

On Contextuality in Behavioral Data

Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov¹, Ru Zhang¹, Victor H. Cervantes¹, and Janne Kujala²

¹Purdue University, ehtibar@purdue.edu

²University of Jyväskylä, jvk@iki.fi

Abstract

Dzhafarov, Zhang, and Kujala (arXiv:1504.07422) reviewed several behavioral data sets imitating the formal design of the quantum-mechanical contextuality experiments (such as EPR-Bell or Leggett-Garg ones); the conclusion was that contextuality was not present in any of these data sets. Aerts and Sozzo recently announced a new experiment (arXiv:1508.00434) whose results, they claimed, prove the presence of contextuality of the EPR-Bell type (entanglement) in conceptual combinations. We show that their experimental data exhibit no contextuality in the sense of the general definition of contextuality proposed in Dzhafarov, Kujala, and Larsson (Foundation of Physics 7, 762-782, 2015); while the traditional, narrow definition of contextuality does not apply to their data because they violate the condition of consistent connectedness (also known as marginal selectivity, no-signaling condition, no-disturbance principle, etc.). To circumvent the latter problem Aerts and Sozzo transform their experimental data using a computational procedure that makes all marginal probabilities equal to one half. We argue that this procedure is unjustifiable. It only works because it turns out to be a special version of the “depolarization” procedure described by Masanes, Acin, and Gisin (Physical Review A 73, 012112, 2006). Because this “correction” of probabilities is universally applicable, a definition of contextuality that would allow it would amount to simply ignoring marginal probabilities altogether. This would make the concept of contextuality trivial if not entirely empty.

1 Introduction: A Disclaimer

Although prompted by Ref. [2], this note is not meant to be a critique of one particular paper. Our use of an experiment presented in Ref. [2] is primarily an opportunity to demonstrate the workings of our theory of contextuality [6–8, 10–12, 14–16] (in the same way as Ref. [5] used an experiment by Aerts, Gabora, and Sozzo [1] as an opportunity to spell out the illegitimacy of using the classical CHSH inequalities while ignoring marginal probabilities). We would like therefore to play down the critical aspects of this note.

2 Definition and Criterion of Contextuality in Bell Systems

2.1 Bell systems (of measurements) in contextual notation

Let us begin by introducing notation and basic definitions. Although the theory of contextuality we espouse is completely general [10, 11, 15, 16], in this paper the discussion is confined to one class of systems (of measurements) only.

Definition 1. A *Bell system* (or EPR-Bell, or EPR-Bohm) is a quadruple of pairs of jointly distributed binary (+1/−1) random variables

$$\{(A_{\alpha\beta}, B_{\alpha\beta})\}_{\alpha, \beta \in \{1, 2\}}. \quad (1)$$

Index α here represents one of two *inputs* or *properties* ($\alpha = 1$ or $\alpha = 2$) interpreted as being measured by random variable A , index β represents one of two properties ($\beta = 1$ or $\beta = 2$) interpreted as being measured by random variable B . Thus, in the experiment by Aerts and Sozzo [2], α and β are spatial orientations while their measurements are choices of one of two possible directions along each of these orientations:

Table 1.

Properties (Orientations in space)	Measurements (Choices of direction)
North-South ($\alpha = 1$)	$A = +1 =$ North $A = -1 =$ South
East-West ($\alpha = 2$)	$A = +1 =$ East $A = -1 =$ West
Northeast-Southwest ($\beta = 1$)	$B = +1 =$ Northeast $B = -1 =$ Southwest
Northwest-Southeast ($\beta = 2$)	$B = +1 =$ Southeast $B = -1 =$ Northwest

Note the contextual notation (double-indexation) for A and B in the definition of a Bell system. Random variable $A_{\alpha\beta}$ is interpreted as the outcome of measuring property α *in the context* of being measured together with property β (whether or not the distribution of $A_{\alpha\beta}$ depends on β); $B_{\alpha\beta}$ is the outcome of measuring property β *in the context* of being measured together with property α (whether or not the distribution of $B_{\alpha\beta}$ depends on α).¹

Each of the four pairs $(A_{\alpha\beta}, B_{\alpha\beta})$ in a Bell system is completely characterized by three expected values,

$$\langle A_{\alpha\beta} \rangle, \langle B_{\alpha\beta} \rangle, \langle A_{\alpha\beta} B_{\alpha\beta} \rangle. \quad (2)$$

Two different pairs in (1), say, (A_{11}, B_{11}) and (A_{12}, B_{12}) are not jointly distributed, so the expectations like $\langle A_{11} B_{12} \rangle$ or $\langle A_{11} A_{12} \rangle$ are undefined.

¹For more general variants of contextual notation see Refs. [10, 12, 16]

2.2 Couplings, connections, and maximally connected couplings

Definition 2. A (probabilistic) *coupling* for a Bell system (1) is a vector of eight jointly distributed random variables

$$\left(\tilde{A}_{11}, \tilde{B}_{11}, \tilde{A}_{12}, \tilde{B}_{12}, \tilde{A}_{21}, \tilde{B}_{21}, \tilde{A}_{22}, \tilde{B}_{22} \right) \quad (3)$$

such that, for any $\alpha, \beta \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$\left\langle \tilde{A}_{\alpha\beta} \right\rangle = \langle A_{\alpha\beta} \rangle, \quad \left\langle \tilde{B}_{\alpha\beta} \right\rangle = \langle B_{\alpha\beta} \rangle, \quad \left\langle \tilde{A}_{\alpha\beta} \tilde{B}_{\alpha\beta} \right\rangle = \langle A_{\alpha\beta} B_{\alpha\beta} \rangle. \quad (4)$$

In other words, all expectations that have well-defined values in the Bell system have the same values in any of its couplings, but a coupling also has all other higher-order expectations defined, such as

$$\left\langle \tilde{A}_{11} \tilde{B}_{12} \right\rangle, \left\langle \tilde{A}_{11} \tilde{A}_{12} \right\rangle, \left\langle \tilde{A}_{11} \tilde{A}_{12} \tilde{B}_{22} \right\rangle, \left\langle \tilde{A}_{11} \tilde{B}_{11} \tilde{A}_{12} \tilde{B}_{12} \tilde{A}_{21} \right\rangle, \text{etc.}$$

Of particular interest are the four pairs

$$\begin{aligned} \{A_{\alpha 1}, A_{\alpha 2}\}, \quad \alpha \in \{1, 2\}, \\ \{B_{1\beta}, B_{2\beta}\}, \quad \beta \in \{1, 2\}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

each of which represents one and the same property measured in two different contexts. These pairs are called *connections*.

Definition 3. For any $\alpha \in \{1, 2\}$, the pair $(A_{\alpha 1}, A_{\alpha 2})$ is called the connection for this α ; for any $\beta \in \{1, 2\}$, the pair $(B_{1\beta}, B_{2\beta})$ is the connection for this β .

The product expectations $\langle A_{\alpha 1} A_{\alpha 2} \rangle$ and $\langle B_{1\beta} B_{2\beta} \rangle$ in the Bell system itself are undefined, but each coupling (3) of (1) has definite values of the corresponding expectations $\langle \tilde{A}_{\alpha 1} \tilde{A}_{\alpha 2} \rangle$ and $\langle \tilde{B}_{1\beta} \tilde{B}_{2\beta} \rangle$.

The following definition is central for the theory of contextuality (as applied to Bell systems).

Definition 4. A coupling (3) of a Bell system (1) is called *maximally connected* if this coupling has the maximal possible probability of $\tilde{A}_{\alpha 1} = \tilde{A}_{\alpha 2}$ for each $\alpha \in \{1, 2\}$, and the maximal possible probability of $\tilde{B}_{1\beta} = \tilde{B}_{2\beta}$ for each $\beta \in \{1, 2\}$.

Since the expectations $\langle \tilde{A}_{\alpha 1} \rangle$ and $\langle \tilde{A}_{\alpha 2} \rangle$ in all couplings (3) are fixed by the property (4), the maximal probability of $\tilde{A}_{\alpha 1} = \tilde{A}_{\alpha 2}$ is equivalent to the maximal possible value for the product expectation $\langle \tilde{A}_{\alpha 1} \tilde{A}_{\alpha 2} \rangle$; and analogously for $\tilde{B}_{1\beta}$ and $\tilde{B}_{2\beta}$. These maximal possible values are easy to compute.

Lemma 5 (Refs. [10, 16]). *A coupling (3) of a Bell system (1) is maximally connected if and only if, for every $\alpha, \beta \in \{1, 2\}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{A}_{\alpha 1} \tilde{A}_{\alpha 2} \rangle &= 1 - \left| \langle \tilde{A}_{\alpha 1} \rangle - \langle \tilde{A}_{\alpha 2} \rangle \right|, \\ \langle \tilde{B}_{1\beta} \tilde{B}_{2\beta} \rangle &= 1 - \left| \langle \tilde{B}_{1\beta} \rangle - \langle \tilde{B}_{2\beta} \rangle \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

It follows that a maximally connected coupling is any vector of eight jointly distributed random variables (3) that satisfies (4) and (6).

2.3 Contextuality and (in)consistent connectedness

Definition 6 (Refs. [10, 14–16]). A Bell system (1) is noncontextual if it has a maximally connected coupling; otherwise it is contextual.

The following criterion (necessary and sufficient condition) of contextuality is a special case of a general theorem for cyclic systems, see Refs. [10, 15, 16].

Theorem 7. *A Bell system (1) is noncontextual if and only if*

$$\text{CHSH} - \text{ICC} \leq 2, \quad (7)$$

where

$$\text{CHSH} = \max_{\alpha, \beta \in \{1, 2\}} \left| -2 \langle A_{\alpha\beta} B_{\alpha\beta} \rangle + \sum_{i, j \in (1, 2)} \langle A_{ij} B_{ij} \rangle \right|, \quad (8)$$

and

$$\text{ICC} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 |\langle A_{\alpha 1} \rangle - \langle A_{\alpha 2} \rangle| + \sum_{\beta=1}^2 |\langle B_{1\beta} \rangle - \langle B_{2\beta} \rangle|. \quad (9)$$

The abbreviations in this theorem are as follows. CHSH is the left-hand side expression in the classical CHSH inequality [3],

$$\text{CHSH} \leq 2. \quad (10)$$

ICC is *inconsistency of the connectedness* [10, 14, 16]: if it is zero, then the criterion (7) reduces to the CHSH inequality (10).

Let us elaborate this relationship between our general definition and the classical analysis of contextuality (or of entanglement) in Bell systems.

Definition 8. A Bell system is *consistently connected* (or satisfies *marginal selectivity*) if

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A_{\alpha 1} \rangle &= \langle A_{\alpha 2} \rangle, \quad \alpha \in \{1, 2\}, \\ \langle B_{1\beta} \rangle &= \langle B_{2\beta} \rangle, \quad \beta \in \{1, 2\}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

It is clear that for a consistently connected Bell system, a maximally connected coupling is any vector of eight jointly distributed random variables (3) which satisfies (4) and in which

$$\langle \tilde{A}_{\alpha 1} \tilde{A}_{\alpha 2} \rangle = \langle \tilde{B}_{1\beta} \tilde{B}_{2\beta} \rangle = 1, \quad (12)$$

for any $\alpha, \beta \in \{1, 2\}$. Therefore:

Corollary 9. *A consistently connected Bell system is noncontextual if and only if it has a coupling satisfying (12). Such a coupling exists if and only if the Bell system satisfies (10).*

This is a rigorous version of the traditional understanding of contextuality and of the CHSH inequalities.

2.4 Application to Aerts and Sozzo’s experiment

In Aerts and Sozzo’s experiment [2],

$$\text{CHSH} = 2.47, \text{ICC} = 0.71,$$

whence

$$\text{CHSH} - \text{ICC} = 1.76 < 2.$$

There is no contextuality in accordance with Definition 6.²

3 Isotropy, Depolarization, and Data Doctoring

3.1 Isotropy?

The authors of Ref. [2] are aware of the difficulties caused by inconsistent connectedness, so they propose a computational modification of their data that makes all marginal distributions uniform (with equal probabilities of +1 and -1). They justify this procedure by some kind of isotropy argument, according to which any direction in the frontal plane could be taken to play the role of the vector North, with all other directions rotated to preserve their angles with respect to this new North. Using this consideration, Aerts and Sozzo average the observed probabilities in such a way that all marginal probabilities become $1/2$ while the value of CHSH does not change.

The isotropy argument would be valid if the probability distributions of responses to pairs of orientations depended only on the angle between them. However, the data presented in Ref. [2] exhibit strong anisotropy: e.g., the distribution of responses for $\alpha = 1, \beta = 1$ (N-S combined with NE-SW) is significantly different from the distribution of responses for $\alpha = 1, \beta = 2$ (N-S

²One is free, of course, not to accept Definition 6 and to stick with the traditional understanding only: but the latter only applies to consistently connected systems of measurements. This has been explained in Refs. [4, 5].

combined with NW-SE). Even simpler: the very fact that the observed marginal probabilities in the experiment are not all equal to $1/2$ is a proof that two different directions along a given orientation are not subjectively equivalent.

3.2 Averaging of jointly-opposite outcomes

Why does then this computational procedure work in achieving uniform marginals while retaining the value of CHSH? It is easy to see that all that matters here is that one considers, for any given α, β , the *jointly-opposite* outcomes

$$(A_{\alpha\beta} = i, B_{\alpha\beta} = j) \text{ and } (A_{\alpha\beta} = -i, B_{\alpha\beta} = -j), \quad (13)$$

with $i, j \in \{-1, +1\}$, to be “equivalent” or “interchangeable.” Whether this is justified by successive rotations or by any other argument, one could then replace the probability of each of them with their average:

$$\frac{\Pr[A_{\alpha\beta} = i, B_{\alpha\beta} = j] + \Pr[A_{\alpha\beta} = -i, B_{\alpha\beta} = -j]}{2}. \quad (14)$$

Let’s denote by $A_{\alpha\beta}^*$ and $B_{\alpha\beta}^*$ the new random variables with these symmetrized distributions. Due to the symmetry,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A_{\alpha\beta}^* \rangle &= \Pr[A_{\alpha\beta}^* = +1] - \Pr[A_{\alpha\beta}^* = -1] = 0, \\ \langle B_{\alpha\beta}^* \rangle &= \Pr[B_{\alpha\beta}^* = +1] - \Pr[B_{\alpha\beta}^* = -1] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

At the same time,

$$\langle A_{\alpha\beta}^* B_{\alpha\beta}^* \rangle = 2 \Pr[A_{\alpha\beta}^* = B_{\alpha\beta}^*] - 1, \quad (16)$$

and since it follows from (14) that

$$\Pr[A_{\alpha\beta}^* = B_{\alpha\beta}^*] = \Pr[A_{\alpha\beta} = B_{\alpha\beta}], \quad (17)$$

the value of CHSH remains intact.³

3.3 “Depolarization”

This averaging procedure has been described in the quantum physics literature by Masanes, Acin, and Gisin [19]; it is the first part of their “depolarization”

³In Ref. [2], the jointly-opposite outcomes correspond to rotations by π . The averaging (14) in Ref. [2] is performed twice: between the actual configuration of directions and the version rotated by π , as well as between the versions rotated by $\pi/2$ and $3\pi/2$. Both leave CHSH unchanged and make marginals uniform. The averaging between these two averages therefore has the same properties (and is superfluous with respect to either of them). Note that rotations by $\pi/2$ merely relabel value 1 of α and β into value 2, and vice versa (and, depending on how one chooses the labels +1 and -1 for the outcomes, these rotations may also reverse one or both of them): this does not change CHSH. Note also, that rotation by $\pi/2$ is usable only because all angles in the experiment are multiples of $\pi/4$. If we replaced, e.g., the NE-SW axis with NNE-SSW, leaving the remaining three axes unchanged, the only rotation angles usable for averaging would be multiples of π .

procedure. It is, however, explicitly a data generation or data doctoring procedure (not a data analysis one), involving either direct signaling between Alice or Bob, or a third party, Charley, who receives from Alice and from Bob their settings and their measurements results, flips a fair coin, and multiplies these measurement results (always both of them) by +1 or -1 accordingly.

4 Why Not Allow This?

4.1 Averaging means ignoring

The question is: why not allow the averaging of the probabilities of jointly-opposite outcomes as a legitimate procedure in determining (non)contextuality? We can immediately reformulate this question. Since this averaging procedure is universal (applicable to all Bell systems without exception), this definition would simply amount to ignoring the marginal probabilities (or expectations) altogether and simply *defining* contextuality (or entanglement) as any violation of the CHSH inequality (10).

Why not adopt this approach?⁴ It is definitely simpler than the approach advocated by us: (1) labeling the measurements contextually, (2) determining stochastically unrelated to each other subsystems of measurements, (3) defining contextuality in terms of the (non)existence of a coupling for these subsystems with certain constraints imposed on the connections (measurements of the same properties in different contexts); and (4) deriving CHSH inequalities or their generalizations as theorems [6–11, 15, 16].

The answer to the question is that adopting the definition in question would make construction of contextual systems child’s play: the contextual system will become ubiquitous and obviously identifiable, including the systems in classical mechanics and human behavior that no one normally would think of as contextual. Moreover, with the definition in question one would have to forget about the “quantum” motivation, as the contextual systems in classical mechanics and human behavior then would violate Tsirelson bounds [17] as easily as they do the CHSH ones.

Consider just one example. The table below represents the probabilities of $[A_{\alpha\beta} = i, B_{\alpha\beta} = j]$ in a hypothetical Bell system $(\alpha, \beta \in \{1, 2\}, i, j \in \{-1, +1\})$.

⁴The approach was criticized in Ref. [5] using as an example an experiment by Aerts, Gabora, and Sozzo [1].

Table 2.

		<i>B</i>				<i>B</i>				
	(1, 1)	+1	-1			(1, 2)	+1	-1		
A		+1	1	0	1	+1	1	0	1	0
		-1	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0
		1 0				1 0				
		<i>B</i>				<i>B</i>				
	(2, 1)	+1	-1			(2, 2)	+1	-1		
A		+1	1	0	1	+1	0	0	0	0
		-1	0	0	0	-1	1	0	1	0
		1 0				1 0				

Here,

$$\text{CHSH} = 4,$$

the algebraically maximal possible value for CHSH. The system is, however, noncontextual by Definition 6: ICC in it equals the value of $\langle A_{21} \rangle - \langle A_{22} \rangle = 2$, whence

$$\text{CHSH} - \text{ICC} = 2$$

(to be contextual, the difference should exceed 2).

If one decides to ignore marginal probabilities, however, the system is maximally “supercorrelated,” more contextual than allowed by quantum mechanics. Or, instead of openly ignoring the marginals, one can equivalently employ the averaging of the probabilities of jointly-opposite outcomes, transforming Table 2 to the table below:

Table 3.

		<i>B*</i>				<i>B*</i>				
	(1, 1)	+1	-1			(1, 2)	+1	-1		
A*		+1	1/2	0	1/2	+1	1/2	0	1/2	1/2
		-1	0	1/2	1/2	-1	0	1/2	1/2	1/2
		1/2 1/2				1/2 1/2				
		<i>B*</i>				<i>B*</i>				
	(2, 1)	+1	-1			(2, 2)	+1	-1		
A*		+1	1/2	0	1/2	+1	0	1/2	1/2	1/2
		-1	0	1/2	1/2	-1	1/2	0	1/2	1/2
		1/2 1/2				1/2 1/2				

Unlike the system in Table 2, this new system is contextual by Definition 6 (but, of course, not equivalent to Table 2).

4.2 Contextuality as child’s play

It is trivial to find or construct a system described by Table 2. To begin with conceptual combinations, consider, e.g., the experiment in which the properties α, β and measurements A, B are identified as shown in Table 4.

Table 4.

Properties (choices between)	Measurements (choices)
Green Triangle and Yellow Circle ($\alpha = 1$)	$A = +1 =$ Green Triangle $A = -1 =$ Yellow Circle
Green Circle and Yellow Triangle($\alpha = 2$)	$A = +1 =$ Green Circle $A = -1 =$ Yellow Triangle
Green and Red ($\beta = 1$)	$B = +1 =$ Green $B = -1 =$ Red
Triangular and Square ($\beta = 2$)	$B = +1 =$ Triangular $B = -1 =$ Square

Such an experiment would yield Table 2 unless the participants choose to make fun of the experimenter and deliberately choose wrong responses. There is, in fact, nothing wrong in considering the conceptual inferences like “Green Triangle is Green” and “Green Triangle is Triangular” as examples of contextuality or “(super)entanglement,” but this looks to us as making the concept of contextuality too trivial to be of interest.

Another example of “conceptual (super)entanglement” involves creation of new concepts in children by means of teaching them the following tong-twister:

Pips and Nips are Zops, not Zogs.
Pops and Nops aren't Zops nor Zogs.
Pips and Nops are Gots, not Gons.
Pops and Nips aren't Gots nor Gons.

Children who learned this piece of poetry would confidently respond to the questions like “Are Pips Zops?” and “Are Pops Gots?” The resulting table of the probabilities for them will be the same as in Table 2, on denoting the conditions and outcomes as in Table 5.

Table 5.

Properties (choices between)	Measurements (choices)
Pip and Pop ($\alpha = 1$)	$A = +1 =$ Pip $A = -1 =$ Pop
Nip and Nop($\alpha = 2$)	$A = +1 =$ Nip $A = -1 =$ Nop
Zop and Zog ($\beta = 1$)	$B = +1 =$ Zop $B = -1 =$ Zog
Got and Gon ($\beta = 2$)	$B = +1 =$ Got $B = -1 =$ Gon

Finally, here is a scenario of creating Table 2 in a purely classical physical situation. There is a gadget “Alice” that responds to inputs $\alpha, \beta \in \{1, 2\}$ by computing $A = \min(1, 2\alpha + 2\beta - 5)$, and a gadget “Bob” that outputs 1 no matter what. This example is essentially identical to one given by Filks in Figure 3 of Ref. [13]. No physicist, as it seems to us, would call the system consisting

of these two gadgets entangled or contextual. It is simply that both inputs influence one of the outputs (Alice’s), resulting in the observed inconsistent connectedness.

4.3 We do need a theory taking marginals into account

Inconsistent connectedness is almost a universal rule in behavioral and social data (e.g., it is obvious that the task of choosing between the North and South winds affects the probabilities with which one, in the same trial, chooses between the Northeast and Southwest winds). It is therefore a sound scientific strategy to make inconsistent connectedness part of one’s theory of contextuality. Inconsistent connectedness means that the measurement of a property is directly influenced by other properties, and this may or may not be sufficient to account for a system’s behavior. For instance, in the experiment described in Ref. [18] we find violations of consistent connectedness due to context-dependent biases in measurements, but the detailed analysis presented in Ref. [16] shows that contextuality, in the sense of Definition 6, is still prominently present in their data. By contrast, the system in Table 2 is noncontextual by Definition 6, which means that the direct influences and one cross-influence it entails are sufficient to explain its behavior (no contextuality exists “on top of” these input-output relations). The same conclusion applies to the experiment reported in Ref. [2].

5 Conclusion: More Disclaimers

We make no claim that Aerts and Sozzo in Ref. [2] subscribe to data-doctoring by means of the averaging employed in the depolarization procedure. All we say is that the justification proposed by these authors is not tenable, and the reason it works as they wish it to work is its (perhaps unintended) equivalence to the averaging in question, which in turn is equivalent to ignoring marginal probabilities altogether. This allows us to demonstrate the consequences of such ignoring: contextuality becomes trivial and uninteresting.

Nor do we claim that contextuality, in the sense of our rigorous definition, is never present in behavioral data. We also acknowledge that there may be viable alternatives to our Definition 6 that also take into account inconsistent connectedness. All we say is that using this definition we have found so far no evidence for contextuality in the known to us data sets [5, 12]. The experiment by Aerts and Sozzo [2] squarely falls within this category.

Finally, we would like to refer the reader to the concluding part of Ref. [12] to emphasize that absence of contextuality in behavioral and social systems *does not* mean that quantum formalisms are not applicable to them. The so-called QQ equality, in our opinion the most impressive outcome of quantum cognition research up to date [20, 21], provides a clear illustration of how absence of contextuality can in fact be predicted by quantum theory.

Acknowledgments

This research has been supported by NSF grant SES-1155956, AFOSR grant FA9550-14-1-0318, A. von Humboldt Foundation, and by the J. William Fulbright Grant from Fulbright Colombia.

References

- [1] 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.
- [2] Aerts, D., & Sozzo, S. 2015. Spin and wind directions: Identifying entanglement in nature and cognition. arXiv:1508.00434.
- [3] 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.
- [4] Dzhafarov, E.N. & Kujala, J.V. 2012 Quantum entanglement and the issue of selective influences in psychology: An overview. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 7620, 184-195.
- [5] Dzhafarov, E.N. & Kujala, J.V. 2014. Selective influences, marginal selectivity, and Bell/CHSH inequalities. *Topics in Cognitive Science* 6, 121-128.
- [6] Dzhafarov, E.N., & Kujala, J.V. (2014). A qualified Kolmogorovian account of probabilistic contextuality. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 8369, 201-212.
- [7] Dzhafarov, E., Kujala, J. 2014. Embedding quantum into classical: Contextualization vs conditionalization. *PLoS One* 9(3): e92818.
- [8] Dzhafarov, E.N., & Kujala, J.V. 2014. Contextuality is about identity of random variables. *Physica Scripta* T163, 014009.
- [9] Dzhafarov, E.N., & Kujala, J.V. 2015. Conversations on contextuality. In E.N. Dzhafarov, J.S. Jordan, R. Zhang, V.H. Cervantes (Eds). *Contextuality from Quantum Physics to Psychology*. To be published by World Scientific Press.
- [10] Dzhafarov, E.N., & Kujala, J.V., & Larsson, J.-Å. 2015. Contextuality in three types of quantum-mechanical systems. *Foundations of Physics* 7, 762-782.
- [11] Dzhafarov, E.N., & Kujala, J.V., Larsson, J.-Å, Cervantes, V.H. 2015. Contextuality-by-Default: A brief overview of ideas, concepts, and terminology. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, in press.

- [12] Dzhafarov, E.N., Zhang, R., & Kujala, J.V. 2015. Is there contextuality in behavioral and social systems? arXiv:1504.07422.
- [13] Filk, T. 2015. It is the theory which decides what we can observe. In E.N. Dzhafarov, J.S. Jordan, R. Zhang, V.H. Cervantes (Eds). *Contextuality from Quantum Physics to Psychology*. To be published by World Scientific Press.
- [14] Kujala, J.V., & Dzhafarov, E.N. Probabilistic Contextuality in EPR/Bohm-type systems with signaling allowed. In E.N. Dzhafarov, J.S. Jordan, R. Zhang, V.H. Cervantes (Eds). *Contextuality from Quantum Physics to Psychology*. To be published by World Scientific Press.
- [15] Kujala, J.V., Dzhafarov, E.N. 2015. Proof of a conjecture on contextuality in cyclic systems with binary variables. arXiv:1503.02181.
- [16] Kujala, J.V., Dzhafarov, E.N., & Larsson, J.-Å. 2015. Necessary and sufficient conditions for maximal noncontextuality in a broad class of quantum mechanical systems. arXiv:1412.4724.
- [17] Landau, L.J. (1987). On the violation of Bell's inequality in quantum theory. *Physical Letters A* 120, 54–56.
- [18] Lapkiewicz, R., Li, P., Schaeff, C., Langford, N. K., Ramelow, S., Wieśniak, M., & Zeilinger, A. 2011. Experimental non-classicality of an indivisible quantum system. *Nature* **474**, 490–493.
- [19] Masanes, Ll., Acin, A., & Gisin, N. 2006. General properties of nonsignaling theories. *Physical Review A* 73, 012112.
- [20] 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.
- [21] 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.