variables $\{R^c\}_{c \in C}$ (each of which is a set of jointly distributed random variables) can be coupled at will, with no coupling being privileged.
3. The random variables $\{R^c\}_{c \in C}$ can be characterized by the (im)possibility of finding couplings for them that satisfy certain constraints.

Below I will give an example of how these principles work in solving the problem of selective influences in psychology, as well as its generalized version, the problem of contextuality, primarily studied in quantum mechanics. First, however, I have to address some obvious objections to the radical contextualism.

II.7. Possible objections

The first objection is that it is impossible to take into account all conditions in the world, and without knowing them one would not know if one deals with stochastically related or unrelated random variables. The response to this objection lies in the qualification “in a given study” I made when I introduced object sets Q and context sets C . The identification of random variables by what they measure and by how they measure it depends on what other variables in the world one records and relates to realizations of the random variables in question.

To give an example, let there be a very large group of husband-and-wife couples; to each of the husbands Alice poses one of two different Yes/No questions, a_1 or a_2 ; to each of the wives Bob poses one of two different Yes/No questions, b_1 or b_2 (that may be the same as or different from a_1, a_2). Alice decides (this is not a matter of truth or falsity but one of convention) to consider the responses to a_1 and a_2 in the group of husbands as realizations of random variables R_{a_1} and R_{a_2} , respectively; and Bob defines R_{b_1} and R_{b_2} for the group of wives analogously. This labeling indicates that Alice treats a_1 and a_2 as objects being

measured (by responses to these questions), and so does Bob for b_1 and b_2 .⁷

Let us ask now: what are the contexts in which Alice records her R_{a_1} and R_{a_2} ? By the rules of the survey each person answers a single question, so asking a_1 excludes asking a_2 and vice versa. In other words, the conditions under which one records answers to a_1 and a_2 are incompatible. Formally, this means that a_1 is measured in the context a_1 while a_2 is measured in the context a_2 : Alice has therefore stochastically unrelated random variables $R_{a_1}^{a_1}$ and $R_{a_2}^{a_2}$. Analogously, Bob has stochastically unrelated $R_{b_1}^{b_1}$ and $R_{b_2}^{b_2}$. Their stochastic unrelatedness is quite obvious: why should any response by a person to a_1 (or b_1) be paired with any response by another person to a_2 (resp., b_2)?

By the same argument, either of Alice’s measurements is stochastically unrelated to either of Bob’s: the four measurements

$$R_{a_1}^{a_1}, R_{a_2}^{a_2}, R_{b_1}^{b_1}, R_{b_2}^{b_2} \quad (10)$$

are made in four different contexts. It is clear, however, that Alice and Bob could try to form joint distributions of their measurements using some empirical coupling procedure, e.g., the pairing of the measurements by the marital relation: that is, pairing a husband’s response to a_i with his wife’s response to b_j , for each of the four combinations of $i = 1, 2$ and $j = 1, 2$. To do this means to form new contexts, (a_1, b_1) , (a_1, b_2) , (a_2, b_1) , and (a_2, b_2) , and to re-label Alice’s random variables as

$$R_{a_1}^{(a_1, b_1)}, R_{a_1}^{(a_1, b_2)}, R_{a_2}^{(a_2, b_1)}, R_{a_2}^{(a_2, b_2)} \quad (11)$$

while Bob’s random variables become

$$R_{b_1}^{(a_1, b_1)}, R_{b_1}^{(a_2, b_1)}, R_{b_2}^{(a_1, b_2)}, R_{b_2}^{(a_2, b_2)}. \quad (12)$$

The previous four pairwise stochastically unrelated variables (10) are replaced now with the four pairwise stochastically unrelated variables

$$R^{(a_i, b_j)} = \left(R_{a_i}^{(a_i, b_j)}, R_{b_j}^{(a_i, b_j)} \right), \quad i, j \in \{1, 2\}. \quad (13)$$

There is no justification for saying that either of these representations, (10) or (13), is more “correct” than another: Alice who does not know whose husband her respondent is and Alice who knows this deal with different sets of random variables.

Another, related objection is that radical contextualism should lead to considering every realization of a random variable as being stochastically unrelated to every other realization. In the previous example, if Alice records the identities of the people she is posing the question a_1 to, then in place of a single $R_{a_1}^{a_1}$ she creates random variables $R_{a_1}^{John}$, $R_{a_1}^{Peter}$, etc., each with a single realization. In a

⁷ This example is formally equivalent to the EPR/Bohm experiment in quantum physics (see Section II.8).

typical behavioral experiment, John, Peter, etc. can be replaced with “trial 1,” “trial 2,” etc. As the contexts (upper indexes) differ, the variables are stochastically unrelated. Isn’t this a problem? In particular, does not stochastic unrelatedness of the realizations of a random variable clash with the standard statistical practice of viewing them as independent identically distributed variables? The answer to these questions is essentially the same as to the previous objection. Alice does not have to record the identity of the people she queries, and if she does not, then $R_{a_1}^{a_1}$ is the random variable she forms. If she does, then she creates new contexts, and it is indeed true then that $R_{a_1}^{John}$, $R_{a_1}^{Peter}$, etc., are pairwise stochastically unrelated. They can, however, be coupled, and as always when coupling is not based on an empirical procedure, this can be done in a multitude of ways. One possible coupling is the independent coupling, the other is the identity coupling, and one could create an infinity of other couplings.

This may be difficult to understand. Suppose we know that John responded Yes, Peter responded No, Paul responded No, etc. — then how could one speak of the identity coupling? Or, we know that the response in trial $n + 1$ repeats the response in trial n with probability 0.7 — how can one speak then of the independent coupling? To answer these questions one should recall that by coupling pairwise stochastically unrelated $R^{(1)}, R^{(2)}, R^{(3)}, \dots$ one does not mysteriously transform them into jointly distributed random variable. Instead one creates a new sequence $(\tilde{R}^{(1)}, \tilde{R}^{(2)}, \tilde{R}^{(3)}, \dots)$, in which each $\tilde{R}^{(i)}$ has the same distribution as $R^{(i)}$, and all these components have a joint distribution. The table below demonstrates the logical structure of the identity coupling:

$$\begin{array}{cccc}
 & R^{(1)} & R^{(2)} & R^{(3)} & \dots \\
 \tilde{R}^{(1)} & \boxed{r_1} & r_2 & r_3 & \dots \\
 \tilde{R}^{(2)} & r_1 & \boxed{r_2} & r_3 & \dots \\
 \tilde{R}^{(3)} & r_1 & r_2 & \boxed{r_3} & \dots \\
 \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots
 \end{array} \quad (14)$$

The boxed values are the ones factually observed, the rest of the values in each column are those attained by the corresponding components of the identity coupling. As we see, this has nothing to do with the observed values being or not being equal to each other.

The next table demonstrates the logical structure of the independent coupling:

$$\begin{array}{cccc}
 & R^{(1)} & R^{(2)} & R^{(3)} & \dots \\
 \tilde{R}^{(1)} & \boxed{r_1} & r'_2 & r'_3 & \dots \\
 \tilde{R}^{(2)} & r'_1 & \boxed{r_2} & r''_3 & \dots \\
 \tilde{R}^{(3)} & r''_1 & r''_2 & \boxed{r_3} & \dots \\
 \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots
 \end{array} \quad (15)$$

The boxed values, again, are those factually observed, and the primed values in the i th column are sampled from a

coupling $(\tilde{R}^{(1)}, \tilde{R}^{(2)}, \tilde{R}^{(3)}, \dots)$ with stochastically independent components and $\tilde{R}^{(i)} = r_i$. Again, this has nothing to do with the observed values forming or not forming a sequence with certain statistical properties. Focusing on the statistical properties of the observed (“boxed”) values means, formally, that the observations in different trials (or responses from different persons) are treated as objects rather than contexts, all these objects being measured in a single context and therefore jointly distributed:

$$R_1^{(1,2,3,\dots)}, R_2^{(1,2,3,\dots)}, R_3^{(1,2,3,\dots)}, \dots \quad (16)$$

A third objection one can raise against the revised KPT with radical contextualism is that the notions of an “object” and a “context” are not mathematically defined: they are primitives of the language proposed. How can one know what objects and what contexts to invoke in a specific situation? The response to this is that it is indeed not a mathematical issue. Mathematical analysis begins once one has specified a set Q of objects and a set C of contexts, and there is no one correct way of doing it.

Consider, e.g., the situation when two questions are asked in one of two orders, $a \rightarrow b$ or $b \rightarrow a$. One can take a to be the same object measured in two different contexts, and the same for b , forming thereby four random variables (responses to the questions)

$$R_a^{a \rightarrow b}, R_b^{a \rightarrow b}, R_a^{b \rightarrow a}, R_b^{b \rightarrow a}. \quad (17)$$

By our rules, they are grouped into two stochastically unrelated random variables

$$R^{a \rightarrow b} = (R_a^{a \rightarrow b}, R_b^{a \rightarrow b}) \text{ and } R^{b \rightarrow a} = (R_a^{b \rightarrow a}, R_b^{b \rightarrow a}). \quad (18)$$

This view of the situation leads to an interesting contextual analysis (Dzhafarov, Zhang, & Kujala, 2015).

It is, however, possible to deny that “the same question a ” means “the same object a ” in the two contexts: one can maintain instead that a asked first is simply a different object from a asked second; and the same for b . In this view we have four objects, a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 (where index indicates whether the question is asked first or second), measured in two contexts, $a_1 \rightarrow b_2$ and $b_1 \rightarrow a_2$. One ends up with two stochastically unrelated random variables

$$\begin{array}{c}
 R^{a_1 \rightarrow b_2} = (R_{a_1}^{a_1 \rightarrow b_2}, R_{b_2}^{a_1 \rightarrow b_2}) \\
 \text{and} \\
 R^{b_1 \rightarrow a_2} = (R_{a_2}^{b_1 \rightarrow a_2}, R_{b_1}^{b_1 \rightarrow a_2}).
 \end{array} \quad (19)$$

This representation allows for no nontrivial contextual analysis (see below), as the stochastically unrelated random variables have no objects in common. It is, nevertheless, as legitimate a representation as the previous one. A psychologist will most probably choose (18) over (19) (Wang & Busemeyer, 2013; Wang et al., 2014), but it is not mathematics that dictates this choice.

II.8. An example of contextual analysis

The problem of selective influences was introduced to psychology by Sternberg (1969) and developed through a series of publications (Schweickert & Townsend, 1989; Townsend, 1984, 1990; Townsend & Schweickert, 1989; Roberts & Sternberg, 1993; Townsend & Nozawa, 1995; Schweickert, Giorgini, & Dzhamfarov, 2000; Dzhamfarov 2003; Dzhamfarov, Schweickert, & Sung, 2005; Kujala & Dzhamfarov, 2008; Dzhamfarov & Kujala, 2010). Later, a link of this problem has been established with the quantum-mechanical analysis of entanglement (Dzhamfarov & Kujala, 2012a-b, 2013, 2014c) and, more generally, probabilistic contextuality (Dzhamfarov & Kujala, 2014a-b; Dzhamfarov, Kujala, & Larsson, 2015).

I will formulate the problem using the contextual language introduced above. Let there be a system acted upon by two inputs, α and β , and reacting by two simultaneous distinct responses, R_α and R_β (or distinct aspects of the same response, such as response time and response accuracy). The indexation here reflects the belief (or hypothesis) that R_α is “primarily” influenced by α and R_β by β . One can also say, R_α measures α and R_β measures β . The question is whether R_α is also influenced by β and/or R_β is also influenced by α . Let us simplify the problem by assuming that α and β vary on two levels each, in a completely crossed factorial design:

$$\alpha = \{1, 2\} \times \{1, 2\} = \beta. \quad (20)$$

Each of the treatments $(\alpha, \beta) = (i, j)$ should be considered a context, wherefrom the responses of the system must be labeled

$$R^{(\alpha=i, \beta=j)} = \left(R_{\alpha=i}^{(\alpha=i, \beta=j)}, R_{\beta=j}^{(\alpha=i, \beta=j)} \right), \quad i, j \in \{1, 2\}. \quad (21)$$

To remind the interpretation, $R_{\alpha=i}^{(\alpha=i, \beta=j)}$ measures the object $\alpha = i$ in the context $(\alpha = i, \beta = j)$; $R_{\beta=j}^{(\alpha=i, \beta=j)}$ measures the object $\beta = j$ in the same context; being in the same context, these two measurements form a random variables (i.e., they possess a joint distribution); however, the four random variables $R^{(\alpha=i, \beta=j)}$ are pairwise stochastically unrelated. To lighten the notation, let us put

$$R_{\alpha=i}^{(\alpha=i, \beta=j)} = A_i^{ij}, \quad R_{\beta=j}^{(\alpha=i, \beta=j)} = B_j^{ij}. \quad (22)$$

According to the definition of selective influences given in Dzhamfarov (2003) and elaborated in Dzhamfarov and Kujala (2010), one says that A_i^{ij} is not influenced by β and B_j^{ij} is not influenced by α (for all i, j) if one can find a coupling

$$\left(\tilde{A}_1^{11}, \tilde{B}_1^{11}, \tilde{A}_1^{12}, \tilde{B}_2^{12}, \tilde{A}_2^{21}, \tilde{B}_1^{21}, \tilde{A}_2^{22}, \tilde{B}_2^{22} \right) \quad (23)$$

in which the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{A}_1^{11} &= \tilde{A}_1^{12}, & \tilde{A}_2^{21} &= \tilde{A}_2^{22}, \\ \tilde{B}_1^{11} &= \tilde{B}_1^{21}, & \tilde{B}_2^{12} &= \tilde{B}_2^{22} \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

hold with probability 1. Put differently, the random variables \tilde{A}_1^{11} and \tilde{A}_1^{12} in the joint distribution of (23) always attain one and the same value, even though the value of β changes; and analogously for the remaining three equalities. Note that, by the definition of a coupling,

$$\tilde{A}_i^{ij} \sim A_i^{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{B}_j^{ij} \sim B_j^{ij}, \quad i, j \in \{1, 2\}, \quad (25)$$

where \sim means “has the same distribution as.” In quantum mechanics lack of selectiveness, i.e., nonexistence of a coupling (23) with the stipulated properties, is described by saying that the system is *contextual* (see, e.g., Kurzynski, Ramanathan, & Kaszlikowski, 2012).

If all A and B responses of the system have a finite number of possible values, this situation generalizes Bohm’s version of the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) paradigm (Bohm & Aharonov, 1957; Bell, 1964). Of course, the distributions of the A, B need not be generally in compliance with the quantum rules for entangled particles, but the existence or nonexistence of a coupling with the stipulated properties should be determinable for any observed A and B . Let us assume for simplicity that both A and B responses of the system are binary, and let us denote their values $+1$ and -1 . In this special case the necessary and sufficient conditions for the selectiveness of influences are given by

$$\begin{aligned} A_i^{i1} &\sim A_i^{i2} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2 \\ B_j^{1j} &\sim B_j^{2j} \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2 \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

and

$$\max_{k, l \in \{1, 2\}} \left| \sum_{i, j \in \{1, 2\}} \mathbf{E} \left[A_i^{ij} B_j^{ij} \right] - 2\mathbf{E} \left[A_k^{kl} B_l^{kl} \right] \right| \leq 2, \quad (27)$$

where \mathbf{E} stands for expected value. This (in an algebraically different form) was first proved by Fine (1982), although (26) in his work is implied by the notation rather than stated explicitly. The distributional equalities (26) describe the condition known as *marginal selectivity*: the distribution of A_i^{ij} does not change with the value j of β , and the distribution of B_j^{ij} does not change with the value i of α . The numerical inequality (27) is known as the *CHSH inequality* (after the authors of Clauser et al., 1969).

If the marginal selectivity (26) is violated, the CHSH inequality (27) cannot be derived, and it makes no difference whether it is satisfied or not. Moreover, if marginal selectivity is violated, it seems unnecessary to look at anything else: clearly then A is not selectively influenced by α alone, and/or B is not selectively influenced by β alone. As it turns out, however, one may still be interested in the question: is the influence of β upon A and/or of α upon B entirely described by the violations of marginal selectivity? Indeed, since the CHSH inequality (27) may very well be violated when the marginal selectivity (26) holds, and since we then conclude that selectiveness of influences is violated too, we have to admit that the “wrong” influences (from β to A and/or from α to B) can be indirect, without manifesting themselves in changed marginal distributions. This

leads us to a generalized notion of contextuality (Dzhafarov, Kujala, & Larsson, 2015).

When applied to our example with two binary inputs α, β and two binary random outputs A, B , the definition is as follows. A system

$$(A_1^{11}, B_1^{11}), (A_1^{12}, B_2^{12}), (A_2^{21}, B_1^{21}), (A_2^{22}, B_2^{22})$$

is noncontextual if it has a coupling (23) in which each of the equalities (24) holds with the maximal possible probability. To explain, if $A_1^{11} \sim A_1^{12}$, then the maximal possible value for $\Pr[\tilde{A}_1^{11} = \tilde{A}_1^{12}]$ is 1. Applying this to all other equalities in (24), we get the previous definition. If, however, A_1^{11} and A_1^{12} have different distributions, then the maximal possible value for $\Pr[\tilde{A}_1^{11} = \tilde{A}_1^{12}]$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & \min \{ \Pr[A_1^{11} = 1], \Pr[A_1^{12} = 1] \} \\ & + \min \{ \Pr[A_1^{11} = -1], \Pr[A_1^{12} = -1] \} \\ & = 1 - |\Pr[A_1^{11} = 1] - \Pr[A_1^{12} = 1]|. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

If some coupling (23) has this and the analogously computed maximal values for other equalities in (24), then the system is noncontextual: the “wrong” influences in it are all confined to directly changing the distributions of the “wrong” random variables. If no such a coupling exists, however, the system is contextual: the influence of β upon A and/or α upon B is greater than just distributional changes. As shown in Dzhafarov et al. (2015) and Kujala and Dzhafarov (2015), the necessary and sufficient conditions for noncontextuality in accordance with this definition are

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{k,l \in \{1,2\}} \left| \sum_{i,j \in \{1,2\}} \mathbb{E}[A_i^{ij} B_j^{ij}] - 2\mathbb{E}[A_k^{kl} B_l^{kl}] \right| \\ & \leq 2 + \sum_{i=1}^2 |\mathbb{E}[A_i^{i1}] - \mathbb{E}[A_i^{i2}]| + \sum_{j=1}^2 |\mathbb{E}[B_j^{1j}] - \mathbb{E}[B_j^{2j}]|. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

For application of this and other criteria of contextuality to available experimental data in physics and psychology see, respectively, Kujala, Dzhafarov, and Larsson (2015) and Dzhafarov, Zhang, and Kujala (2015).

III. CONCLUSION

I have argued in this paper that KPT (Kolmogorov’s probability theory) must allow for stochastically unrelated random variables, and these must not be confused with stochastically independent ones. I have argued for radical contextualism: any two random variables recorded under different conditions (in different contexts) are stochastically unrelated. There is no fixed set of pairwise stochastically unrelated random variables: they can be freely introduced and freely coupled. To couple a given set of stochastically unrelated random variables means to create their jointly distributed “copies” (stochastically unrelated to the “originals”). The couplings for a given set of random variables are typically infinite in number, with no coupling being

“more correct” than another. This applies also to couplings with stochastically independent components. The idea I and Janne Kujala have been promoting in recent publications is that stochastically unrelated random variables can be usefully characterized by their possible couplings, in particular, by determining whether these variables allow for couplings subject to certain constraints. I have illustrated this idea on the issue of selective influences, generalized into the issue of probabilistic contextuality.

Returning to my departure point, what would be R. Duncan Luce’s reaction to the arguments presented in this paper? I think (in part due to his reaction to my talk at the Tufts University in 2011) he would have accepted the notion of stochastic unrelatedness as distinct from independence, but he would not probably have liked my analysis. The conceptual apparatus of this paper is too far from Duncan’s ideal of avoiding numerical relations in the foundations of a theory and introducing them only through representation theorems. Duncan, however, had a remarkable facility and enthusiasm for discussing at length points of view he did not like, to the great benefit of their proponents.

Acknowledgments.

This research has been supported by NSF grant SES-1155956 and AFOSR grant FA9550-14-1-0318.

REFERENCES

- Bell, J. (1964). On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox. *Physics* 1, 195-200.
- Bohm, D., & Aharonov, Y. (1957). Discussion of experimental proof for the paradox of Einstein, Rosen and Podolski. *Physical Review* 108, 1070-1076.
- Clauser, J.F., Horne, M.A., Shimony, A., & Holt, R.A. (1969). Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories. *Physical Review Letters* 23, 880-884.
- Fine, A. (1982). Hidden variables, joint probability, and the Bell inequalities. *Physical Review Letters* 48 291-295.
- Dzhafarov, E.N. (1995). Empirical meaningfulness, measurement-dependent constants, and dimensional analysis. In R. D. Luce, M. D’Zmura, D. Hoffman, G.J. Iverson, & A.K. Romney (Eds.), *Geometric Representations of Perceptual Phenomena* (pp. 113-134). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Dzhafarov, E.N. (2003). Selective influence through conditional independence. *Psychometrika*, 68, 7-26.,
- Dzhafarov, E.N., & Kujala, J.V. (2010). The Joint Distribution Criterion and the Distance Tests for selective probabilistic causality. *Frontiers in Psychology* 1:151, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2010.00151.
- Dzhafarov, E.N. & Kujala, J.V. (2012a). Selectivity in probabilistic causality: Where psychology runs into quantum physics. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 56, 54-63.

- Dzhafarov, E.N., & Kujala, J.V. (2012b). Quantum entanglement and the issue of selective influences in psychology: An overview. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 7620, 184-195.
- Dzhafarov, E.N., & Kujala, J.V. (2013). Order-distance and other metric-like functions on jointly distributed random variables. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 141, 3291-3301.
- Dzhafarov, E.N., & Kujala, J.V. (2014a). A qualified Kolmogorovian account of probabilistic contextuality. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 8369, 201-212.
- Dzhafarov, E.N., & Kujala, J.V. (2014b). Contextuality is about identity of random variables. *Physica Scripta* T163, 014009.
- Dzhafarov, E.N., & Kujala, J.V. (2014c). On selective influences, marginal selectivity, and Bell/CHSH inequalities. *Topics in Cognitive Science* 6, 121-128.
- Dzhafarov, E.N., & Kujala, J.V. (in press). Probability, random variables, and selectivity. In W.Batchelder et al. (Eds). *New Handbook of Mathematical Psychology*. To be published by Cambridge University Press.
- Dzhafarov, E.N., Kujala, J.V., & Larsson, J.-A. (2015). Contextuality in three types of quantum-mechanical systems. *Foundations of Physics* 7, 762-782.
- Dzhafarov, E.N., Zhang, R., & Kujala, J.V. (2015). Is there contextuality in behavioral and social systems? arXiv:1504.07422.
- Khrennikov, A. (2005). The principle of supplementarity: A contextual probabilistic viewpoint to complementarity, the interference of probabilities, and the incompatibility of variables in quantum mechanics. *Foundations of Physics* 35, 1655-1693.
- Khrennikov, A. (2008). Bell-Boole inequality: Nonlocality or probabilistic incompatibility of random variables? *Entropy* 10, 19-32.
- Khrennikov, A. (2009a). Bell's inequality: Physics meets Probability. *Information Science* 179, 492-504.
- Khrennikov, A. (2009b). *Contextual Approach to Quantum Formalism*. Springer: Berlin.
- Kolmogoroff, A. N. (1933). *Grundbegriffe der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrech.* Berlin: Springer Verlag. English translation: Kolmogorov, A.N. (1956). *Foundations of the Probability Theory*. New York: Chelsea Publishing Company.
- Krantz, D.H., Luce, R.D, Suppes, P., & Tversky, A. (1971). *Foundations of Measurement*, vol. I: *Additive and Polynomial Representations*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- P. Kurzynski, R. Ramanathan, & D. Kaszlikowski (2012). Entropic test of quantum contextuality. *Physical Review Letters* 109, 020404.
- Larsson, J.-Å. (2002). A Kochen-Specker inequality. *Europhysics Letters*, 58, 799-805.
- Luce, R.D. (1996). The ongoing dialog between empirical science and measurement theory. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 40, 78-98.
- Luce, R.D. (2013). Analogs in Luce's global psychophysical theory of Stevens's psychophysical regression effect. *American Journal of Psychology* 126, 47-52
- Simon, C., Brukner, Č., & Zeilinger, A. (2001). Hidden-variable theorems for real experiments. *Physical Review Letters* 86, 4427-4430.
- Svozil, K. (2012). How much contextuality? *Natural Computing* 11, 261-265.
- Thorisson, H. (2000). *Coupling, Stationarity, and Regeneration*. New York: Springer.
- Wang, Z., Busemeyer, J.R. (2013). A quantum question order model supported by empirical tests of an a priori and precise prediction. *Topics in Cognitive Science* 5, 689-710.
- Wang, Z., Solloway, T., Shiffrin, R.M., Busemeyer, J.R. (2014). Context effects produced by question orders reveal quantum nature of human judgments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111, 9431-9436.
- Winter, A. (2014). What does an experimental test of quantum contextuality prove or disprove? *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* 47, 42403.