arXiv:1510.02686v1 [physics.soc-ph] 9 Oct 2015

Role of information in decision making of social agents

V.I. Yukalov[a,b*] and D. Sornette[a,c]

[a] *Department of Management, Technology and Economics, ETH Zürich, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zürich CH-8092, Switzerland*
e-mail: syukalov@ethz.ch

[b] *Bogolubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna 141980, Russia*
e-mail: yukalov@theor.jinr.ru

[c] *Swiss Finance Institute, c/o University of Geneva, 40 blvd. Du Pont d'Arve, CH 1211 Geneva 4, Switzerland*
e-mail: dsornette@ethz.ch

Abstract

The influence of additional information on the decision making of agents, who are interacting members of a society, is analyzed within the mathematical framework based on the use of quantum probabilities. The introduction of social interactions, which influence the decisions of individual agents, leads to a generalization of the quantum decision theory developed earlier by the authors for separate individuals. The generalized approach is free of the standard paradoxes of classical decision theory. This approach also explains the error-attenuation effects observed for the paradoxes occurring when decision makers, who are members of a society, consult with each other, increasing in this way the available mutual information. A precise correspondence between quantum decision theory and classical utility theory is formulated via the introduction of an intermediate probabilistic version of utility theory of a novel form, which obeys the requirement that zero-utility prospects should have zero probability weights.

JEL classification: C44, D03, D71, D81, D83

Keywords: Information and knowledge, Decision theory, Decisions under uncertainty, Group consultations, Social interactions

*Corresponding author: V.I. Yukalov
E-mail address: yukalov@theor.jinr.ru

1 Paper goal and guide

The main goal of the paper is to develop a mathematical model describing the role of additional information received by decision makers characterized by two features. First, the decision makers take decisions not according to the normative utility theory, but their decisions are influenced by behavioral biases. Second, these decision makers are members of a society, where they interact with each other by exchanging information that influences their decisions.

To treat the first problem of including behavioral biases into decision making, we employ the approach we recently developed, based on the use of quantum probabilities (Yukalov and Sornette, 2008, 2009a,b,c, 2010a,b, 2011). In this approach, we employ the techniques similar to those used in quantum theory, justifying the name "Quantum Decision Theory" (QDT). This, however, does not require that decision makers be quantum objects, but the used techniques just play the role of a convenient mathematical tool for characterizing behavioral biases. It is well known that classical decision making, based on the notion of utility theory, is plagued by numerous paradoxes caused by behavioral biases. We have shown in our previous publications that in our approach, all these paradoxes are cured, since QDT takes behavioral biases into account.

In our previous papers, QDT has been developed for single decision makers isolated from others and taking decisions on the basis of their present available information. But when decision makers are the agents of a society, they interact with each other by exchanging information. The principal problem, we consider in the present paper, is the generalization of the QDT approach, taking account of behavioral biases, to a society of interacting agents.

All the technical, as well as the related psychological points are carefully explained in the following sections. However, because the mathematical methods we use may be not customary for scholars in social sciences, in order that they would not be lost in technical details, it can be useful to give a brief guide of the particular problems treated in each of the sections.

In Section 2, we explain why it has been necessary to develop a novel approach in order to avoid numerous behavioral paradoxes of classical decision making, based on utility theory. We recall that the mathematical approach, we advocate, contains no paradoxes when considering isolated decision makers. And we stress that there are other interesting phenomena related to behavioral biases, when decision makers are the members of a society and interact with each other. The most known among such phenomena is the *bias attenuation effect*, when the exchange of information between the society members reduces the role of behavioral biases.

In Section 3, we generalize QDT to the case of social decision makers, who are members of a society and who interact with each other. Developing any novel theory, it is crucially important to understand under what conditions it can be reduced to the known theories. We show that classical decision theory is a limiting case of QDT, corresponding to the neglect of behavioral biases in a precise sense that can be expressed rigorously in mathematical language. It is also very important that the developed theory would not be just a mathematical exercise, but that it could be applied to real-life situations and would explain them. We illustrate this by explaining how QDT is used for removing the disjunction effect and

conjunction error, making predictions that are in agreement with empirical observations.

In Section 4, we analyze how the information received by an agent from other members of the society influences his/her decisions by changing the role of behavioral biases. We explain the conjunction fallacy attenuation observed in real-life experiments.

In Section 5, we summarize the novel results of the present paper and stress the basic problems it has solved. Some possible future experimental studies are discussed. The main questions and related answers are explicitly listed, providing to the reader a clear understanding of the paper content.

2 Importance of behavioral biases in decision making

Decision theory underlies essentially all the social sciences, including economics, finance, political sciences, psychology, and so on. It is also employed in studying the evolution of various social systems, where the evolution equations that describe population dynamics are constructed so as to provide the maximum of utility, or fitness, for the species of the considered social system. Decision theory is also an important part of information technology, including quantum information processing.

Decision makers are usually members of a society and, hence, are influenced by other members of the society through mutual exchange of information. This is why information processing and decision making are intimately connected with each other. Recent trends in the interconnection of these subjects have been emphasized by Shi (2009).

The predominant theory, describing individual behavior under risk and uncertainty is nowadays the expected utility theory of preferences over uncertain prospects. This theory, first introduced by Bernoulli (1738) in his investigation of the St. Petersburg paradox, was axiomatized by von Neumann and Morgenstern (1953), and integrated with the theory of subjective probability by Savage (1954). The theory was shown to possess great analytical power by Arrow (1971) and Pratt (1964) in their work on risk aversion and by Rothschild and Stiglitz (1970, 1971) in their work on comparative risk. Friedman and Savage (1948) and Markowitz (1952) demonstrated its tremendous flexibility in representing decision makers attitudes toward risk. It is fair to state that expected utility theory has provided a solid foundation for the theory of games, the theory of investment and capital markets, the theory of search, and for other branches of economics, finance, and management (Lindgren, 1971; White, 1976; Hastings and Mello, 1978; Rivett, 1980; Buchanan, 1982; Berger, 1985; Marshall and Oliver, 1995; Bather, 2000; French and Insua, 2000; Raiffa and Schlaifer, 2000; Weirich, 2001; Gollier, 2001).

However, a number of economists and psychologists have uncovered a growing body of evidence showing that individuals do not always conform to prescriptions of expected utility theory. Moreover, human beings very often depart from the theory in predictable and systematic way. Actually, the possibility that problems could arise has already been discussed by Bernoulli (1738) himself. Then, many researchers, starting with the works by Allais (1953), Edwards (1955, 1962), and Ellsberg (1961), and continuing through the present, have experimentally confirmed pronounced and systematic deviations from the predictions of expected utility theory, leading to the appearance of many paradoxes. Neuroscience re-

search suggests that the choice process used by human beings is systematically biased and suboptimal (Fehr and Rangel, 2011). Among the known paradoxes of classical utility making, we can list the Bernoulli St. Petersburg paradox (Bernoulli, 1738), the Allais paradox (Allais, 1953), the independence paradox (Allais, 1953), the Ellsberg paradox (Ellsberg, 1961), the Kahneman-Tversky paradox (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979), the Rabin paradox (Rabin, 2000), the Ariely paradox (Ariely, 2008), the disjunction effect (Tversky and Shafir, 1992), the conjunction fallacy (Tversky and Kahneman, 1983; Shafir et al., 1990), the isolation effects (McCaffery and Baron, 2006), the combined paradoxes (Yukalov and Sornette, 2009b, 2010b, 2011), the planning paradox (Kydland and Prescott, 1977), and dynamic inconsistency (Strotz, 1955; Frederick et al., 2002). A large literature on this topic can be found in the recent reviews (Camerer et al., 2003; Machina, 2008).

All paradoxes, which have been discovered in classical decision making, appear in decision problems that can be formulated as follows. One considers a set of outcome payoffs $X \equiv \{x_i : i = 1, 2, \ldots\}$, on which a probability measure $p : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is given. Over the payoff set, there are several lotteries, or prospects, $\pi_j = \{x_i \, , p_j(x_i) : \; i = 1, 2, \ldots\}$, differing by the outcome probabilities. The payoff set is the domain of a utility function $u(x)$ that is a non decreasing concave function. The expected utility of a lottery π_j is defined as $U(\pi_j) = \sum_i u(x_i) p_j(x_i)$. A lottery π_1 is said to be preferable to π_2 if and only if $U(\pi_1) > U(\pi_2)$. And the lotteries are indifferent, when $U(\pi_1) = U(\pi_2)$. Suppose that the given data are such that, according to the classical decision making, a lottery π_1 is preferable or indifferent to π_2, that is, $U(\pi_1) \geq U(\pi_2)$, However, decision makers, when deciding between several lotteries under uncertainty and in the presence of risk, often choose π_2, instead of π_1, thus, contradicting the prescription of utility theory.

Because of the large number of paradoxes associated with classical decision making, there have been many attempts to change the expected utility approach, which has been classified as non-expected utility theories. There exists a number of such non-expected utility theories, among which we may mention some of the best known: prospect theory (Edwards, 1955; Kahneman and Tversky, 1979), weighted-utility theory (Karmarkar, 1978, 1979; Chew, 1983), regret theory (Loomes and Sugden, 1982), optimism-pessimism theory (Hey, 1984), dual-utility theory (Yaari, 1987), ordinal-independence theory (Green and Jullien, 1988), and quadratic-probability theory (Chew et al., 1991). More detailed information can be found in the review by Machina (2008).

However, as has been shown by Safra and Sigal (2008), none of non-expected utility theories can explain all those paradoxes. The best that could be achieved is a kind of fitting for interpreting just one or, in the best case, a few paradoxes, while the other paradoxes remained unexplained. In addition, spoiling the structure of expected utility theory results in the appearance of complications and inconsistencies. As has been concluded in the detailed analysis of Al-Najjar and Weinstein (2009), any variation of the classical expected utility theory "ends up creating more paradoxes and inconsistencies than it resolves".

Inconsistencies between utility theory and actual decision making are caused by the assumption of the classical utility theory that decision makers are rational, while in reality their decisions are always influenced by subconscious feelings, various prejudices, and emotions. Taking these subjective features into account implies the necessity of resorting to a kind of behavioral decision making (Simon, 1955).

Biases, such as subconscious feelings, emotions, and other subjective effects, are superimposed on the objective evaluation of utility, introducing some kind of indeterminacy in decision-maker choices. The situation reminds that occurring in quantum theory, where the physical reality is decorated by the probabilistic description of phenomena. The idea that the functioning of the human brain could be described by the techniques of quantum theory has been advanced by one of the founders of quantum theory (Bohr, 1933;1958). Von Neumann, who is both a founding father of game theory and of expected utility theory on the one hand and the developer of the mathematical theory of quantum mechanics on the other hand, himself mentioned that the quantum theory of measurement can be interpreted as decision theory (von Neumann, 1955).

The main difference between the classical and quantum techniques is the way of calculating the probability of events. As soon as one accepts the quantum way of defining the concept of probability, the latter generally becomes non-additive. And one immediately meets such quantum effects as interference and entanglement. The possibility of employing the techniques of quantum theory in several branches of sciences, that previously have been analyzed by classical means, is nowadays widely considered. As examples, we can mention quantum game theory (Eisert and Wilkens, 2000; Landsburg, 2004; Guo et al., 2008), quantum information processing and quantum computing (Williams and Clearwater, 1998; Nielsen and Chuang, 2000; Keyl, 2002).

After the works by Bohr (1933, 1958) and von Neumann (1955), there have been a number of discussions on the possibility of applying quantum rules for characterizing the process of human decision making (Aerts and Aerts, 1994; Segal and Segal, 1998; Baaquie, 2004, 2009; Busemeyer et al., 2006; Bagarello, 2009; Lambert-Mogiliansky et al., 2009; Kitto, 2009; Pothos and Busemeyer, 2010; Leaw and Cheong, 2010; West and Grigolini, 2010; Zabaletta and Arizmendi, 2010). More references can be found in the recent review article (Yukalov and Sornette, 2009b). However, no general theory with quantitative predictive power has been suggested. This was the motivation for our introduction of a general quantum theory of decision making, based on the Hilbert-space functional analysis and von Neumann theory of quantum measurements (von Neumann, 1955), which could be applied to any possible situations (Yukalov and Sornette, 2008, 2009a,b,c, 2010a,b, 2011). Our approach is, to the best of our knowledge, the first theory using the mathematical formulation of quantum theory that allows for the *quantitative* treatment of different classical paradoxes in the frame of a single general scheme. Indeed, practically all paradoxes of classical decision making find their natural explanation in the frame of the Quantum Decision Theory (Yukalov and Sornette, 2008, 2009a,b,c, 2010a,b, 2011).

Our framework does not assume that decision makers are quantum objects. The techniques of quantum theory are employed just as a convenient mathematical tool allowing us to combine the notions of objective utility and subjective biases. Actually, the sole thing we need is the theory of Hilbert spaces. Generally, it is worth stressing that the use of quantum techniques requires that neither brain nor consciousness would have anything to do with genuinely quantum systems. The techniques of quantum theory are used solely as a *convenient mathematical tool* and language to capture the properties associated with decision making. It is known that the description of any quantum system could be done as if it was a classical system, via the introduction of the so-called contextual hidden variables.

However, their number has to be infinite in order to capture the same level of elaboration as their quantum equivalent (Dakic et al., 2008), which makes unpractical the use of a classical equivalent description. Instead, quantum techniques are employed to describe systems in which interference and entanglement effects occur, because they are much simpler than to deal with a classical system having an infinite number of hidden unknown variables. Similarly, we use quantum techniques for decision theory in order to implicitly take into account the existence of many hidden variables in humans, such as emotions, subconscious feelings, and various biases. The existence of these hidden variables strongly influences decision making, as captured partially, for instance, by the notion of bounded rationality (Simon, 1955) and confirmed by numerous studies in Behavioral Economics, Behavioral Finance, Attention Economy, and Neuroeconomics (Cialdini, 2001; Loewenstein et al., 2008).

The standard setup displaying the paradoxes in classical decision making corresponds to *individual* decision makers that take decisions without consulting each other. However, in a number of experimental studies, it has been found that consultation sharply reduces errors in decision making. For example, Cooper and Kagel (2005) and Blinder and Morgan (2005) find that groups consistently play more strategically than do individuals and generate positive synergies in more difficult games. Charness et al. (2007a,b) show that group membership affects individual choices in strategic games. Charness and Rabin (2002) and Chen and Li (2009) investigate the minimal-group paradigm and find a substantial increase in charity concerns and social-welfare-maximizing actions when participants are matched with in-group members. It was found that the errors in the famous disjunction effect and conjunction fallacy strongly attenuate when group members get information by learning from their experience (Kühberger et al., 2001) or exchange information by consulting (Charness et al., 2010). Groups usually perform better than individuals at quantitative judgment tasks (Sung and Choi, 2012; Schultze et al., 2012).

Explaining these attenuation effects, caused by information transfer through the interactions between decision makers, requires extending the theory from isolated individuals to human beings who are part of a society within which they interact and exchange information. It is the aim of the present paper to generalize the QDT approach to the case of decision makers who interact within a group or society. The information received from the society influences the decisions. This leads to a natural explanation of the error attenuation effect, as compared with the paradoxes existing for decisions without within-group consultations.

In the next Section 3, we present the generalization of QDT for a decision maker who is not a separate individual, but a member of a society. In the following Section 4, we show how the additional information, received by the decision maker through interactions with the surrounding society, leads to a decrease of errors compared with classical decision making. We discuss the experiments by Charness et al. (2010) and explain why the initial error in the conjunction fallacy diminishes with the received information.

3 Social decision makers

Let us consider a society defined as a collective of several agents. Each agent is a decision maker, whose decisions are influenced by other members of the society. A decision maker

aims at choosing between several admissible choices, called lotteries or prospects. Note that a decision maker can also be represented by a group jointly making a choice through a group decision making (Xu, 2011; Tapia et al, 2012). In that case, the society is understood as a collection of several such groups, each acting as a separate decision maker. Our aim is to study how the choice of individual decision makers is influenced by their interactions in a society, leading to the exchange of information.

It is necesssary to mention that decision making in a society has been considered by invoking the techniques of statistical mechanics, following the Brock-Durlauf (1999, 2001) approach. Statistical models are usually formulated as some variants of the Ising model, where a node is associated with a single decision maker deliberating on a binary choice "yes-or-now". In that sense, an undividual decision maker possesses a classical bit of information and acts as a subject obeying classical rules (Durlauf, 1999; Brock, 2001; Contucci, 2008; Barra, 2010; Barra, 2012).

In the approach of Quantum Decision Theory (Yukalov and Sornette, 2008, 2009a,b,c, 2010a,b, 2011), a single decision maker enjoys quantum bits of information. This becomes especially important and makes a principal difference with the classical way of decision making when the considered prospects are composite. Then, even in the case of a binary "yes-no" problem, in the presence of uncertainty, the available information is characterized by *quantum qubits*, which leads to the appearance of interference effects. Such interference effects do not occcur for a single decision maker dealing with a simple binary choice, if no composite events are present. The latter situation happens in classical societies described by statistical models. In such models, uncertainty is caused by the fact that an individual decision maker does not know what are the decisions of other members of the society. Contrary to this, in the quantum approach, even a single decision maker experiences uncertainty, without the presence of any other members. This is what principally distinguishes our approach from the classical statistical models. In our case, there exist two types of uncertainty: purely quantum, occuring even for a single decision maker, and statistical, caused by the existence of other members of the society.

In our previous papers (Yukalov and Sornette, 2008, 2009a,b,c, 2010a,b, 2011), we have considered separate decision makers. For each prospect, we associate a vector in a Hilbert space. But now, in addition to the space of mind for a given separate decision maker, there exists the decision space of the society as a whole. Below, we give a generalization of QDT for social decision makers. All mathematical definitions and their relation to real-life situations have been thoroughly explained in our previous publications, and we do not think it would be appropriate to essentially extend the present paper by repeating all those technical details. Rigorous mathematical techniques for defining the quantum probabilities of composite prospects can be found in (Yukalov and Sornette, 2013). In the following sections, we give only the necessary mathematical minimum for correctly describing and justifying the use of the prospect probabilities. The readers, who are not accustomed to the techniques of Hilbert-space functional analysis, can omit the mathematical explanations and can jump to the end of this section, just accepting the form of the prospect probabilities and the rules they satisfy.

3.1 Decision spaces

Let an agent A be a member of a society. Assume that, for this agent, there exists a set of elementary prospects that are represented by a set of vectors $\{|n\rangle\}$. The elementary-prospect vectors are orthonormalized, so that the scalar product $\langle m|n\rangle = \delta_{mn}$ is a Kronecker delta. The orthogonality of the elementary prospects means that they are independent and not compatible, so that only one of them can be realized. The elementary prospects represent the variety of separate possible actions that could be accomplished by the decision maker. For instance, such possible actions could is be represented by choosing whom to marry and what job to accept. The detailed life examples can be found in Yukalov and Sornette (2009a,b, 2010b, 2011). Strictly speaking, the prospects are assumed to be well defined. This distinguishes our consideration from the case of imprecise knowledge of prospects and imprecise available information, which requires the use of the fuzzy decision theory (Aliev et al. 2012).

The space of mind of a decision maker, by definition, is a closed linear envelope

$$\mathcal{H}_A \equiv \mathrm{Span}\{|n\rangle\} \tag{1}$$

spanning all admissible elementary prospects. Then the elements of the space of mind represent all admissible combinations of various actions. Similarly, such a space of mind can be constructed for each member of the society, the states of mind of two distinct individuals being in general different. Let the space of mind for all members of the society, except the agent A, be denoted as $\mathcal{H}_B$. Then the total decision space of the whole society is the tensor product

$$\mathcal{H}_{AB} \equiv \mathcal{H}_A \bigotimes \mathcal{H}_B \; . \tag{2}$$

This is a Hilbert space, where a scalar product is defined. The space $\mathcal{H}_B$ can also be presented as a tensor product of the individual spaces of all other society members.

The elementary prospects serve as a basis for constructing the Hilbert space of mind. But they are not necessarily the prospects a decision maker is evaluating. They just enumerate all admissible possibilities. But, generally, a decision maker deliberates choosing not between the elementary prospects, but between combinations of these. For instance, one may decide whether to accept a particular job, under the condition of marrying either one or another person (see details in our cited papers).

3.2 Prospect states

The decision maker A considers a set of prospects

$$\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_j : \; j = 1, 2, \ldots N\} \; . \tag{3}$$

Each prospect π_j is put into correspondence to a vector $|\pi_j\rangle$, called the prospect state, in the space of mind $\mathcal{H}_A$. The prospects of $\mathcal{L}$ are, generally, composite objects composed of several elementary prospects. Many concrete examples are given in the published papers (Yukalov and Sornette, 2009a,b, 2010b, 2011).

Being an element of the space $\mathcal{H}_A$, a prospect state can be represented as an expansion over the elementary prospects,

$$| \pi_j \rangle = \sum_n \langle n | \pi_j \rangle | n \rangle . \tag{4}$$

The prospect states are not assumed to be either orthogonal or normalized, so that the scalar product

$$\langle \pi_i | \pi_j \rangle = \sum_n \langle \pi_i | n \rangle \langle n | \pi_j \rangle \tag{5}$$

is not a Kronecker delta. The prospects states are not orthogonal with each other, since they are not necessarily incompatible, but can interfere and entangle with each other. And the appropriate normalization condition will be imposed later.

The prospects are the targets of the decision maker in the sense that he/she chooses which of them to prefer. As far as one can compare the prospects by qualifying them as more or less preferable, the set $\mathcal{L}$ of these prospects π_j should be ordered, forming a complete transitive lattice. The ordering procedure will be given below. The aim of decision making is to find out which of the prospects is the most favorable.

There can exist two types of setups. One is when a number of agents choose between the given prospects. Another type is when a single decision maker takes decisions in a repetitive manner, for instance taking decisions several times. These two cases are treated similarly.

3.3 Prospect operators

To each prospect π_j, with a vector state $|\pi_j\rangle$ in the Hilbert space of mind $\mathcal{H}_A$, there corresponds the prospect operator

$$\hat{P}(\pi_j) \equiv | \pi_j \rangle \langle \pi_j | . \tag{6}$$

By this definition, the prospect operators are self-adjoint. These operators, generally, are not projectors, as far as they are not necessarily idempotent,

$$\hat{P}^2(\pi_j) = \langle \pi_j | \pi_j \rangle \hat{P}(\pi_j) ,$$

which follows from the fact that the prospect states, generally, are not normalized. The prospect operators are not commutative, since the expressions

$$\hat{P}(\pi_i)\hat{P}(\pi_j) = \langle \pi_i | \pi_j \rangle | \pi_i \rangle \langle \pi_j | , \qquad \hat{P}(\pi_j)\hat{P}(\pi_i) = \langle \pi_j | \pi_i \rangle | \pi_j \rangle \langle \pi_i | ,$$

differing by the order of operators, are not equivalent. The noncommutativity of the prospect operators represents the noncommutativity of decisions in real life (Yukalov and Sornette, 2009a,b, 2010b, 2011).

The collection $\{\hat{P}(\pi_j)\}$ of the prospect operators is analogous to the algebra of local observables in quantum theory. In the latter, as is known, not each product of local observables is, strictly speaking, an observable. But it is always possible to define symmetrized products so that the collection of local observables would form an algebra. In the same way as for the operators of local observables in quantum theory, we can consider the family $\{\hat{P}(\pi_j)\}$ of prospect operators as an algebra of observables in QDT.

Note that we use here the standard terminology related to operator algebras in Hilbert spaces (Neumann, 1955). The operator of an observable is not, of course, an observable quantity by itself, but it corresponds to such a quantity that is obtained by defining the operator expected value.

3.4 Prospect probabilities

QDT is a probabilistic theory, whose observable quantities are the prospect probabilities. These prospect probabilities are defined as the expected values, that is, averages of the prospect operators. In that sense, the prospect probabilities play the role of the observable quantities (Yukalov and Sornette, 2008). In our previous papers, the averages were defined with respect to a given *strategic state* $|\psi\rangle$ characterizing the decision maker. Such a procedure corresponds to the averaging over a prescribed pure state, which assumes that the considered decision maker is an individual, not interacting with any surrounding. But when considering a decision maker in a society, which he/she interacts with, such a decision maker cannot be characterized by a pure state.

The society as a whole could be described by a pure wave function, with the decision maker being a part of the society, which would then lead to the necessity of characterizing this decision maker by a statistical operator. This is in a direct analogy with treating subsystems of large systems by density matrices (Coleman and Yukalov, 2000). The statistical operator characterizes the state of the system as a whole, weighting the admissible microscopic states, in that sense being analogous to the probability distribution of classical probability theory.

Moreover, we could describe the society by a wave function only if we would assume that the society is completely isolated from its surrounding. But such an assumption is certainly unreasonable, since there are no absolutely isolated societies. Again, this is completely equivalent to the absence of absolutely isolated finite quantum systems (Yukalov, 2002, 2003a,b). Thus, the most general way of describing the society state is by a statistical operator.

In the present case, the society state, including the considered decision maker, is to be characterized by a statistical operator $\hat{\rho}_{AB}$ that is a positive operator on $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$, normalized as

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{AB}\hat{\rho}_{AB} = 1 \; , \tag{7}$$

with the trace operation being performed over $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$. The observable quantities are to be defined by the expectation values over the statistical state. Therefore the prospect probabilities are given by the averages

$$p(\pi_j) \equiv \mathrm{Tr}_{AB}\hat{\rho}_{AB}\hat{P}(\pi_j) \; . \tag{8}$$

The prospect operators act on the space of mind $\mathcal{H}_A$ of the decision maker. Hence the above average can be represented as

$$p(\pi_j) \equiv \mathrm{Tr}_A\hat{\rho}_A\hat{P}(\pi_j) \; , \tag{9}$$

where the trace is over $\mathcal{H}_A$ and the reduced statistical operator is

$$\hat{\rho}_A \equiv \mathrm{Tr}_B\hat{\rho}_{AB} \; . \tag{10}$$

This operator characterizes the decision maker in the society. The reduction to the previous situation of a single separated decision maker, as considered in our previous papers, would correspond to the representation of the statistical operator $\hat{\rho}_A$ in the pure form $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, with the state $|\psi\rangle$ being the decision maker strategic state. But, generally, the statistical operator $\hat{\rho}_A$ cannot be represented in such a factor form, since the decision maker state is entangled with that of the society.

Introducing the matrix elements over the elementary-prospect basis for the statistical operator

$$\rho_{mn} \equiv \langle\, m \mid \hat{\rho}_A \mid n \,\rangle \tag{11}$$

and for the prospect operators

$$P_{mn}(\pi_j) \equiv \langle\, m \mid \hat{P}(\pi_j) \mid n \,\rangle = \langle\, m \mid \pi_j \,\rangle\langle\, \pi_j \mid n \,\rangle \tag{12}$$

makes it possible to rewrite the prospect probabilities as

$$p(\pi_j) = \sum_{mn} \rho_{mn} P_{nm}(\pi_j) \; . \tag{13}$$

To really represent probabilities, the above quantities are to be normalized so that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} p(\pi_j) = 1 \; . \tag{14}$$

Since the statistical operator, by definition, is a positive operator, we have

$$0 \leq p(\pi_j) \leq 1 \; . \tag{15}$$

This defines the collection $\{p(\pi_j)\}$ as a probability measure. The most favorable prospect corresponds to the largest of the probabilities.

Let us introduce the *utility factor*

$$f(\pi_j) \equiv \sum_n \rho_{nn} P_{nn}(\pi_j) \tag{16}$$

and the *attraction factor*

$$q(\pi_j) \equiv \sum_{m \neq n} \rho_{mn} P_{nm}(\pi_j) \; , \tag{17}$$

whose meanings will be explained below. Then, separating the diagonal and non-diagonal terms in the sum over m and n, we obtain the probability of a prospect π_j as the sum

$$p(\pi_j) = f(\pi_j) + q(\pi_j) \tag{18}$$

of the above two factors.

Though some intermediate steps of the theory might look a bit complicated, the final result is rather simple and can be straightforwardly used in practice, provided the way of evaluating the utility and attraction factors are known.

3.5 Utility factors and correspondence with classical utility theory

As is known (Neumann, 1955), the expectation values of observables in quantum theory can be separated in two terms, one having a diagonal representation over the chosen basis and another being off-diagonal in this representation. The diagonal part corresponds to the classical value of the observable, while the off-diagonal part characterizes purely quantum effects caused by interference. The same holds in our case, where the prospect probability (8) is defined as the expectation value of the prospect operator. The diagonal part is the utility factor (16) describing the weight of the prospect calculated classically. To be defined as a weight, the set of these factors is to be normalized as

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} f(\pi_j) = 1 \; , \tag{19}$$

from where one has

$$0 \leq f(\pi_j) \leq 1 \; , \tag{20}$$

since, by definition (16), the factor is non-negative.

In classical decision theory, the choice of a decision maker is based on the notion of expected utility. One considers a set of measurable payoffs $\{x_i\}$ associated with the related probabilities $p_j(x_i)$ whose family forms a probability measure with the standard properties

$$\sum_i \; p_j(x_i) = 1 \; , \qquad 0 \leq p_j(x_i) \leq 1 \; .$$

A prospect π_j is represented by a lottery

$$\pi_j \equiv \{x_i \; , p_j(x_i) : \; i = 1, 2, \ldots\} \; . \tag{21}$$

Linear combinations of lotteries are defined as

$$\sum_j \lambda_j \pi_j = \left\{ x_i \; , \; \sum_j \lambda_j p_j(x_i) \right\} \; ,$$

with the constants λ_j such that

$$\sum_j \lambda_j = 1 \; , \qquad 0 \leq \lambda_j \leq 1 \; .$$

Introducing a utility function $u(x)$, which is defined as a non-decreasing and concave function, one constructs the expected utility

$$U(\pi_j) = \sum_i u(x_i) p_j(x_i) \; . \tag{22}$$

As quantum decision theory is a more general theory than classical utility theory, it is desirable to formulate a correspondence such that the predictions of quantum decision theory

would reduce to those of classical decision theory in some limit to be defined. For this, since quantum decision theory is intrinsically probabilistic, while classical decision theory is deterministic (the prospect with the largest expected utility is assumed to be chosen with certainty), we need to first generalize the classical utility theory to endow it with a probabilistic skin, which itself could be reduced to the deterministic form of utility theory under appropriate conditions. Then, the correspondence between quantum decision theory and classical utility theory could be formulated via the probabilistic extension of the latter. In essence, when decoherence occurs, the attraction factors in quantum decision theory tend to zero and the prospect probabilities should tend to the utility factor of the probabilistic version of classical decision theory. The utility factor is interpreted as the probability of having the given utility. Note that several variants of such a probabilistic reformulation of classical utility theory have been considered (Luce, 1958; Marschinski et al., 2007; Cadogan, 2011) by postulating the Boltzmann distribution of prospects. The latter, however, does not satisfy the necessary boundary condition requiring that the prospect of zero utility should have zero weight:

$$f(\pi_j) \rightarrow 0 \qquad (U(\pi_j) \rightarrow 0) \; . \tag{23}$$

Here, we show how the correct form of the utility factor can be derived.

The most general way of deriving distributions is suggested by the principle of minimal information allowing one to define the most accurate distribution form, given a number of known constraints or facts, under the condition of assuming the minimum amount of additional structures in the absence of other information on the system. The relevant tool is thus to minimize the Kullback-Leibler information function in the presence of the constraints. The necessary first step in this procedure is the definition of a representative statistical ensemble, taking into account all conditions that uniquely characterize the considered statistical system (Yukalov, 2007).

In the probabilistic formulation of utility theory, the prospects π_j are treated as random events. Then, the prospect lattice (3) plays the role of the field of these random events. As a consequence, the expected utility $U(\pi_j)$ is also interpreted as a random quantity, which, for concreteness, is assumed to be non-negative. Therefore, there should exist a probability measure describing the distribution of the expected utilities.

The corresponding probability $f(\pi_j)$ of a prospect π_j is to be normalized according to (19). We also impose that the average of the random expected utilities should exit, giving the total utility

$$\sum_j U(\pi_j) f(\pi_j) = U \; . \tag{24}$$

Imposing that the average utility exists as a given value U means that the decision maker is operating under the hope of keeping his/her level of satisfaction constant. This is close in spirit to the notion of "satisficing" introduced by Simon (1956), in which a person stops searching and optimizing when a sufficient level of utility is reached.

The prospect that yields the maximal utility,

$$U(\pi_{max}) \equiv \max_j U(\pi_j) \; , \tag{25}$$

plays a special role for the decision maker. In the deterministic version of classical utility theory, it is the chosen prospect, with certainty. This suggests to normalize the utilities of each prospect by this value taken as a reference. We thus introduce a kind of likelihood function

$$f_0(\pi_j) = C\ \frac{U(\pi_j)}{U(\pi_{max})}\ , \tag{26}$$

where C is a normalization coefficient. This function quantifies the relative value of each expected utility in units of the maximal utility value taken as the natural reference. Here, we capture the fact that typical decision makers ponder their options in relative terms.

Then, the utility factor $f(\pi_j)$ should be such as obeying the conditions (19) and (24) and being as close as possible to the reference likelihood function $f_0(\pi_j)$ defined by expression (26). For this, we use the distance measure or relative information between $f(\pi_j)$ and $f_0(\pi_j)$

$$\sum_j f(\pi_j) \ln\ \frac{f(\pi_j)}{f_0(\pi_j)}\ , \tag{27}$$

introduced by Kullback and Leibler (1951, 1959). Note that expression (27) tends to zero as $f(\pi_j) \rightarrow f_0(\pi_j)$.

The representative statistical ensemble is the pair $\{\mathcal{L}, f(\pi_j)\}$ of the field of events, that is, of random prospects, and of the prospect distribution $f(\pi_j)$, under conditions (19) and (24), with the Kullback-Leibler relative information (27). The corresponding information functional reads as

$$I[f(\pi_j)] = \sum_j f(\pi_j)\ \ln\ \frac{f(\pi_j)}{f_0(\pi_j)} +$$

$$+ \lambda \left[\sum_j f(\pi_j) - 1 \right] - \beta \left[\sum_j f(\pi_j) U(\pi_j) - U \right]\ , \tag{28}$$

where λ and β are Lagrange multipliers.

Minimizing the information functional (28) yields the distribution

$$f(\pi_j) = \frac{U(\pi_j)}{Z}\ \exp\{\beta U(\pi_j)\}\ , \tag{29}$$

with the normalization factor

$$Z = \sum_j U(\pi_j) \exp\{\beta U(\pi_j)\}\ .$$

The parameter β can be called the *confidence*, or *belief*, or *certainty parameter*, since it characterizes how confident is the choice of the prospect lattice. Requiring that $f(\pi_j)$ would increase together with $U(\pi_j)$ implies that the confidence parameter is to be non-negative: $\beta \geq 0$. We stress that the utility factor is a normalized function of the expected utility, but not the utility itself. This function increases together with the utility.

In the limiting case of absolute certainty, when $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, we return to the completely deterministic choice of the prospect with the maximal expected utility, as specified by classical utility theory:

$$f(\pi_j) = \begin{cases} 1, & \pi_j = \pi_{max} \\ 0, & \pi_j \neq \pi_{max} \end{cases} \qquad (\beta \rightarrow \infty) \; .$$

And in the case of the completely uncertain choice of prospects, when $\beta = 0$, we come to the form of the utility factor

$$f(\pi_j) = \frac{U(\pi_j)}{\sum_j U(\pi_j)} \; . \tag{30}$$

It is worth emphasizing that the utility factor (29) satisfies the necessary limiting condition (23), telling that the weight (or probability to be chosen) of a prospect having no utility is zero.

The parameter β constitutes an important ingredient in the formulation of a probabilistic version of utility theory. We expect it to be individual-dependent. What quantum decision theory adds is the existence of coherence and interference between prospects, which are quantified by the attraction factors.

In summary, quantum decision theory reduces to the probabilistic version of utility theory specified in terms of the utility factors (29) in the absence of coherence and interference effects. These utility factors (29) give the probability that a prospect, with a given expected utility, is chosen. And our probabilistic version of utility theory reduces to the classical deterministic utility theory when the belief factor β tends to infinity. This concludes the construction of the correspondence between classical utility theory and quantum decision theory.

3.6 Attraction factors

The off-diagonal term in the expectation value (9) is the attraction factor (17) representing quantum interference, or coherence, effects. In QDT, the attraction factor is a contextual object describing subconscious feelings, emotions, and biases, playing the role of hidden variables. Despite their contextuality, the attraction factors satisfy some general properties that make possible their quantitative evaluation.

In view of normalizations (14) and (19), the attraction factors satisfy the *alternation property*, such that the sum

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} q(\pi_j) = 0 \tag{31}$$

over the prospect lattice $\mathcal{L}$ is always zero, and the values of the attraction factor are in the range

$$-1 \leq q(\pi_j) \leq 1 \; . \tag{32}$$

In addition, the average absolute value of the attraction factor is estimated (Yukalov and

Sornette, 2009b, 2011) by the *quarter law*

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N} \mid q(\pi_j) \mid = \frac{1}{4} \; . \tag{33}$$

These properties allow us to *quantitatively* define the prospect probabilities (18).

We may note that the attraction factor exists only for composite prospects, composed of several actions, while for elementary prospects this term is zero. This is easy to show as follows. Let e_j be an elementary prospect corresponding to a state $|j\rangle$, hence $\langle n|j\rangle = \delta_{nj}$. The related prospect operator $\hat{P}(e_j)$ is defined in Eq. (6). Then the prospect probability (13) reduces to

$$p(e_j) = \sum_{mn} \rho_{mn}\delta_{mj}\delta_{nj} = \rho_{jj} \; ,$$

and the attraction factor is zero:

$$q(e_j) = 0 \; .$$

In this way, there exists a direct general relation between Quantum Decision Theory and classical decision theory, based on the maximization of expected utility. Classical decision theory is retrieved when the attraction factor is zero. The form of the utility factor (30) shows that, in this situation, maximizing the expected utility is equivalent to maximizing the utility factor. Thus, classical decision theory is a particular case of the more general QDT in the case when only objective information on the decision utility is taken into account, while subjective sides, such as biases, emotions, and subconscious feelings play no role. The latter variables do play a very important role in decision making performed in many important and practical situations. Our approach takes into account both the objective utility of considered prospects as well as their subjective attractiveness for the decision maker.

Let us briefly summarize. As we said, the attraction factor in QDT appears naturally in order to account for subconscious feelings, emotions, and biases. Despite the fact that the attraction factor is contextual, it satisfies three pivotal general properties: (i) an attraction factor varies in the interval $[-1, 1]$; (ii) the sum of all attraction factors over the lattice of considered prospects is zero; (iii) the average absolute value of an attraction factor is 0.25. These properties make it possible to give a *quantitative* evaluation of prospect probabilities and, thus, to develop a practical way of applying QDT to realistic problems of decision making.

3.7 Prospect ordering

Since the prospect probability (18) consists of two terms, we should consider both of them, when comparing the probabilities of different prospects. That is, we have to compare the usefulness as well as attractiveness of the prospects.

The usefulness of prospects is measured by the utility factor. The prospect π_1 is more useful than π_2, when

$$f(\pi_1) > f(\pi_2) \; . \tag{34}$$

The prospects π_1 and π_2 are equally useful, if

$$f(\pi_1) = f(\pi_2) \ . \tag{35}$$

And the prospect π_1 is not less useful (more useful or equally useful) than π_2, if

$$f(\pi_1) \geq f(\pi_2) \ . \tag{36}$$

The attractiveness of prospects is characterized by their attraction factors. The prospect π_1 is more attractive than π_2, if

$$q(\pi_1) > q(\pi_2) \ . \tag{37}$$

The prospects π_1 and π_2 are equally attractive, when

$$q(\pi_1) = q(\pi_2) \ . \tag{38}$$

And the prospect π_1 is not less attractive (more attractive or equally attractive) than π_2, when

$$q(\pi_1) \geq q(\pi_2) \ . \tag{39}$$

The comparison between the attractiveness of prospects can be done on the basis of the *aversion to uncertainty and risk* or *ambiguity aversion* (Rothschild and Stiglitz, 1970; Gollier, 2001; Sornette, 2003; Malvergne and Sornette, 2006; Abdellaoui et al., 2011a; 2011b; Yukalov and Sornette, 2011).

For example, a prospect is more attractive when:

(i) it provides more certain gain (more uncertain loss).

(ii) it promotes to be active under certainty (passive under uncertainty).

The total evaluation of prospects that finally influences the decision maker choice is based on the prospect probabilities. The prospect π_1 is preferable to π_2, if

$$p(\pi_1) > p(\pi_2) \ . \tag{40}$$

The prospects π_1 and π_2 are indifferent, when

$$p(\pi_1) = p(\pi_2) \ . \tag{41}$$

And the prospect π_1 is preferable or indifferent to π_2, if

$$p(\pi_1) \geq p(\pi_2) \ . \tag{42}$$

The classification of prospects of a set $\mathcal{L}$ as more or less preferable establishes an order in $\mathcal{L}$ making this ordered set a *lattice*. Among all prospects, there exists the least preferable prospect with the minimal probability, and the most preferable prospect with the largest probability. Hence, the prospect lattice $\mathcal{L}$ is *complete*. The lattice is also *transitive* since, if π_1 is preferable to π_2, with π_2 being preferable to π_3, then π_1 is preferable to π_3.

Decision makers may choose the most preferable prospect, whose probability is the largest. Such a prospect is called *optimal*. The prospect π_* is optimal if and only if

$$p(\pi_*) = \max_j p(\pi_j) \; . \tag{43}$$

In the presence of two criteria characterizing each prospect, a given prospect can be more useful, while being less attractive, or vice-versa. As a consequence, there are situations where the ordering of classical utility theory is inverted, so that the less useful though more attractive prospect is preferred, having the largest probability. This important fact can be formalized by the following statement.

Proposition 1. *The prospect π_1 is preferable to π_2 if and only if*

$$f(\pi_1) - f(\pi_2) > q(\pi_2) - q(\pi_1) \; . \tag{44}$$

Proof: It follows from the comparison of the prospect probabilities (18) for π_1 and π_2.

This inequality provides an explanation for the appearance of paradoxes in classical decision making as resulting from the role of the attraction factor representing the interference between prospects caused by behavioral biases. It is remarkable that this simple idea seems to be sufficient to remove the empirical paradoxes and make QDT consistent with the decisions made by real human beings. The existence of the attraction factor is due to the presence of risk and uncertainty associated with the choices to be made.

3.8 Binary lattice

A situation that is very often considered in empirical research consists in choosing between two prospects, which corresponds to a binary lattice

$$\mathcal{L} = \{\pi_1 \, , \pi_2\} \; . \tag{45}$$

This case is sufficient to clearly illustrate the above general considerations.

For a binary lattice, we have

$$p(\pi_1) = f(\pi_1) + q(\pi_1) \; , \qquad p(\pi_2) = f(\pi_2) + q(\pi_2) \; . \tag{46}$$

The normalization (19) reads as

$$f(\pi_1) + f(\pi_2) = 1 \; , \tag{47}$$

and the alternation property (31) becomes

$$q(\pi_1) + q(\pi_2) = 0 \; . \tag{48}$$

If the considered two prospects are equally attractive, which implies $q(\pi_1) = q(\pi_2)$, then, according to (48), we get $q(\pi_1) = q(\pi_2) = 0$. Therefore, the prospect probabilities coincide with their utility factors, $p(\pi_1) = f(\pi_1)$ and $p(\pi_2) = f(\pi_2)$. In such a situation, we return to the standard decision making recipe based on the comparison between the prospect utilities.

But when the prospects are not equally attractive, say π_1 is more attractive than π_2, that is, $q(\pi_1) > q(\pi_2)$, then the alternation property (48) yields

$$q(\pi_1) = -q(\pi_2) > 0 \; .$$

This allows one to make accurate predictions of the choice of real human beings who have to choose an optimal prospect.

3.9 Individual decisions

Suppose that a decision maker has to choose between several prospects. Let he/she be assumed to make a decision sufficiently quickly, with no consultations with other members of society, and without getting additional information from other sources. This kind of decision making can be termed *individual* or *spontaneous*. Such a setup is typical of the majority of experimental observations, where different paradoxes have been documented.

In the case of this spontaneous decision making, it is possible to quantitatively predict typical decisions and, respectively, to explain the occurrence of characteristic paradoxes. This can be done as follows. Let us consider a binary lattice of prospects. Assume that, according to the risk-uncertainty aversion formulated above, the prospect π_1 is more attractive than π_2, hence

$$q(\pi_1) > q(\pi_2) \; .$$

It is possible to estimate the attraction factors by their mean values, as explained above, evaluating $q(\pi_1)$ as equal to $1/4$ and $q(\pi_2)$ as given by $-1/4$. At the same time, the probability belongs to the interval $[0, 1]$. To take this into account, it is convenient to invoke the function, called *retract*, such that

$$\mathrm{Ret}_{[a,b]}\{z\} = \begin{cases} a \; , & z \leq a \\ z \; , & a < z < b \\ b \; , & z \geq b \end{cases} \; .$$

Then the prospect probabilities (46) can be represented as

$$p(\pi_1) = \mathrm{Ret}_{[0,1]} \left\{ f(\pi_1) + \frac{1}{4} \right\} \; , \qquad p(\pi_2) = \mathrm{Ret}_{[0,1]} \left\{ f(\pi_2) - \frac{1}{4} \right\} \; . \tag{49}$$

Since, the utility factors are calculated by means of formula (30), one gets a quantitative estimate for the prospect probabilities, which makes it possible to choose the preferable prospect.

Proposition 2. *Let the prospect π_1 from a binary prospect lattice be more attractive than π_2 and let the prospect probabilities be evaluated by expressions (49), then π_1 is preferable over π_2 when the utility factor of π_1 is such that*

$$f(\pi_1) > \frac{1}{4} \qquad (\pi_1 > \pi_2) \; . \tag{50}$$

Respectively, the prospects are indifferent, if $f(\pi_1) = 1/4$ and the prospect π_2 is preferable, if $f(\pi_1) < 1/4$.

Proof: It follows from expressions (49) and the condition that the prospect π_1 is more attractive than π_2, so that $q(\pi_1) > q(\pi_2)$.

3.10 Comparison with empirical observations

Strictly speaking, being defined to reflect subjective factors embodying subconscious feelings, emotions, and biases, the attraction factors are contextual. This means that their values can be different for different decision makers. Moreover, they can be different for the same decision maker at different times. These features seem to be natural when one keeps in mind that we are describing real humans, whose decisions are usually different, even under identical conditions. It is also known that the same decision maker can vary his/her decisions at different times and under different circumstances. However, focusing solely on the contextual character of the interference terms, gives the wrong impression of a lack of predictive power of the approach, which would make it rather meaningless.

Fortunately, there is a way around the problem of contextuality, based on the fact that QDT has been constructed as a probabilistic theory, with the probabilities interpreted in the frequentist sense. This is equivalent to saying that QDT is a theory of the aggregate behavior of a population. In other words, the predictions of the theory are statistical statements concerning the population of individualistic behaviors, namely, QDT provides the probability for a given individual to take this or that decision, interpreted in the sense of the fraction of individuals taking these decisions.

The prospect probabilities, calculated in the frame of QDT, can be compared with the results of experimental tests. In experiments, one usually interrogates a pool of M decision makers, asking them to choose a prospect from the given prospect set $\{\pi_j\}$. Different decision makers, of course, can classify as optimal different prospects. Since the utility factor is an objective quantity, we assume that it is the same for all decision makers. The difference between the decisions of the pool members happens because the attraction factors, being subjective quantities, can be different for different decision makers. Here, we thus do not need to invoke random utilities and heterogeneous expectations in the objective utility factor (Cohen, 1980; McFadden and Richter, 1991; Clark, 1995; Regenwetter, 2001). The heterogeneity or differences between different decision makers appears due to the presence of the attraction factor that embodies different states of minds among the human population, and as a function of context and time.

The experimental probability that a prospect π_j is chosen can be defined as a frequency in the following way. Let M_j agents from the total number M of decision makers choose the prospect π_j. Then, assuming a large number of agents, the aggregate probability of this prospect is given by the frequency

$$p_{exp}(\pi_j) = \frac{M_j}{M} \; . \tag{51}$$

This experimental probability is to be compared with the theoretical prospect probability $p(\pi_j)$, using the standard tools of statistical hypothesis testing.

It is also possible to define the aggregate value of the attraction factor by the equation

$$q(\pi_j) = p_{exp}(\pi_j) - f(\pi_j) \tag{52}$$

and to compare this with the mean values $\pm 1/4$.

In this way, QDT provides a practical scheme that can be applied to realistic problems for various kinds of decision making in psychology, economics, finance, and other cases, when behavioral effects are important.

As an illustration, we have applied this theory to several examples in which the disjunction effect occurs. The latter is specified by Savage (1954) as a violation of the sure-thing principle. A typical setup for illustrating the disjunction effect is a two-step gamble (Tversky and Shafir, 1992). Suppose that a group of people accepted a gamble in which the player can either win an amount of money or lose a possibly different amount. After the first gamble, the participants are invited to gamble a second time, being free to either accept the second gamble or to refuse it. Experiments by Tversky and Shafir (1992) showed that the majority of people accept the second gamble when they know the result of the first gamble, whatever its result, whether they won or lost in the previous gamble, but only a minority accepted the second gamble when the outcome of the first gamble was unknown to them.

Another example, studied by Tversky and Shafir (1992), had to do with a group of students who reported their preferences about buying a nonrefundable vacation, following a tough university test. They could pass the exam or fail. The students had to decide whether they would go on vacation or abstain. It turned out that the majority of students purchased the vacation when they passed the exam as well as when they had failed. However, only a minority of participants purchased the vacation when they did not know the results of the examination.

Another example of the disjunction effect concerns stock markets, as analyzed by Shafir and Tversky (1992). Consider the USA presidential election, when either a Republican or a Democrat wins. On the eve of the election, market players can either sell certain stocks from their portfolio or hold them. It is known that a majority of people would be inclined to sell their stocks, if they would know who wins, regardless of whether the Republican or Democrat candidate wins the upcoming election. This is because people expect the market to fall after the elections. At the same time, a great many people do not sell their stocks before knowing who really won the election, thus contradicting the sure-thing principle. Thus, investors could have sold their stocks before the election at a higher price, but, abiding to the disjunction effect, they were waiting until after the election to know its result, thereby selling sub-optimally at a lower price after stocks have already fallen.

We have presented a detailed analysis of the above experiments (Yukalov and Sornette, 2009b; 2011). The absolute value of the aggregate attraction factor (52) was found, within the typical statistical error of the order of 20% characterizing these experiments, to coincide with the predicted value 0.25.

Another known paradox in classical decision making is the conjunction error. A typical situation is when people judge about a person, who can possess one characteristic and also some other characteristics, as in the often-cited example of Tversky and Kahneman (1980): Linda is 31 years old, single, outspoken, and very bright. She majored in philosophy. As a student, she was deeply concerned with issues of discrimination and social justice, and also participated in anti-nuclear demonstrations. Which is more likely? (i) Linda is a bank teller; (ii) Linda is a bank teller and is active in the feminist movement. Most people answer (ii) which is an example of the conjunction fallacy.

There are many other examples of the conjunction fallacy. For a quantitative analysis,

we have taken the data from Shafir et al. (1990), who present one of the most carefully accomplished and thoroughly discussed set of experiments on the conjunction fallacy. Again, we found (Yukalov and Sornette, 2009b; 2011) that the value of the aggregate attraction factor, within the experimental accuracy of 20%, coincides with 0.25, in excellent agreement with the QDT quarter law.

The planning paradox has also found a natural explanation within QDT (Yukalov and Sornette, 2009a). Moreover, it has been shown (Yukalov and Sornette, 2010b) that QDT explains practically all typical paradoxes of classical decision making, arising when decisions are taken by separate individuals.

4 Influence of information obtained through social interactions

The standard setup displaying the paradoxes in classical decision making corresponds to *individual* decision makers that take decisions without consulting each other. As has been mentioned in the Introduction, in a number of experimental studies, it has been found that exchange of information through consultations sharply reduces errors in decision making compared with the prescription of classical utility theory. For instance, the errors in the disjunction effect and conjunction fallacy strongly decrease, when group members get information by learning from their experience (Kühberger et al., 2001) or exchange information by consulting (Charness et al., 2010).

The theory developed in the previous sections has been formulated for a decision maker that is a member of a society. An individual decision maker is just a particular instance for the application of the theory. The suggested general approach can also be applied to the case of a decision maker interacting with other members of the society and receiving information from them, which may change his/her preferences and decrease the errors typical of individual decision makers. A decision maker, receiving information from the surrounding members of his/her society, can be called a *learning decision maker*.

4.1 Learning decision maker

Let us denote by μ a measurable amount of information received by a decision maker from the surrounding society. The amount of information can be measured by invoking some of the known information measures (Khinchin, 1957; Arndt, 2004). For instance, information can be represented in the form of a Kullback-Leibler information functional over a set of given facts. The information can be received through direct interactions, that is, consultations with other members of the society. Or each member of the society can receive information by learning the results of other agents activity. Thus, the aggregate trades of agents in a market produce the data characterizing this market that is then available to all and mediates the indirect interactions between them. Learning these data gives information to each of the traders (Barber et al., 2009).

If each member of the society gets the same amount of information μ, the state of each member changes, hence the state of the society also varies depending on the amount of this

additional information. The statistical state, characterizing the society, is now a function $\hat{\rho}_{AB}(\mu)$, which is normalized as

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{AB}\hat{\rho}_{AB}(\mu) = 1 \; . \tag{53}$$

We then follow a procedure similar to that described in Section 3. The prospect probability is defined as before by

$$p(\pi_j, \mu) \equiv \mathrm{Tr}_{AB}\hat{\rho}_{AB}(\mu)\hat{P}(\pi_j) \; , \tag{54}$$

with the difference that we have now an additional variable μ characterizing the amount of additional information. By convention, if the latter is set to zero, we return to the same formulas as those presented in Section 3. Since the prospect operators act on the space of mind $\mathcal{H}_A$, by defining the reduced statistical operator

$$\hat{\rho}_A(\mu) \equiv \mathrm{Tr}_B\hat{\rho}_{AB}(\mu) \; , \tag{55}$$

the prospect probability takes the form

$$p(\pi_j, \mu) \equiv \mathrm{Tr}_A\hat{\rho}_A(\mu)\hat{P}(\pi_j) \; . \tag{56}$$

And in the matrix representation, we get

$$p(\pi_j, \mu) = \sum_{mn} \rho_{mn}(\mu) P_{nm}(\pi_j) \; , \tag{57}$$

with the notation

$$\rho_{mn}(\mu) \equiv \langle \, m | \, \hat{\rho}_A(\mu) \, | n \, \rangle \tag{58}$$

and the normalization condition

$$\mathrm{Tr}_A\hat{\rho}_A(\mu) = \sum_n \rho_{nn}(\mu) = 1 \; . \tag{59}$$

Let us introduce the evolution operator $\hat{U}(\mu)$ that describes the evolution of the system state under the varying amount of additional information μ. The initial state, before the information exchange starts, is

$$\hat{\rho}_{AB}(0) = \hat{\rho}_{AB} \; , \tag{60}$$

and corresponds to the situation when decision makers were still separate non-interacting individuals.

The transformation resulting from the interactions between decision makers can be represented as

$$\hat{\rho}_{AB}(\mu) = \hat{U}(\mu)\hat{\rho}_{AB}\hat{U}^{+}(\mu) \; . \tag{61}$$

To satisfy the initial condition (60), it is necessary that the initial value of the evolution operator $\hat{U}(0)$ be the identity operator $\hat{1}_{AB}$ acting on $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$:

$$\hat{U}(0) = \hat{1}_{AB} \; . \tag{62}$$

In order for the normalization condition (53) to be valid for all μ, the evolution operator has to be unitary such that

$$\hat{U}^{+}(\mu)\hat{U}(\mu) = \hat{1}_{AB} \; . \tag{63}$$

Assuming that $\hat{U}(\mu)$ is continuous with respect to μ, differentiating condition (63), applying the operator $\hat{U}(\mu)$ and using again (63) gives

$$\frac{d\hat{U}(\mu)}{d\mu} + \hat{U}(\mu)\,\frac{d\hat{U}^{+}(\mu)}{d\mu}\,\hat{U}(\mu) = 0\;. \tag{64}$$

This equation for a unitary operator $\hat{U}(\mu)$ can be rewritten as

$$i\,\frac{d\hat{U}(\mu)}{d\mu} = \hat{H}_{AB}\hat{U}(\mu)\;, \tag{65}$$

where H_{AB} is called the *evolution generator*, which is a self-adjoint operator on $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$ assumed to be invariant with respect to μ. Equation (65) yields the evolution operator

$$\hat{U}(\mu) = \exp\left(-i\hat{H}_{AB}\mu\right)\;. \tag{66}$$

This evolution operator, in view of Eq. (61), defines the variation of the total state of the society under the varying amount of information μ.

4.2 Decision maker as a personality

The interaction of the decision maker with his/her social environment is supposed to ensure that he/she keeps his/her distinct identity and personality while, at the same time, possibly changing his/her state of mind. In other words, the surrounding society does influence the decision maker state, but does so in a way that does not suppress him/her as a person taking his/her own decisions. In modeling terms, this corresponds to the behavior of a subsystem that is part of a larger system that changes the subsystem properties, while the subsystem is not destroyed and retains its typical features. Such a subsystem is called *quasi-isolated* (Yukalov, 2011, 2012a). Another correspondence is the influence exerted on a finite system by an external measuring device that acts so as not to destroy the main system features, a situation referred to as *nondestructive measurements* (Yukalov, 2012b). In mathematical language, these properties are formulated as follows.

Reflecting the fact that the total system, that is considered, consists of the decision maker, his/her surrounding society, and their mutual interactions, the evolution generator $\hat{H}_{AB}$ is represented as a sum of the corresponding three terms

$$\hat{H}_{AB} = \hat{H}_A + \hat{H}_B + \hat{H}_{int}\;. \tag{67}$$

The first term characterizes the decision maker, which implies that the operator $\hat{H}_A$ generates the space of mind $\mathcal{H}_A$ by defining the basis of elementary prospects that are typical of the decision maker, through the eigenvalue problem

$$\hat{H}_A \mid n \,\rangle = E_n \mid n \,\rangle\;, \tag{68}$$

with the span over the basis yielding the space of mind (1). The second term, acting on the space $\mathcal{H}_B$, describes the surrounding society. And the third term, acting on the total space

$\mathcal{H}_{AB}$, corresponds to the interaction of the decision maker with his/her social environment, associated with the process of information flow.

As mentioned above, the interaction of the decision maker with his/her social environment is supposed to ensure that the decision maker keeps his/her identity and personality, although possibly changing his/her state of mind. In mathematical language, this is formulated as the following commutativity property

$$\left[\hat{H}_A,\ \hat{H}_{int}\right] = 0 \ , \tag{69}$$

where $[a, b] \equiv ab - ba$. This property, in combination with (67), is equivalent to the commutativity condition

$$\left[\hat{H}_A,\ \hat{H}_{AB}\right] = 0 \ . \tag{70}$$

Actually, these general properties are sufficient for characterizing the decision maker as a distinct personality, and more detailed structure of the evolution generators is not important.

Let the space $\mathcal{H}_B$ be generated by the generator $\hat{H}_B$ through the span over the basis formed by the eigenvectors given by the eigenproblem

$$\hat{H}_B \mid k \rangle = B_k \mid k \rangle \ . \tag{71}$$

In view of Eq. (69), there exists a set of real numbers $\{\beta_{nk}\}$ such that the interaction term satisfies the eigenproblem

$$\hat{H}_{int} \mid nk \rangle = \beta_{nk} \mid nk \rangle \ , \tag{72}$$

in which $|nk\rangle \equiv |n\rangle \otimes |k\rangle$ denotes the tensorial product between the eigenvectors $|n\rangle$ and $|k\rangle$. Then, the generator of the total system yields the eigenproblem

$$\hat{H}_{AB} \mid nk \rangle = (E_n + B_k + \beta_{nk}) \mid nk \rangle \ . \tag{73}$$

The above equations make it straightforward to derive the explicit expression for the prospect probability (57). For this purpose, let us introduce some convenient notations. We define the eigenvalue differences

$$\omega_{mn} = E_m - E_n \ , \qquad \varepsilon_{mnk} \equiv \beta_{mk} - \beta_{nk} \tag{74}$$

and the matrix elements

$$\overline{\rho}_{mn}(\mu) = \rho_{mn}(0) \exp(-i\omega_{mn}\mu) \ , \tag{75}$$

in which

$$\rho_{mn}(0) = \langle \ m \mid \hat{\rho}_A \mid n \ \rangle = \rho_{mn} \ .$$

We introduce the *effect density* describing the distribution of the impacts of the surrounding environment affecting the considered decision maker during the process characterizing the transfer of information:

$$g_{mn}(\varepsilon) \equiv \sum_k \ \frac{\langle \ mk \mid \hat{\rho}_{AB} \mid nk \ \rangle}{\langle \ m \mid \hat{\rho}_A \mid n \ \rangle} \ \delta(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_{mnk}) \ . \tag{76}$$

It is clear that the latter is normalized as

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} g_{mn}(\varepsilon)\, d\varepsilon = 1 \; . \tag{77}$$

The Fourier transform of the effect density gives the *decoherence factor*

$$D_{mn}(\mu) \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} g_{mn}(\varepsilon) e^{-i\varepsilon\mu}\, d\varepsilon \; . \tag{78}$$

Finally, we come to the prospect probability (57) represented as

$$p(\pi_j, \mu) = f(\pi_j) + q(\pi_j, \mu) \; . \tag{79}$$

Here, the first term is the same utility factor as in Eq. (16). It does not depend on the received additional information, being assumed to be an objective invariant quantity. And the second term is the attraction factor as a function of the received information

$$q(\pi_j, \mu) = \sum_{m \neq n} \overline{\rho}_{mn}(\mu) P_{nm}(\pi_j) D_{mn}(\mu) \; . \tag{80}$$

Generally, the decoherence factor can depend on the indices m, n. For simplicity, it is possible, resorting to the theorem of average, to employ an averaged decoherence factor not depending on the indices, which reduces the attraction factor (80) to the form

$$q(\pi_j, \mu) = \overline{q}(\pi_j, \mu) D(\mu) \; ,$$

where

$$\overline{q}(\pi_j, \mu) \equiv \sum_{m \neq n} \overline{\rho}_{mn}(\mu) P_{nm}(\mu) \; .$$

Since the effect density is normalized as in Eq. (77), the decoherence factor $D(\mu)$, derived from the above use of the theorem of average, with (78), enjoys the property $D(0) = 1$. Therefore, at zero information, the attraction factor

$$q(\pi_j, 0) = q(\pi_j) \tag{81}$$

has the properties described in Section 3.6, and we return to the initial prospect probability

$$p(\pi_j, 0) = p(\pi_j) \; , \tag{82}$$

defined by Eq. (18).

Thus, we see that the absolute value of the attraction factor essentially depends on the value of the decoherence factor (78).

4.3 Attraction factor attenuation

If the surrounding society does not influence the decision maker, the effect density is given by the delta function $\delta(\varepsilon)$. Then, the decoherence factor is constant: $D(\mu) = 1$. That is, we always have the same expression of the prospect probability as in Eq. (18), which is quite clear, since getting no additional information does not change the preferences of the decision maker.

The nontrivial situation is when the decision maker consults with other members of the society, acquiring additional information. Interactions of the decision maker with the society can be of different types, which defines particular forms of the effect density.

If the number of the members in the society is large, and they act on the decision maker independently, then, by the central limit theorem, the effect density can be modeled by a Gaussian

$$g(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\,\gamma}\,\exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\gamma^2}\right)\;, \tag{83}$$

where γ is the variance of the impacts from different members of the society. Respectively, the decoherence factor (78) is also a Gaussian

$$D(\mu) = exp\left(-\frac{\mu^2}{2\mu_c^2}\right) \qquad \left(\mu_c \equiv \frac{1}{\gamma}\right)\;, \tag{84}$$

diminishing with the increasing amount of information. Thence, the attraction factor (80) decreases with increasing μ, which implies the decrease of deviations from the classical decision making and the attenuation of the related paradoxes, as has been observed in experiments with social groups (Charness et al., 2010). The characteristic critical decoherence information μ_c is smaller for larger variance of the impacts, when there are many society members with different properties.

When the society members are not independent, the effect density can differ from the Gaussian form. For example, it can be given by the Lorentz distribution

$$g(\varepsilon) = \frac{\gamma}{\pi(\varepsilon^2 + \gamma^2)}\;. \tag{85}$$

As a result, the decoherence factor is exponential:

$$D(\mu) = \exp(-\gamma\mu)\;. \tag{86}$$

If the effect density is represented by the Poisson distribution

$$g(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{2\gamma}\,\exp\left(-\frac{|\varepsilon|}{\gamma}\right)\;, \tag{87}$$

the decoherence factor is of the power law form:

$$D(\mu) = \frac{1}{1 + (\gamma\mu)^2}\;. \tag{88}$$

When the society influence is described by a uniform distribution on the bounded interval $[-\gamma, +\gamma]$,

$$g(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{2\gamma}\Theta(\gamma - \varepsilon)\Theta(\gamma + \varepsilon) \; , \tag{89}$$

where $\Theta(\cdot)$ is a unit-step function, then the decoherence factor decays with oscillations as

$$D(\mu) = \frac{\sin(\gamma\mu)}{\gamma\mu} \; . \tag{90}$$

These examples can be generalized by showing that, typically, the decoherence factor asymptotically diminishes with increasing information, which leads to a decreasing attraction factor and a convergence of the prospect probability to the classical form characterized by the utility factor. This is summarized by the following theorem.

Proposition 3. *Let the effect density $g(\varepsilon)$ be a measurable function. Then, the prospect probability $p(\pi_j, \mu)$, under asymptotically large amount of information μ, tends to the classical form represented by the utility factor $f(\pi_j)$:*

$$\lim_{\mu\rightarrow\infty} p(\pi_j, \mu) = f(\pi_j) \; . \tag{91}$$

Proof: Suppose the effect density $g(\varepsilon)$ is measurable, hence being not of the delta-function type. By definition (77), it is L^1-integrable. Therefore, by the Riemann-Lebesgue lemma (Bochner and Chandrasekharan, 1949), the decoherence factor (78) tends to zero for asymptotically large μ:

$$\lim_{\mu\rightarrow\infty} D(\mu) = 0 \; . \tag{92}$$

Consequently, because of relation (80), the attraction factor also tends to zero:

$$\lim_{\mu\rightarrow\infty} q(\pi_j, \mu) = 0 \; . \tag{93}$$

Then, from Eq. (79) it follows that the prospect probability reduces to the classical utility factor, as is stated in Eq. (91).

4.4 Conjunction fallacy disappearance

Charness et al. (2010) accomplished a series of experiments designed to test whether and to what extent individuals succumb to the conjunction fallacy. They used an experimental design of Tversky and Kahneman (1983) and found that, when subjects are allowed to consult with other subjects, the proportions of individuals who violate the conjunction principle fall dramatically, particularly when the size of the group rises. It has also been found that financial incentives for providing the correct answer are effective in inducing individuals to make efforts to find the correct answer. When individuals are forced to think, they recover in their minds additional information that has been forgotten or shadowed by emotions. The amount of received information increases with the size of the group. As a result, there is a substantially larger drop in the error rate when the group size is increased from two to three

than when it is increased from one to two (Charness et al., 2007a; 2010). These findings confirm the earlier studies by Sutter (2005), who finds only a marginal difference between the choices of individuals and two-person groups, but a significant difference between the choices of two-person and four-person groups in an experimental guessing game. In any event, the effects of group interaction are not proportional to group size. In other words, the error attenuation decays faster than the inverse information, which is compatible with the decoherence factors of the Gaussian (78) or exponential (80) forms. In order to determine the exact form of the error attenuation, it would be necessary to perform a number of experiments in which the group size or the amount of received information would be varied over significantly larger intervals than done until now.

In the experiment by Charness et al. (2010), with groups of three members, the fraction of individuals giving incorrect answers dropped to 0.17. It would be interesting to study how the errors would diminish with further increase of the number of the consulting decision makers. It is clear that the error should not disappear completely, since the amount of received information is never actually infinite. However, there exists a critical amount of information, when the error could be neglected. This critical value would also be interesting to find experimentally.

5 Conclusion

We have considered the role of information received by decision makers, when the agents interact with each other by increasing the amount of their mutual information. For this purpose, we have generalized the quantum decision theory (QDT), developed earlier for individual decision makers (Yukalov and Sornette, 2008, 2009a,b,c, 2010a,b, 2011), to the case of decision makers that are members of a society. Mathematically, this corresponds to replacing the description of strategic states of decision makers from wave functions to statistical operators. In QDT, a choice is made by choosing the prospect that corresponds to the largest probability, each prospect probability consisting of two terms, a utility factor and an attraction factor. The utility factor characterizes the objective utility of prospects, while the attraction factor represents subjective feelings, emotions, and biases. Setting the attraction factor to zero reduces QDT to the classical decision making based on the maximization of expected utility, albeit within a probabilistic framework. So, classical decision theory is a particular case of QDT. Real decision makers depart from the predictions of classical utility theory, which does not take account of the attraction factor, leading to a variety of paradoxes. But in QDT, all those paradoxes find simple and natural explanations, since the theory accounts for the decisions of real human beings.

At an initial stage, when the decision makers of a given society have not had yet sufficient time for mutual interactions to increase their information, the attraction factor, quantifying the deviations from classical decision theory, is crucially important. Its aggregate absolute value is about 0.25 on a maximum scale of 0 to 1 for the choice probabilities. It is therefore highly significant. The occurrence of the attraction factor is due to the interference of prospects in the decision maker brains. Since, in quantum theory, interference is necessarily connected with coherence, it is possible to say that the decision maker is in a coherent state.

However, the level of this coherence, and the value of the attraction factor, essentially depend on the amount of information available to a decision maker. If, in the process of mutual interactions between the members of the society, the amount of information of a decision maker increases, then the attraction factor diminishes. This can be called the decoherence process. Respectively, the prospect probabilities tend to their classical values represented by the utility factors. This rationalizes experimental findings showing that the deviations from classical decision making decrease when agents make decisions after receiving additional information, for instance, by consulting with each other (Charness et al., 2010; Sung and Choi, 2012; Schultze et al., 2012).

It is possible to imagine a situation where a decision maker receives wrong, that is negative, information from the society members, for instance when cheating on this particular individual. In that case, the attraction factor could increase, hence, the deviations from classical decision making would rise. It would be interesting to perform such experiments with decision makers getting wrong or misleading information to calibrate better the effect density functions that are central to QDT for interacting individuals.

We would like to stress that the central point distinguishing our approach from the classical decision theory is the possibility of taking into account subjective degrees of freedom of decision makers, such as subconscious feelings and behavioral biases. Mathematically, this is achieved by employing the techniques of quantum theory for defining the probabilities of prospects. This definition results in the appearance of quantum effects, such as interference, coherence, and decoherence, modeling subconscious feelings and biases. Recall that in the interpretation of quantum theory there exists the explanation of its statistical properties as due to hidden variables. The standard techniques of quantum theory avoid directly dealing with these variables, nevertheless effectively taking them into account. The same concerns the application of quantum techniques to decision making. Using quantum techniques allows us to effectively take into account such hidden variables as subconscious feeling and biases, at the same time avoiding their direct description. Briefly speaking, the subjective feelings and biases are the hidden variables of quantum decision theory, which are treated by the techniques of quantum theory. As a result, in quantum decision theory, there appear two characteristics, the utility factor and the attraction factor. The first is an objective characteristic uniquely defined by the utility of the considered prospects. And the attraction factor describes the subjective attitude of decision makers to the prospects. Generally, being a subjective characteristic, the attraction factor is a random quantity. However, the employed quantum rules allow us to find the typical value of this factor, as is explained in Sec. 3.6. The knowledge of this expected typical value makes it possible to make quantitative predictions for the decision maker choices.

The mathematical techniques, we have used, may be not customary for scholars in social sciences. Therefore, to clearly state the content of this work, we list the concrete questions posed in the present paper and the related given answers.

- *Question*: Why is it necessary to develop a novel approach in decision making, generalizing the expected utility theory?

  Answer: Classical utility theory does not take into account behavioral biases, which leads to numerous paradoxes in decision making.

- *Question*: Does quantum decision theory remove the paradoxes of classical decision making by individual decision makers and, if so, why?

  Answer: Quantum decision theory removes the paradoxes of classical decision theory by individual decision makers by taking into account behavioral biases.

- *Question*: When does quantum decision theory reduce to the classical decision theory based on the notion of expected utility?

  Answer: Neglecting behavioral biases reduces quantum decision theory to the classical decision theory.

- *Question*: Is it possible to give quantitative predictions in quantum decision theory and, if so, do they agree with empirical observations?

  Answer: Quantum decision theory does give quantitative predictions that are in excellent agreement with empirical observations.

- *Question*: Why is it necessary to consider decision makers as members of a society?

  Answer: In a society, decision makers interact with each other, varying by this their available information.

- *Question*: How does the amount of available information influence the decisions of social agents?

  Answer: Increasing the amount of information reduces the role of behavioral biases.

- *Question*: Does the reduction of behavioral biases with information increase correspond to empirical observations?

  Answer: The reduction of behavioral biases with information increase is in agreement with empirical observations, explaining the experimentally studied effects of error attenuation, e.g., in disjunction effect and conjunction fallacy.

We claim that our approach of developing a "quantum decision theory" is of a radically different type from the previous works referring to the use of quantum methods in cognitive sciences, in the sense that we do not fine-tune a model or borrow by analogy some quantum mechanical formalism to a specific decision making experiment, as often done in this literature. In contrast, we have proposed a general formalism, based on the mathematics of Hilbert spaces that applies to any decision making situation. We stress it that the use of Hilbert spaces is the only main link with quantum mechanics we employ for the underlying mathematical generalization of classical probabilities. Actually, except the functional analysis in the Hilbert spaces, we do not involve other techniques of quantum theory and our approach does not need and does not touch at all those questionable problems of quantum theory interpretations.

One should not confuse the mathematical techniques we employ for calculation purpose and the problems of interpretation concerning physical effects that we do not touch and that have nothing to do with the aim of our approach.

In our previous papers, we have shown how our approach explains the main paradoxes and fallacies of decision theory, such as Allais paradox, the conjunction fallacy, the disjunction effect, and many more, without adjustable parameters. We have also predicted new effects that makes the theory falsifiable.

We would like to emphasize that our approach, not merely qualitatively explains numerous paradoxes in decision theory, but, as we have shown, provides quantitative predictions.

Summarizing, we would like to stress again the basic difference of our approach, as compared to all previous works on this topic: (i) we use only the mathematical techniques of Hilbert spaces, but do not invoke other physics postulates from quantum theory; (ii) we do not need to touch the interpretation problems of quantum mechanics that have nothing to do with our theory; (iii) our approach is principally different from all previously published works, being general and providing quantitative predictions.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge financial support from the Swiss National Science Foundation. Useful discussions with E.P. Yukalova are appreciated.

References

Abdellaoui, M., Baillon, A., Placido, L., Wakker, P.P. (2011a). The rich domain of uncertainty: source functions and their experimental implementation. *American Economic Review*, 101, 695–723.

Abdellaoui, M., Driouchi, A., L' Haridon, O. (2011b). Risk aversion elicitation: reconciling tractability and bias minimization. *Theory and Decision*, 71, 63–80.

Aerts, D., Aerts, S. (1994). Applications of quantum statistics in psychological studies of decision processes. *Foundation of Science*, 1, 85–97.

Aliev, R.A., Petrycz, W., Huseynov, O.H. (2012). Decision theory with imperfect probabilities. *International Journal of Information Technology and Decision Making*, 11, 271–306.

Allais, M. (1953). Le comportement de l'homme rationnel devant le risque: critique des postulats et axiomes de l'ecole Americaine. *Econometrica*, 21, 503–546.

Al-Najjar, N.I., Weinstein, J. (2009). The ambiguity aversion literature: a critical assessment. *Economics and Philosophy*, 25, 249–284.

Ariely, D. (2008). *Predictably Irrational*. Harper: New York.

Arndt, C. (2004). *Information Measures*. Springer: Berlin.

Arrow, K.J. (1971). *Essays in the Theory of Risk Bearing*. Markham: Chicago.

Baaquie, B.E. (2004). *Quantum Finance*. Cambridge University: Cambridge.

Baaquie, B.E. (2009). *Interest Rates and Coupon Bonds in Quantum Finance*. Cambridge University: Cambridge.

Bagarello, F. (2009). A quantum statistical approach to simplified stock markets. *Physica A*, 388, 4397–4406.

Barber, B.M., Odean, T., Zhu, N. (2009). Systematic noise. *Journal of Financial Markets*, 12, 547–569.

Barra, A., Agliari, E. (2012). A statistical mechanics approach to Granovetter theory. *Physica A*, 391, 3017–3026.

Barra, A., Contucci, P. (2010). Toward a quantitative approach to migrants social interactions. *Europhysics Letters*, 89, 68001.

Bather, J. (2000). *Decision Theory*. Wiley: Chichester.

Berger, J.O. (1985). *Statistical Decision Theory and Bayesian Analysis*. Springer: New York.

Bernoulli, D. (1738). Exposition of a new theory on the measurement of risk. *Proceedings of Imperial Academy of Sciences of St. Petersburg*, 5, 175–192. Reprinted in (1954), *Econometrica*, 22, 23–36.

Blinder, A., Morgan, J. (2005). Are two heads better than one? An experimental analysis of

group versus individual decision-making. *Journal of Money and Credit Banking*, 37, 789–811.

Bochner, S., Chandrasekharan, K. (1949). *Fourier Transforms*. Princeton University: Princeton.

Bohr, N. (1933). Light and life. *Nature*, 131, 421–423, 457–459.

Bohr, N. (1958). *Atomic Physics and Human Knowledge*. Wiley: New York.

Brock, W.A., Durlauf, S.N. (2001). Discrete choice with social interactions. *Review of Economic Studies*, 68, 235–260.

Buchanan, J.T. (1982). *Discrete and Dynamic Decision Analysis*. Wiley: Chichester.

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

Cadogan, G. (2011). The source of uncertainty in probabilistic preferences over gambles. http://ssrn.com/abstract=1971954.

Camerer, C.F., Loewenstein, G., Rabin, R. (Eds.) (2003). *Advances in Behavioral Economics*. Princeton University: Princeton.

Charness, G., Rabin, M. (2002). Understanding social preferences with simple tests. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117, 817–869.

Charness, G., Karni, E., Levin, D. (2007a). Individual and group decision making under risk: An experimental study of Bayesian updating and violations of first-order stochastic dominance. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 35, 129–148.

Charness, G., Rigotti, L., Rustichini, A. (2007b). Individual behavior and group membership. *American Economic Review*, 97, 1340–1352.

Charness, G., Karni, E., Levin, D. (2010). On the conjunction fallacy in probability judgement: new experimental evidence regarding Linda. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 68, 551–556.

Chen, Y., Li, S. (2009). Group identity and social preferences. *American Economic Review*, 99, 431–457.

Chew, S. (1983). A generalization of the quasilinear mean with applications to the measurement of income inequality and decision theory resolving the Allais paradox. *Econometrica*, 51, 1065–1092.

Chew, S., Epstein, L., Segal, U. (1991). Mixture symmetry and quadratic utility. *Econometrica*, 59, 139–163.

Cialdini, R.B. (2001). The science of persuasion. *Scientific American*, 284, 76–81.

Clark, S.A. (1995). The random utility model with an infinite choice space. *Economic Theory*, 7, 179–189.

Cohen, M.A. (1980). Random utility systems - the infinite case. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 22, 1–23.

Coleman, A.J., Yukalov, V.I. (2000). *Reduced Density Matrices*. Springer: Berlin.

Contucci, P., Gallo, I., Menconi, G. (2008). Phase transitions in social sciences: two-populations mean-field theory. *International Journal of Modern Physics B*, 22, 2199–2212.

Cooper, D., Kagel, J. (2005). Are two heads better than one? Team versus individual play in signaling games. *American Economic Review*, 95, 477–509.

Dakic, B., Suvakov, M., Paterek, T., Brukner, C. (2008). Efficient hidden-variable simulation of measurements in quantum experiments. *Physical Review Letters*, 101, 190402.

Durlauf, S.N. (1999). How can statistical mechanics contribute to social science? *Proceedings of National Academy of Sciences of USA*, 96, 10582–10584.

Edwards, W. (1955). The prediction of decision among bets. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 50, 200–204.

Edwards, W. (1962). Subjective probabilities inferred from decisions. *Psychological Review*, 69, 109–135.

Eisert, J., Wilkens, M. (2000). Quantum games. *Journal of Modern Optics*, 47, 2543–2556.

Ellsberg, D. (1961). Risk, ambiguity, and the Savage axioms. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 75, 643–669.

Fehr, E., Rangel, A. (2011). Neuroeconomic foundations of economic choice: recent advances. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 25, 3–30.

French, S., Insua, D.R. (2000). *Statistical Decision Theory*. Arnold: London.

Friedman, M., Savage, L. (1948). The utility analysis of choices involving risk. *Journal of Political Economy*, 56, 279–304.

Gollier, G. (2001). *Economics of Risk and Time*. MIT: Cambridge.

Green J., Jullien, B. (1988). Ordinal independence in nonlinear utility theory. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 1, 355–387.

Guo, H., Zhang, J., Koehler, G.J. (2008). A survey of quantum games. *Decision Supporting Systems*, 46, 318–332.

Hastings, N.A., Mello, J.M. (1978). *Decision Networks*. Wiley: Chichester.

Hey, J. (1984). The economics of optimism and pessimism: a definition and some applications. *Kyklos*, 37, 181–205.

Kahneman, D., Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: an analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47, 263–291.

Karmarkar, U. (1978). Subjectively weighted utility: a descriptive extension of the expected utility model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 21, 61–72.

Karmarkar, U. (1979). Subjectively weighted utility and the Allais paradox. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 24, 67–72.

Keyl, M. (2002). Fundamentals of quantum information theory. *Physics Reports*, 369, 431–548.

Khinchin, A.I. (1957). *Mathematical Foundations of Information Theory*. Dover: New York.

Kitto, K. (2009). Science and subjectivity. *Literary Parintantra*, 1, 18–28.

Kühberger, A., Komunska, D., Perner, J. (2001). The disjunction effect: does it exist for two-step gambles? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 85, 250–264.

Kullback, S., Leibler, R.A. (1951). On information and sufficiency. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 22, 79–86.

Kullback, S. (1959). *Information Theory and Statistics*. Wiley: New York.

Kydland, F.E., Prescott, E.C. (1977). Rules rather than discretion: the inconsistency of optimal plans. *Journal of Political Economy*, 85, 473–492.

Lambert-Mogiliansky, A., Zamir, S., Zwirn, H. (2009). Type indeterminacy: A model of the Kahneman-Tversky man. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 53, 349–361.

Landsburg, S.E. (2004). Quantum game theory. *American Mathematical Society*, 51, 394–399.

Leaw J.N., Cheong, S.A. (2010). Strategic insights from playing quantum tic-tac-toe. *Journal of Physics A*, 43, 455304.

Lindgren, B.W. (1971). *Elements of Decision Theory*. Macmillan: New York.

Loewenstein, G., Rick, S., Cohen, J.D. (2008). Neuroeconomics. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59, 647–672.

Loomes, G., Sugden, R. (1982). Regret theory: an alternative theory of rational choice under uncertainty. *Economical Journal*, 92, 805–824.

Luce, R.D. (1958). A probabilistic theory of utility. *Econometrica*, 26, 193–224.

Machina, M.J. (2008). Non-expected utility theory. In: *New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*. Durlauf, S.N., Blume, L.E. (Eds.), Macmillan: New York.

Malevergne, Y., Sornette, D. (2006). *Extreme Financial Risks*. Springer: Heidelberg.

Markovitz, H. (1952). The utility of wealth. *Journal of Political Economy*, 60, 151–158.

Marshall, K.T., Oliver, R.M. (1995). *Decision Making and Forecasting*. McGraw-Hill: New York.

Marschinski, R., Rossi, P., Tavoni, M., Cocco, F. (2007). Portfolio selection with probabilistic utility. *Annals of Operations Research*, 151, 223–239.

McCaffery, E.J., Baron, J. (2006). Isolation effects and the neglect of indirect effects of fiscal policies. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 19, 289–302.

McFadden, D., Richter, M. (1991). Revealed stochastic preference. In: *Preferences, Uncertainty and Optimality*. Chipman, J.S., McFadden, D., Richter, M.K. (Eds.), Westview Press: Boulder.

Neumann, J. von (1955). *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*. Princeton University: Princeton.

Neumann, J. von, Morgenstern, O. (1953). *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*. Princeton University: Princeton.

Nielsen, M.A., Chuang, I.L. (2000). *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University: New York.

Pothos, E.M., Busemeyer, J.R. (2010). A quantum probability explanation for violations of rational decision theory. *Proceedings of Royal Society B*, 276, 2171–2178.

Pratt, J.W. (1964). Risk aversion in the small and in the large. *Econometrica*, 32, 122–136.

Rabin, M. (2000). Risk aversion and expected-utility theory: a calibration theorem. *Econometrica*, 68, 1281–1292.

Raiffa, H., Schlaifer, R. (2000). *Applied Statistical Decision Theory*. Wiley: New York.

Regenwetter, M., Marley, A.A.J. (2001). Random relations, random utilities and random functions. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 45, 864–912.

Rivett, P. (1980). *Model Building for Decision Analysis*. Wiley: Chichester.

Rothschild, M., Stiglitz, J. (1970). Increasing risk: a definition. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 2, 225–243.

Rothschild, M., Stiglitz, J. (1971). Increasing risk: its economic consequences. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 3, 66–84.

Safra, Z., Segal, U. (2008). Calibration results for non-expected utility theories. *Econometrica*, 76, 1143–1166.

Savage, L.J. (1954). *The Foundations of Statistics*. Wiley: New York.

Schultze, T., Mojzisch, A., Schulz-Hardt, S. (2012). Why groups perform better than individuals at quantitative judgement tasks. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 118, 24–36.

Seetharaman, P.B. (2003). Probabilistic versus random-utility models of state. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 20, 87–96.

Segal, W., Segal, I.E. (1998). The Black-Scholes pricing formula in the quantum context. *Proceedings of National Academy of Sciences of USA*, 95, 4072–4075.

Shafir, E.B., Smith, E.E., Osherson, D.N. (1990). Typicality and reasoning fallacies. *Memory and Cognition*, 18, 229–239.

Shafir, E., Tversky, A. (1992). Thinking through uncertainty: Nonconsequential reasoning and choice. *Cognitive Psychology*, 24, 449–474.

Shi, Y. (2009). Current research trend: information technology and decision making. *International Journal of Information Technology and Decision Making*, 8, 1–5.

Simon, H.A. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*,

69, 99–118.

Simon, H.A. (1956). Rational choice and the structure of the environment. *Psychological Review* 63, 129–138.

Sornette, D. (2003). *Why Stock Markets Crash*. Princeton University: Princeton.

Strotz, R.H. (1955). Myopia and inconsistency in dynamic utility maximization. *Review of Economic Studies*, 23, 165–180.

Sung, S.Y., Choi, J.N. (2012). Effects of team management on creativity and financial performance of organizational teams. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 118, 4–13.

Sutter, M. (2005). Are four heads better than two? An experimental beauty-contest game with teams of different size. *Economic Letters*, 88, 41–46.

Tapia Garcia, J.M., Del Moral, M.J., Martinez, M.A., Herrera-Viedma, E. (2012). A consensus model for group decision-making problems with interval fuzzy preference relations. *International Journal of Information Technology and Decision Making*, 11, 709–725.

Tversky, A., Kahneman, D. (1980). Judgements of and by representativeness. In: *Judgements Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases*. Kahneman, D., Slovic, P., Tversky, A. (Eds.), Cambridge University: New York, p. 84–98.

Tversky, A., Kahneman, D. (1983). Extensional versus intuitive reasoning: the conjunction fallacy in probability judgement. *Psychological Review*, 90, 293–315.

Tversky, A., Shafir, E. (1992). The disjunction effect in choice under uncertainty. *Psychological Science*, 3, 305–309.

Weirich, P. (2001). *Decision Space*. Cambridge University: Cambridge.

West, B.J., Grigolini, P. (2010). A psychophysical model of decision making. *Physica A*, 389, 3580–3587.

White, D.I. (1976). *Fundamentals of Decision Theory*. Elsevier: New York.

Williams, C.P., Clearwater, S.H. (1998). *Explorations in Quantum Computing*. Springer: New York.

Xu, Z. (2011). Approaches to multi-stage multi-attribute group decision making. *International Journal of Information Technology and Decision Making*, 10, 121–146.

Yaari, M. (1987). The dual theory of choice under risk. *Econometrica*, 55, 95–115.

Yukalov, V.I. (2002). Stochastic instability of quasi-isolated systems. *Physical Review E*, 65, 056118.

Yukalov, V.I. (2003a). Irreversibility of time for quasi-isolated systems. *Physics Letters A*, 308, 313–318.

Yukalov, V.I. (2003b). Expansion exponents for nonequilibrium systems. *Physica A*, 320, 149–168.

Yukalov, V.I. (2007). Representative ensembles in statistical mechanics. *International Journal of Modern Physics*, 21, 69–86.

Yukalov, V.I. (2011). Equilibration and thermalization in finite quantum systems. *Laser Physics Letters*, 8, 485–507.

Yukalov, V.I. (2012a). Equilibration of quasi-isolated quantum systems. *Physics Letters A*, 376, 550–554.

Yukalov, V.I. (2012b). Decoherence and equilibration under nondestructive measurements. *Annals of Physics (N.Y.)*, 327, 253–263.

Yukalov, V.I., Sornette, D. (2008). Quantum decision theory as quantum theory of measurement. *Physics Letters A*, 372, 6867–6871.

Yukalov, V.I., Sornette, D. (2009a). Physics of risk and uncertainty in quantum decision making. *European Physical Journal B*, 71, 533–548.

Yukalov, V.I., Sornette, D. (2009b). Processing information in quantum decision theory. *Entropy*, 11, 1073–1120.

Yukalov, V.I., Sornette, D. (2009c). Scheme of thinking quantum systems. *Laser Physics Letters*, 6, 833–839.

Yukalov, V.I., Sornette, D. (2010a). Entanglement production in quantum decision making. *Physics of Atomic Nuclei*, 73, 559–562.

Yukalov, V.I., Sornette, D. (2010b). Mathematical structure of quantum decision theory. *Advances in Complex Systems*, 13, 659–698.

Yukalov, V.I., Sornette, D. (2011). Decision theory with prospect interference and entanglement. *Theory and Decision*, 70, 283–328.

Yukalov,V.I. Sornette, D. (2013). Quantum probabilities of composite events in quantum measurements with multimode states. *Laser Physics*, 23, 105502.

Zabaleta, O.G., Arizmendi, C.M. (2010). Quantum dating market. *Physica A*, 389, 2858–2863.