

Spin and Wind Directions: Identifying Entanglement in Nature and Cognition

Diederik Aerts* and Sandro Sozzo†

Abstract

We performed a cognitive experiment in which we asked the participants to pick a pair of directions they considered as the ‘preferred good example of two different wind directions’. The results of the experiment reveal that the ‘Clauser Horne Shimony Holt’ (CHSH) form of Bell inequalities is violated. The violation is significant and, amazingly enough, numerically almost equal to the violation of the CHSH inequality in coincidence spin measurements on a compound system of two quantum particles in an entangled spin state. Hence, it seems as if the human mind selects probabilistically on wind directions and their difference in the same way as Stern-Gerlach apparatuses select probabilistically on spin directions and their difference. As in the quantum case, our violation reveals that entanglement systematically occurs in human cognition, and that non-classical probabilistic structures of a quantum type are needed in the modeling of cognitive processes. We support this result by presenting a quantum theoretical model in Hilbert space, which exactly reproduces the collected data and further illustrates the analogies between quantum and cognitive entities.

Keywords: Human cognition; quantum modeling; Bell inequalities; entanglement.

1 Introduction

Entanglement is one of the principle fingerprints of quantum structure. We will show that we can see its friction ridges in all its glory when we interrogate human minds on wind directions. More specifically, we analyse the data collected in an experiment where human participants are asked to choose ‘a good example of two different wind directions’, amongst a set of each time four combinations of such different wind directions. Let us illustrate the experiment somewhat more in detail by first giving four such examples of ‘two different wind directions’, and then describing how we experimented with them: (1) North and Northeast, (2) North and Southwest, (3) South and Northeast, and (4) South and Southwest, could be four such examples of ‘two different wind directions’, they are presented graphically in Figure 1.

In our experiment human participants were asked to pick one, and only one, of four pairs of wind directions, and pick the one they considered their ‘preferred good example of two different wind directions’. We will describe in detail how the experiment was precisely performed in the following. We would however like to reveal right away the attained result: we found that the human mind picks amongst such examples of different wind directions almost in exactly the same way as coincidence spin measurement apparatuses pick amongst different spin directions of a compound system of two quantum particles in a state of entangled spins. Of course, also what we mean with ‘almost in exactly the same way’ we will make clear in detail in

*Center Leo Apostel for Interdisciplinary Studies and Department of Mathematics, Brussels Free University, Krijgskundestraat 33, 1160 Brussels (Belgium). Email address: dieraerts@vub.ac.be

†School of Management and Institute IQSCS, University Road, LE1 7RH Leicester (United Kingdom). Email address: ss831@le.ac.uk




Figure 1: A graphical representation of an example of four possible combinations of wind direction that human participants were asked to elect from with the criterion that they should elect ‘a good example of two different wind directions’: (1) North and Northeast, (2) North and Southwest, (3) South and Northeast, and (4) South and Southwest

the following. More specifically, we will show that it is the nature of the statistics of the data collected in this experiment that make it possible for us to prove the presence of quantum entanglement in the situation measured upon by the experiment.

2 Spin and Wind Directions

Entanglement was identified as a real existing phenomenon, first in the seventies of the foregoing century by not completely convincing experiments containing still many disputable idealizations [1, 2, 3, 4], culminating in 1982 in the major photon correlation experiment performed by the team of Alain Aspect in Paris [5], also subject of Aspect’s PhD thesis [6]. There existed still loopholes in the experiments, depending on which aspect was aimed at to being tested, but generally speaking also the following experiments [7, 8, 9], meant to investigate some of these loopholes, confirmed that ‘quantum mechanics describes properly the given situation’.

Without going into the technical details of the quantum theoretical modeling of the situation already here – we will do so further up in the article, when we have been able to introduce the necessary notions – we put forward a description of the experimental situation. Two quantum entities form a compound entity prepared in a specific state such that this compound entity has no spin. The state of the compound entity is also such that the sub entities fly apart in opposite directions of space. In regions of space located symmetrically with respect to the compound entity the spin of each of these sub entities is measured, in direction (A_1, A_2) for the sub entity moving to the left, and in direction (B_1, B_2) for the sub entity moving to the right. A schematic representation of this experimental situation is presented in Figure 2. The result of the experiment is that the spin direction measured on the sub entities turn out to be correlated in a very special way. It is the nature of this very special correlation that make it possible to prove the presence of entanglement in the original pre-measurement situation with the compound entity. The values of the probabilities corresponding to this correlation can be calculated from the quantum model of the situation, and they are as follows. If α is the angle between A_1 and B_1 (A_2 and B_2 , A_1 and B_2 , A_2 and B_1), then the probability to find the spins in directions A_1 and B_1 (A_2 and B_2 , A_1 and B_2 , A_2 and B_1) is given by $\frac{1}{2} \sin^2 \frac{\alpha}{2}$. In the experiments that have been performed the measured relative frequencies of correlation counts corresponded in all cases well with the quantum predictions. There remain of course problems of interpretation, with respect to question of what the experiments exactly have tested, and we will touch




Figure 2: A schematic representation of the experimental situation in which entanglement is identified in physics

upon different aspects of this type of question while we analyse the situation more in depth in the following of this article. More specifically, we will also pay some attention to a strange type of anomaly that appeared in the experimental data [6].

In the concrete experiments that have been performed, an angle of 45° is chosen between directions A_1 and B_1 , and directions A_2 and B_2 , and hence an angle of $180^\circ - 45^\circ = 135^\circ$ between directions A_1 and B_2 , and directions A_2 and B_1 , like presented in Figure 2. The choice of this angle is specifically made, because, like we will make explicit in the following, this choice makes it possible to produce correlations that show maximal visible fingerprints of entanglement. Since $\frac{1}{2} \sin^2 \frac{45^\circ}{2} = 0.0732$ and $\frac{1}{2} \sin^2 \frac{135^\circ}{2} = 0.4268$, this means that quantum theory predicts probability $p(A_1, B_1) = 0.0732$ for A_1 and B_1 directions to correlate, probability $p(A_2, B_2) = 0.0732$ for A_2 and B_2 directions to correlate, probability $p(A_1, B_2) = 0.4268$ for A_1 and B_2 directions to correlate, and probability $p(A_2, B_1) = 0.4268$ for A_2 and B_1 directions to correlate. Note that indeed $p(A_1, B_1) + p(A_1, B_2) + p(A_2, B_1) + p(A_2, B_2) = 0.0732 + 0.4268 + 0.4268 + 0.0732 = 1$, which expresses that the measurement gives with certainty rise to one of the correlations A_1, B_1 , or A_1, B_2 , or A_2, B_1 , or A_2, B_2 . All experiments indeed give rise to values for the frequencies of correlated pairs that are close enough to these values predicted by quantum theory to make a convincing case for the hypothesis that quantum theory gives rise to a faithful modeling of the considered situation.

Let us now explain the main aspects of the strangeness of these correlations, and how they allow the identification of entanglement. So this is the moment that we need to introduce Bell inequalities [10] and, more specifically, we will use the ‘Clauser Horne Shimony Holt’ (CHSH) variant of them [11]. First we want to explain what is the main aspect of physical reality tested by these inequalities. If we consider the scheme of the experimental situation presented in Figure 1, there is an obvious analogy of everyday reality that comes to mind, namely the situation could present the explosion of a piece of material, and one part of it flying to the left and the other flying to the right. It is obvious from our experience of everyday reality that the two parts of such an exploding piece of material, flying apart to the left and to the right, contain many types of correlations. To name an obvious one, if the piece of material has a color, the two parts flying apart will have also this color. Suppose for a moment that what explodes is a piece of classical matter, we then can describe this situation by classical physics. The weights of the two parts will then be correlated, their sum being equal to the weight of the compound piece of matter. Their momenta will be correlated, in case the original piece of matter was at rest, both pieces flying apart will have opposite directed momenta equal in magnitude. Also the distances they are from the central point where the explosion took place will be correlated, depending on the weights of each of the parts. Equally so, if rotation is involved, the angular momenta of the parts will be correlated, and in case the compound piece of matter had no angular momentum before the explosion, the angular momenta of the parts flying apart will be opposite in direction. Suppose that we have some indeterminism involved, i.e.

we lack knowledge about the exact state of the compound entity. In that case, also the correlations will appear probabilistically. However, not all combinations of probabilities related to the correlations can make their appearance in reality in such a situation of an exploding piece of material. This fact, that not all probabilities are possible, is the main content of Bell inequalities.

Bell choose to look at the expectation values instead of directly looking at the probabilities, and that is what we also will do here now. An expectation value for a probabilistic outcome is obtained by attributing value +1 if the outcome occurs, and value -1 if the outcome does not occur. So, for the situation considered in Figure 2, the expectation value of the joint measurement consisting of measuring the spin in direction A_1 to the left, and measuring the spin in direction B_1 to the right, is given by

$$E(A, B) = p(A_1, B_1) - p(A_1, B_2) - p(A_2, B_1) + p(A_2, B_2) \quad (1)$$

Hence, in case of the choices of 45° and 135° , we find

$$E(A, B) = 0.0732 - 0.4268 - 0.4268 + 0.0732 = -0.7071 \quad (2)$$

It expresses that if we give value +1, each time a correlation appears of the type A_1, B_1 or A_2, B_2 , and we give value -1 each time a correlation appears of the type A_1, B_2 or A_2, B_1 , we find an average value of -0.7071.

The result of Bell's characterization of situations such as the exploding piece of material with sub part flying apart is an inequality that is satisfied always in such a situation. To formulate the inequality we need to consider, next to the joint measurement AB , represented in Figure 1, three more joint measurements, AB' , $A'B$ and $A'B'$, formed in this specific way, hence combining two measurements A and A' to the left part of the explosion, and two measurements B and B' to the right part of the explosion. What was shown by Bell is that for all possible measurements AB , AB' , $A'B$ and $A'B'$, formed in the above explained by joining the single measurements A , A' and B , B' , the following inequality for the expectation values of correlations is always satisfied

$$-2 \leq -E(A, B) + E(A, B') - E(A', B) - E(A', B') \leq +2 \quad (3)$$

Let us show right away how this inequality is violated by the situation we have represented in Figure 2. To this end we first need to introduce the additional experiments A' , and B' , and the joint experiments AB' , $A'B$ and $A'B'$, as follows.

The additional experiment B' is performed in such a way that an angle of 45° is chosen between directions A_1 and B'_2 , and directions A_2 and B'_1 , and hence an angle of 135° between directions A_1 and B'_1 , and directions A_2 and B'_2 . Since again $\frac{1}{2} \sin^2 \frac{45^\circ}{2} = 0.0732$ and $\frac{1}{2} \sin^2 \frac{135^\circ}{2} = 0.4268$, this means that quantum theory predicts probabilities $p(A_1, B'_2) = 0.0732 = p(A_2, B'_1)$ and $p(A_1, B'_1) = 0.4268 = p(A_2, B'_2)$. Hence, if we only choose +1 and -1 for the outcomes, the expectation value of the joint measurement consisting of measuring the spin in direction A_1 to the left, and measuring the spin in direction B'_1 to the right, is given by

$$E(A, B') = p(A_1, B'_1) - p(A_1, B'_2) - p(A_2, B'_1) + p(A_2, B'_2) = 0.4268 - 0.0732 - 0.0732 + 0.4268 = 0.7071 \quad (4)$$

Then, the additional A' is performed in such a way that an angle of 45° is chosen between directions A'_1 and B_1 , and directions A'_2 and B_2 , and hence an angle of 135° between directions A'_1 and B_2 , and directions A'_2 and B_1 . Quantum theory predicts probabilities $p(A'_1, B_1) = 0.0732 = p(A'_2, B_2)$ and $p(A'_1, B_2) = 0.4268 = p(A'_2, B_1)$. Hence, the expectation value of the joint measurement consisting of measuring the spin in direction A'_1 to the left, and measuring the spin in direction B_1 to the right, is given by

$$E(A', B) = p(A'_1, B_1) - p(A'_1, B_2) - p(A'_2, B_1) + p(A'_2, B_2) = 0.0732 - 0.4268 - 0.4268 + 0.0732 = -0.7071 \quad (5)$$

Finally, the experiments A' and B' are performed in such a way that an angle of 45° is chosen between directions A'_1 and B'_1 , and directions A'_2 and B'_2 , and hence an angle of 135° between directions A'_1 and B'_2 , and directions A'_2 and B'_1 . Quantum theory predicts probabilities $p(A'_1, B'_1) = 0.0732 = p(A'_2, B'_2)$ and $p(A'_1, B'_2) = 0.4268 = p(A'_2, B'_1)$. Hence, the expectation value of the joint measurement consisting of measuring the spin in direction A'_1 to the left, and measuring the spin in direction B'_1 to the right, is given by

$$E(A', B') = p(A'_1, B'_1) - p(A'_1, B'_2) - p(A'_2, B'_1) + p(A'_2, B'_2) = 0.0732 - 0.4268 - 0.4268 + 0.0732 = -0.7071 \quad (6)$$

If we now insert the expectation values obtained in this way into Equation (3), then the CHSH inequality is violated in quantum theory, since

$$-E(A, B) + E(A, B') - E(A', B) - E(A', B') = 2.8284 \quad (7)$$

This theoretical prediction is confirmed by a huge amount of experimental data collected up to now (see, e.g., the review in [12]). It unavoidably proves that entanglement is a really existing phenomenon in quantum physics, and that it entails the presence of statistical correlations between micro particles that cannot be reproduced in a traditional Kolmogorovian probability framework [13].

3 ‘Two Different Wind Directions’ entangled in human cognition

Following on our previous studies on the foundations of quantum theory and quantum probability [14, 15, 16], we recently investigated how Bell inequalities can be violated in situations where concepts are combined [17, 18]. In the present article we want to investigate in a deeper and more detailed way this phenomenon. More concretely, we will put forward a situation, where the Bell inequalities are violated exactly in the way as they are violated in the well known and studied situation in micro physics. What we mean, is the situation of two spin $1/2$ quantum particles in a singlet spin state.

We consider the following combination of concepts: *Two Different Wind Directions*. If analyzed from the perspective of its meaning, it is a combination of the following two conceptual structures: *One Wind Direction* ‘and’ *Another Wind Direction*, but in the English language we express this combination by the sentence *Two Different Wind Directions*.

Our investigation of this combination of concept, with the aim of identifying the presence of quantum structures, more specifically entanglement, consists of considering measurements that can be performed on the involved concepts, and analyse the statistics of the outcomes connected to combinations of these measurements. Indeed, it is in this statistics that traces are to be found of the presence of quantum structure, i.e. entanglement.

To show how measurements are introduced and analyzed, let us first of all consider the single conceptual structure *One Wind Direction*, part of the combination of two such conceptual structures *Two Different Wind Directions*. A typical measurement, let us call it A , consists of asking a human person to choose one of two wind directions, for example *North* or *South*. So this measurement A has two possible outcomes *North*, and *South*. We also consider the effect of the measurement on the considered conceptual structure *One Wind Direction*, and see this effect as a change of the state of the conceptual structure *One Wind Direction* into two possible new states, called *North* or *South*, depending on which choice of outcome *North* or *South* is made by the human person involved in the measurement.

For a typical setting to test the violation of Bell inequalities, we need four such measurements and consider their combinations. So let us, next to the measurement A , introduce the three other measurements needed to define the situation where the violation of Bell inequalities can be tested, and call them, also in compliance with the custom notation with respect to investigations of violations of Bell inequalities, B , A'

and B' . All four measurements can be performed on the conceptual structure *One Wind Direction*, but as we will see when we specify the combined measurements, A and A' are to be performed on one of the wind directions of the combination *Two Different Wind Directions*, while B and B' are to be performed on the other wind direction.

The measurement A' , consists in a human person choosing between wind direction *East* and wind direction *West*. This means that this measurement changes the state of *One Wind Direction* into *East* or *West*, depending on the choice made by the person involved in the measurement. The measurement B consists in a human person making a choice between wind direction *Northeast* and the wind direction *Southwest*, and hence it changes the state of *One Wind Direction* into *Northeast* or *Southwest*, depending on the choice made by the person involved in the measurement. And the measurement B' consists in a human person choosing between wind direction *Southeast* and wind direction *Northwest*, which means that it changes the state of *One Wind Direction* into *Southeast* or *Northwest*, depending on the choice made by the person involved in the measurement.

In Figure 3 we have represented the four measurements graphically. To define the situation to test for




Figure 3: A graphical representation of the four measurements, A , A' , B and B' , consisting in a human person making a choice for the conceptual structure *One Wind Direction*, between wind directions *North* and *South* for measurement A , between wind directions *East* and *West* for measurement A' , between wind directions *Northeast* and *Southwest* for measurement B , and, between wind directions *Southeast* and *Northwest* for measurement B'

Bell inequalities, we need to look now at different combined measurements that can be formed by these four measurements, more specifically A combined with B , and we denote AB , and A combined with B' , and we denote AB' , and A' combined with B , and we denote $A'B$, and finally A' combined with B' , and we denote $A'B'$. These combined measurements will now be performed on the combined concept *Two Different Wind Directions*.

Combined measurement AB consists of a human person choosing between one of the four possible combinations of outcomes that are the combined outcomes of measurement A and measurement B . Hence the possible outcomes of AB are *North* and *Northeast*, *North* and *Southwest*, *South* and *Northeast*, and *South* and *Southwest*. Hence, as a consequence of this combined measurement, we have the conceptual combination, *Two Different Wind Directions*, that collapses in one of the four following states: wind direction *North* and wind direction *Northeast*, wind direction *North* and wind direction *Southwest*, wind direction *South* and wind direction *Northeast*, and, wind direction *South* and wind direction *Southwest*. In Figure 4 we represent these four possible outcomes for the measurement AB . Combined measurement AB' consists of a human person choosing between one of the four possible combinations of outcomes that are the combined outcomes of measurement A and measurement B' . Hence the possible outcomes of AB' are *North* and *Southeast*, *North* and *Northwest*, *South* and *Southeast*, and *South* and *Northwest*. Hence, as




Figure 4: A graphical representation of the four possible outcomes of the combined measurement AB . The outcomes are *North* and *Northeast*, *North* and *Southwest*, *South* and *Northeast*, and *South* and *Southwest*

a consequence of this combined measurement, we have the conceptual combination, *Two Different Wind Directions*, that collapses in one of the four following states: wind direction *North* and wind direction *Southeast*, wind direction *North* and wind direction *Northwest*, wind direction *South* and wind direction *Southeast*, and, wind direction *South* and wind direction *Northwest*. In Figure 5 we represent these four possible outcomes for the measurement AB' .




Figure 5: A graphical representation of the four possible outcomes of the combined measurement AB' . The outcomes are *North* and *Southeast*, *North* and *Northwest*, *South* and *Southeast*, and *South* and *Northwest*

Combined measurement $A'B$ consists of a human person choosing between one of the four possible combinations of outcomes that are the combined outcomes of measurement A' and measurement B . Hence the possible outcomes of $A'B$ are *East* and *Northeast*, *East* and *Southwest*, *West* and *Northeast*, and *West* and *Southwest*. Hence, as a consequence of this combined measurement, we have the conceptual combination, *Two Different Wind Directions*, that collapses in one of the four following states: wind direction *East* and wind direction *Northeast*, wind direction *East* and wind direction *Southwest*, wind direction *West* and wind direction *Northeast*, and, wind direction *West* and wind direction *Southwest*. In Figure 6 we represent these four possible outcomes for the measurement $A'B$. Combined measurement $A'B'$ consists of a human person choosing between one of the four possible combinations of outcomes that are the combined outcomes of measurement A' and measurement B' . Hence the possible outcomes of $A'B'$




Figure 6: A graphical representation of the four possible outcomes of the combined measurement $A'B$. The outcomes are *East* and *Northeast*, *East* and *Southwest*, *West* and *Northeast*, and *West* and *Southwest*

are *East* and *Southeast*, *East* and *Northwest*, *West* and *Southeast*, and *West* and *Northwest*. Hence, as a consequence of this combined measurement, we have the conceptual combination, *Two Different Wind Directions*, that collapses in one of the four following states: wind direction *East* and wind direction *Southeast*, wind direction *East* and wind direction *Northwest*, wind direction *West* and wind direction *Southeast*, and, wind direction *West* and wind direction *Northwest*. In Figure 7 we represent these four possible outcomes for the measurement $A'B'$.




Figure 7: A graphical representation of the four possible outcomes of the combined measurement $A'B'$. The outcomes are *East* and *Southeast*, *East* and *Northwest*, *West* and *Southeast*, and *West* and *Northwest*

4 Description of the experiment and its results

Let us describe the cognitive experiment we performed on human participants following the outline as the experiment we have put forward in Section 3.

Participants and design. We asked 85 persons, chosen at random among our colleagues and friends, to fill in a questionnaire with closed-ended questions. The experimental design was a ‘repeated measures’, or ‘within subjects’ design, hence all participants were subject to the same questions and experimental conditions.

Procedure and materials. The questionnaire consisted in four subsequent questions, where each question had four different answers, and each participant had to pick one and only one answer. For the sake of

simplicity, let us use the terminology adopted in Section 3.

In the first question, or combined measurement AB , the participants, to answer the question ‘is a good example of two different wind directions’, had to choose one answer among (11) *North* and *Northeast*, (12) *North* and *Southwest*, (21) *South* and *Northeast*, and (22) *South* and *Southwest* (see Figure 4). If the answer (11) or (22) was chosen, the outcome of the measurement AB was +1, if the answer (12) or (21) was chosen, the outcome of the measurement AB was -1.

In the second question, or combined measurement AB' , the participants, to answer the question ‘is a good example of two different wind directions’, had to choose one answer among (11) *North* and *Southeast*, (12) *North* and *Northwest*, (21) *South* and *Southeast*, and (22) *South* and *Northwest* (see Figure 5). If the answer (11) or (22) was chosen, the outcome of the measurement AB' was +1, if the answer (12) or (21) was chosen, the outcome of the measurement AB' was -1.

In the third question, or combined measurement $A'B$, the participants, to answer the question ‘is a good example of two different wind directions’, had to choose one answer among (11) *East* and *Northeast*, (12) *East* and *Southwest*, (21) *West* and *Northeast*, and (22) *West* and *Southwest* (see Figure 6). If the answer (11) or (22) was chosen, the outcome of the measurement $A'B$ was +1, if the answer (12) or (21) was chosen, the outcome of the measurement $A'B$ was -1.

In the fourth question, or combined measurement $A'B'$, the participants, to answer the question ‘is a good example of two different wind directions’, had to choose one answer among (11) *East* and *Southeast*, (12) *East* and *Northwest*, (21) *West* and *Southeast*, and (22) *West* and *Northwest* (see Figure 7). If the answer (11) or (22) was chosen, the outcome of the measurement $A'B'$ was +1, if the answer (12) or (21) was chosen, the outcome of the measurement $A'B'$ was -1.

For each combined measurement AB , AB' , $A'B$, and $A'B'$, we calculated the relative frequency $\nu(A_i, B_j)$, $\nu(A_i, B'_j)$, $\nu(A'_i, B_j)$, and $\nu(A'_i, B'_j)$, of the outcome ij , $i, j = 1, 2$. In the large number limit these relative frequencies can be interpreted as the probability $p(A_i, B_j)$, $p(A_i, B'_j)$, $p(A'_i, B_j)$, and $p(A'_i, B'_j)$ that the combined measurement AB , AB' , $A'B$, and $A'B'$, gives the outcome ij .

Results. Let us start with the combined measurement AB . We got a probability $p(A_1, B_1) = 0.13$ for the outcome (11) *North* and *Northeast*, $p(A_1, B_2) = 0.55$ for (12) *North* and *Southwest*, $p(A_2, B_1) = 0.25$ for (21) *South* and *Northeast*, and $p(A_2, B_2) = 0.07$ for (22) *South* and *Southwest*.

Let us come to the combined measurement AB' . We got a probability $p(A_1, B'_1) = 0.47$ for the outcome *North* and *Southeast*, $p(A_1, B'_2) = 0.12$ for (12) *North* and *Northwest*, $p(A_2, B'_1) = 0.06$ for (21) *South* and *Southeast*, and $p(A_2, B'_2) = 0.35$ for (22) *South* and *Northwest*.

Let us next consider the combined measurement $A'B$. We got a probability $p(A'_1, B_1) = 0.13$ for the outcome (11) *East* and *Northeast*, $p(A'_1, B_2) = 0.38$ for (12) *East* and *Southwest*, $p(A'_2, B_1) = 0.42$ for (21) *West* and *Northeast*, and $p(A'_2, B_2) = 0.07$ for (22) *West* and *Southwest*.

Let us finally consider the combined measurement $A'B'$. We got a probability $p(A'_1, B'_1) = 0.09$ for the outcome (11) *East* and *Southeast*, $p(A'_1, B'_2) = 0.44$ for (12) *East* and *Northwest*, $p(A'_2, B'_1) = 0.38$ for (21) *West* and *Southeast*, and $p(A'_2, B'_2) = 0.09$ for (22) *West* and *Northwest*.

By adopting the usual convention for the outcomes, $ij = +1$ if $i = j$ and $ij = -1$ if $i \neq j$, $i, j = 1, 2$, we have the following expectation values

$$E(A, B) = p(A_1, B_1) - p(A_1, B_2) - p(A_2, B_1) + p(A_2, B_2) = -0.6 \quad (8)$$

$$E(A, B') = p(A_1, B'_1) - p(A_1, B'_2) - p(A_2, B'_1) + p(A_2, B'_2) = 0.65 \quad (9)$$

$$E(A', B) = p(A'_1, B_1) - p(A'_1, B_2) - p(A'_2, B_1) + p(A'_2, B_2) = -0.6 \quad (10)$$

$$E(A', B') = p(A'_1, B'_1) - p(A'_1, B'_2) - p(A'_2, B'_1) + p(A'_2, B'_2) = -0.62 \quad (11)$$

for a numerical value of the CHSH factor in Equation (3) equal to

$$B = -E(A, B) + E(A, B') - E(A', B) - E(A', B') = 2.47 \quad (12)$$

As we can see, the value in Equation (12) shows a striking similarity with the numerical values that are found in the typical experiments to detect entanglement and nonlocality in spin coincidence measurements on pairs of quantum particles (electrons, ions, photons). For example, according to [12], Aspect et al. (1982) found $B = 2.697 \pm 0.015$, Tittel et al. (1998) found $B = 2.38 \pm 0.16$, Weihs et al. (1998) found $B = 2.73 \pm 0.02$, Aspelmeyer et al. (2003) found $B = 2.41 \pm 0.10$, Pittman & Franson (2003) found $B = 2.44 \pm 0.13$, and Peng et al. (2004) found $B = 2.45 \pm 0.09$.

We performed a statistical analysis of our experiment to test whether the observed deviation from the numerical value 2 coming from the CHSH inequality was due to chance. To this end we computed a one tail one sample t-test for means of the experimental values of B in Equation (12) against the constant value 2, finding a p-value $p(df = 84) = 0.05$. This is a borderline result with respect to the rejection of the null hypothesis that the two means are equal in the t-test, and it is probably due to the dimension of the participants sample. However, this issue can be amended, as we will see in Section 5.

The result we have just discussed is a fundamental one, in our opinion. It shows that cognitive entities exhibit entanglement, and this entanglement is of the same type, also numerically, of the entanglement that is identified in the coincidence spin measurements on pairs of spin 1/2 quantum particles.

Let us now come to another important aspect of the violation of Bell inequalities in cognitive experiments on human participants, namely, the preservation of the marginal law. As suggested by some authors, the violation of any Bell inequalities is not conclusive about the presence of entanglement whenever the marginal law of classical Kolmogorovian probability is violated too, as this marginal law is typically assumed in the derivation of Bell-type inequalities, including the CHSH inequality [19, 20].

In our former cognitive experiment on *The Animal Acts*, the marginal law was violated [17], and we had to explicitly construct a quantum theoretical model in the Hilbert space \mathbb{C}^4 to show that the violation of the CHSH inequality is due to entanglement [18]. In the present cognitive experiment of the concept combination *Two Different Wind Directions*, we found:

$$p(A_1, B_1) + p(A_1, B_2) = 0.68 \neq 0.59 = p(A_1, B'_1) + p(A_1, B'_2) \quad (13)$$

$$p(A_2, B_1) + p(A_2, B_2) = 0.32 \neq 0.41 = p(A_2, B'_1) + p(A_2, B'_2) \quad (14)$$

$$p(A_1, B_1) + p(A_2, B_1) = 0.38 \neq 0.55 = p(A'_1, B_1) + p(A'_2, B_1) \quad (15)$$

$$p(A_1, B_2) + p(A_2, B_2) = 0.62 \neq 0.45 = p(A'_1, B_2) + p(A'_2, B_2) \quad (16)$$

$$p(A'_1, B_1) + p(A'_1, B_2) = 0.51 \neq 0.53 = p(A'_1, B'_1) + p(A'_1, B'_2) \quad (17)$$

$$p(A'_2, B_1) + p(A'_2, B_2) = 0.49 \neq 0.47 = p(A'_2, B'_1) + p(A'_2, B'_2) \quad (18)$$

$$p(A_1, B'_1) + p(A_2, B'_1) = 0.53 \neq 0.47 = p(A'_1, B'_1) + p(A'_2, B'_1) \quad (19)$$

$$p(A_1, B'_2) + p(A_2, B'_2) = 0.47 \neq 0.53 = p(A'_1, B'_2) + p(A'_2, B'_2) \quad (20)$$

Hence, the marginal law is violated also in our new cognitive experiment, though the violation is less pronounced than in the case of *The Animal Acts*. We could now separately construct an explicit quantum theoretical model in complex Hilbert space, and show that also this violation of the CHSH inequality can be interpreted as a genuine deviation of classical Kolmogorovian probability. But, it is not needed in this case, as we think we have identified the deep reasons for the violation of the marginal law in the present experiment, and for the setting up of a new experiment with human participants, where the marginal law is instead satisfied, while the CHSH inequality is again violated. The reason is that in the experiment we performed the fundamental symmetry following from the isotropy of our three dimensional Euclidean space is broken by connecting these directions of space with wind directions. In other words, it is obvious that the participants in their choice of ‘difference with respect to directions of space’ will be influenced by the directions being connected to wind directions, in exactly a way that breaks the isotropy of space symmetry of space directions. For example, the difference between *North East* and *South East*, which is represented by an angle of 45° if looked upon as pure space directions, might be felt bigger than for

example the difference between *South East* and *South West*, which is also represented by an angle of 45° if looked upon as pure space directions. Indeed, both *South East* and *South West*, certainly in Europe, can be connected with relatively ‘warm weather’, while from *North East* to *South East* there is a substantial change from cold to warm.

Many other influences brought into the situation as a consequence of ‘wind directions’ not being aligned to the isotropy of space, and hence the symmetries entailed in pure space directions, when it comes to estimating them being different, give rise to effects on the probabilities that we measured. An analysis of the situation shows that it is exactly this breaking of the symmetry of isotropy of space that gives rise to the violation of the marginal law, while the violation of Bell inequalities is not at all provoked by it and in structure completely independent of it.

With other words, if we had made our experiment without connecting wind directions to the space directions, and hence considering pure space directions instead, we would have violated the CHSH inequality in an equal manner, while we would not have violated the marginal law.

In a subtle manner, which we will analyze in detail in next section, we have collected all data in the course of performing our experiment with the wind directions specified for the space directions, to show what such an experiment that only considers pure space directions would result in. Or, with other words, we have identified a way to eliminate the symmetry breaking with respect to pure space directions brought in by the wind directions. We will have to make full use for this of the inherent symmetry contained in the 45° angles between all the wind directions that we considered, as it can be seen in the analysis in Section 5. We will prove that, if the breaking of the symmetries of the pure space directions as a consequence of attaching wind directions is eliminated, the marginal law will be satisfied for cases, while the violation of the CHSH inequality remains unchanged.

5 An experiment preserving the marginal law

The idea we want to explore is the following. We have performed the four coincidence experiments AB , AB' , $A'B$ and $A'B'$ by choosing A to be directed in the *South - North* space direction and B in the *Southwest - Northeast* space direction. Then we have chosen A' and B' rotated 90° clockwise with respect to respectively A and B . In principle, in case we would have been interested in testing rather the pure space directions instead of the wind directions, we could have chosen A differently, in principle any space direction, and keep the other choices the same, i.e. rotate B an angle of 45° clockwise with respect to A , A' an angle of 90° clockwise with respect to A and B' an angle of 135° clockwise with respect to A . If we would choose randomly A and then the corresponding B , A' and B' as just specified, we would avoid the broken symmetry due to wind directions. However, due to the already existing symmetry of the each time 45° , 90° or 135° of the rotation angles in the configuration, we can annihilate the symmetry breaking due to wind directions by choosing four different starting directions for A . Each time rotating the new starting direction 45° clockwise from the foregoing one.

Let us describe this procedure in all detail. The first starting direction for A is the one we choose for our actually performed experiment, hence *South - North*, and we discussed in Section 4. Let us call it ‘experiment I’. The other three starting positions, which we call ‘experiment II’, ‘experiment III’, and ‘experiment IV’, consist in rotating each time 45° clockwise. What is a surprise is that our actual performed experiment has collected the data for all of these four starting positions, hence for all of the four experiments I,II, III and IV. We just have to carefully reallocate the data collected, as we explain in detail in the following.

Let us consider experiment I, measurement AB , and its outcomes (11) *North* and *Northeast*, (12) *North* and *Southwest*, (21) *South* and *Northeast*, and (22) *South* and *Southwest*. To construct the measurement AB for experiment II we shift each wind direction in (11), (12), (21) and (22) by 45 degrees clockwise, so

that the outcomes of the new measurement AB of experiment II are (11) *East* and *Southeast*, (12) *East* and *Northwest*, (21) *West* and *Southeast*, and (22) *West* and *Northwest*. These outcomes correspond to the outcomes of measurement $A'B'$ of experiment I, exactly in the same order. Hence, we take the data collected in measurement $A'B'$ of experiment I as the data for the measurement AB of experiment II. Then, we consider measurement AB' of experiment II and shift the wind directions contained in its outcomes by 45 degrees clockwise. The obtained outcomes will correspond to the outcomes of measurement $A'B$ of experiment I. Hence, we take the data collected in measurement $A'B$ of experiment I as the data for the measurement AB' of experiment II. We construct in the same way measurements $A'B$ and $A'B'$ of experiment II.

Let us now come to the construction of experiment III. Consider the measurement AB of experiment II, and its outcomes (11) *East* and *Southeast*, (12) *East* and *Northwest*, (21) *West* and *Southeast*, and (22) *West* and *Northwest*. To construct the measurement AB for experiment III we shift each wind direction in (11), (12), (21) and (22) by 45 degrees clockwise, so that the outcomes of the new measurement AB of experiment III are (11) *South* and *Southwest*, (12) *South* and *Northeast*, (21) *North* and *Southwest*, and (22) *North* and *Northeast*. By referring to Section 4, we can see that these outcomes correspond to the outcomes of measurement AB of experiment I, though in a different order. Thus, we take the data of outcome (11) of measurement AB of experiment I as the data of outcome (22) of measurement AB of experiment III, the data of outcome (12) of of measurement AB of experiment I as the data of outcome (21) of measurement AB of experiment III, the data of outcome (21) of of measurement AB of experiment I as the data of outcome (12) of measurement AB of experiment III, and the data of outcome (22) of of measurement AB of experiment I as the data of outcome (11) of measurement AB of experiment III. Then, we do the same with the measurements AB' , $A'B$ and $A'B'$ of experiment III, looking at the corresponding outcomes of the measurements of experiment I, taken in the proper order.

Finally, let us construct experiment IV. We consider the measurement AB of experiment III, and its outcomes (11) *South* and *Southwest*, (12) *South* and *Northeast*, (21) *North* and *Southwest*, and (22) *North* and *Northeast*. To construct the measurement AB for experiment IV we again shift each wind direction in (11), (12), (21) and (22) by 45 degrees clockwise, so that the outcomes of the new measurement AB of experiment IV are (11) *West* and *Northwest*, (12) *West* and *Southeast*, (21) *East* and *Northwest*, (22) *East* and *Southeast*. By referring to Section 4, we can see that these outcomes correspond to the outcomes of measurement $A'B'$ of experiment I, though in a different order. Thus, we take the data of outcome (11) of measurement $A'B'$ of experiment I as the data of outcome (22) of measurement AB of experiment IV, the data of outcome (12) of of measurement $A'B'$ of experiment I as the data of outcome (21) of measurement AB of experiment IV, the data of outcome (21) of of measurement $A'B'$ of experiment I as the data of outcome (12) of measurement AB of experiment IV, and the data of outcome (22) of of measurement $A'B'$ of experiment I as the data of outcome (11) of measurement AB of experiment IV. Then, we apply the same procedure for the measurements AB' , $A'B$ and $A'B'$ of experiment IV, looking at the corresponding outcomes of the measurements of experiment I, taken in the proper order.

Therefore, for each outcome ij , $ij = +1$ if $i = j$, $ij = -1$ otherwise, of the measurements AB , AB' , $A'B$, and $A'B'$, we have 4 sets of data coming from 85 participants each, for a total of 340 estimations. Let us denote by $\tilde{p}(A_i, B_j)$, $\tilde{p}(A_i, B'_j)$, $\tilde{p}(A'_i, B_j)$, and $\tilde{p}(A'_i, B'_j)$ the probability that the combined measurement AB , AB' , $A'B$, and $A'B'$, gives the outcome ij , respectively, recalculated by taking into account all 340 estimations. We get the following results.

Let us start with the combined measurement AB . We got a probability $\tilde{p}(A_1, B_1) = 0.10$ for the outcome (11) *North* and *Northeast*, $\tilde{p}(A_1, B_2) = 0.40$ for (12) *North* and *Southwest*, $\tilde{p}(A_2, B_1) = 0.40$ for (21) *South* and *Northeast*, and $\tilde{p}(A_2, B_2) = 0.10$ for (22) *South* and *Southwest*.

Let us come to the combined measurement AB' . We got a probability $\tilde{p}(A_1, B'_1) = 0.41$ for the outcome *North* and *Southeast*, $\tilde{p}(A_1, B'_2) = 0.09$ for (12) *North* and *Northwest*, $\tilde{p}(A_2, B'_1) = 0.09$ for (21) *South* and

Southeast, and $\tilde{p}(A_2, B_2) = 0.41$ for (22) *South* and *Northwest*.

Let us next consider the combined measurement $A'B$. We got a probability $\tilde{p}(A'_1, B_1) = 0.09$ for the outcome (11) *East* and *Northeast*, $\tilde{p}(A'_1, B_2) = 0.41$ for (12) *East* and *Southwest*, $\tilde{p}(A'_2, B_1) = 0.41$ for (21) *West* and *Northeast*, and $\tilde{p}(A'_2, B_2) = 0.09$ for (22) *West* and *Southwest*.

Let us finally consider the combined measurement $A'B'$. We got a probability $\tilde{p}(A'_1, B'_1) = 0.10$ for the outcome (11) *East* and *Southeast*, $\tilde{p}(A'_1, B'_2) = 0.40$ for (12) *East* and *Northwest*, $\tilde{p}(A'_2, B'_1) = 0.40$ for (21) *West* and *Southeast*, and $\tilde{p}(A'_2, B'_2) = 0.10$ for (22) *West* and *Northwest*.

The corresponding expectation values are

$$\tilde{E}(A, B) = \tilde{p}(A_1, B_1) - \tilde{p}(A_1, B_2) - \tilde{p}(A_2, B_1) + \tilde{p}(A_2, B_2) = -0.61 \quad (21)$$

$$\tilde{E}(A, B') = \tilde{p}(A_1, B'_1) - \tilde{p}(A_1, B'_2) - \tilde{p}(A_2, B'_1) + \tilde{p}(A_2, B'_2) = 0.62 \quad (22)$$

$$\tilde{E}(A', B) = \tilde{p}(A'_1, B_1) - \tilde{p}(A'_1, B_2) - \tilde{p}(A'_2, B_1) + \tilde{p}(A'_2, B_2) = -0.61 \quad (23)$$

$$\tilde{E}(A', B') = \tilde{p}(A'_1, B'_1) - \tilde{p}(A'_1, B'_2) - \tilde{p}(A'_2, B'_1) + \tilde{p}(A'_2, B'_2) = -0.61 \quad (24)$$

for a numerical value of the CHSH factor equal to

$$\tilde{B} = -\tilde{E}(A, B) + \tilde{E}(A, B') - \tilde{E}(A', B) - \tilde{E}(A', B') = 2.47 \quad (25)$$

We can see that the value in Equation (25) coincides with the one we found in the real experiment in Equation (12), which confirms that our result shows amazing analogies with the results in spin coincidence experiments on pairs of quantum particles in the singlet spin state [12]. This violation of the CHSH inequality is statistically significant, $p(df = 339) = 0.0006$ in a one sample t-test against the constant value 2.

What about the marginal law? By looking at the recalculated probabilities, we find that, for every $i = 1, 2$, $j = 1, 2$, $\sum_{j=1}^2 \tilde{p}(A_i, B_j) = \sum_{j=1}^2 \tilde{p}(A_i, B'_j) = 1/2$, $\sum_{j=1}^2 \tilde{p}(A'_i, B_j) = \sum_{j=1}^2 \tilde{p}(A'_i, B'_j) = 1/2$, $\sum_{i=1}^2 \tilde{p}(A_i, B_j) = \sum_{i=1}^2 \tilde{p}(A'_i, B_j) = 1/2$, and $\sum_{i=1}^2 \tilde{p}(A_i, B'_j) = \sum_{i=1}^2 \tilde{p}(A'_i, B'_j) = 1/2$. Therefore, the marginal law is completely satisfied. Hence we proved that the combined experiment, testing the estimations corresponding to pure space directions were the breaking of symmetry due to wind directions has been eliminated, does not violate the marginal law. We also proved that the violation of Bell's inequalities is not affected by the elimination of the symmetry breaking due to wind directions, which shows that Bell's inequalities violation test definitely a much deeper property of non Kolmogorivity than the violation of the marginal laws does.

The conclusion follows at once. We have identified a strong experimental evidence that concept combinations violate the Bell inequalities, thus revealing statistical correlations that cannot be described in a single classical probabilistic framework satisfying the axioms of Kolmogorov. This violation can be perfectly explained in terms of presence of entanglement between the component concepts, and this entanglement shows very strong analogies with the entanglement identified in coincidence spin measurements on pairs of quantum particles.

6 The quantum model

In the present section we construct an explicit quantum theoretical representation in complex Hilbert space that faithfully models the data in Section 5. We follow the general lines is [18].

Let us preliminarily provide an operational description of our experiment in Section 4, by assigning states, measurements, outcomes and probabilities of outcomes. Let us denote by $p_{\text{Two Wind Directions}}$ the initial state of the concept combination *Two Different Wind Directions*. This is the initial state of the corresponding conceptual entity.

Let us then consider the combined measurement AB . It is completely defined by the outcomes (11) *North* and *Northeast*, (12) *North* and *Southwest*, (21) *South* and *Northeast*, and (22) *South* and *Southwest*, and by the final states p_{AB11} , p_{AB12} , p_{AB21} , and p_{AB22} , respectively, when the corresponding outcome is obtained in the measurement AB . As in Section 5, we denote by $\tilde{p}(A_i, B_j)$ the recalculated probability of getting the outcome ij , $i, j = 1, 2$, in AB .

Let us come to the combined measurement AB' . It is completely defined by the outcomes (11) *North* and *Southeast*, (12) *North* and *Northwest*, (21) *South* and *Southeast*, and (22) *South* and *Northwest*, and by the final states $p_{AB'11}$, $p_{AB'12}$, $p_{AB'21}$, and $p_{AB'22}$, respectively, when the corresponding outcome is obtained in the measurement AB' . As in Section 5, we denote by $\tilde{p}(A_i, B'_j)$ the recalculated probability of getting the outcome ij , $i, j = 1, 2$, in AB' .

Let us now consider the combined measurement $A'B$. It is completely defined by the outcomes (11) *East* and *Northeast*, (12) *East* and *Southwest*, (21) *West* and *Northeast*, and (22) *West* and *Southwest*, and by the final states $p_{A'B11}$, $p_{A'B12}$, $p_{A'B21}$, and $p_{A'B22}$, respectively, when the corresponding outcome is obtained in the measurement $A'B$. As in Section 5, we denote by $\tilde{p}(A'_i, B_j)$ the recalculated probability of getting the outcome ij , $i, j = 1, 2$, in $A'B$.

Let us finally take the combined measurement $A'B'$. It is completely defined by the outcomes (11) *East* and *Southeast*, (12) *East* and *Northwest*, (21) *West* and *Southeast*, and (22) *West* and *Northwest*, and by the final states $p_{A'B'11}$, $p_{A'B'12}$, $p_{A'B'21}$, and $p_{A'B'22}$, respectively, when the corresponding outcome is obtained in the measurement $A'B'$. As in Section 5, we denote by $\tilde{p}(A'_i, B'_j)$ the recalculated probability of getting the outcome ij , $i, j = 1, 2$, in $A'B'$.

As in Section 4, we choose $ij = +1$ if $i = j$ and $ij = -1$ if $i \neq j$, $i, j = 1, 2$.

Our quantum model is set in the complex Hilbert space \mathbb{C}^4 . We denote by $(1, 0, 0, 0)$, $(0, 1, 0, 0)$, $(0, 0, 0, 1)$ and $(0, 0, 0, 1)$ the unit vectors constituting the canonical base of \mathbb{C}^4 , and we represent the initial conceptual state $p_{\text{Two Wind Directions}}$ by the unit vector $|\Psi\rangle = (ae^{i\alpha}, be^{i\beta}, ce^{i\gamma}, de^{i\delta})$ in the canonical base of \mathbb{C}^4 . Further, we represent the measurement AB by the self-adjoint operator \mathcal{E}_{AB} over \mathbb{C}^4 , whose eigenvectors

$$|AB11\rangle = (a_1 e^{i\alpha_1}, b_1 e^{i\beta_1}, c_1 e^{i\gamma_1}, d_1 e^{i\delta_1}) \quad (26)$$

$$|AB12\rangle = (a_2 e^{i\alpha_2}, b_2 e^{i\beta_2}, c_2 e^{i\gamma_2}, d_2 e^{i\delta_2}) \quad (27)$$

$$|AB21\rangle = (a_3 e^{i\alpha_3}, b_3 e^{i\beta_3}, c_3 e^{i\gamma_3}, d_3 e^{i\delta_3}) \quad (28)$$

$$|AB22\rangle = (a_4 e^{i\alpha_4}, b_4 e^{i\beta_4}, c_4 e^{i\gamma_4}, d_4 e^{i\delta_4}) \quad (29)$$

represent the states p_{AB11} , p_{AB12} , p_{AB21} , and p_{AB22} , respectively, and form an orthonormal base in \mathbb{C}^4 , so that

$$\mathcal{E}_{AB} = |AB11\rangle\langle AB11| - |AB12\rangle\langle AB12| - |AB21\rangle\langle AB21| + |AB22\rangle\langle AB22| \quad (30)$$

The eigenvectors are to be chosen in such a way that, for every $i, j = 1, 2$, $\tilde{p}(A_i, B_j) = |\langle ABij|\Psi\rangle|^2$. Finally, the states p_{AB11} , p_{AB12} , p_{AB21} , and p_{AB22} should be product states, because the marginal law is satisfied by the recalculated probabilities in Section 5. The latter can be obtained by exploiting the canonical isomorphism between the Hilbert space \mathbb{C}^4 and the tensor product Hilbert space $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$, defined by $(1, 0, 0, 0) \leftrightarrow (1, 0) \otimes (1, 0)$, $(0, 1, 0, 0) \leftrightarrow (1, 0) \otimes (0, 1)$, $(0, 0, 1, 0) \leftrightarrow (0, 1) \otimes (1, 0)$, and $(0, 0, 0, 1) \leftrightarrow (0, 1) \otimes (0, 1)$. One can easily show that the condition that, for every $i, j = 1, 2$, $|ABij\rangle$ is a product state vector is equivalent to the four complex conditions

$$a_1 d_1 e^{i(\alpha_1 + \delta_1)} - b_1 c_1 e^{i(\beta_1 + \gamma_1)} = 0 \quad (31)$$

$$a_2 d_2 e^{i(\alpha_2 + \delta_2)} - b_2 c_2 e^{i(\beta_2 + \gamma_2)} = 0 \quad (32)$$

$$a_3 d_3 e^{i(\alpha_3 + \delta_3)} - b_3 c_3 e^{i(\beta_3 + \gamma_3)} = 0 \quad (33)$$

$$a_4 d_4 e^{i(\alpha_4 + \delta_4)} - b_4 c_4 e^{i(\beta_4 + \gamma_4)} = 0 \quad (34)$$

One can verify that the following unit vectors satisfy all the conditions above

$$|AB11\rangle = (0.71e^{i159.12^\circ}, 0.71e^{i23.02^\circ}, 0e^{i21.56^\circ}, 0) \quad (35)$$

$$|AB12\rangle = (0e^{i132.51^\circ}, 0e^{i28.88^\circ}, 1e^{i21.17^\circ}, 0e^{i29.24^\circ}) \quad (36)$$

$$|AB21\rangle = (0e^{i162.38^\circ}, 0, 0e^{i23.07^\circ}, 1e^{i29.24^\circ}) \quad (37)$$

$$|AB22\rangle = (0.71e^{i26.71^\circ}, 0.71e^{i70.61^\circ}, 0e^{i58.97^\circ}, 0e^{i44.22^\circ}) \quad (38)$$

for an initial entangled state vector

$$|\Psi\rangle = (0.44e^{i26.27^\circ}, 0e^{i32.12^\circ}, 0.63e^{i31.65^\circ}, 0.63e^{i31.88^\circ}) \quad (39)$$

If one now looks at the recalculated probabilities in Section 5, one realizes at once that they are satisfied whenever the self-adjoint operators $\mathcal{E}_{AB'}$, $\mathcal{E}_{A'B}$, and $\mathcal{E}_{A'B'}$ representing the measurements AB' , $A'B$, and $A'B'$, respectively, are such that $\mathcal{E}_{A'B} = \mathcal{E}_{A'B'} = \mathcal{E}_{AB} = -\mathcal{E}_{AB'}$.

Our quantum mechanical model is thus completed. It constitutes a further confirmation that the violation of the CHSH inequality we have identified in Section 5 is significant of the existence of genuine entanglement in the concept combination *Two Different Wind Directions*, and of the impossibility of a classical Kolmogorovian probability framework to reproduce the data. We also remind, to conclude, that the marginal law is satisfied by the recalculated probabilities, which can effectively occur in a concrete cognitive experiment, as discussed in Section 5.

7 Connections with existing results on quantum cognitive structures

Entanglement is one of the fundamental fingerprints of quantum structure. Its presence implies that quantum particles exhibit statistical correlations that cannot be reproduced by classical probabilistic structures, as it is proved in quantum physics by the violation of Bell inequalities [10, 11, 15, 19]. And, spin experiments on quantum particles systematically confirm the existence of these bizarre features of the micro world [5, 8, 9, 12].

Growing evidence in cognitive psychology reveals that quantum structures are not peculiar of microscopic quantum systems, but they are also systematically present in cognitive systems [16, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43]. In particular, we recently proved that the statistical correlations we measured in the conceptual combination *The Animal Acts*, violating Bell inequalities in the Clauser Horne Shimony Holt (CHSH) form [17], can be interpreted in terms of entanglement between the concept *Animal* and the concept *Acts* [18].

In this paper, we have presented some further progress along this direction, proposing an experiment on a specific conceptual combination which astonishingly violates Bell inequalities in the CHSH form with almost the same numerical value as in coincidence spin experiments on pairs of quantum particles. More specifically, we have analyzed the data collected in an experiment where participants were asked to choose ‘a good example of two different wind directions’, amongst a set of each time four combinations of such different wind directions (Section 3).

In our experiment human subjects were asked to pick one, and only one, of four pairs of wind directions, and pick the one they considered their ‘preferred good example of two different wind directions’. We have described the details of the experiment in Section 4. However, the main result we found is the following: the human mind picks amongst such examples of different wind directions ‘almost in exactly the same way’ as coincidence spin measurement apparatuses pick amongst different spin directions of a compound system of two quantum particles in an entangled spin state (Section 2). We have proved that it is the nature of the statistics of the data collected in this experiment that make it possible for us to prove the presence of quantum entanglement in the situation measured upon by the experiment (Section 4).

A relevant aspect of our experiment is that *Two Different Wind Directions* violates the marginal law, which is typically assumed in the derivation of Bell inequalities, including its CHSH version [19, 20]. This also occurred in the experiment on *The Animal Acts*. But, we have found an explanation for such a violation of the marginal law in our present experiment on the conceptual combination *Two Different Wind directions*. It is due to the presence of biases in the preference of the participants with respect to specific outcomes in the various measurements on wind directions. For example, a person loving warm places will have an a priori preference for *South* and *Southwest* than for *North* and *Northeast*, because the person will associate warm places with south and cold places with north, and so on. This asymmetry is reflected in the small violation of the marginal law we found (Section 4). For this reason, we have renormalized the preference probabilities in Section 5 by using a specific procedure that avoids this bias, and we have indeed found that the marginal law is satisfied, with the same amount of violation of the CHSH inequality. This renormalization is very reasonable, in our opinion, as one could perform a real experiment on spatial directions, rather than wind directions, and find that Bell inequalities are violated, while the eventual violation of the marginal law would be not significant, as we expect that the marginal law is not violated in the latter case, due to isotropy of space.

Hence, we conclude that the violation of Bell inequalities is significant and confirms the presence of conceptual entanglement of a quantum-type. We have proved this in Section 6, where we have constructed an explicit quantum theoretical model in the complex Hilbert space $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$ with an entangled initial conceptual state and four product measurements giving rise to the same violation of the CHSH inequality as our experiment with recalculated probabilities.

References

- [1] Freedman, S.J. and Clauser, J.F. (1972). Experimental test of local hidden variable theories. *Physical Review Letters*, **28**, pp. 938-941.
- [2] Holt, R.A. (1973). Atomic Cascade Experiments. Ph.D. Thesis, Physics Department, Harvard University.
- [3] Fry, E.S. and Thompson, R.C. (1976). Experimental test of local hidden-variable theories. *Physical Review Letters*, **37**, pp. 465-468.
- [4] Laméhi-Rachti, M. and Mittag, W. (1976). Quantum mechanics and hidden variables: A test of Bell's inequality by the measurement of spin correlation in low-energy proton-proton scattering. *Physical Review D*, **14**, pp. 2543-2555.
- [5] Aspect, A., Grangier, P., and Roger, G. (1982). Experimental realization of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen-Bohm Gedankenexperiment: a new violation of Bell's Inequalities. *Physical Review Letters*, **49**, pp. 91-94.
- [6] Aspect, A. (1983). Trois tests expérimentaux des inégalités de Bell par mesure de corrélation de polarisation de photons. Orsay: Thèse d'Etat.
- [7] Aspect, A., Dalibard, J., and Roger, G. (1982). Experimental test of Bell's Inequalities using time-varying analyzers. *Physical Review Letters*, **49**, pp. 1804-1807.
- [8] Tittel, W., Brendel, J., Zbinden, H., and Gisin N. (1998). Violation of Bell's inequalities by photons more than 10 km apart. *Physical Review Letters*, **81**, pp. 3563-3566.
- [9] Weihs, G., Jennewein, T., Simon, C., Weinfurter, H., and Zeilinger, A. (1998). Violation of Bell's inequality under strict Einstein locality condition. *Physical Review Letters*, **81**, pp. 5039-5043.
- [10] Bell, J.S. (1964). On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox. *Physics*, **1**, pp. 195-200.
- [11] Clauser, J.F., Horne, M.A., Shimony, A., and Holt, R.A. (1969). Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories. *Physical Review Letters*, **23**, pp. 880-884.
- [12] Genovese, M. (2005). Research on Hidden Variable Theories. A Review of Recent Progresses. *Physics Reports*, **413**, pp. 319-396.

- [13] Kolmogorov, A. N. (1933). *Grundbegriffe der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung*, Ergebnisse Der Mathematik; translated as *Foundations of Probability*. New York: Chelsea Publishing Company, 1950.
- [14] Aerts, D. (1986). A possible explanation for the probabilities of quantum mechanics. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 27, 202–210.
- [15] Pitowsky, I. (1989). *Quantum Probability, Quantum Logic*. Lecture Notes in Physics vol. **321**. Berlin: Springer.
- [16] Aerts, D., Aerts, S., Broekaert, J., & Gabora, L. (2000). The violation of Bell inequalities in the macroworld. *Foundations of Physics* 30, 1387–1414.
- [17] Aerts, D., & Sozzo, S. (2011). Quantum structure in cognition. Why and how concepts are entangled. *Quantum Interaction. Lecture Notes in Computer Science 7052*, 116–127. Berlin: Springer.
- [18] Aerts, D., & Sozzo, S. (2014). Quantum entanglement in conceptual combinations. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* 53, 3587–3603.
- [19] Fine, A. (1982). Joint distributions, quantum correlations, and commuting observables. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 23, 1306–1310.
- [20] Dzhafarov, E.N., & Kujala, J.V. (2014). Selective influences, marginal selectivity, and Bell/CHSH inequalities. *Topics in Cognitive Science* 6, 121–128.
- [21] Aerts, D., & Aerts, S. (1995). Applications of quantum statistics in psychological studies of decision processes. *Foundations of Science* 1, 85–97.
- [22] Aerts, D., & Gabora, L. (2005). A theory of concepts and their combinations I: The structure of the sets of contexts and properties. *Kybernetes* 34, 167–191.
- [23] Aerts, D., & Gabora, L. (2005). A theory of concepts and their combinations II: A Hilbert space representation. *Kybernetes* 34, 192–221.
- [24] Aerts, D. (2009). Quantum structure in cognition. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 53, 314–348.
- [25] Aerts, D. (2009). Quantum particles as conceptual entities: A possible explanatory framework for quantum theory. *Foundations of Science* 14, 361–411.
- [26] Pothos, E. M., & Busemeyer, J. R. (2009). A quantum probability explanation for violations of ‘rational’ decision theory. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 276, 2171–2178.
- [27] Khrennikov, A. Y. (2010). *Ubiquitous Quantum Structure*. Berlin: Springer.
- [28] Aerts, D., Sozzo, S., & Tapia, J. (2012). A quantum model for the Ellsberg and Machina paradoxes. *Quantum Interaction. LNCS 7620*, 48–59. Berlin: Springer.
- [29] Busemeyer, J. R., Pothos, E. M., Franco, R., & Trueblood, J. S. (2011). A quantum theoretical explanation for probability judgment errors. *Psychological Review* 118, 193–218.
- [30] Busemeyer, J. R., & Bruza, P. D. (2012). *Quantum Models of Cognition and Decision*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [31] Aerts, D., Broekaert, J., Gabora, L., & Sozzo, S. (2013). Quantum structure and human thought. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 36, 274–276.
- [32] Aerts, D., Gabora, L., & Sozzo, S. (2013). Concepts and their dynamics: A quantum–theoretic modeling of human thought. *Topics in Cognitive Science* 5, 737–772.
- [33] Haven, E., & Khrennikov, A. Y. (2013). *Quantum Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [34] Pothos, E. M., & Busemeyer, J. R. (2013). Can quantum probability provide a new direction for cognitive modeling? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 36, 255–274.
- [35] Wang, Z., Busemeyer, J. R., Atmanspacher, H., & Pothos, E. (2013). The potential of quantum probability for modeling cognitive processes. *Topics in Cognitive Science* 5, 672–688.
- [36] Aerts, D., Sozzo, S., & Tapia, J. (2014). Identifying quantum structures in the Ellsberg paradox. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* 53, 3666–3682.
- [37] 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.

- [38] Khrennikov, A.Y., Basieva, I., Dzhafarov, E.N., Busemeyer, J.R. (2014). Quantum models for psychological measurements: An unsolved problem. *PlosOne* 9(10), e110909.
- [39] Sozzo, S. (2014). A quantum probability explanation in Fock space for borderline contradictions. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 58, 1–12.
- [40] Sozzo, S. (2015). Conjunction and negation of natural concepts: A quantum-theoretic modeling. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 66. 83–102.
- [41] Aerts, D., Sozzo, S., & Veloz, T. (2015). Quantum nature of identity in human concepts: Bose-Einstein statistics for conceptual indistinguishability. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*. DOI 10.1007/s10773-015-2620-4 (published online).
- [42] Aerts, D., Sozzo, S., & Veloz, T. (2015). Quantum structure in cognition and the foundations of human reasoning. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*. DOI 10.1007/s10773-015-2717-9 (published online).
- [43] Aerts, D., Sozzo, S., & Veloz, T. (2015). A new fundamental evidence of non-classical structure in the combination of natural concepts. Accepted in *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*. Archive reference and link: *ArXiv: 1505.04981*.