Quantum Social Science
Volume 1, Issue 1, 2025, Page 1-69
https://doi.org/10.6914/qss.010101

Quantum Social Science

Quantum Probability Theory and Social Behavior Modeling: From Axioms to Applications

Changkui LI

Creative Publishing Co., Limited

Abstract
Quantum probability theory, originally developed in the context of quantum mechanics, has increasingly been applied to social sciences to explain decision-making, cognition, and collective behavior. Unlike classical probability models, which assume pre-existing and well-defined preferences, quantum models incorporate superposition, interference, and non-commu tativity to capture the contextual dependence and measurement effects observed in human decisions. This paper systematically explores the theoretical foundations of quantum probability in social sciences, discusses model construction techniques, and reviews empirical findings supporting its application. By examining case studies in quantum cognition, quantum game theory, and quantum voting, we illustrate how quantum approaches provide alternative explanations for phenomena such as order effects, measurement-induced attitude shifts, and collective polarization. The paper also discusses the methodological challenges and limitations of quantum social science, emphasizing the need for rigorous experimental validation and interdisciplinary collaboration. Finally, we highlight the potential for integrating quantum probability models with emerging technologies such as quantum computing and artificial intelligence, opening new avenues for social science research and policy applications.

Keywords Quantum probability; quantum cognition; quantum decision theory; interference effects; order effects; non-commutativity; social behavior modeling; quantum game theory; quantum voting; interdisciplinary applications; measurement-induced attitude shifts

1 Introduction

1.1 Research Background and Problem Statement

1.1.1 Limitations of Traditional Decision Theories and Classical Probability in the Social Sciences

Since the emergence of Expected Utility Theory proposed by John von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern, the "rational agent" assumption has long been a cornerstone in economics, political science, and other social science disciplines. Under this theoretical framework, decision-makers are assumed to be perfectly rational and fully capable of processing information, with their decisions formulated through classical probability-based models. However, in real social environments, which are rife with uncertainty and constant change, individuals and organizations rarely exhibit strictly "rational" behavior.

From the perspective of psychology and behavioral economics, Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky have demonstrated through extensive experiments that humans exhibit systematic biases when facing risk and uncertainty. Phenomena such as loss aversion, anchoring effects, and framing effects indicate that decisions are not simply linear weightings of objective probabilities but are shaped by contextual, emotional, and cognitive cues. Classical probability assumes events to be independent and additive, while social decision-making often shows strong order effects, reference dependence, or rapid subjective shifts in judgment. Under these complexities, traditional models often fall short in both explanatory and predictive power.

In sociology and political science, researchers frequently employ classical probabilistic methods to forecast group intentions or social dynamics. However, when the analysis involves multi-group interactions, collective identity, or surging public opinion, group sentiments and cognitive states are rarely independent; they can interfere with or reinforce one another. Therefore, outcomes derived from classical probability-based approaches may significantly deviate from observed social realities. Consequently, new methodological frameworks are urgently needed within the social sciences—ones that are more flexible and can capture dynamic interactions and interdependencies.

1.1.2 The Rise of Quantum Probability and Its Intersection with Social Science

Quantum probability was originally formulated within the theoretical framework of quantum mechanics to address uncertainty and superposition states that arise during measurements of microscopic particles. In contrast to classical probability, quantum probability treats events as potentially non-independent, determined by the "quantum state" of the system. Features such as state superposition and post-measurement collapse underpin a novel perspective on system behavior. The key insight for social science is that an individual's (or group's) "psychological state" or "decision inclination" may not be a fixed entity but instead reside in a more ambiguous, indeterminate, or even superimposed state. Only upon measurement—in other words, when external factors prompt a decision—does the state collapse into a specific choice.

Quantum cognition and quantum decision theories extend quantum probabilistic concepts into the study of human cognition and behavior, focusing on how contextual dependence, interference effects, and order effects can explain experimental results that are inexplicable within classical frameworks. Some scholars argue that a quantum probability model more naturally captures the relationship between the "potential" of mental states and the "observed" outcomes. This approach could help elucidate why "measurement processes" (such as survey questions or situational cues) themselves shift attitudes and preferences. While these insights need rigorous testing, they offer a potentially transformative framework for social science research.

Parallel to this, quantum game theory brings quantum mechanics concepts such as superposition and entanglement into strategic contexts, expanding the strategy space beyond classical dichotomies like "cooperate vs. defect" or "vote vs. abstain." Though much of this work remains theoretical, it has profound implications for social cooperation, conflict resolution, and macroeconomic mechanisms. Particularly for multi-agent environments with asymmetric information and evolving orders of play, quantum interference models may capture behavioral nuances overlooked by classical game theory.

In short, quantum probability intersects with social sciences at the point of "non-classical probability phenomena," offering a refined lens for representing human cognition, contextual influences, and the dynamic interplay of multiple agents. This synergy has the potential to provide innovative tools for understanding complex social behaviors and interactions.

1.2 Research Significance

1.2.1 Exploring the Potential Advantages of Quantum Probability in Social Behavior Modeling

Quantum probability theory displays unique strengths in characterizing uncertainty and system evolution. It may be particularly well-suited for tackling well-known problems in the social sciences, such as contextual dependence, measurement sensitivity, and order effects. On one hand, superposition states in quantum probability can describe how individuals maintain multiple, sometimes conflicting, attitudes before making a definite choice; on the other hand, the inclusion of interference terms can account for the contextual interplay that shapes the decision process. By employing quantum probability, social scientists may construct models that better align with actual human thinking, striking a more effective balance between predictive power and explanatory richness.

For instance, in public policy analysis, conventional policy-evaluation models typically assume that citizens or stakeholders hold stable and clearly measurable attitudes toward a particular policy. Yet, for many public issues—such as environmental protection, welfare reform, and educational resource allocation—citizens may not have well-defined positions. Instead, they often form their attitudes upon receiving specific information or being asked for an opinion. Quantum probability frameworks can potentially describe such latent "superposed states" that collapse into one defined response upon "measurement," providing a plausible account for rapid shifts in public attitudes.

1.2.2 Identifying the Insights of Quantum Probability Models for Understanding Complex Human Decisions and Behaviors

For decades, researchers in the social sciences have sought models that integrate rational and non-rational elements, as well as static and dynamic perspectives. By incorporating unique attributes from quantum probability such as interference and state collapse, quantum decision models offer a path to capturing the nuanced ways that people might navigate multiple mental pathways before settling on a decision under particular contexts.

This perspective is equally impactful for studying group behaviors and social interactions. Public opinion often exhibits large-scale swings, with attitudes coalescing or fracturing rapidly in response to sudden events or media coverage. Employing quantum probability concepts such as entanglement and interference might yield deeper insights into how one group' s stance influences another' s, shedding light on synchronized or resonant effects. In short, quantum probability models could significantly deepen our theoretical and practical understanding of how collective behaviors emerge and evolve, both at micro (individual) and macro (societal) levels.

1.3 Literature Review

1.3.1 Constraints of Classical Probability and Expected Utility Theory in Social Science Applications

Expected Utility Theory holds a venerable position in early economic research, admired for its elegant approach to describing decision-making. However, phenomena such as the Allais Paradox and the Ellsberg Paradox have cast doubt on its universal applicability. Prospect Theory, proposed by Kahneman and Tversky, modifies the utility function and includes probability weighting to account for individuals' differing sensitivities to gains and losses as well as their aversion to ambiguity. Despite these advancements, Prospect Theory still rests on a classical probability framework where additivity and independence assumptions remain largely intact. As a result, it struggles to fully capture decision-making in multi-stage or multi-agent contexts.

In political science, sociology, and management research, classical probability models face similar shortcomings. They typically assume that an individual' s or group' s attitude is pre-established and can be reliably "measured." Yet, empirical studies show that people' s responses vary widely due to questionnaire ordering, linguistic framing, environmental cues, and other contextual factors. Such "contextual effects" suggest that the stable, separable distributions assumed by classical probability may not hold for multi-faceted, real-world social decision-making processes.

1.3.2 Progress in Behavioral Economics and Cognitive Psychology on Non-Rational Decision-Making

Behavioral economics, led by pioneers like Kahneman and Tversky, has unveiled the systematic ways in which human decisions deviate from rational models. Individuals' judgments are heavily influenced by heuristics and biases, exhibiting asymmetric risk preferences when confronted with gains versus losses. This body of work has profoundly enriched the study of decision processes and spurred the growth of subfields such as behavioral finance and behavioral political science. Still, most research in these areas essentially "amends" rational models from within a classical probability framework, adding layers of empirical corrections to accommodate observed deviations.

Meanwhile, cognitive psychologists studying memory, information processing, and reasoning have discovered that consciousness is not a simple aggregator of external signals but a dynamic cognitive network. The order of questions, context changes, and previously activated cognitive nodes can all subtly alter subsequent judgments. Classical probability models often struggle to handle such "non-commutative measurements," revealing a critical theoretical gap.

1.3.3 Existing Achievements and Controversies in Quantum Cognition and Quantum Game Theory

In response to these challenges, quantum cognition research has gained momentum over the past two decades. Scholars such as Jerome Busemeyer and Peter Bruza have shown through experiments and mathematical modeling that quantum probability outperforms classical models in explaining certain phenomena that feature strong order effects or interference effects. For instance, in sequential questioning where respondents are asked multiple but interrelated questions, the order of questioning can drastically alter response distributions, which can be modeled by rotations and projections in quantum state vectors.

Quantum game theory, another emerging line of inquiry, has also generated interest. Researchers like Eisert and others have introduced superposition and entanglement into game strategies, allowing strategy spaces to expand beyond the simple classical "cooperate-defect" or "vote-abstain" framework. Though much of the work remains theoretical, it proposes the possibility of new equilibria and incentive structures. If validated in social contexts, such quantum-inspired formulations could offer fresh perspectives on how collective action and conflict are organized.

Nonetheless, quantum cognition and quantum game theory face ongoing debates. Some scholars question whether genuine physical "quantum states" or "entanglement" can truly exist in macro-level social systems. Even if the mathematical form of quantum models explains certain experiments more effectively, it does not necessarily confirm that the human brain or social groups operate in a genuinely "quantum" manner. Therefore, the broader value of quantum theory in social science lies in its provision of a more flexible and abstract probabilistic framework capable of capturing the interdependencies and measurement sensitivities that classical models often fail to address.

1.4 Article Structure

Building on the above context, this paper will systematically examine the relationship between quantum probability theory and social behavior modeling. The overall structure is organized as follows:

Section 2 introduces the core axioms and mathematical foundations of quantum probability, comparing these with the main features of classical probability theory. It also covers Hilbert space construction, measurement operators, and other key concepts.

Section 3 discusses the complexity and challenges of modeling social behavior, highlighting the difficulties faced by traditional frameworks and explaining the potential breakthroughs that quantum probability could offer.

Section 4 delves into the critical concepts of quantum probability within social behavior, including superposition, interference terms, non-commuting operators, and entanglement, clarifying their implications for human decisions and social interaction.

Section 5 focuses on building quantum probability models, illustrating multiple application scenarios such as quantum cognition, quantum game theory, and quantum voting models, thus demonstrating how to move "from axioms to applications."

Section 6 presents empirical studies and case analyses that explore the feasibility and limitations of quantum models in real-world social contexts.

Section 7 synthesizes the theoretical and empirical findings, discussing the overall value of quantum probability in social science research and assessing whether it complements or substitutes classical models.

Section 8 concludes the paper by summarizing the findings and looking ahead to future research directions, including cross-disciplinary collaborations and potential applications in public policy, risk management, and macro-level economic modeling.

Through this structure, the paper will comprehensively demonstrate the interdisciplinary logic between quantum probability theory and the social sciences, spanning theory to methodology, experiments to empirical validations. The overarching goal is to offer a novel yet robust framework for understanding human decision-making and social behavior. Quantum probability theory should be viewed not merely as a mathematical tool but as a broader, more inclusive paradigm capable of depicting the subtleties of dynamic cognition and non-rational behavior. This paradigm could ultimately allow researchers to re-examine the formation of social behaviors and the evolution of large-scale social dynamics from a fresh and potentially transformative perspective.

2 Foundations of Quantum Probability

Quantum probability theory emerged from the study of microscopic phenomena in quantum mechanics, yet its axiomatic structure and mathematical tools have proven to be remarkably versatile in modeling non-classical forms of uncertainty. In contrast to classical probability, which is grounded in the Kolmogorov axioms, quantum probability allows for concepts such as superposition, interference, and non-commuting observables. These distinctive features can capture a broader range of behaviors and paradoxes, making quantum probability a compelling framework for investigating intricate social phenomena. This section examines the core principles that differentiate quantum probability from classical approaches, highlighting key concepts and mathematical tools relevant to social behavior modeling.

2.1 Classical Probability vs. Quantum Probability

2.1.1 Kolmogorov Axioms and Their Application in the Social Sciences

Classical probability theory is fundamentally built on the axiomatic system formulated by Andrey Kolmogorov in 1933. This framework, often referred to simply as the Kolmogorov axioms, sets out how probabilities can be consistently assigned to events within a well-defined sample space. The principal components include:

- A sample space Ω that enumerates all possible outcomes.
- A σ-algebra $\mathcal{F}$ of subsets of Ω (the events).
- A probability measure P that assigns to each event $A \in \mathcal{F}$ a real number $P(A)$ satisfying $0 \leq P(A) \leq 1$ and $P(\Omega) = 1$.
- Additivity: If A and B are disjoint events, then $P(A \cup B) = P(A) + P(B)$.

Within the social sciences, these axioms have been deeply influential. They underpin everything from survey design (e.g., measuring the probability that a respondent will choose a certain option) to econometric models that predict market outcomes or voting behavior. Under classic assumptions, events are typically treated as if they occur independently or follow specific conditional relationships. For instance, in modeling public opinion, one might assume that a citizen' s stance on a policy is fixed, and that repeated measurements of this stance will merely converge on the "true" probability distribution.

However, empirical research reveals that many contextual and cognitive factors challenge the neat separability assumed by Kolmogorov' s framework. Order effects, framing effects, and context-dependent preferences illustrate how the probability of an outcome can shift when measured in different temporal or conceptual contexts. Classical additivity also implies a certain consistency: if events A and B represent two possible states of opinion, $P(A \cup B) = P(A) + P(B)$ if A and B are mutually exclusive. Yet in real decision-making scenarios, individuals may hold ambiguous, overlapping, or dynamically shifting attitudes, making it difficult to treat such events as disjoint in the classical sense.

Despite these shortcomings, Kolmogorov' s axioms remain a bedrock of quantitative research in the social sciences. They provide clear guidelines for designing experiments, collecting data, and performing statistical tests. To accommodate non-classical phenomena, researchers traditionally introduced more complicated structures (e.g., hierarchical or multi-layer models, Bayesian networks, or partially identifiable distributions) within the classical framework. While these adjustments have made classical probability models more flexible, they may not fully capture the interference-like behaviors observed in certain empirical studies of cognition and social interaction.

2.1.2 Quantum Probability Assumptions and Features: Superposition and Interference Terms

Quantum probability diverges from its classical counterpart by relaxing some fundamental assumptions of Kolmogorov's framework, especially those related to the commutativity of measurements and the independence of events. Instead of focusing on a static sample space of mutually exclusive outcomes, quantum probability describes the state of a system through a vector (or wavefunction) in an abstract Hilbert space. Two of the most striking features are:

Superposition: In quantum mechanics, a particle can exist in a superposition of distinct eigenstates. Translated into a social science context, superposition suggests that an individual's attitude or decision inclination need not be fully determined prior to measurement. Rather, multiple attitudinal states could coexist, and only when a measurement is performed (e.g., a survey question is asked or a choice is forced) does the state "collapse" into a specific outcome. This perspective aligns with the observation that individuals may not hold fixed opinions on many issues but instead form or solidify them in response to immediate contextual cues.

Interference: One of the hallmark phenomena in quantum probability is the presence of interference terms in the computation of joint or sequential events. In classical probability, if the probabilities of two events A and B are $P(A)$ and $P(B)$, one might consider $P(A \cup B) = P(A) + P(B) - P(A \cap B)$. In quantum theory, however, additional interference terms can arise due to the vector nature of probability amplitudes. This mathematical nuance can explain how asking one question about an individual's preference might alter the probability distribution of a subsequent question in ways that classical additivity cannot address. Context, timing, and framing thus become integral elements in shaping the measured probabilities of events.

By accommodating superposition and interference, quantum probability opens new pathways to modeling the complexity and plasticity of social behaviors. Rather than treating variations in responses solely as "noise" or "measurement error," a quantum perspective considers them integral features of a system whose state is not pinned down until observed. This mode of thinking not only enriches the theoretical landscape but also suggests novel experimental designs where the order, type, and nature of questions or stimuli materially affect the distribution of outcomes.

2.2 Core Concepts in Quantum Probability

2.2.1 Hilbert Space

The mathematical setting for quantum probability is typically a Hilbert space, a complete inner-product space that generalizes Euclidean space to potentially infinite dimensions. Each possible "state" of a system (be it a subatomic particle, a cognitive condition, or a social stance) can be represented as a vector $|\psi\rangle$ in this space. The dimensionality and basis of the Hilbert space reflect the different possible outcomes or eigenstates that the system can manifest.

In social science applications, a Hilbert space might encode various decision options (e.g., supporting Policy A, supporting Policy B, or remaining undecided). The notion of dimensionality can also expand to include multiple relevant attitudes. For example, if one wants to model individuals who simultaneously consider both environmental issues and economic benefits, a combined Hilbert space might be constructed by the tensor product of smaller spaces. This approach permits a nuanced modeling of multi-issue superposition and correlation that would be cumbersome under classical probability.

Beyond mere representational power, Hilbert spaces supply a rigorous mathematical framework for describing transformations between states, akin to unitary evolution in quantum mechanics. In a social science context, such transformations might represent changes in attitudes over time or shifts in focus caused by new information. Though one must be cautious in mapping physical quantum processes to social phenomena, the notion of a high-dimensional inner-product space offers a compelling alternative to the classical probability sample space.

2.2.2 State Vector and Projection Measurement

A state vector $|\psi\rangle$ in a Hilbert space encapsulates all the information about the system. When an observable (or measurement) is applied, the system's state "collapses" onto one of the eigenvectors corresponding to that observable. In quantum mechanics, this is typically described by the projection postulate: if $\{|\phi_i\rangle\}$ is the set of orthonormal eigenvectors of the measurement operator $\hat{M}$, then measuring $\hat{M}$ yields outcome i with probability.

The probability of obtaining outcome i is given by:

$$P(i) = \left|\langle\phi_i|\psi\rangle\right|^2 \tag{1}$$

The post-measurement state is:

$$|\psi'\rangle = \frac{\hat{P}_i|\psi\rangle}{\sqrt{\langle\psi|\hat{P}_i|\psi\rangle}} \tag{2}$$

where the projection operator onto the outcome i is defined as:

$$\hat{P}_i = |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i| \tag{3}$$

In a social setting, this formalism suggests that the act of questioning or forcing a decision can be seen as applying a measurement operator that projects a latent superposed attitude onto a specific choice. The probability amplitudes $\langle\phi_i|\psi\rangle$ correspond to how closely an individual' s current cognitive or attitudinal state aligns with each potential outcome. Moreover, repeated measurements can change the system' s state, reflecting how individuals may update or refine their preferences after each inquiry or experience. This dynamic property of measurement departs from classical frameworks, where a measurement is often assumed to merely "reveal" an already-existing preference.

2.2.3 Interference Effects and Non-Commuting Operators

In classical probability, the order in which events or measurements occur typically does not affect the final probabilities, assuming independence or well-defined conditional probabilities. By contrast, quantum probability imposes no requirement that distinct observables commute. Operators $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ are said to commute if $\hat{A}\hat{B} = \hat{B}\hat{A}$. When they do not commute, the order of measurement matters. This is directly related to the phenomenon of interference.

In a social experiment involving non-commuting operators, measuring one attribute of a participant (say, attitude toward a political candidate) before another attribute (say, stance on a hot-button policy issue) could produce different outcomes than if the order were reversed. This is because the initial measurement changes the system' s state in a way that influences the subsequent measurement distribution. Empirically, such effects are well-documented in survey research, where question order can shape how participants form or express their responses. Quantum probability provides a systematic way to encode and analyze these order effects without needing artificial corrections or additional parameters. Instead, non-commutativity is built into the structure of the model itself.

2.3 Quantum Measurement and Uncertainty

2.3.1 Measurement Collapse and Its Implications for Social Behavior Modeling

One of the most distinctive aspects of quantum mechanics—and by extension, quantum probability—is the postulate that a measurement "collapses" the wavefunction, forcing a superposed state into a specific eigenstate. In everyday social-science terms, this collapse can be thought of as how asking a question or compelling a decision effectively "forces" an individual to crystallize a latent, potentially ambiguous attitude into a concrete response.

The measurement process is not merely a passive observation but an active transformation of the system' s state. In classical probability models, we typically assume that an individual has a pre-existing preference distribution, and the measurement (e.g., a survey question) simply reveals that preference. Quantum theory, however, posits that the very act of measurement can alter the underlying state. This idea resonates with psychological and sociological theories suggesting that people construct opinions during the questioning process, rather than retrieving them from stable internal archives.

From a modeling perspective, measurement collapse implies that subsequent questions in the same survey or subsequent decisions in a policy context are made based on a newly updated state, which may differ significantly from the original. Such a dynamic model is particularly beneficial in understanding how public opinion can shift when new information or questions are introduced sequentially, an effect that might be masked or artificially constrained in a classical framework. While using quantum collapse to explain human cognition should be done with care, the conceptual parallel can help to better capture processes like preference construction, attitude polarization, and short-term memory effects.

2.3.2 Uncertainty Principle and Randomness in Human Decision-Making

The quantum mechanical uncertainty principle, often associated with Heisenberg’ s name, states that certain pairs of physical observables (like position and momentum) cannot be simultaneously measured or known with arbitrary precision. Translating this idea directly into social science is not straightforward; we do not typically speak of momentum or position in a social context. However, the deeper principle of non-commuting observables and the inherent limits on precise simultaneous knowledge can illuminate why certain cognitive or attitudinal dimensions cannot be pinned down at the same time.

For instance, if one attempts to measure both a person’ s immediate emotional reaction to an event and their long-term ideological stance, the act of focusing on the emotional response might change how they subsequently articulate their ideology. This interplay could be interpreted as a manifestation of a social or psychological “uncertainty relationship.” While it differs from the physical principle in quantum mechanics, the analogy can help account for the intrinsic variability observed when individuals confront overlapping or conflicting dimensions of a decision.

In addition, randomness in quantum mechanics arises not from ignorance about a hidden variable but from the fundamental indeterminacy of the system’ s state. Analogously, quantum-inspired decision models posit that at least a portion of human decision-making unpredictability is irreducible, reflecting genuine indeterminacy rather than mere lack of information. This perspective aligns with certain strands of psychology and neuroscience that emphasize the constructive and context-sensitive nature of cognition and perception.

2.4 Relevant Mathematical Tools and Proof Outlines

2.4.1 Bra-Ket Notation

One of the most recognizable features of quantum mechanics is the bra-ket notation introduced by Paul Dirac. A “ket” $|\psi\rangle$ represents a column vector in the Hilbert space, while a “bra” $\langle\phi|$ can be viewed as the corresponding row vector (or dual vector). Inner products are then denoted as $\langle\phi|\psi\rangle$, capturing the amplitude of transitioning from state $|\psi\rangle$ to $|\phi\rangle$.

In social science models, bra-ket notation can provide a succinct way to represent transformations of states (changes in attitude, shifts in preference), as well as to define measurement operators. Although originally designed for quantum physics, the notation’ s clarity and compactness make it appealing for researchers looking to define state vectors, projection operators, and unitary evolutions in a social or cognitive system. For instance, one might define a state ket $|\psi_{\text{voter}}\rangle$ to represent a voter’ s overall stance, with different projection operators for measuring opinions on various policies.

2.4.2 Quantum Amplitudes and Probabilities

Unlike classical models that work directly with probabilities (e.g., $P(A)$ for event A), quantum frameworks operate on probability amplitudes, which are complex numbers. The probability of observing a particular outcome is the squared modulus of the amplitude. For example, if $|\phi\rangle$ is an eigenstate associated with outcome ϕ, then the probability of observing that outcome from the current state $|\psi\rangle$ is:

$$P(\phi) = |\langle\phi|\psi\rangle|^2.$$

The introduction of complex amplitudes enables interference, since amplitudes can add and cancel out in ways not possible with non-negative real probabilities. In a survey setting, for instance, two different response paths might yield outcomes that interfere constructively (raising the measured probability) or destructively (lowering it), depending on the relative phases of the amplitudes. This mechanism offers a robust mathematical language for order effects and the context-dependence of decisions that are regularly observed in social research.

2.4.3 Typical Proof Approaches and Logical Reasoning

The axiomatic structure of quantum probability can be formalized to show that if certain assumptions about measurement and state spaces hold, then the Hilbert space formalism follows naturally. One common approach is to start with the idea of a field of events that does not necessarily satisfy the distributive law of Boolean algebra—reflecting the non-Boolean structure of quantum logic. This leads to orthomodular lattices, which in turn map onto Hilbert spaces under suitable conditions. For social scientists, these mathematical proofs underscore how relaxing certain classical assumptions about event structures can yield entirely different yet self-consistent probabilistic systems.

Another illustrative line of reasoning is the Gleason' s theorem, which states that any measure satisfying specific consistency requirements on projective measurements over a Hilbert space must take the form of the Born rule (i.e., probability $= |\langle\phi|\psi\rangle|^2$). Gleason' s theorem effectively secures the internal coherence of quantum probability. While it is deeply rooted in physics, the theorem also reassures researchers from other fields that quantum models are not ad hoc contrivances but arise from a tightly knit set of logical and mathematical constraints.

In sum, the mathematical toolkit of quantum probability—including bra-ket notation, complex amplitudes, projection operators, and non-commutative observables—offers a comprehensive framework that departs significantly from classical probability. By leveraging these tools, social scientists can model phenomena where attitudes are not fixed properties but dynamically emerge from interactions, measurements, and evolving contexts. Whether one views quantum probability as a literal description of neurocognitive processes or as an abstract analogy, it provides powerful concepts and methods for capturing the intricate patterns of real-world behavior.

3 Challenges in Social Behavior Modeling

Social behavior modeling has always been a highly complex and challenging endeavor in the social sciences. Although traditional decision theories have provided concise and compelling analytical frameworks for many scenarios, their limitations become evident when faced with real-world phenomena: diverse psychological factors, contextual dependencies, and dynamic interactions among groups. As researchers increasingly focus on the non-rational and context-sensitive aspects of human decision-making, a key question arises: *How can we better capture these intricate features at both the theoretical and methodological levels?* This section explores three main facets: (1) the limitations of traditional decision theories, (2) the multi-layered characteristics of complex social behavior, and (3) the potential applicability of a quantum perspective to these challenges.

3.1 Limitations of Traditional Decision Theories

3.1.1 Deficiencies of Expected Utility Theory and Prospect Theory

In the early phases of economics and behavioral science, **Expected Utility Theory** (EUT) stood as a primary pillar for analyzing decision-making. It posits that in uncertain circumstances, decision-makers behave *rationally*, evaluating all possible outcomes and selecting the option with the highest expected utility. Under this framework, individuals are assumed to possess stable preferences and clear subjective probabilities for each outcome. However, numerous paradoxes and anomalies (e.g., the Allais Paradox, the Ellsberg Paradox) have emerged, challenging the universality and completeness of EUT. These paradoxes reveal that real people do not consistently adhere to "rational maximization" and often exhibit context-dependent and psychologically driven biases when confronting risk and uncertainty.

Prospect Theory, introduced by Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky, partly addressed EUT' s inability to explain these deviations. By proposing a value function and a probability weighting function, Prospect Theory accounts for empirical phenomena such as loss aversion and ambiguity aversion. It thereby moves beyond the strict assumption of perfect rationality. Nonetheless, Prospect Theory remains rooted in the framework of classical probability: it generally assumes that individuals maintain relatively stable subjective probability estimates and value judgments. When real-world scenarios involve complex interactive processes or multi-stage decision-making, Prospect Theory also encounters challenges in providing a fully adequate explanation.

More critically, both Expected Utility Theory and Prospect Theory typically rely on *static* preference assumptions: individuals are presumed to hold well-defined internal utilities or values, and decision-making becomes a matter of evaluating them under risk. Yet in real social contexts, preferences can shift over time and show high sensitivity to contextual cues, external stimuli, or group interactions. Consequently, classical theories sometimes fail to predict or capture *dynamic* changes in behavioral patterns.

3.1.2 Cognitive Biases, Context Dependence, and Other Non-Rational Factors

Over decades of research, behavioral economists and cognitive psychologists have documented how humans exhibit systematic biases in risk and uncertainty scenarios. Phenomena like the **Framing Effect** show that the way a choice is presented (gain-framed vs. loss-framed) can radically alter decisions. The **Anchoring Effect** demonstrates how individuals' estimates for uncertain quantities heavily depend on initial "anchor" values. Additional biases include confirmation bias, overconfidence, and loss aversion, among others. These all point to a key insight: real decision-making is not merely a matter of weighting objective probabilities and values, but is profoundly influenced by subjective cognition and affective states.

"Context dependence" is another central feature of social behavior modeling. Survey responses or judgments are often affected by the order of questions, the manner of phrasing, or other contextual cues. Such effects clash with classical probability's assumption of event independence and additive structure. Traditional models can attempt to handle these phenomena by adding extra parameters or post-hoc modifications (such as order-effect correction terms), but they struggle to provide an elegant, unified theoretical explanation.

As non-rational decision phenomena have come into clearer focus, the rational-actor paradigm faces growing pressure. While classical models remain valuable for simplifying problems and establishing baseline predictions, there is a pressing need for new methodological tools that can incorporate non-rationality, context effects, and dynamic evolution. In recent years, researchers have turned to quantum probability and quantum cognition as potentially fruitful paradigms that address some of these gaps.

3.2 The Multi-Layered Nature of Complex Social Behavior

A second profound challenge in social behavior modeling arises from the fact that social actions unfold across multiple interactive levels: from individual psychological and cognitive processes to broader social structures, cultural systems, and institutional constraints; from micro-level affective reactions to macro-level shifts in public opinion and policy. A single-level model often fails to capture the synergy across these layers.

3.2.1 Individual-Level Psychology, Cognition, and Emotion

At the individual level, personal behavior is shaped by a variety of internal states, including emotional responses, cognitive heuristics, and underlying motivations. For instance, when a consumer chooses a product, they do not merely conduct a cost-benefit analysis; they also rely on affective preferences, habitual tendencies, and brand perceptions. Once external information—advertisements, peer recommendations, discount offers—changes, these internal states can shift, prompting real-time adjustments in decision-making.

Additionally, individuals do not always possess full information or stable preference structures. Indeed, for questions or issues on which a person has not formed a strong opinion, the attitude may remain *ambiguous* until the moment of decision-making or survey response. Cognitive psychology underscores that memory, attention, and mental framing can all influence how individuals process and integrate new information. The sequence, format, and frequency of stimuli can produce different cognitive patterns. Such dynamic, context-driven mechanisms often exceed the explanatory reach of traditional decision models.

3.2.2 Group-Level Social Networks, Culture, and Institutional Factors

Beyond the individual, social behavior is profoundly shaped by group interactions. Humans are highly social creatures whose actions are deeply intertwined with networks, cultural norms, and institutional frameworks. In political science, for instance, a voter' s inclination is not merely a function of personal ideology or policy preference but is also subject to social influences: media framing, peer pressure, and party affiliation. Moreover, social movements and opinion cascades often exhibit *collective* dynamics, where key opinion leaders or influential network nodes may amplify certain attitudes, sparking rapid shifts within the population at large.

Cultural and institutional contexts further modulate behavioral outcomes. The same policy could receive drastically different public reactions across different societies or governance systems. Similarly, while certain cognitive biases might operate universally at the individual level, their behavioral manifestations can differ significantly from one culture to another. Traditional decision theories generally treat these "external" factors as exogenous parameters or background conditions. They rarely capture how cultural values, social norms, and institutional rules dynamically interact with individual-level biases to produce emergent social phenomena.

To construct a more holistic yet flexible framework for social behavior, it is crucial to integrate both micro-level psychological mechanisms and macro-level social structures, along with considerations of time and contextual shifts. Achieving such a framework is no trivial task, requiring robust new theoretical and methodological approaches capable of representing multi-factor, multi-scale dynamics.

3.3 The Potential Alignment of a Quantum Perspective

The overarching challenge revealed by the shortcomings of traditional models is that social behavior does *not* necessarily arise from pre-fixed states. Instead, social behavior can exhibit varying degrees of ambiguity, contextual sensitivity, and measurement-induced shifts. Quantum probability theory, with its notions of superposition, interference, and non-commuting measurements, offers an alternative viewpoint that may resonate with these aspects of social behavior.

3.3.1 Interference Effects and "Context Dependence" in Human Cognition

In quantum mechanics, interference occurs when probability amplitudes add or subtract, yielding outcomes that defy simple classical addition. The presence of interference is intimately linked to the notion that measurement outcomes can change if the order or context of measurements is altered. Analogously, in social science, context dependence can be viewed as a form of "interference" that modifies response distributions across sequential questions or stimuli. For instance, if a participant is asked about their attitude toward a policy, followed by their view of a candidate, the result may differ from a reversed question order. These sequential or contextual variations violate the independence assumption of classical probability.

Quantum models handle such phenomena by allowing measurement operators to be non-commutative: measuring one observable (e.g., policy attitude) collapses the system's state, thereby influencing subsequent measurements (e.g., candidate preference). Consequently, quantum formalism can incorporate a built-in mechanism for capturing order effects, overshadowing classical probability's need for ad hoc corrections. It also helps interpret the seeming "contradictions" or "emotional swings" in human decision processes as manifestations of constructive or destructive interference patterns.

3.3.2 Quantum Superposition and the Analogy to Ambiguous or Conflicting Attitudes

In quantum theory, a particle can exist in a superposition of different eigenstates, only collapsing into one definite state upon measurement. By analogy, individuals may hold multiple latent predispositions regarding an issue until they are "forced" by a question or decision context to adopt a specific stance. Traditional models generally presume that individuals already maintain well-defined probabilistic weights for each option, or treat ambiguity as mere noise. Quantum-inspired perspectives, however, view this *ambiguous* or *conflicting* set of attitudes as a genuine superposition state. A measurement—in the form of a question, a nudge, or a survey—precipitates a collapse into one definite choice.

This conceptual framework naturally accommodates the realities of contradictory preferences or uncertain attitudes many people harbor, such as simultaneously recognizing the merits of Policy A while also valuing certain aspects of Policy B. Instead of forcibly assigning a numeric probability in advance, the quantum view underscores that the state remains unresolved until the moment of measurement. This provides a novel means of modeling the dynamic formation of attitudes, including their rapid shifts upon receiving new information or prompts.

At the group level, superposition-like scenarios might emerge in the form of widespread ambivalence, shifting opinion climates, or polarized factions that remain open to persuasion under specific contexts. Quantum probability offers both mathematical elegance and conceptual clarity for studying how context order, measurement design, and overlapping issue dimensions may tilt a community's stance in markedly different directions.

3.4 Summary

In conclusion, traditional decision theories face three main challenges in explaining social behavior:

The assumption of rational actors with stable preferences often conflicts with empirical evidence of cognitive biases, framing effects, and non-rational factors.

The multi-layered nature of social behavior—from individual cognition to group dynamics, from emotional states to institutional constraints—complicates naive additive or equilibrium-based models.

Social systems evolve as a result of both measurement and interaction; thus, capturing dynamic superposition or interference calls for new theoretical frameworks.

Quantum probability theory, including its offshoots such as quantum cognition and quantum game theory, emerges as a promising candidate under these circumstances. Its foundational principles naturally incorporate "measurement changes the system" and "states exist in superposition"—concepts that align well with the non-classical aspects of human and collective decision processes. While this does not imply a wholesale replacement of classical models, it provides a complementary—and potentially transformative—paradigm that can more richly capture the nonlinearity, ambiguity, and interplay of attitudes frequently observed in real-world social contexts.

As the quantum perspective gains traction, it opens up new avenues for experimental design, modeling techniques, and empirical validation in social science research. By recognizing that people may hold overlapping or conflicting predispositions and that contextual measurement can reshape those predispositions, quantum-inspired frameworks offer a powerful lens for understanding the deeper complexity behind human behavior. Ultimately, embracing this broader methodological toolbox may enable researchers to move beyond simplistic assumptions about rationality and arrive at more nuanced insights into how social systems evolve and respond to changing information.

4 Key Concepts and Mechanisms of Quantum Probability in Social Behavior

One of the primary reasons quantum probability theory has attracted considerable interest in the social sciences is that it offers a coherent and unified mathematical and conceptual framework for understanding "measurement-altered systems," "context dependence," and "attitudinal superposition," which are distinctly non-classical phenomena. In practical applications, quantum models often treat social behavior as a measurement process on a state of "attitude," using such concepts as superposition, interference terms, non-commuting operators, and entanglement to analyze how individuals or groups can arrive at markedly different reactions and choices under various contexts. This section focuses on four key mechanisms:

1. Superposition and indeterminate choice

2. Interference terms and contextual effects

3. Non-commuting operators and order effects in decision-making

4. Quantum entanglement and group-level social behavior

By examining how these concepts can be "mapped" onto social contexts, we may deepen our understanding of the complexity and dynamic plasticity of social behavior, thereby providing novel perspectives for areas like social surveys, policy design, and opinion forecasting.

4.1 Superposition and Indeterminate Choice

4.1.1 "Superposition" of Multiple Options: Modeling Ambiguity and Hesitation in Human Preferences

In traditional decision models, it is usually assumed that individuals assign fixed subjective probabilities or utility weights to all available options, even if these weights have not been externally "measured." However, repeated observations in social surveys and psychological experiments show that, when confronted with a new or uncertain question, many people do not have a well-formed, stable preference and instead remain in a state of ambiguity or indecision. The concept of a "superposition state" in quantum probability provides a fruitful way to represent this state of "unfixed" or "undifferentiated" attitude.

In quantum mechanics, a particle can simultaneously exist in a linear combination of multiple eigenstates (such as spin-up and spin-down), only collapsing to one definite eigenstate when measured. Mapping this idea to the social sciences, an individual may hold some degree of endorsement or opposition to both Option A and Option B prior to explicitly being asked, without having decided which one they favor more. The moment they are asked to choose (for instance, in a survey or a policy decision), it effectively performs a "measurement" on their "attitude state," causing it to collapse from superposition into a single concrete outcome.

This perspective helps explain why people often produce different responses depending on questionnaire order, phrasing, or timing. Under this view, individuals may not be forced into a stable, explicit preference until a measurement compels them to take a definite stance. For modeling purposes, superposition allows researchers to abandon the assumption that individuals always maintain a stable, observable distribution of subjective probabilities. Instead, we allow multiple potential directions in an "attitude space" to coexist and only manifest upon measurement.

4.1.2 Collapsing Effects on Individual Choice Triggered by "Measurement"

Another crucial feature in quantum theory is the collapse of the wavefunction: when a system in superposition undergoes measurement, it projects onto one of the eigenstates associated with that measurement operator, and the observed outcome corresponds to that eigenstate. In social behavior, "measurement" can be analogized to various external inquiries—questionnaires, opinion polls, voting sessions, or any decision-making demand. People may initially exist in a diverse set of latent intentions but will present only one definite answer when forced to respond. After responding, an individual's psychological state can change, tending to "lock in" that attitude for a period of time.

Such an effect explains many findings in social research: for instance, why some respondents change their attitudes from one question to the next based on context, or why individuals who initially have no firm stance quickly become convinced of a particular position after one public discussion or vote. Unlike classical models, which generally assume "measurement only reveals a pre-existing preference," the quantum viewpoint posits that measurement can itself "create" or "shape" the system's state. Though mystifying in its original physics context, this is not difficult to comprehend in the social sciences if we accept that human attitudes can remain in a state of indeterminacy before being solidified by external inquiry.

4.2 Interference Terms and Contextual Effects

4.2.1 How Quantum Cognitive Models Explain Context-Induced Shifts

One salient difference between quantum and classical probability lies in the fact that quantum probability involves adding or subtracting probability amplitudes, leading to "interference terms." In classical probability, we typically compute $P(A \cup B) = P(A) + P(B) - P(A \cap B)$, a linear relationship. By contrast, quantum models describe state vectors that combine to form new states, often yielding non-linear interference effects.

For social cognition or behavior, when an individual is subject to multiple related measurements in a short time span (e.g., answering a series of interconnected questions), each new response can be influenced by the mind-set or context triggered by earlier questions. Classic models often label this a "sequential bias" or "contextual effect" and attempt corrective adjustments in the analysis. However, quantum cognitive models see it as an interference phenomenon arising from consecutive projections on the "attitude wavefunction." In simpler terms, each measurement (question) modifies the relative phase of the system, thereby changing subsequent measurement outcomes. This viewpoint allows non-linear outcomes or extreme response probabilities to emerge systematically from the model's mathematics.

As an example, let us suppose an individual is asked Question A about environmental policy (e.g., "Do you support increased protection?") and Question B about industrial development (e.g., "Do you approve of policies to boost manufacturing output?"). In a classical model, the person is assumed to have pre-existing, stable distributions for A and B. Reversing the order of A and B should not change the joint probability if external conditions remain consistent. In quantum terms, however, measuring A first collapses the "state" into an eigenstate related to A, thus changing the initial conditions for measuring B. As a result, one might observe significant shifts in responses depending on the question order—an "interference term" in action.

4.2.2 Manifestations of Interference in Social Surveys and Questionnaire Design

Such interference is not uncommon and is, in fact, quite prevalent in survey research. For instance, if you first ask respondents about raising environmental taxes to reduce pollution, then immediately ask whether they support increased industrial subsidies for economic growth, participants might answer the second question in a way strongly shaped by the environmental mindset set off by the first question. Conversely, if the order is reversed, the weighted importance of environmental factors may be diminished. Classical probability struggles to explain how merely reversing the sequence leads to drastically different joint outcomes. Researchers tend to categorize it under "measurement bias" or "questionnaire bias."

In a quantum perspective, the first question' s measurement operator fundamentally changes the initial state, affecting the subsequent probability distribution. The interference term can be positive or negative, meaning it might increase or decrease specific response probabilities. By incorporating interference into a quantum probability model, one can offer a more unified, systematic account of order and context dependence—rather than repeatedly invoking ad hoc corrections for different experimental designs.

4.3 Non-Commuting Operators and Order Effects in Decision-Making

4.3.1 How Question or Information Sequences Are Modeled in Quantum Terms

Non-commuting operators stand out as another signature concept in quantum mechanics: if operators $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ do not commute (i.e., $\hat{A}\hat{B} \neq \hat{B}\hat{A}$), measuring $\hat{A}$ first, followed by $\hat{B}$, will yield a different result from measuring $\hat{B}$ first, then $\hat{A}$. The social-science analogy is intuitive: if two questions or two modes of information presentation are not independent—and if each measurement shifts the internal state of the subject—then the order in which they appear produces different outcomes.

Traditional models often assume that individuals have predetermined answers for each question, or at least that the question order is merely "reading out" these answers. Yet abundant evidence from surveys and experiments shows that reality is more complex: reversing the question order can lead to substantial changes in response probabilities. Quantum models can directly embed this "asymmetry in order" within their mathematical structure. Measuring $\hat{A}$ first projects the system into a state aligned with $\hat{A}$; only then does the system measure $\hat{B}$. If $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ do not commute—i.e., they involve different or incompatible projections—this order reversal becomes consequential.

In fields such as sociology or political science, well-known "order effects" can be viewed as a macro-level manifestation of non-commuting operators: for instance, asking respondents about their evaluation of a political candidate prior to asking about a specific policy can produce a different joint distribution of answers than if the sequence is reversed. The first measurement collapses the "attitude state" toward one axis, shifting the baseline for the second measurement.

4.3.2 Classic “Order Effects” in Social Surveys and Political Elections

A famous case in political communication and polling is the “primacy effect” or forms of “spiral of silence”: if respondents are first asked about negative economic data, it might prime them to judge a politician’ s performance more harshly. Conversely, if you start by highlighting that politician’ s past successes in social welfare, respondents might then approach subsequent economic questions with a more positive bias. In quantum terms, the measurement operator used in the first question modifies the overall state, leading to a different probability distribution in the second measurement.

Ignoring order effects or treating them merely as outliers can introduce biases into any analysis. A quantum decision model accepts and explains the underlying logic of order effects, positing that different measurement sequences naturally yield different outcomes. This perspective transforms order effects from an “unexpected anomaly” into a “systematic property” consistent with the model’ s foundational assumptions. Practically, it underscores the importance of recognizing how measurement sequences—whether in designing surveys, conducting public opinion polls, or organizing political campaigns—may induce interference or asymmetry in outcomes.

4.4 Quantum Entanglement and Group-Level Social Behavior

4.4.1 Analogies Between Entangled States and Correlated Behavior in Groups

Quantum entanglement is considered one of the most intriguing phenomena in quantum mechanics: once multiple particles become entangled, their combined quantum state cannot be factored into individual subsystems, and measuring one particle’ s state instantaneously influences the others, regardless of distance. While there is no literal “spooky action at a distance” in macro-level social systems, certain group behaviors do display a form of strong correlation, as if people’ s attitudes or decisions are instantly linked.

Mathematically, an “entangled state” implies that the overall system vector cannot be broken into a simple tensor product of individual states. Analogously, in social science, we can imagine a group’ s “collective attitude” existing in a joint state space: in a strongly correlated network, individuals’ attitudes are not independent but “entangled.” A shift in one person’ s attitude might imply changes in another’ s. This might be observed in social media contexts where opinion leaders quickly guide a large number of followers to adopt similar views, or in political factions where members nearly simultaneously adopt unified stances.

Of course, genuine “spooky action” from quantum physics does not literally apply to social systems. However, the “holistic” and “inseparable” aspect of entanglement does offer insights into group dynamics: with a suitable mathematical model, strong and rapid consensus or coordination in social contexts could be described using an entanglement-like framework. For instance, when social systems experience opinion polarization or group extremism, individuals’ attitudes may remain tightly coupled—classical probability models often struggle to handle these strong couplings without introducing numerous "conditional probabilities" or "covariates." Quantum entanglement models could propose an alternative path by embedding these couplings in a higher-dimensional joint state space.

4.4.2 Potential Quantum Perspectives on Group Polarization and Opinion Cascades

Group polarization occurs when members of a group, upon interacting, shift their average attitude toward a more extreme position. Opinion cascades, meanwhile, refer to rapid, large-scale surges in public sentiment prompted by salient events or media coverage, often culminating in short-lived but intense "waves" of consensus. Classical game theory or network analyses attempt to explain these processes via peer pressure, central nodes, or hierarchical information flows. However, many such models still hinge on assumptions of individual-level independence or Markovian transitions, which can fail to capture "instant consensus" or abrupt polarization.

Using a notion akin to entangled states, one could hypothesize that a collective attitude space exhibits "entanglement," meaning that individual attitudes are inherently interlinked. When an external event or new information stimulates the group, it acts like a "measurement" that can cause the entire system to collapse to a particular viewpoint—akin to a sudden opinion wave. Similarly, with fresh stimuli, the group might jump to an opposing extreme. Such a model would more naturally capture "viral" reactions or intense polarization in social media environments, where a single piece of news triggers broad, nearly simultaneous shifts throughout an interconnected community.

Admittedly, applying quantum entanglement directly to group behavior raises theoretical and empirical questions: Can large social systems genuinely be treated as high-dimensional Hilbert spaces? Is "entanglement" only a mathematical analogy, rather than a physical phenomenon in human networks? Nevertheless, the holistic and indivisible perspective inherent in quantum entanglement may inspire social scientists to develop innovative methods for modeling strongly coupled collective decision-making or consensus formation. Through experimentation and simulation, researchers might discover that quantum entanglement-style frameworks provide richer explanatory power for the emergence of group polarization and synchronous attitudes.

Within the intersection of quantum probability and social behavior modeling, superposition offers a natural way to represent "attitudinal indeterminacy," while interference terms and non-commuting operators mathematically capture the influence of measurement context and sequence. Quantum entanglement suggests intriguing possibilities for understanding strongly coupled group dynamics. Compared to classical probability models, these quantum concepts seem better equipped to handle multi-stage measurement, order effects, collective polarization, and opinion cascades under complex conditions. Rather than aiming to replace established theories, quantum probability can serve as a complementary or alternative paradigm, highlighting the "non-classical" and "highly interconnected" attributes of social phenomena.

On the operational side, numerous questions remain: How does one construct a Hilbert space for social attitudes? How should measurement operators be defined or implemented? Under what conditions do interference terms substantively impact results? Can large-scale empirical data validate quantum entanglement in public opinion? Each of these issues signals a broad space for theoretical exploration and empirical testing. As social scientists deepen their understanding of quantum models, we may discover yet more exciting theoretical and practical innovations, enabling a more dynamic and multi-dimensional grasp of how human social behaviors are formed and evolve.

5 Model Construction: From Axioms to Applications

In the study of social sciences, quantum probability offers a novel perspective for analyzing complex human behaviors, decision-making processes, and collective outcomes. Traditional models grounded in classical probability often assume that individuals hold fixed, well-defined preferences, and that observations merely reveal these underlying probabilities. However, as researchers continue to explore contexts where decisions are context-dependent, non-commutative, or influenced by previous measurements, quantum approaches become increasingly relevant. The fundamental premise is that social agents may exist in superposed cognitive or behavioral states, and that measurement—be it in the form of a survey question, a vote, or a strategic choice—actively influences the final outcome. In this section, we will articulate how quantum probability can move from its axiomatic foundations in physics and mathematics to practical applications in social science scenarios.

We begin by discussing the basic process of constructing a quantum probability model, including the formal definition of state spaces and measurement operators, along with the mathematical and conceptual underpinnings of interference. We then explore three major applications —quantum cognition, quantum game theory, and quantum voting—that highlight the advantages and unique explanatory power of quantum frameworks over classical ones. Finally, we address experimental design and data collection strategies that are specifically tailored for testing and validating quantum social science models. By traversing this theoretical-to-empirical trajectory, we aim to illustrate both the promise and the current challenges of implementing quantum probability in real-world social research.

5.1 Quantum Probability Model Workflow

The construction of a quantum probability model in social science involves several core steps. These steps mirror the logical development of quantum theory in physics, adapted for scenarios where human cognition, decision-making, or social interaction plays a central role.

(1) Defining the State Space (Hilbert Space) and Decision Variables. The first task is to identify the relevant decision or attitude variables within a given social context. In classical probability, one might define a sample space consisting of distinct outcomes for a behavioral choice—such as "cooperate" versus "defect" in a social dilemma, or "support," "oppose," "neutral" in an opinion poll. In quantum models, these outcomes become basis vectors in a Hilbert space, enabling superposition and interference effects. The dimensionality of this space depends on how many relevant states or attitudes need to be captured. For instance, investigating a single binary choice could be modeled with a 2-dimensional space, while a multi-issue context might require a tensor product structure combining multiple sub-spaces.

A key challenge is ensuring that the chosen Hilbert space remains tractable. In principle, one could define arbitrarily large dimensional spaces to capture every nuance of cognition, but such expansions risk creating models that are difficult to calibrate with real data. Thus, the principal objective in this step is to balance expressive richness against empirical feasibility.

(2) Designing Measurement Operators (Observables) and Experimental Methods. The second major step is to define measurement operators that correspond to questions, prompts, or interventions. In quantum mechanics, observables are represented by Hermitian operators whose eigenvalues correspond to potential measurement outcomes. In social science contexts, these observables might be political questions ("Do you support Policy A?"), preference prompts ("Which product do you choose?"), or strategic decision points ("Choose to cooperate or defect"). When an individual is "measured" by being asked a question, the quantum state collapses onto one of the operator' s eigenstates, producing a probabilistic outcome.

Sequence matters significantly in quantum frameworks because non-commuting operators can yield different results depending on the order in which measurements are performed. This aspect is often overlooked in classical survey design, which typically treats question order as a potential bias to be controlled. Under quantum assumptions, question order is not merely a bias but an intrinsic aspect of how human decisions unfold, reflecting the non-commutative properties of mental states.

(3) Parsing and Quantifying Interference Terms. A hallmark of quantum probability is the presence of interference terms. In classical probability, the joint probability of two sequential events is simply $P(A,B) = P(A)\,P(B|A)$, reflecting the law of total probability. In quantum models, however, the amplitude-based formulation can introduce cross-terms and phase factors, generating outcomes that deviate from classical predictions. Researchers in quantum social science often design studies that test for these deviations, for instance by calculating predicted probabilities from both classical and quantum models and then measuring how the observed data aligns with either model.

Interference can manifest in various phenomena, such as violation of the "sure-thing principle" or the presence of "order effects" (where responding to question A before question B yields systematically different results compared to asking B first). By statistically estimating the interference term or phase parameter, one can gauge the extent to which quantum effects are at play in a particular setting. This step provides critical empirical content, as it allows researchers to confirm whether quantum interference is truly required to explain observed behaviors.

5.2 Quantum Cognition Model

Quantum cognition is an emerging field that seeks to explain various cognitive biases, paradoxes, and context effects that challenge classical probabilistic models. Cognitive psychologists have long noted that human judgments and decisions often depend on the context or sequence of information, giving rise to phenomena like framing effects, conjunction fallacies, and order effects. Quantum cognition leverages the mathematical formalisms of Hilbert space and measurement to explain why these effects occur, without resorting to ad hoc assumptions.

(1) Attitude Change and Memory Retrieval. Classical models of attitude change typically assume that individuals update their beliefs in a Bayesian fashion or integrate new information additively. However, empirical studies indicate that the same piece of information can have drastically different impacts on an individual's final attitude, depending on previous exposures and the context in which the information is presented. Quantum cognition interprets this as a phenomenon of superposition and collapse: prior to measurement (i.e., a direct question or decision), the individual's attitude remains in a superposed state that can shift phase or amplitude upon measurement.

Memory retrieval likewise demonstrates notable context dependence. People often reconstruct memories differently depending on the phrasing of questions, the order in which they are asked, or the environment in which recall is prompted. In a quantum model, memory states reside in a superposition, and the act of retrieving a memory projects this state onto a particular eigenbasis, influenced by the retrieval context. This approach provides a more unified theoretical framework for explaining apparently inconsistent recollections.

(2) Predicting and Explaining Measurement Order Effects and Compatibility Effects. Perhaps the most compelling evidence for quantum cognition arises from measurement order effects. A series of empirical studies has shown that survey responses about an issue can shift dramatically based on the sequence in which questions are asked. Classical theory would chalk this up to "context effects" or "carryover effects," but often fails to systematically predict the direction or magnitude of these shifts. Quantum cognition, on the other hand, naturally incorporates non-commuting measurements, meaning that the cognitive state influenced by the first question can produce interference terms affecting responses to the second.

Compatibility effects occur when two different questions—assumed to be independent in a classical sense—display correlation upon measurement. In quantum terms, these questions correspond to observables that do not commute, leading to a joint probability distribution that cannot be factorized in a classical manner. The resulting patterns match empirical data more closely than standard probability theory, offering a principled explanation for the "mysterious" dependencies observed in many psychological experiments. As research in quantum cognition expands, it highlights the broader applicability of quantum concepts to areas like attention, memory, and problem-solving in psychology.

5.3 Quantum Game Theory and Social Cooperation

Quantum game theory extends the realm of strategic interaction by introducing superposition, entanglement, and non-commuting choices into classical game setups. Although originally formulated to explore fundamental questions in quantum mechanics, quantum games have analogies that can inform social and economic interactions where classical assumptions fail or need additional nuance.

(1) Differences in Strategy Space and Payoff Distribution. Classical game theory typically assumes that each player chooses from a set of well-defined strategies. In quantum game theory, a player can employ quantum operations—unitary transformations that act on superposed states—to define their "move." This results in a richer strategy space in which classical strategies appear as limiting cases (e.g., a specific angle of a Bloch sphere if we consider a two-strategy situation). Entanglement between players' states allows for correlations that cannot be replicated by classical mixed strategies.

This expanded strategy space has implications for payoff distributions. In certain quantum games, players can achieve outcomes that strictly dominate the best classical Nash equilibria. For instance, in a quantum version of the prisoner's dilemma, entangling the players' strategies can produce cooperation levels not attainable classically. While the direct translation of quantum entanglement to real human interactions remains debated, the conceptual lesson is that there may be non-classical pathways to cooperation, grounded in correlations or trust mechanisms that are not easily captured by standard rational-choice models.

(2) Simulating Public Goods and Bargaining Games with Quantum Factors. Public goods games revolve around the tension between personal interest and collective welfare. When participants remain in a quantum-like superposition of contributing and not contributing, interference or entanglement might shift payoffs, creating a context in which cooperation is more stable. Quantum game theory suggests that the introduction of quantum correlations—analogous to entanglement—could effectively penalize free-riders or reward cooperators in ways that classical frameworks do not allow.

In bargaining scenarios, classical analyses often assume that rational agents will converge to a solution like the Nash bargaining outcome, given symmetrical information and common knowledge of rationality. Introducing quantum strategies can alter the negotiation process by allowing superposed offers and dynamic collapse based on the negotiation "measurement." Empirical questions remain regarding how closely real-world negotiators can approximate quantum strategies. Nonetheless, modeling such interactions through a quantum lens could reveal hidden cooperative equilibria or highlight contexts in which negotiation order or anchoring strongly influences final outcomes.

5.4 Quantum Voting Model

Voting is a cornerstone of collective decision-making in democratic societies. Traditional voting theory typically assumes that voters hold fixed preferences, or at least that these preferences can be approximated by stable probability distributions. Yet empirical studies of elections frequently document last-minute preference shifts, context effects, and strategic voting patterns that deviate from the predictions of classical theories.

(1) Willingness Superposition and Outcome Measurement under Quantum Voting Rules. Quantum voting theory posits that voters' preferences may remain in superposed states until the act of voting collapses them into a definite choice. This perspective addresses why some voters appear genuinely undecided for much of an election cycle, only committing to a candidate or policy when they cast their ballot or respond to a poll. In a sense, measurement (voting) reveals a final preference that might not have been well-defined beforehand, influenced by the last interactions, media coverage, or specific wording on the ballot.

Another insight offered by quantum voting is the potential for interference between different ballot items, especially when multiple questions (like referendums, candidate selections, and proposals) appear on the same ballot. Non-commuting measurement operators can capture the phenomenon where voting on one issue first influences how the voter perceives a subsequent issue, leading to outcomes that deviate from a straightforward, issue-by-issue aggregation.

(2) How Interference Terms Affect Voting Outcomes and Preferences. The presence of interference terms can drastically impact electoral outcomes, particularly in close races or on contentious issues. Consider a scenario where a voter is torn between two candidates. If the voter's preference is represented by a state that is nearly balanced between both options, even a slight contextual nudge can cause a significant shift in the final measurement outcome. Because quantum models incorporate the idea of amplitudes and phases, small changes in context can produce large differences in the distribution of final votes.

Moreover, quantum voting models can help explain phenomena such as "spoiler effects," "vote splitting," or strategic compromise in a more nuanced way than classical models. In classical models, a third candidate is typically either a spoiler if they siphon votes from one side or irrelevant if they cannot surpass a certain threshold. In a quantum model, the introduction of a new candidate could interfere constructively or destructively with existing voter preferences, thus reshaping outcomes in non-intuitive ways.

5.5 Experimental Design and Data Collection

Ultimately, for quantum social science to progress beyond theoretical formulations, it must be anchored in well-designed empirical research. Establishing rigorous experimental protocols that can detect quantum effects—such as interference, non-commutativity, or entanglement-like correlations—is pivotal to validating (or falsifying) quantum probability models in social contexts.

(1) Questionnaires and Experimental Platforms from a Quantum Perspective. Classical survey methods often treat question order as a bias, attempting to control or randomize it to minimize systematic distortions. However, if quantum effects are real in social cognition, question order is not merely a bias but a central component of the phenomenon. Researchers therefore design experiments where order is systematically varied. Participants might be split into different groups, each receiving a distinct sequence of questions, allowing for robust comparisons that can unearth quantum interference patterns.

In addition, multi-dimensional prompts can be employed to elicit correlated attitudes, thereby testing whether measurements along one dimension (e.g., economic policy support) affect outcomes along another dimension (e.g., environmental policy stance). Digital platforms that record real-time response data could track the transitions in respondents' states as each new question is asked, providing further insight into how state collapse occurs in real time.

(2) Data Quantification and Model Parameter Calibration. Once data are collected, researchers must fit quantum models to the observed distributions. This typically involves translating frequency counts of responses into probabilities, then computing the corresponding quantum amplitudes, phase factors, or density matrices that best match the data. Techniques like maximum likelihood estimation or Bayesian inference can be adapted to handle quantum parameter estimation, especially in higher-dimensional or multi-issue models.

Comparisons with classical alternatives are crucial to ascertain whether quantum models offer a genuinely superior explanation. This often entails calculating model fit metrics (e.g., log-likelihood, Akaike information criterion, or Bayes factors) for both the quantum and corresponding classical models. Demonstrating that a quantum model surpasses its classical counterpart in predictive accuracy and explanatory coherence strongly supports the presence of quantum-like processes.

In terms of large-scale data collection, researchers face challenges in replicating the precise conditions under which quantum effects are hypothesized to appear. As quantum social science is still an emerging field, further progress depends on developing standardized protocols for administering quantum-based surveys and games, collecting large representative samples, and systematically analyzing potential confounds. Collaborations between methodologists, statisticians, and subject-area experts are vital to navigate these complexities effectively.

Future Directions. As quantum social science gains traction, the need for interdisciplinary efforts will grow. Psychologists, sociologists, political scientists, and economists can collaborate with physicists and mathematicians to refine theoretical assumptions, design nuanced experiments, and interpret data. Advancements in computational techniques—like the use of quantum-inspired algorithms or machine learning methods—may also expand the toolkit for analyzing entangled or interference-laden data.

By rigorously testing quantum models against empirical observations, researchers will either validate the premise that many social behaviors exhibit quantum-like properties, or identify the boundaries where classical explanations suffice. In either case, the process will refine our understanding of human cognition and decision-making. If validated, quantum models could reshape how scholars think about everything from consumer behavior and voting patterns to international negotiations and cultural exchange, offering a fresh lens through which to capture the nuanced and context-sensitive nature of social life.

7 Results and Discussion

Empirical research on the application of quantum probability models in the social sciences typically culminates in a "Results and Discussion" section, where the study's central findings are presented and interpreted. This section addresses four key topics: the accuracy and applicability of quantum probability models, their limitations and main points of contention, their implications for broader social science research paradigms, and directions for future developments. By integrating these perspectives, researchers can better gauge how quantum probability theory fits into and contributes to social science, as well as how this emerging interdisciplinary field might continue to advance.

7.1 Accuracy and Applicability of Quantum Probability Models

7.1.1 Comparing Model Predictive Capacity and Explanatory Power with Classical Models

A great deal of quantum social science research employs classical decision models (e.g., Expected Utility Theory, Prospect Theory, Logit/Probit regressions) as baseline references to examine whether quantum models can exhibit a "non-classical advantage" in explaining and predicting social behavior. Researchers typically focus on several types of metrics to compare the strengths and weaknesses of quantum versus classical models:

- **Predictive accuracy:** After calibrating model parameters on training data, one tests predictive performance on new data or via cross-validation. If quantum models yield closer predictions to observed distributions (e.g., response patterns, choice probabilities, collective behaviors), that suggests quantum probability may capture non-classical characteristics more effectively.

- **Model fit and information criteria:** Criteria such as AIC, BIC, and likelihood ratio tests measure how well each model balances complexity and goodness of fit. If a quantum model, with only a moderate increase in parameters, significantly improves the explanation of experimental data, it supports the inclusion of quantum probability.

- **Explanation of anomalies:** Many "paradoxes" or "anomalies" in the social sciences (e.g., order effects, violations of additivity, bimodal distributions, and non-rational decisions) are problematic for traditional models or can only be accommodated through "patchwork" solutions. If a quantum model inherently covers these phenomena with a mathematically coherent structure aligned with empirical evidence, it underscores its theoretical potential.

In existing literature, quantum models often perform on par with or better than classical alternatives in settings that emphasize context dependence, measurement order, or interference effects. They are particularly compelling for short-term decision tasks, attitude measurement, and shifts in political stances, where interference terms naturally align with the nonlinear phenomena present in real data. However, in certain contexts (e.g., highly rationalized repeated games or attitude domains lacking ambiguity), classical models may still be sufficiently accurate or more parsimonious, indicating that application of quantum methods must be context-specific.

7.1.2 Scope, Boundary Conditions, and Constraints

Quantum probability theory is not a universal solution for all social science problems; its application has clear boundaries and constraints:

- **Ambiguous or uncertain attitudes:** If subjects' preferences are relatively stable or clearly defined, and if they show low sensitivity to measurement, then quantum advantage may be minimal. Quantum interference effects are only salient when significant attitude uncertainty or context dependence exists.
- **Importance of measurement processes:** Quantum models presume that "measuring" (e.g., surveying or forcing a choice) actively shapes the system's state. If the social process studied involves little immediate measurement or forced decision-making (i.e., purely passive observation), the value of quantum modeling may not be realized.
- **Complex multi-agent interactions:** In large-scale, complex interactions, constructing a high-dimensional Hilbert space and defining operators can be challenging. Parameter estimation may become computationally intensive, requiring advanced statistical or numerical techniques.

Such boundaries indicate that quantum probability is especially suitable for scenarios emphasizing *the shaping role of measurement*, *the presence of attitudinal superposition or ambiguity*, and *pronounced context dependence*. Meanwhile, purely stable preferences, complete-information domains, or large-scale multi-agent systems may demand more nuanced approaches or hybrid methods.

7.2 Model Limitations and Points of Controversy

7.2.1 Theoretical Debates Over Quantum Probability in the Social Sciences

Although quantum social science has gained notable attention and support, it also faces critiques about its core assumptions and mathematical analogies, including:

- **Fundamental differences between quantum physics and social systems:** In the physical micro-world, quantum superposition and measurement collapse are underpinned by rigorous experimental evidence and formal axioms. In the macro social world, does a genuine "quantum state" exist, or is it purely metaphorical? Critics argue that if social processes lack authentic physical quantum mechanisms (e.g., true entanglement, Planck-scale effects), then applying quantum probability may be "overly analogical."

- **Disconnection between mathematical tools and ontological reality:** Some question whether quantum modeling is essentially a mathematical device to describe order effects or interference phenomena, without implying that society *truly* operates under quantum laws. If the resemblance is merely formal, can we say that quantum theory is genuinely "landing" in the social sciences?

- **Distinguishability from nonlinear or high-parameter classical models:** Others suggest that adding more nonlinear or context-dependent terms to a classical framework might replicate the results that quantum models achieve. Is the quantum advantage purely from new parameters, or does it stem from a genuinely unique structure (e.g., non-commuting operators)?

These debates highlight that the ongoing development of quantum social science still involves establishing a "community consensus." Gaining broader acceptance in mainstream scholarship will likely require more conclusive theoretical, experimental, and applied findings.

7.2.2 Challenges in Experimental Design, Measurement Error, and External Validity

Even if one concedes that quantum frameworks might be relevant in social modeling, numerous practical challenges remain:

- **Complexity of experimental design:** To distinguish quantum model predictions from those of classical counterparts often requires intricate setups that elicit interference or order effects while controlling confounds. Designing such experiments demands considerable methodological finesse.

- **Measurement error:** Quantum probability hinges on precise identification of measurement operators and the timing of collapses. If surveys or questionnaires contain substantial noise or biases, subtle interference or sequence effects could be obscured. Conversely, if the mapping from "questions" to "quantum operators" is imperfect, model fitting becomes difficult.

- **External validity:** Much quantum social science research is carried out in laboratories or small-scale scenarios. Whether these non-classical patterns generalize to complex real-world environments, with numerous confounding factors, still needs extensive empirical evidence.

7.3 Implications for Social Science Research Paradigms

7.3.1 Rethinking "Rationality" Assumptions and Decision Processes

A major impact of quantum social science on conventional paradigms is that it offers a systematic mathematical framework for scenarios where "measurement shapes attitudes" and "decisions drift with context." This can prompt us to **reassess the "rational agent" assumption** or the premise of stable preferences. In a quantum model, an individual might remain in a superposed mental state until an external query forces selection, a stark contrast to classical conceptions wherein preferences preexist and are merely "revealed" by measurement.

Such a perspective also introduces new uncertainty and contextual interference into decision processes: not all forms of non-rationality must be attributed to "lack of information" or "cognitive biases." Some cross-context or temporal shifts in attitudes could be seen as quantum-like collapse events. Understanding this logic could deepen analyses of economic behavior, voting, consumer choices, and more, by focusing on how measurement order and sequence logically shape outcomes.

7.3.2 Providing New Analytical Tools and Frameworks for Behavioral Economics and Social Psychology

From a methodological standpoint, quantum probability's mathematical toolkit (Hilbert spaces, non-commuting operators, superposition states, interference terms, etc.) could introduce novel models and testable hypotheses in **behavioral economics and social psychology**, for instance:

- **Non-commuting operators:** Useful for capturing multi-dimensional attitudes or multiple issues whose measurement order matters, highlighting how the same questions yield different responses in different sequences.
- **Entangled states:** Inspires examination of strongly "inseparable" structures in group polarization or network homogeneity.
- **Interference phases:** Through phase-fitting, one can quantify the "inconsistency" between implicit and explicit attitudes or track how interference patterns change under varied experimental manipulations.

Such new tools could be integrated with traditional experimental economics and psychology paradigms to build more holistic "cognition-affect-social" composite models, potentially enhancing our grasp of complex social behaviors.

7.4 Future Directions

7.4.1 Strengthening Interdisciplinary Collaboration: Quantum Computing, Complex Systems, Neuroscience, and More

Quantum social science is inherently interdisciplinary. To achieve deeper breakthroughs, it must harness progress from related fields:

- **Quantum computing:** Advances in quantum computing may someday allow large-scale, high-dimensional quantum models to be solved or simulated more efficiently. Quantum random walks on complex social networks or quantum game simulations with numerous agents could become more tractable.
- **Complex systems science:** Social behaviors often arise from multi-level, multi-agent systems. Integrating quantum probability with complex network dynamics, nonlinear evolution equations, and agent-based simulations might drive new theoretical syntheses.
- **Neuroscience:** If future discoveries indicate biological underpinnings for quantum-like cognition or reveal a pronounced susceptibility of brain processes to order effects, this would offer more concrete support for quantum social science from an ontological perspective.

7.4.2 Potential Theoretical Extensions: Quantum Field Theory, Large-Scale Entanglement in Groups

Currently, most quantum social science centers on *quantum probability* and *quantum games*, yet deeper theoretical extensions may emerge:

- **Quantum field theory analogies:** In physics, field theories describe particle creation and annihilation across continuous spacetime. A social-scientific analogy might treat opinions, attitudes, or discourses as "fields," exploring how they propagate, interfere, and interact over time and space to yield new perspectives on how public opinion or culture evolves.
- **Group entanglement:** On a larger collective scale, if individual attitudes are tightly coupled, one could define group states analogous to "entangled states," where measuring a small subset of individuals alters the state of the entire group. Whether such models can describe real-world phenomena (e.g., opinion polarization, meme propagation, large-scale protests) remains an open question requiring both theoretical elaboration and empirical testing.

In sum, any discussion of quantum social science's "Results and Discussion" must weigh the accuracy and scope of quantum probability, clarify the controversies and limitations it faces, and place new findings within a broader reflection on social science research paradigms. Although quantum models have shown impressive explanatory power in certain contexts, they also encounter theoretical and practical challenges: identifying the scenarios in which quantum models truly excel, designing experiments that effectively differentiate quantum from high-order classical alternatives, and addressing skepticism about whether quantum analogies hold physical significance for social processes.

Nevertheless, the quantum perspective provides more flexible and diverse mathematical and conceptual tools for the social sciences, potentially freeing researchers from fixed "rational agent" or "stable preference" assumptions and opening new possibilities in understanding human complexity. As interdisciplinary collaboration intensifies, quantum social science may further reveal non-classical yet demonstrably real patterns of social behavior.

8 Conclusion and Outlook

After traversing theoretical foundations, methodological discussions, empirical explorations, and results analyses, the potential and limitations of the emerging research paradigm known as *quantum social science* are gradually coming into focus. Quantum probability theory offers non-classical perspectives for understanding individual and group decision-making processes. Its emphases on superposition states, interference terms, non-commuting measurements, and measurement-induced collapse all show notable consistency with observed phenomena in psychology, political science, economics, and social network studies. Below, we provide an integrated conclusion and outlook in four areas: key contributions and summary, suggestions for future research, an application outlook, and final remarks.

8.1 Major Contributions and Summary

8.1.1 Contributions in Theory, Methodology, and Empirics

First, on the theoretical level, this work systematically reviews the core concepts most relevant to the social scientific application of quantum probability theory, including superposition states, interference effects, non-commuting operators, and quantum entanglement. We show how these concepts can be mapped onto crucial social phenomena such as attitudinal ambiguity, order effects, and group polarization. By comparing them with traditional models, we underscore how the quantum approach places greater emphasis on the shaping function of measurement in social decision-making.

Second, on the methodological level, this paper outlines how to represent social attitudes in Hilbert space, design measurement operators to mimic real-world questionnaires and decision scenarios, and use interference terms or phase parameters to assess the accuracy and feasibility of quantum-based predictions. We also propose concrete steps for experiment design, data collection, and the fitting of interference terms.

Finally, on the empirical level, this paper explores cognitive biases, social network diffusion, political attitudes, and both laboratory and field investigations to illustrate how quantum models can provide novel interpretive routes for a range of non-classical behaviors. Moreover, in comparisons with classical baseline models, quantum approaches demonstrate certain advantages in prediction or goodness of fit across multiple domains. These convergent findings preliminarily confirm the viability and potential value of quantum probability in social research.

8.1.2 Core Findings and Key Insights

Several core findings emerge from these theoretical and empirical endeavors:

- Quantum models, particularly in areas involving context dependence, measurement order, and superposition of attitudes, can more naturally capture phenomena that traditional models often struggle to address.
- Observed patterns such as order effects, bimodal distributions, and nonlinear clustering can be explained via quantum interference or state collapse.
- In political science and social psychology, the quantum perspective provides a new way of understanding *when* a "real attitude" is formed and *how* measurement itself modifies the psychological state of those being measured.

These insights encourage a reevaluation of the common social science assumption that preferences always "preexist" and that measurement simply "reveals" them. Instead, measurement may *create* or *reshape* attitudes in a non-classical manner, thereby offering new ways to interpret the complexity of human behavior.

8.2 Suggestions for Future Research

8.2.1 Extending to Richer Social Contexts and Larger Empirical Data

To further validate the generality of quantum social science, subsequent studies should apply quantum models to more diverse social contexts, such as cross-cultural comparisons, organizational decision-making, and large-scale online social media interactions. Larger samples and higher-dimensional variables will test the quantum model's stability and computational feasibility in more complex scenarios. Should robust evidence of quantum interference emerge in large-scale longitudinal data or nationwide surveys (e.g., election panels or consumer databases), it would considerably strengthen the scholarly acceptance of this theory.

8.2.2 Delving into the Internal Logical Consistency of Quantum Probability Axioms

Some critics argue that genuine "quantum states" may not exist in the social sciences, and that quantum probability is simply a flexible mathematical tool. Future research should investigate, at both methodological and philosophical levels, the internal logical consistency of quantum probability's axioms as applied to social modeling. Clarifying why concepts such as "measurement-induced collapse" and "non-commuting operators" are not merely metaphors but can offer testable predictions about social processes is essential. If subsequent progress in neuroscience or cognitive science uncovers partial neural correlates or biological plausibility for quantum-like measurement processes, it would provide additional robust support for quantum social science.

8.3 Application Outlook

8.3.1 Potential of Quantum Probability in Public Policy, Risk Management, Organizational Decisions, and Market Analysis

With the continuing evolution of quantum social science, the prospects for applications are becoming increasingly clear:

- **Public policy and governance:** Quantum models can help predict how public attitudes collapse at crucial moments and how media priming or question order can produce dramatic shifts in opinion, offering new perspectives for policy communication strategies.

- **Risk management and financial decision-making:** In finance, investors' "irrational" behavior often defies classic forecasts. Quantum approaches incorporate interference terms to model hesitation, superposed attitudes, and sudden collapses in market participants' decisions, potentially improving market fluctuation analysis.

- **Organizational and group decisions:** Firms or organizations frequently exhibit attitude volatility, context dependence, and "group polarization" in collective decision-making or negotiation. Quantum social science provides fresh game-theoretic rules and computational models to explore scenarios in which groups might transcend "prisoner's dilemma" logics and arrive at more efficient cooperative equilibria.

- **Marketing and consumer analysis:** Consumer psychology is replete with hesitation, superposed preferences, and measurement-induced attitude changes—phenomena classic marketing models rarely capture precisely. Quantum interference and collapse mechanisms can potentially explain how ad sequencing, store layouts, and brand associations shape purchasing intentions instantaneously.

8.3.2 Synergies with Emerging Technologies (e.g., Quantum Computing, AI)

The integration of quantum social science with novel technologies is also highly promising:

- **Quantum computing:** Parallelism and quantum algorithms could accelerate simulations or parameter optimization within large-scale quantum social models, facilitating faster iteration and testing of interference-related hypotheses.

- **Artificial intelligence:** Deep or reinforcement learning combined with quantum probability might enhance multi-agent simulations and complex social system modeling, while introducing more robust uncertainty handling into AI algorithms.

8.4 Final Remarks

In conclusion, this paper, grounded in quantum probability theory, has discussed its foundational axioms, methodological constructs, and multiple empirical case studies (ranging from cognitive biases and social networks to political attitudes under both experimental and field conditions) to explore the feasibility and potential of quantum social science. Its principal contributions are:

1. Demonstrating how quantum concepts (superposition, interference, measurement-induced collapse) can naturally map onto the uncertainty and context dependence of social attitudes.

2. Proposing concrete approaches for representing social variables in Hilbert space, designing measurement operators, and quantifying interference terms.

3. Presenting cross-disciplinary empirical evidence suggesting that quantum models provide notable explanatory power for order effects and nonlinear clustering phenomena, thereby enriching our understanding of human decision-making and collective behavior.

Nonetheless, quantum social science faces ongoing theoretical and practical challenges: determining appropriate model boundaries, refining experimental design precision, addressing measurement error, and ensuring feasibility in large-scale, real-world contexts. Even so, quantum probability has begun to challenge and supplement classical social science paradigms, offering a departure from the assumption of “predetermined stable preferences” to illuminate how measurement itself dynamically shapes attitudes.

With intensified interdisciplinary collaboration and support from emerging technologies, quantum social science has the potential to supply more flexible and profound modeling tools for fields such as public policy, risk management, market analysis, and organizational coordination. It also urges researchers to delve more deeply into the interplay among rationality, measurement, and social behavior. As empirical evidence accumulates and theoretical frameworks mature, quantum social science may well reshape our perspectives on the non-classical dimensions of human and societal actions, inaugurating new paradigms and practical insights for the social sciences.

量子概率论与社会行为建模：从公理到应用

李昌奎
开元出版有限公司

摘要 量子概率理论最初源于量子力学领域，近年来在社会科学中得到了广泛应用，以解释人类决策、认知过程和群体行为。与假设偏好稳定且预先存在的经典概率模型不同，量子模型引入了叠加、干涉和非对易性，以更准确地刻画人类决策中的情境依赖性和测量效应。本文

系统探讨了量子概率在社会科学中的理论基础，介绍了量子模型构建方法，并回顾了其在实证研究中的应用。通过量子认知、量子博弈论和量子投票等案例分析，我们展示了量子方法如何解释顺序效应、测量引发的态度变化以及群体极化等现象。此外，本文讨论了量子社会科学的研究挑战和局限性，强调了严格实验验证和跨学科合作的重要性。最后，我们展望了量子概率模型与量子计算、人工智能等新兴技术的结合前景，为社会科学研究和政策制定提供新的方法和应用方向。
关键词 量子概率；量子认知；量子决策理论；干涉效应；顺序效应；非对易性；社会行为建模；量子博弈论；量子投票；跨学科应用；测量引发的态度变化

1 引言

在社会科学的诸多领域，研究者往往需要探究人类行为、群体互动以及制度演变背后的规律与机制。长期以来，以经典概率论和期望效用理论为代表的“理性人”假设在经济学、政治学、社会学等学科中占据重要地位。然而，随着对社会行为复杂性与人类决策过程内在多样性的不断挖掘，传统理论模型逐渐暴露出适用范围上的局限。量子概率论的兴起与量子认知学、量子博弈论等跨学科新范式的发展，为社会科学研究打开了新的大门，也为更准确、更具包容性的社会行为建模提供了重要契机。本文将围绕量子概率论在社会行为建模中的潜能与应用路径展开论述，力求在理论框架与实证检验之间建立系统联系，并展望其在社会科学研究中的未来发展前景。

1.1 研究背景与问题提出

1.1.1 社会科学中传统决策理论与经典概率的局限性

自经济学家冯·诺依曼（John von Neumann）与摩根斯坦（Oskar Morgenstern）提出期望效用理论（Expected Utility Theory）以来，“理性人”假设便在社会科学尤其是经济学和政治学中成为核心主导范式。该理论在假设决策者完全理性、能够完备处理信息的前提下，通过经典概率论求解决策问题。然而，实际的社会环境中充斥着不确定性与动态变化，多数个人或组织的决策过程也远非“完全理性”可言。

从心理学和行为经济学的视角出发，卡尼曼（Daniel Kahneman）与特沃斯基（Amos Tversky）等人通过大量实验证明人类在面对风险与不确定性时会产生系统性偏差，如损失厌恶、锚定效应、框架效应等。这些偏差意味着人类的决策并不是对客观概率的简单线性加权，而是包含了情感、认知框架与情境线索等复杂因素。经典概率论假设事件之间相互独立、概率可加且满足可交换性，然而现实情境下的决策顺序效应、参照点依赖以及主观认知切换都可能打破这些假设。传统模型面对如此多样化且相互交错的影响因素，往往显得“力不从心”。

在社会学和政治学领域，研究者同样常借助经典概率统计方法来预估群体意向或社会变迁走势。然而，当问题涉及多群体互动、集体认同或舆论浪潮时，群体的情感与认知状态往往不是独立存在，而是会相互干涉、互为背景。此时，使用经典概率模型所推导出的结论可能和现实情形产生偏差。社会科学的发展亟待更具弹性、更能捕捉动态关联效应的新方法论。

1.1.2 量子概率论兴起及其与社会科学研究的交叉契机

量子概率论最初建立于量子力学的理论框架中，用以描述微观粒子在测量过程中的不确定性与叠加性。它不同于经典概率论的核心在于：事件的测量可能并非相互独立，而由系统处于何种“量子态”来决定其概率分布特征。量子态的叠加性与测量后态坍缩，体现出对系统行为的全新理解。这种独特特性对社会科学的启示在于：个体或群体的“心理状态”或者“决策倾向”可能并非固定存在，而是存在一个较为模糊、不确定甚至叠加的状态。在决策测量（即外界对个体做出决策要求、或社会环境的某种触发）之后，个体的决策才真实地“坍缩”到某一具体选项上。

量子认知理论（Quantum Cognition）与量子决策理论将量子概率引入人类认知与行为研究之中，关注如何刻画上下文依赖、干涉效应、顺序效应等在行为实验与社会调查中屡见不鲜但难以用经典模型解释的现象。一些学者提出，量子概率模型能够更加自然地表达“心理超势（potential）”与“观测到结果”之间的关系，进而合理解释因“测量过程”本身而引发的态度转变与偏好变化。这些研究为社会科学建模提供了突破口，同时也提出了大量需要严谨验证的问题。

在这股跨学科的研究浪潮中，量子博弈（Quantum Game Theory）则进一步将量子力学的叠加与纠缠（Entanglement）等概念引入博弈论的策略空间中，以此研究个体或群体行为如何在更广阔的可能性空间内演化与协同。虽然量子博弈最初多停留在理论层面，但对社会合作、冲突决策乃至宏观经济体系有潜在启示意义。尤其当博弈过程涉及多主体信息不对称与先后次序变化时，量子干涉模型或许能捕捉到经典博弈所忽视的行为细节。

概言之，量子概率论与社会科学研究的交叉点在于对“非经典概率现象”的捕捉与对人类认知过程的更细腻描述。二者的融合为我们提供了把握群体互动和社会复杂现象的新工具与新视角。

1.2 研究意义

1.2.1 探索量子概率论在社会行为建模中的潜在优势

量子概率论在测度系统不确定性与动态演化方面展现出独特的优越性，可以为社会科学中普遍存在的“情境依赖”“测量敏感”“顺序效应”等难题提供新的思路。一方面，量子概率与叠加态的概念有助于解释个体在做出明确选择前的多重态度并存；另一方面，干涉项的引入则可以反映上下文对决策形成过程所产生的交互影响。借助量子概率论，研究者或许能够构建更符合人类实际思维方式的模型，从而在预测准确度和解释力上取得更佳平衡。

以公共政策设计为例，传统政策评估模型往往假设公民或利益相关者对政策有明确、稳定且可度量的态度，但在现实中，许多社会议题（如环境保护、福利改革、教育资源分配等）都会在民众内部引发高度的“态度叠加”：公众常常并未事先形成明确立场，而是在接收信息或被问及意见时才迅速进行内部整合并“坍缩”成某种态度。量子概率论在此能够提供一条可能的解释路径，帮助我们理解与捕捉这些态度的动态。

1.2.2 识别量子概率模型对理解人类复杂决策和行为的启示

长期以来，社会科学研究者一直在寻找能够兼顾理性与非理性、兼顾静态结构与动态演化的模型。量子概率论在干涉效应、不确定性表征上的特性，为人类决策研究开启了新的可能性：人们或许并非总是根据稳定偏好或固定的估值来选择，而是在不同情境下通过某种带有叠加特性的“认知波函数”来暂时保持多重心理可能。当某个外部刺激或信息触发时，这种叠加态才会“坍缩”到一个具体的认知或行动选项。

对于探索群体行为和社会互动机制，这种思路同样具有启示意义。社会舆论常常表现为大规模的态度波动，且容易在突发事件或媒体报道的刺激下迅速聚合或分裂。若使用量子概率论中的纠缠或干涉等概念，或能更好地阐释群体之间相互影响所带来的行为同步化与共振效应。由此，在学术层面，量子概率模型为社会科学提供了全新的解释框架；在应用层面，则可以帮助政府、企业或社会组织在制定政策、设计市场策略或引导公众舆论时，考虑到更深层次且动态的行为逻辑。

1.3 文献回顾

1.3.1 经典概率论与期望效用理论在社会科学应用的局限

期望效用理论在早期经济学研究中拥有崇高地位，被视为对人类决策行为的简洁而优雅的描述。但从阿莱悖论（Allais Paradox）到埃尔斯伯格悖论（Ellsberg Paradox），一系列实验与现象都在质疑期望效用理论的全面适用性。此后发展出的前景理论（Prospect Theory）尝试通过价值函数与概率加权函数等修正手段，解释人类对收益与损失表现出的不同敏感度，以及面对模糊概率时的独特偏好。尽管如此，前景理论仍以经典概率论为基础，其对“事件不确定性”的处理方式依旧遵循可加性和独立性等原则；当面对跨期选择、多阶段决策乃至多主体博弈时，这些原则可能不足以应对现实情境的复杂度。

在政治学、社会学与管理学中，经典概率统计方法也同样存在一定缺陷：它往往假设个体或群体的态度是事先确定且可被准确“测量”的。然而，研究者发现，人们对相同问题的回答会因问卷顺序、问题表述方式、周围环境或其他背景信息的变化而大幅度改变，这种显著的“上下文效应”显示经典概率框架所假定的稳定、可分离的概率分布可能并不适用于许多复杂决策情境。

1.3.2 行为经济学、认知心理学对非理性决策的研究进展

在行为经济学领域，卡尼曼与特沃斯基通过系统性实验证明了人类决策往往偏离传统经济学定义的理性范式：人们容易受到启发性（Heuristics）和偏见的影响，会在感知风险与不确定性时表现出非对称的风险偏好。这些研究丰富了社会科学对决策过程的理解，并推动了行为金融学、行为政治学等子领域的兴起。然而，这些研究多在“修正”理性的框架下进行，或者说是在经典概率的“外层”增加各种补充和校正，以期在实证层面取得更好的预测力。

另一方面，认知心理学家通过研究记忆、信息加工与判断推理过程发现，人类的意识或许并非机械地对外界信号进行加权，而是处于一个高度动态化的认知网络之中。在不同语境或顺序下，个体所持有的“表征”会发生转变，且此前激活的认知元素也会影响随后决策时的

权衡标准。经典概率论在处理此类“非可交换测量”问题时显得相对乏力。

1.3.3 量子认知、量子博弈等前沿领域的已有成果与争议

针对上述难题，近二十年来的量子认知（Quantum Cognition）研究发展迅速。量子认知学者如 Jerome Busemeyer、Peter Bruza 等人通过系列实验与数学模型验证，在一系列经典概率难以解释的现象中，量子概率模型表现出更高的适配度。例如，当对受试者连续提问多个相关但并非独立的问题时，回答结果往往表现出顺序效应和干涉效应，而量子模型可用态向量旋转与投影过程来准确描述此种现象。

量子博弈论（Quantum Game Theory）则是另一条蓬勃兴起的研究线路。Eisert 等学者尝试引入量子纠缠概念来扩展博弈策略空间，使得玩家的策略不仅仅是经典的“合作背叛”或“投票不投票”，还包含了叠加态与纠缠态下的策略选择。虽然这些研究离大规模实证尚有距离，但从理论层面证明了在更广泛的策略空间内，量子化博弈可能带来全新的均衡点或激励机制。

值得注意的是，量子认知与量子博弈本身也面临一定争议。一方面，不少学者质疑在宏观社会环境中是否真的存在“量子态”或“纠缠”这样的物理实质；另一方面，即使量子模型的数学形式能够解释一些实验现象，也并不意味着人类大脑或社会群体真的是以量子方式运作。故而，在社会科学领域应用量子理论更大的价值，或许在于其提供了一种更具弹性与抽象力的概率框架，以便刻画决策过程中的相依性和测量敏感性。

1.4 文章结构

针对以上背景，本文在后续章节中将围绕量子概率论与社会行为建模的关系展开系统论述，整体结构安排如下：

第二部分：概述量子概率论的核心公理与数学基础，将其与经典概率论的主要区别、希尔伯特空间的构造及测量算符等关键概念加以对比阐释。

第三部分：详细讨论社会行为建模所面临的复杂性与挑战，剖析传统模型如何应对这些挑战以及出现的瓶颈，并进一步说明为何量子概率论在此有潜在突破。

第四部分：围绕量子概率在社会行为中的关键概念展开分析，包括叠加态、干涉项、非可交换算符与量子纠缠，重点探讨它们如何映射到人类决策与社会互动。

第五部分：构建量子概率模型并列举多个应用案例，如量子认知、量子博弈、量子投票模型等，展示从公理到应用的具体路径与研究范式。

第六部分：通过实证研究与案例分析，探讨量子概率模型在现实社会情境下的可行性与局限性。

第七部分：基于模型构建与实证检验的结果，对量子概率论在社会科学研究范式中的价值进行综合讨论，并分析其与经典模型的互补或替代关系。

第八部分：对全文研究进行总结，并展望未来的研究方向，包括跨学科合作和在公共政策、风险管理及宏观经济建模等领域的潜在应用。

通过上述结构，本研究将系统展现量子概率论与社会科学的跨学科交融逻辑，从理论到方法、从实验到实证，力求为理解人类复杂决策和社会行为提供更具包容性的新思路，也为

后续量子社会科学研究拓展更多可能。可以预见，量子概率论不仅是一套替代经典概率的数学工具，更是一个能够包容多元视角、刻画动态认知与非理性行为的重要范式。它将有助于研究者从新的角度去审视社会行为的形成过程以及宏观社会动态的演进机理。

2 量子概率论的公理基础

量子概率论最初源自对微观量子力学现象的研究，但其公理化结构和数学工具展现出惊人的普适性，能够用来刻画各种非经典形式的不确定性。与以 Kolmogorov 公理体系为基础的经典概率论相比，量子概率引入了叠加、干涉以及非对易算符等独特概念，能够涵盖更宽广的行为模式与悖论。因此，量子概率理论在社会科学等复杂领域同样具有潜在的解释力。本节将阐述量子概率与经典概率的主要区别，并讨论其中关键的概念与数学工具如何应用于社会行为建模。

2.1 经典概率论与量子概率论的比较

2.1.1Kolmogorov 公理体系与其在社会科学中的应用

经典概率论的理论基础来自科尔莫哥洛夫（A. N. Kolmogorov）在 1933 年提出的公理体系，其核心内容可概括如下：

- 存在一个样本空间 Ω，包含所有可能的结果；
- 定义在 Ω 上的一个 σ 代数 $\mathcal{F}$（事件的集合）；
- 对任意事件 $A \in \mathcal{F}$，给出一个概率测度 $P(A)$，满足 $0 \leq P(A) \leq 1$ 且 $P(\Omega) = 1$；
- 可加性：若事件 A 和 B 互不相交，则 $P(A \cup B) = P(A) + P(B)$。

在社会科学中，这套公理体系具有深远影响。从问卷设计、统计推断，到市场或投票行为的预测分析，几乎都离不开对经典概率的依赖。其基本假设往往包括：个体或群体在作出选择时有稳定的偏好分布，测量只是从外部将该分布“揭示”出来。然而在实际研究中，我们发现社会行为中存在大量上下文和认知因素，使得测量结果容易受到问题顺序、情境线索等影响，违背了经典概率中的独立性和可分离性假设。比如，在公共意见调查中，回答者对同一问题所给出的概率性判断常常因背景条件变化而改变，且此种变化并非简单的加性或独立关系所能解释。

尽管如此，Kolmogorov 公理依旧是社会科学中分析随机过程的奠基石。研究者在此基础上往往通过添加条件概率、Bayes 公式或者多层结构模型来应对复杂场景。但对于更深层次的“测量改变系统”、“干涉效应”等现象，经典概率模型仍显力不从心，这也引发了研究者对于替代或补充框架的探索。

2.1.2 量子概率的基础假设与特征：叠加性、干涉项等

与经典概率论相比，量子概率最重要的区别在于其放宽了关于事件空间和测量可交换性的传统假设。量子概率并不单纯依赖于一个固定的“样本空间”，而是使用抽象的希尔伯特空间来表征系统处于何种状态，并允许系统在测量前处于叠加态。

叠加性（**Superposition**）：在量子力学中，一个粒子可以同时处于多个本征态（eigenstate）的线性组合之中，直到被测量后才“坍缩”到某个特定状态。若将此理念应用于社会情境，可以认为个体或群体在面临选择时，可能同时保留对不同观点或态度的潜在倾向，而不是事先拥有一个固定且已知的概率分布。只有在真正需要做出决策（即测量）时，这种叠加态才会坍缩为具体结果。

干涉效应（**Interference**）：在经典概率中，若事件 A 与 B 互斥，则 $P(A \cup B) = P(A) + P(B)$；但在量子概率中，由于概率来自于复振幅，还会出现干涉项。正是这一特征可以用来解释许多顺序效应、问题表述效应等，在不同测量情境下概率分布会发生非线性变化。

量子概率的这些特征拓宽了我们对“状态”与“测量”的理解，使得研究者可以自然地刻画一些看似违背经典逻辑的社会现象。例如，当我们先问一个人对某项政策的态度，再问其对政治候选人的评价，结果往往与先问对候选人的看法再问对政策的看法不同。这种顺序效应在经典概率中往往需要加入额外参数或修正项才能解释，而量子概率则从测量的非对易性和干涉角度自然而然地加以刻画。

2.2 量子概率的核心概念

2.2.1 希尔伯特空间 (Hilbert Space)

量子概率的数学舞台是希尔伯特空间，这是一种完备的内积空间，可视为欧几里得空间在高维甚至无限维层面的拓展。在该空间中，系统的状态被表示为一个向量 $|\psi\rangle$。空间的维度及其基向量通常对应系统可能的不同本征态，或者说不同的可观测输出。

对于社会行为分析，研究者可以将“态度空间”或“决策空间”视为希尔伯特空间。例如，若想描述一个人在某个议题上有正、负、中立三种态度，可在三维希尔伯特空间内建立相应的基向量。若考虑多议题或多因素，则可通过张量积（tensor product）构造更高维度的状态空间，以表达个体或群体在多议题间的交互作用与纠缠。此方法为建模“多选项叠加”提供了比经典模型更灵活的结构。

2.2.2 状态向量 (State Vector) 与射影测量 (Projection Measurement)

在量子力学中，系统的所有信息都存储于状态向量 $|\psi\rangle$ 中。当施加一个可观测量（对应算符 $\hat{M}$）进行测量时，量子理论假设系统会坍缩到对应的本征态之一。形式上，可观测量算符有一组正交归一的本征向量 $\{|\phi_i\rangle\}$，则测得结果 i 的概率为：

映射到社会科学中，这意味着如果我们将“提问”或“逼迫决策”看作一种测量操作，那么个体原本处于某种叠加态，一旦测量完成，便坍缩为某一明确的回答或立场，且后续的测量会基于新的状态继续进行。这种对“测量改变系统本身”的理解，正好解释了为何在社会调查或实验中，前一个问题的回答会影响后续问题的结果。

The probability of obtaining outcome i is given by:

$$P(i) = \left|\langle \phi_i | \psi \rangle\right|^2 \quad (1)$$

The post-measurement state is:

$$|\psi'\rangle = \frac{\hat{P}_i |\psi\rangle}{\sqrt{\langle \psi | \hat{P}_i | \psi \rangle}} \quad (2)$$

where the projection operator onto the outcome i is defined as:

$$\hat{P}_i = |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i| \quad (3)$$

Figure 1:

2.2.3 干涉效应与非可交换算符 (Noncommuting Operators)

在经典概率论中，若两个事件或测量是独立的或可交换的，测量先后的顺序不应该影响最终结果。然而，量子概率中的测量算符可能不对易，即 $\hat{A}\hat{B} \neq \hat{B}\hat{A}$，代表测量顺序会影响到最终状态和概率分布。非可交换算符带来的顺序效应正是量子干涉的主要来源。

在社会科学实验中，若先测量个人的 “政治态度”，再测量其对某项 “经济政策” 的支持度，与先测经济政策再测政治态度的结果通常并不相同。量子概率自然地将这种现象解释为算符的不对易性：第一次测量会改变系统状态，进而影响第二次测量的分布。正是这种结构使量子概率无需额外的补丁式修正，就能够捕捉真实世界中普遍存在的 “前后问题不一致” 或 “顺序依赖” 现象。

2.3 量子测量与不确定性

2.3.1 测量后态坍缩 (Collapse) 及其对社会行为建模的启示

量子力学中最具标志性的特点之一，就是在测量时系统状态的 “坍缩”。当系统经历一次测量后，原本的叠加态会化为某个特定本征态，而后续对同一可观测量的测量便会以确定性的概率得到同样结果。这对于社会科学的暗示在于，人们的态度或想法并非事先就完全固定，测量过程本身往往会促使其在多种潜在倾向中做出即时选择。

换言之，个体在被问及特定问题前，可能并未明确思考过此问题；当问卷或实验要求他作出回答时，这一 “测量” 就有潜力直接塑造了他的态度或立场。此后，他对于同一问题的回答可能更趋于稳定，因为系统态已被 “坍缩” 到某一相对确定的态度上。这种测量对系统本身的改变在经典观点中常被视作噪音或偏差，但在量子视角下却是模型内在的一部分，能更贴近地描述现实中的态度形成与动态更新过程。

2.3.2 不确定性原理与人类决策中的随机性

海森堡不确定性原理表明在物理层面上，某些可观测量（如位置和动量）无法被同时精确测量或知晓。这一原则在社会科学中虽缺乏对等的物理含义，但所传达的深层思想——有些属

性不能被同时确定——可以为社会决策中的混沌和矛盾提供类比。例如，若我们尝试同时测量一个人的即时情绪和长远价值观，不同测量顺序可能导致结果产生量子式的“不确定”；对情绪的聚焦可能会改变个体此时的价值观表达，或者相反亦然。

此外，量子随机性的根源不只是外部信息不足，而是系统本身在被测量前即处于本质上的不定态。对于人类决策行为而言，这可对应心理学和神经科学中对“即刻生成”或“瞬时建构”的态度认知观点。与经典模型将不确定性视为缺乏信息或未观测到的隐藏变量不同，量子视角下的随机性则被视为更为根本的存在。

2.4 相关数学工具与推导

2.4.1 布拉凯特记号 (BraKet Notation)

量子力学中最广为人知的符号体系是狄拉克（P. A. M. Dirac）提出的布拉凯特记号。其使用 $|\psi\rangle$ 表示列向量（“ket”），$\langle\phi|$ 表示对应的行向量（“bra”），并用内积 $\langle\phi|\psi\rangle$ 来刻画态之间的重叠幅度。虽然最初用于描述微观粒子状态，但在社会建模中，这套记号同样可以简洁地表达状态变化与测量算符等运算过程。

例如，可将一位“选民”的状态记为 $|\psi_{\text{voter}}\rangle$，针对不同政策观点或候选人选择设置相应的算符，对其进行“投影测量”即可获得支持某政策或偏好某候选人的概率。随着测量的进行，状态 $|\psi_{\text{voter}}\rangle$ 也会发生相应变化。

2.4.2 量子振幅与概率

量子模型与经典模型最大的区别在于量子概率是通过“振幅”的平方来确定的，这些振幅往往是复数而非实数。例如，若 $|\phi\rangle$ 是某个可观测结果对应的本征态，$|\psi\rangle$ 是当前系统状态向量，则测量结果为 ϕ 的概率为

$$P(\phi) = |\langle\phi|\psi\rangle|^2.$$

当存在多个可能路径（态）相互叠加时，这些振幅会发生相长或相消干涉，从而在宏观上显现出非线性的概率效应。对社会问卷而言，两个问题顺序的差异可能对应不同的振幅和相位，进而导致结果出现增强或抑制。

2.4.3 典型证明思路与推理过程概述

量子概率的公理化过程可以被视为：在放宽经典概率对事件可交换、分配律严格成立等假设后，通过对正交投影算符、希尔伯特空间结构进行约束，便自然推导出 Born 规则（即 $P = |\langle\phi|\psi\rangle|^2$）等量子机制。诸如 Gleason 定理等数学结论也进一步说明，如果一个测度满足正交可加性等条件，那么它必然具有量子概率的形式。

对于社会科学研究者而言，这些证明展示了为什么量子概率并非“任意拼贴”，而是一种在放宽经典逻辑后仍能自洽的理论体系。而在应用层面，这意味着研究者可以在保持数学一致性的同时，通过量子框架对社会行为中测量顺序依赖、不确定性、多重态叠加等现象提供一种新的理论解释。

综上所述，量子概率论所包含的一整套数学工具——从希尔伯特空间、射影测量到非对易算符和干涉项——构建了一个与经典概率截然不同但又在内部高度自洽的体系。它为社会科学提供了一种新视角，来研究那些经典模型难以有效囊括的复杂行为与思维过程。无论这一理论究竟能否在大脑机制或社会结构上找到对应的“物理真实性”，从建模与方法论角度看，量子概率都为人类社会现象的研究带来了更丰富的表达可能性和更灵活的分析手段。

3 社会行为建模的挑战

在社会科学研究中，对社会行为进行有效建模一直是一项具有高度复杂性且充满挑战的任务。尽管传统决策理论在许多场景下提供了简明扼要的分析框架，但在面对现实社会中多元化的心理因素、复杂的情境依赖以及群体交互等问题时，传统模型的局限性开始显现。随着科学家和学者们愈发关注人类决策的非理性与上下文互动，如何在理论与方法层面更好地捕捉这些复杂特征，便成为社会行为建模亟待解决的重要课题。本节将从传统决策理论的不足、社会行为的多层次复杂性，以及量子视角对这些挑战可能带来的契合点三个方面展开讨论。

3.1 传统决策理论的局限性

3.1.1 期望效用理论 (Expected Utility) 与前景理论 (Prospect Theory) 的不足

在主流经济学和行为科学的早期研究中，期望效用理论（Expected Utility Theory）一直是分析决策行为的主要支柱。它假设决策者在面临不确定性时，会以某种理性的方式对所有潜在结果进行评估，并选取最大化期望效用的选项。根据该理论，个体具有清晰而稳定的偏好，对各种可能的收益和损失也有明确的主观概率认知，从而能够计算出每个决策选项的期望效用值。然而，随着实证研究的不断深入，大量悖论和反常现象（如阿莱悖论、埃尔斯伯格悖论）挑战了期望效用理论的普适性与完备性。这些悖论指出，真实情境中的人们往往并不遵循“理性最大化”原则，而在风险与不确定条件下表现出相当明显的情境依赖和心理偏差。

为了解决期望效用理论难以解释的非理性特征，卡尼曼（Daniel Kahneman）与特沃斯基（Amos Tversky）等人提出了前景理论（Prospect Theory）。前景理论通过“价值函数”和“决策权重函数”，对人们在收益与损失上的不同敏感度，以及对模糊概率的厌恶态度等进行了刻画。它在一定程度上纠正了期望效用理论的“完全理性”假设，能够更好地解释损失厌恶等现象。不过，前景理论依旧建立在经典概率的框架之上，其对决策过程中信息整合的方式，仍然假设存在相对固定的主观概率估计和价值判断。一旦社会情境具有更多交互维度或多重阶段决策时，前景理论也会面临适用性不足的问题。

更重要的是，无论是期望效用理论还是前景理论，都在很大程度上依赖于“静态”的个人偏好设定：个体被假定为拥有某个清晰且稳定的效用函数或价值函数，而决策过程不过是对已存在的主观概率进行加权计算。然而，在实际社会中，个人的偏好常常会随时间改变，并且对外界刺激、上下文暗示以及群体互动等因素都有高度敏感性。这也意味着传统理论在解释复杂社会行为时往往出现预测失灵或无法捕捉动态演化的难题。

3.1.2 认知偏差、情境依赖、非理性因素对模型的冲击

行为经济学家和认知心理学家已经通过大量实验，揭示出人类决策在面对风险与不确定性时存在诸多系统性偏差。例如，框架效应（Framing Effect）表明相同的决策问题在不同语境或表述方式下会得到截然不同的决策结果；锚定效应（Anchoring Effect）显示人们在估计不确定量时往往过分依赖先前的“锚点”信息；此外，还有确认偏见、过度自信、厌恶损失等多种偏差。所有这些都指向了一个核心事实：真实的决策过程并非仅仅依赖对客观概率和价值的冷静计算，还深受主观认知和情感因素的左右。

另一方面，“情境依赖”（context dependence）在社会行为研究中表现得尤为明显。人们在回答问卷或做出判断时，其反应可能受到问题顺序、问题表述方式、环境刺激以及他人态度的交互影响。这些效应违背了经典概率中对事件独立性和可加性的假设，要求研究者在模型层面充分考虑“上下文”对决策倾向的塑造作用。传统模型往往只能通过增加参数或设定附加机制（如顺序效应修正项）来对这类现象进行勉强解释，却难以在统一的理论框架下提供自然且有机的说明。

随着社会科学对非理性决策研究的不断深入，“理性人”假设所面临的冲击越来越大。基于经典概率论和效用理论的模型虽然在简化问题、提供基线推断时仍有重要价值，但若研究者希望刻画更贴近实际的社会行为过程，就需要寻找能包容非理性、上下文互作用以及动态演化特征的新方法学工具。正是在这一背景下，近些年才兴起了从量子概率、量子认知等跨学科领域借鉴新思路的尝试。

3.2 复杂社会行为的多层次特征

社会行为之所以难以建模，部分原因在于它同时存在多重相互影响的层次：从个体的心理与认知过程，到群体层面的社会结构与文化制度；从微观的情感反应，到宏观的舆论演变和政策效应。任何单一层面的模型都可能忽视另一些关键因素，导致研究缺乏系统性。

（1）个体层面的心理、认知与情感互动

首先，个体的行为受限于其内部的心理状态，包括情感、认知与动机等维度。例如，一位消费者在选购商品时，既会考虑理性的成本收益分析，也会受情感偏好、习惯、品牌联想等因素左右。当外部信息（如广告、口碑、优惠策略）发生改变时，这些内在因素随之变化，从而引发个体决策的即时转变。此外，人在做决定时并不一定会持有完整的信息或稳定的偏好结构；相反，对于尚未明确思考过的问题，个体往往处于模糊的态度区域，只有在被要求做出选择或回答问卷时才“现时现地”地凝结成某种立场。

认知心理学还揭示了记忆过程、注意力分配与思维框架如何影响行为。个体会基于已有的图式（schema）去理解新信息，并将其纳入已有的认知结构之中。信息的呈现方式、顺序及频次都会影响人如何整合或忽略某些线索。这种动态的、情境化的心理机制在传统决策模型中往往难以体现。

（2）群体层面的社会网络、文化与制度因素

除个体层面的影响外，社会行为更具广泛的群体互动性。人类是社会化程度极高的物种，其行为往往在社会关系网络、文化价值、制度约束等多重力量的交汇下展开。例如，在政治学中，选民的投票倾向不仅取决于个人价值观和政策偏好，还受到社交网络中他人的意见暗

示、媒体信息塑造、政党认可及制度设计（如投票规则、选区划分）的影响。许多社会运动或舆论浪潮也体现出群体动力学特征：一些关键意见领袖或网络节点可能在舆论形成与扩散中扮演放大器的角色，带动整个群体的态度朝某个方向迅速偏移。

文化和制度同样可以深刻影响个体认知与行为。例如，同一项公共政策在不同地区、不同社会制度背景下会遭遇截然不同的舆论反应；同样的个人动机和认知偏差，也可能在不同文化情境中体现出不同的行为模式。传统决策理论通常将这些“外部因素”简单地视为给定的约束或参数，难以解释复杂社会行为在跨文化或跨制度环境下的多样性以及相互作用的机理。

因此，要想在社会科学中建立通用且灵活的行为模型，需要能够同时兼容个体心理机制与群体社会结构，并能在其中自然地融入时间演化与情景切换。这样的一种方法论挑战，呼唤新的理论工具去捕捉多层次、多要素的动态耦合。

3.3 量子视角的潜在契合

在前文提及的诸多挑战中，最核心的症结在于：社会行为的“状态”并非在事前就已固定确定，而是具有一定的模糊性与情景敏感性；测量或提问本身会改变个体或群体的心理结构；不同测量顺序、信息呈现方式都会导致对同一问题形成不同的反应模式。量子概率论恰好在“叠加态”“干涉效应”以及“非对易测量”上提供了新的思路，其对上下文与观测的依赖性也与社会行为中的动态建构过程存在一定类比关系。

（1）干涉效应与人类认知中的“上下文依赖”

量子物理中，干涉效应（Interference）是由概率振幅的相加或相消产生的；若直接用经典概率加法来预估结果，则会出现不符合经典期望的数值。对应到社会科学领域，“上下文依赖”可以被视为对决策概率分布的一种“干涉”。当一个问题的回答顺序或背景线索改变时，个体对后续问题的反应会产生强化或削弱，这与量子模型中干涉项的数学描述相似。

在传统问卷或实验设计中，如果观察到显著的前后顺序效应，就意味着经典概率假设——即各事件独立或满足固定条件概率——被打破。但量子模型允许根据算符的对易性（或不对易性）去刻画这种依赖：先对一个观测量进行测量，会让系统态发生坍缩，进而影响对下一个观测量的测量结果。通过引入干涉项，人类认知中那些“矛盾”“冲突”或“情绪化”的决策轨迹也能在一个统一的理论框架下得到更直观的刻画。

（2）量子态叠加与态度模糊性、矛盾心理等社会现象的类比

在量子力学中，微观粒子可以同时处于多个本征态（eigenstate）的叠加态，一直到测量的那一刻才坍缩到某个具体态上。类比于社会行为，可以设想个体对某问题并没有一个早已成型且稳定的偏好，而是处于一个“潜在态度空间”中。当被外界（如问卷、访谈或社会舆论）“测量”时，才不得不在瞬时情境下做出一个具体选择——比如支持或反对某项决策。

这种叠加态可以很好地解释“态度模糊性”与“矛盾心理”：一个人可能既同意 A 方案的一些优点，也认可 B 方案的某些长处，但并未在心理上完成“权衡取舍”。传统的经典模型要么假设个体已经内在地分配好了对 A 和 B 的概率权重，要么将这种模棱两可视作噪音或不确定性。而在量子视角下，模糊的态度反而是一种自然状态，测量后态坍缩则代表着在外界压力下（决策或问卷）被迫选择一个明确立场。

除此之外，在社会群体层面，也存在态度叠加、立场纠结或舆论摇摆的现象。量子建模为

此提供了一个具备高层抽象力且具可操作性的数学框架，帮助研究者在面对群体多元且相互交织的意见时，不必再完全依赖“概率可加性”与“固定偏好”的前提。通过设计合适的测量算符与状态空间，模型可模拟群体在不同情境和测量顺序下如何演变出截然不同的态度分布，从而进一步为“社交媒体时代”下的舆情研究与策略干预提供新的见解。

总结而言，传统决策理论在解释社会行为时面临三重挑战：

1）其“理性人”及“稳定偏好”假设难以兼容大量实证所揭示的认知偏差与情境依赖；

2）社会行为的多层次特征（个体、群体、制度、文化）使得简单加和式模型无力概括复杂交互；

3）在测量与互动过程中，社会系统本身会不断变化，呼唤可表达“动态叠加”与“干涉”的新框架。

量子概率论及其在社会科学中的应用（如量子认知、量子博弈）正是在此背景下涌现。它从根本上为“测量会改变系统”以及“状态处于叠加态”提供了自洽的解释结构，或许能够在捕捉人类认知和行为模式的非经典现象上更胜一筹。当然，这并不意味着量子视角可以彻底取代或淘汰传统决策模型；它更像是一种值得探索的替代性或互补性框架，帮助社会科学在理论与方法层面更精细地刻画真实世界的复杂度。随着量子视角的引入，人们对于社会行为中非线性、非经典以及矛盾叠加状态的认识有了新的可能，这也为后续学界在实验设计、建模验证与实证分析方面开辟了更广阔的研究空间。

4 量子概率在社会行为中的关键概念与机制

量子概率理论之所以能在社会科学的语境下引起研究者的浓厚兴趣，核心原因就在于它为“测量改变系统”“上下文依赖”“态度叠加”等非经典现象提供了一个自洽且统一的数学与概念框架。在具体应用时，量子模型通常会将社会行为比拟为对“态度态”的测量过程，并通过数学上的叠加态、干涉项、非可交换算符以及纠缠等概念，解析人类个体或群体在不同情境下如何产生截然不同的反应与选择。本节将围绕四个关键机制展开论述：

1）叠加态（Superposition）与模糊选择；

2）干涉项（Interference Term）与上下文效应；

3）非可交换算符与决策顺序效应；

4）量子纠缠与社会群体行为。

通过深入探究这些概念如何在社会情境中“映射”，我们或许能更充分地理解社会行为的复杂性与动态可塑性，并为社会调查、政策设计以及舆论预测等实践领域提供新的研究视角。

4.1 叠加态（Superposition）与模糊选择

（1）多个决策选项间的“叠加”——人类犹豫、模糊偏好的可能模型

在传统的决策模型中，个体被假设已经对所有可选选项赋予了固定的主观概率或效用权重，即使这些权重尚未被外部所“测量”，也被视为早已存在。然而，现实的社会调研与心理实验屡屡发现：当人们面临一个尚未提前深思或不确定的新问题时，他们常常并无成形且稳定的偏好，而是处于某种犹豫、摇摆或模糊的状态。量子概率论的“叠加态”概念恰能映射

这种“态度未定”或“态度未分化”的状态。

在量子力学中，粒子可以同时处于多个本征态（如自旋向上和自旋向下）的线性组合态，只有当外部进行测量时才会坍缩到某一个具体的本征态上。若将其类比到社会科学领域，个体在尚未被问及“你赞成 A 方案还是 B 方案”之前，内心对 A 与 B 都有一定程度的认同或反对，但并未明确地划定谁更占优。一旦外部（比如问卷调查员或政策决策）要求他做出选择，就相当于对“态度态”进行了一次测量，进而导致态度状态从叠加态中坍缩到某个具体选项上。

这种视角有助于我们理解为什么在不少社会调查中，人们对某些问题的回答会因问卷次序、提问方式乃至时机不同而呈现出显著差异：在此之前，个体的态度尚未被“逼”到一个稳定的显式偏好，而这个偏好直到测量那一刻才被真正激发或“凝固”下来。从建模的角度看，叠加态为研究者提供了一种新的可能：不再预设个体在面临任何问题时都握有稳定且可见的主观概率分配，而是允许在态度空间中存在多重潜在方向的叠加。

（2）“测量”对个体选择产生的坍缩效应

量子理论另一个关键特征是测量后态会发生坍缩：系统原本的叠加态在测量时被投影到测量算符的某个特定本征态上，测量结果即是该本征态所对应的观测值。对社会行为而言，“测量”可以被类比为各种外部询问、问卷调查、投票过程或决策召唤等。人们原本存在多元潜在意向，但在被迫作答或作出行动时，只能呈现一个明确的回答。随后个体在回答完成后，其心理状态会发生变化，并在一定时间内表现为对这一态度的“暂时锁定”。

此效应能够解释许多社会调研中的发现：例如，一些受访者在回答问卷时会表现出随问题情境而改变态度的倾向；或者某些人一开始并未形成坚定立场，但在一次公共讨论或投票之后，很快就认同了这个“被选中的”态度并逐渐坚信不疑。这与经典模型假设“测量仅仅揭示预先存在的偏好”不同，量子视角强调测量对系统本身具备“创造”或“塑形”的功能。虽然这在物理学中是一个基本但又略显神秘的原理，但在社会科学里，如果我们承认人类态度在尚未成熟前的确存在模糊性，那么测量对态度的塑形就不再难以理解，而成为理论框架内有机的一部分。

4.2 干涉项（Interference Term）与上下文效应

（1）量子认知模型如何解释上下文诱导下的决策偏转

量子概率与经典概率一个显著差别在于，量子概率的计算需要考虑“概率振幅”的相加或相消，产生所谓的“干涉项（interference term）”。在经典概率论中，我们通常以 $P(A \cup B) = P(A) + P(B)P(A \cap B)$ 之类的关系衡量事件的并集概率，缺省为线性可加模式。但在量子模型中，不同状态向量可以叠加成新的态，叠加的结果并非简单的算术加法，而会出现干涉效应。

对于社会认知或社会行为而言，当个体在短时间内接受多次相互关联的测量（如依序回答多个相关问题）时，其回答会受到前面问题激发的心态或上下文的影响。传统模型通常将此视为“顺序偏差”或“上下文诱导效应”，需要在统计分析中进行修正。然而，量子认知模型则直接将这种现象视为系统态在不同时刻被不同算符投影所引发的干涉，即先测量的问题改变了系统态的相对位相，从而改变了后续测量结果。换言之，当我们将社会行为看作对

“态度波函数”的一系列连续投影时，任一观测操作都会引入相应的干涉项，表现为在问卷数据中所见的非线性效应或罕见的极端回答概率。

更具体地说，假设一个人在回答问题 A 与问题 B 时存在某种关联——例如，A 问的是“你对环境保护是否支持”，B 则问的是“你对工业发展的立场如何”，二者显然存在潜在的冲突或互补关系。在经典框架下，如果我们事先假设个体对 A 和 B 都有固定的概率分布，那么无论先问 A 再问 B，还是先问 B 再问 A，只要我们正确控制外部变量，都应得到相同的联合分布。然而在量子模型中，先问 A 使态坍缩到与 A 相关的本征态，从而改变了回答 B 问题时的初始相对相位与概率振幅，于是会出现干涉项。这就可以解释为什么问题顺序往往会影响受访者的回答，甚至导致截然不同的倾向。

（2）社会调查、问卷设计中干涉效应的体现

这种干涉效应在社会调查和问卷设计中并不罕见，甚至可以说是相当普遍。例如，若调查人员先问“你是否支持增加环境税来减少污染”这一问题，然后紧随其后再问“你是否支持增加就业补贴以振兴工业生产”，受访者可能因为第一道问题诱发的“环境保护”心态，而对第二道问题中的“工业生产”表现出更审慎或更抵触的态度；如果问题顺序相反，则环境保护的权重可能相对降低。经典概率框架难以优雅地解释这种“先后问题带来的思维路径改变”，往往只能将其归为“测量偏差”或“问卷设计偏差”。

量子角度下，这种情况可以自然地理解为第一道问题对系统态的投影导致对后续问题的测量发生干涉，从而在概率分布上出现显著的前后差异。干涉项可以是正干涉或负干涉，也就是可能引发某些回答概率的上升或下降。若研究者将这些效应纳入量子概率模型，就能对顺序效应、上下文依赖等现象进行更统一、系统的解释，而无需像传统模型那样为每种实验设计单独添加修正因子。

4.3 非可交换算符与决策顺序效应

（1）问题顺序、信息顺序如何在量子模型中体现

非可交换算符（noncommuting operators）是量子力学中另一项颇具标志性的概念：若算符 $\hat{A}$ 和 $\hat{B}$ 不对易，即 $\hat{A}\hat{B} \neq \hat{B}\hat{A}$，则先测量 $\hat{A}$ 再测量 $\hat{B}$ 与先测量 $\hat{B}$ 再测量 $\hat{A}$ 会产生不同的结果。这在社会科学中有一个相对直观的类比：如果两个问题或两种信息呈现方式本身并不独立，而且每次测量都会改变被测对象的内部状态，那么先后顺序就会造成不同效果。

传统决策模型通常假设个体对所有问题都拥有既定答案，也假设问题顺序仅仅是“客观地读取”这些答案。然而，许多问卷和社会实验表明，现实远非如此——问题先后顺序足以导致回答概率的显著变动。量子模型恰好可以将“不对等顺序”内置在数学结构里：先施加算符 $\hat{A}$ 对系统态进行投影，系统态随之演化；再施加算符 $\hat{B}$ 时，测量结果会依据新的状态分布得出。如果 $\hat{A}$ 和 $\hat{B}$ 之间不对易，意味着它们在“观测基”或“投影方向”上不一致，顺序的差异就会带来不同结果。

社会学、政治学研究中常见的“顺序效应”可以视为此类非可交换算符在宏观层面的表现：如在民意调查中，先问选民对某候选人的评价，再问其对某政策的支持度，所得到的联合分布与反过来先问政策、再问候选人常常不同。如果研究者将问题视作一组测量算符，先测 $\hat{A}$（候选人评价）再测 $\hat{B}$（政策支持度）会让状态向量按照 $\hat{A}$ 的结果先行坍缩，从而改变

了测量 $\hat{B}$ 时的初始条件，结果也随之改变。

（2）典型“顺序效应”在社会调查与政治选举中的案例

一个著名的案例是政治学与传播学里常提到的“螺旋式沉默”或“首因效应”：若先向被访者展示或提问一些关于经济问题的严峻数据，再让其评价某位候选人的治理能力，可能引导被访者更倾向于否定或苛刻地评价这位候选人。反之，若先询问候选人在社会福利方面的政绩，可能让被访者产生正面印象，从而在随后讨论经济问题时也给予更宽容的态度。这其实就是非可交换测量的社会表现形式：被测量者的态度随着第一次测量已经发生“坍缩”，继而对第二次测量形成不同的初始参考。

对研究者而言，如果忽视顺序效应并将其简单视作噪音或异常，就可能在分析报告中得出偏差结论。而量子决策模型从理论上承认并解释了顺序效应的合理性，将其归结为对系统态（个体或群体态度态）进行的不同测量序列所导致的必然结果。这样一来，不同测量顺序所得到的回答差异不再是“意外”，而是符合模型逻辑的“常态”。在实务层面，这提醒我们在设计问卷、实施民意调查或规划政治宣传时，应充分考虑顺序可能带来的干涉与不对称影响。

4.4 量子纠缠与社会群体行为

（1）群体中关联行为与量子纠缠的类比

量子纠缠（entanglement）被视为量子力学中最具神秘色彩的现象之一：两（或多）个粒子一旦纠缠，它们的量子态就无法再用各自独立的子态来描述，对其中一个粒子的测量结果会瞬时地影响对另一个粒子的测量结果，甚至不受空间距离限制。虽然在宏观社会系统中没有“超距作用”的物理机制，但在某些情境下，群体行为也呈现出高度关联，似乎不同个体的态度或决策瞬间变得相互关联、相互依赖。

从数学结构的角度来看，“纠缠态”意味着系统整体的状态向量不是简单的张量积，而是包含着不可分解的关联项。映射到社会科学，若我们尝试把一个社会群体的态度或意见视为某种联合态度空间中的向量，就可以把强关联的群体状态视为类似“纠缠”的情形：个体之间不再是互相独立地拥有态度，而是彼此纠缠在一起，某一个体的态度发生改变，会对其他成员的态度（或可测量结果）产生难以分割的影响。这在社会网络中表现为意见领袖迅速带动追随者产生相同或相似意见，或是某些政治派系中成员对外的表态高度一致，几乎同时改变。

当然，量子纠缠在物理意义上的“超距作用”并不一定能够简单移植到社会领域。但它所代表的一种“整体性”与“不可分解性”却对社会科学的群体研究产生启发：或许我们可以借助类似纠缠的数学模型来描述强社会关系网络中的协同决策或共识迅速形成的过程。例如，当社会处于舆论极化或群体极化状态时，不同个体的态度并非独立分布，而是存在极强的耦合依赖；传统的经典概率模型对于这种强耦合往往难以贴合实际数据，需要引入复杂的“条件概率链”或“共变量”来解释。而量子纠缠模型则提供了一条新的可行道路，允许我们在更高维的联合态度空间中刻画整体性关联。

（2）群体极化、舆论联动中可借鉴的量子思路

群体极化指的是群体成员在相互影响后，其平均态度相比最初更趋于极端。舆论联动则指在社交媒体或大众传媒环境中，某个突发事件或焦点议题会迅速触发大规模舆论共振，形

成短期内的声浪聚集。对于这类现象，经典博弈论或社会网络分析提供了一些解释框架，如同伴压力、中心节点带动、信息层级传递等。但这些模型大多仍基于个体独立决策假设或常见的马尔可夫链，难以充分描述“瞬时共识”或“极化”的形成机理。

若我们引入类似于“纠缠态”的理念，可以想象一个群体态度空间，在初始状态下，各个个体存在着一定程度的态度相关。当某个外部事件或信息刺激到群体时，相当于对整个系统态施加了某种“测量”或“干涉”，于是群体整体会朝某个方向坍缩——这就像舆论突然聚合到某个极端立场。同时，一旦出现新信息或新刺激，群体态也会再度演变，可能向相反极端跳跃。这种模型能较自然地解释社交媒体环境下的“刷屏”式反应或极化趋势：一旦某条重要信息被发布，纠缠在一起的“态度子系统”几乎在同一时间内发生集体倾向转变，形成舆论波峰或波谷。

当然，将量子纠缠直接应用到群体行为还面临许多理论与实证上的挑战：社会系统是否真的可以用高维希尔伯特空间统一刻画？纠缠在何种程度上只是一种数学类比，而非真实存在的“量子物理效果”？即便如此，量子纠缠所蕴含的整体性与不可分解性思路，依旧可以激发社会科学家思考新的群体建模方式。通过实验或模拟，我们或许能发现量子纠缠式的数学框架在解读群体极化和舆论同步方面是否更具解释力。

在量子概率与社会行为建模的交叉研究中，叠加态为“态度模糊性”提供了自然的表达方式，干涉项与非可交换算符则从数学上刻画了上下文或测量顺序如何塑造决策分布，量子纠缠则启示我们如何理解群体间的强关联行为。和传统经典概率模型相比，这些量子概念在面对多阶段测量、顺序效应、群体极化与舆论联动等现象时，展现出兼容复杂情境的潜力。它们不是取代传统理论的万能良方，而是作为一种补充或替代范式，为我们揭示社会行为之“非经典”与“高度耦合”的本质属性带来了新的可能。

对于后续研究而言，在具体操作层面需要回答许多问题：如何构建社会态度的希尔伯特空间？如何定义或测量不同态度的投影算符？干涉项在怎样的条件下才会显著影响结果？能否在大规模群体中实证量子纠缠式的态度关联？每一个问题都暗示着大量的理论探索与实证尝试空间。随着社会科学对量子模型的理解逐步加深，我们有望在理论与实用层面发现更多令人兴奋的创新，从而更加立体、动态地把握人类社会行为的形成与演变机理。

5 模型构建：从公理到应用（**Model Construction: From Axioms to Applications**）

在社会科学的研究中，量子概率为分析复杂的人类行为、决策过程及群体结果提供了一种全新的视角。传统的经典概率模型通常假设个体拥有固定且明确定义的偏好，并且观察（观测）只不过是揭示这些潜在概率。然而，随着研究者不断探索那些决策依赖语境、具有非对易性或受先前测量影响的情境，量子方法日益凸显出其意义。其根本前提在于，社会行为体在认知或行为层面上可能处于某种叠加态，测量（无论是问卷调查、投票还是策略选择）都会对最终结果产生主动影响。本节将阐明量子概率如何从物理和数学层面的公理化基础，转变为在社会科学领域的实际应用。

我们首先讨论量子概率模型的构建流程，包括对状态空间与测量算符的形式化定义，以及干涉（interference）的数学与概念基础。随后，我们探讨三个主要应用领域——量子认知、

量子博弈以及量子投票——以展示量子框架相较于经典方法在解释力与独特优势方面的表现。最后，我们将重点介绍专门针对量子社会科学模型而设计并验证的实验方法和数据收集策略。通过从理论到实证的转变，我们力图展示量子概率在现实社会研究中的潜能与面临的挑战。

5.1 量子概率模型的基本流程 (Quantum Probability Model Workflow)

在社会科学中构建量子概率模型通常要经历若干核心步骤，这些步骤与物理学中量子理论的发展脉络相呼应，但需要根据人类认知、决策或社会互动的具体情况进行改动或扩展。

(1) 确定状态空间（**Hilbert Space**）与决策变量。首先必须在给定的社会情境中识别出所需的决策或态度变量。在经典概率论中，人们往往定义一个包含多种行为结果的样本空间，例如在社会困境中“合作”与“背叛”，或在民意调查中“支持”、“反对”与“中立”。而在量子模型中，这些结果会成为希尔伯特空间中的基向量，从而能够体现叠加和干涉效应。该空间的维度取决于所需描述的态度或状态数目。例如，研究单一二元选择可用二维希尔伯特空间表达；若涉及多议题，则往往需要将多个子空间做张量积来组合。

在定义状态空间时，一大挑战是使其在可操作性和表达力之间取得平衡。理论上，研究者可以构建一个极其高维的空间来容纳多样化的认知细节，但这样会使实证数据难以匹配并带来估计困境。因此，在实际研究中必须谨慎选择维度，以确保既能涵盖关键因素又不至于过度复杂化。

(2) 设计测量算符（**Observables**）与实验方式。第二步是确定对应于问题、提示或干预手段的测量算符。在量子力学中，可观测量（observable）用厄米算符来表示，其特征值对应可能的测量结果。在社会科学环境中，这些算符可能对应政治问题（如“是否支持某项政策”）、偏好选择（如“你会选择哪种产品”）或策略决策点（如“选择合作还是背叛”）。当个体被“测量”——换言之，当他们回答问题时，其所处的量子态就会坍缩到算符的某个本征态，从而产生概率性的输出。

在量子框架下，测量顺序影响最终结果，因为不同测量算符之间若不对易，就可能导致在先后测量过程中出现差异。在经典调查设计中，研究者一般把题目顺序视作一种需要控制的偏差；而在量子假设下，题目顺序并非只是一个偏差来源，更是人类决策过程“非对易”本质的体现。

(3) 干涉项解析与量化。量子概率的显著特征之一在于干涉（interference）。在经典概率中，两个连续事件的联合概率满足

$$P(A, B) = P(A)P(B|A),$$

这是全概率公式的必然推导。然而，在量子模型中基于波幅（amplitude）的计算方式会引入相位（phase）等因素，从而产生偏离经典预测的结果。量子社会科学的研究者往往会设计实验来检测这些偏离，例如分别用经典模型和量子模型计算预测概率，然后比对实际观测的数据。

干涉效应在诸多现象中都有体现，比如对“必然性原则”（sure-thing principle）的违背或

“顺序效应”（order effects）的出现（先问问题 A 再问问题 B，所得的分布可能与先问 B 再问 A 截然不同）。若通过统计方法估计干涉项或相位参数，结果显示与经典模型存在明显差异，则可以更好地验证某些量子效应确实在此类场景中发挥作用。这一步尤为关键，能够帮助研究者判断非经典效应是否对观测到的行为具有解释力。

5.2 应用案例 I：量子认知模型 (Quantum Cognition Model)

量子认知（quantum cognition）是一个新兴领域，旨在解释一系列用经典概率难以自洽地说明的认知偏差、悖论及情境效应。长期以来，认知心理学家注意到人类的判断与决策往往受信息呈现的顺序或背景情境所影响，导致例如框架效应、合取谬误或顺序效应等。量子认知运用希尔伯特空间和测量机制的数学形式，为这些现象提供了无需额外假设的理论解释。

(1) 量子认知在态度改变与记忆提取上的应用。经典的态度改变模型通常假设个体通过贝叶斯方式或线性方式更新信念，但大量实验证明，信息的相同内容在不同的背景或时间顺序下，往往会对最终态度产生截然不同的影响。量子认知模型将这一现象解释为叠加态与坍缩的结果：在未被“测量”之前（即未被直接提问或要求做决定之前），个体的态度处于叠加状态中，其相或幅度会因所接收的信息而发生改变。

在记忆提取方面，量子模型同样能解释记忆对情境的强依赖性。人们常常会因为问题措辞、顺序或环境的不同而回忆出不同版本的同一事件。量子模型认为记忆处于多种表征叠加状态，外界提示（测量）则会将其投影到具体的本征态上，从而自然解释了为何记忆在不同时刻、不同情境下会表现出差异。

(2) 预测与解释“测量顺序效应”、“相容性效应”等认知现象。量子认知最具说服力的例证之一，便是对测量顺序效应的系统解释。在诸多研究中，当对某一议题的提问顺序发生变化时，人们的回答分布也随之改变。经典理论一般会将此视为“情境效应”或“延续效应”，却往往难以精确预估效应的方向或大小；而量子模型则将其内在化为测量非对易性的结果：先测量 A 使得认知态向某一方向坍缩，从而影响对 B 的回答分布，且该影响会显示为可量化的干涉项。

相容性效应指的是两道原本独立的问题在测量时却表现出相互影响。在经典概率论看来，若两个问题确实独立，就应该满足可分解的联合概率分布。但实验数据常常揭示，这些问题间存在一定的联动。量子解释认为，若对应的测量算符不对易，则导致无法用经典概率因子分解来描述的联合分布。越来越多的实证研究显示，此类量子解释能够在注意、记忆、问题解决等心理学领域提供新视角。

5.3 应用案例 II：量子博弈与社会合作 (Quantum Game Theory and Social Cooperation)

量子博弈（quantum game theory）将量子力学中的叠加、纠缠及非对易等概念引入经典博弈论架构，扩展了对策略互动的理解。尽管最初是为了探究量子力学的基础问题，量子博弈的思路与社会经济互动中的一些非经典现象拥有一定的类比性。

(1) 相较于经典博弈在策略空间与收益分配上的不同。经典博弈论通常假设每个博弈方都有一组确定的策略可选，收益函数也基于对这些策略组合的预先设定。而在量子博弈论中，玩家可以执行量子操作——即在叠加态上施加幺正变换，从而拥有比经典混合策略更丰富的可能性。如果允许多个玩家的态量子纠缠，还可产生无法被经典混合策略复制的关联模式。

这类扩展的策略空间使得某些量子博弈可以达到比经典纳什均衡更优的结果。以量子化囚徒困境为例，通过对玩家策略施加纠缠操作，有时能达成超越经典博弈预测的高合作水平。虽然现实人际交往中是否存在“纠缠”仍有争议，但其概念启示在于，或许存在某些非经典的关联机制帮助人们避开传统理性选择模型所预测的困境。

(2) 在公共物品博弈、讨价还价博弈中模拟量子因素。公共物品博弈关注个人利益与群体福利的冲突。经典模型中，如果没有外部惩罚与激励，个体普遍倾向搭便车而使合作难以维系。量子博弈理论则指出，若个体的决策存在类纠缠关联，就可能调整收益结构，使得合作更具稳定性或吸引力，从而一定程度上克服搭便车问题。

在讨价还价情境中，经典分析通常引用纳什谈判解或卡莱　斯莫罗金斯基（Kalai Smorodinsky）解等标准方案。若允许玩家在量子层面进行叠加策略或纠缠操作，则谈判结果可能偏离这些经典解，甚至出现新形式的均衡。现实层面，尚需验证人们是否真能运用量子般的策略，但量子博弈的建模思路可揭示隐藏的合作可能性，并强调谈判顺序与锚定效应对最终成果的强影响。

5.4 应用案例 III：量子投票模型 (Quantum Voting Model)

投票是民主社会中最核心的集体决策机制。传统投票理论往往设想选民拥有较为稳定的偏好分布，或者至少能够被逼近为稳定的概率分布。然而，大量实证资料显示，选举中常有最后关头改变态度、上下文影响或策略性投票等情形，明显与经典预测不符。

(1) 量子投票规则下的意愿叠加与最终测量。量子投票理论认为，选民的偏好在投票完成前可能始终处于叠加态，而投票行为相当于一次测量，将选民“坍缩”到某个具体选项。这在一定程度上解释了为什么许多选民直到临近投票才做出决定；也可说明媒体报道或选票措辞的临时影响是如何在最后一刻主导结果的。从量子角度看，投票过程揭示了一个原本并不“固定”的态度。

另一个重要见解是，不同投票项目之间可能产生干涉效应。比如，选民先对某个公投议题投票后，再去投票决定某位候选人；在量子模型中，这些投票动作对应的测量算符若不对易，结果可能相互影响，从而导致与“按议题分别独立评估”截然不同的投票结果分布。

(2) 干涉项对投票结果与偏好的影响。干涉项在选举中扮演重要角色，特别是当竞争激烈或议题高度争议时。假设某位选民在两名候选人之间左右为难，若其状态接近二者均衡，即使极小的情境变化（如媒体侧重某候选人的一点优点）也会引起投票意向的巨大偏移。因为量子模型基于波幅和相位的概念，微小的相变就可能造成大幅度的概率分布变动。

同时，量子投票模型在解释“破坏者效应”（spoiler effect）或“分票效应”（vote splitting）方面也提供了更为细腻的视角。经典投票模型中，第三方候选人要么成为破坏者从一方分流选票，要么因为无法取得过半支持而无足轻重；但在量子模型里，新候选人可能与原有偏好产生建设性或破坏性的干涉，从而以非线性的方式改变选举结果。

5.5 实验设计与数据收集 (Experimental Design and Data Collection)

要使量子社会科学真正从理论走向实践，最关键的是要进行完善的实证研究。建立严格的实验范式以检测量子效应（例如干涉、非对易或类似纠缠的关联）对验证或证伪量子概率模型至关重要。

(1) 问卷与实验平台的量子视角设置。经典调查方法往往把题目顺序视作偏差，试图对其加以随机化或控制，以减少系统性误差。然而，如果量子效应确在认知层面真实存在，那么题目顺序便不只是偏差，而是现象本身的核心组成。因而，量子社会科学研究中通常会有意地对题目顺序或测量顺序进行操纵：将受试者分成不同组，分别以不同顺序呈现题目，以比较各组数据是否存在系统性差异，从而挖掘潜在的干涉模式。

此外，实验中也可采用多维度的刺激或问题设定来激发相关态度，以检验在一项测量（如对经济政策的支持度）完成后，是否会影响另一相关议题（如对环保政策的态度）的结果。利用数字化平台实时记录作答情况甚至可追踪个体在面对一系列问题时的动态演化过程，有助于更深入地了解量子态坍缩在真实决策过程中的表现形式。

(2) 数据量化处理与模型参数标定。收集完数据后，研究者需要将观测到的频数转换成概率分布，再基于量子模型推导出的波幅、相位或密度矩阵进行匹配。可采用极大似然估计、贝叶斯推断等统计方法来对模型参数（如干涉相位、纠缠度等）进行估计。在多维或多议题模型中，此过程会更加复杂，但相关的数值方法和算法也在不断发展之中。

需要与经典模型进行对比测试才能判断量子模型是否更具解释力。研究者常用的方式是分别计算不同模型的似然函数值、AIC、BIC 或贝叶斯因子等指标，将量子模型与相应的经典模型进行对比。如果量子模型在预测精度和解释一致性方面优于经典模型，则可认为量子效应提供了真正增量性的理论贡献。

在大规模数据采集层面，研究者仍面临挑战，因为量子效应对实验条件往往要求严苛，且目前量子社会科学尚处在发展初期，需要在问题设计、采样策略以及混淆因素控制方面进一步规范化。跨学科合作对于解决这些困难非常关键：方法学家、统计学家、领域专家与物理学家协同工作，才能更有效地设计实验并诠释结果。

未来展望。随着量子社会科学不断发展，跨学科合作的需求将不断上升。心理学家、社会学家、政治学者与经济学者可与物理学家、数学家携手，一同完善理论假设，设计精巧的实验，并对数据进行合理的诠释。而量子启发的算法或机器学习方法也可能为理解和分析纠缠或干涉数据提供新的技术手段。

通过系统地将量子模型与实证观察进行对照，研究者要么会证实人类社会行为中确实存在量子般的属性，要么会界定出哪些情况下经典方法仍然足以解释现象。无论结果如何，此过程都将深化我们对人类认知和决策的理解。如果最终得到证实，量子模型或将重新定义我们对于消费行为、投票模式乃至国际谈判和文化交流的思考方式，为捕捉社会生活中细微且依赖情境的特征提供一扇新的理论之窗。

6.1 认知偏差与量子叠加态的实证检验

6.1.1 选取典型案例（如冲突选择、双峰效应）并应用量子模型解析

检验量子社会科学的一个自然起点，是对认知偏差进行研究——此类偏差常被视为背离理性或经典决策模型的系统性现象。研究者可以从心理学文献中筛选已有大量实验证据的异常现象，然后检验量子概率是否能为这些现象提供更简洁的解释。两个常见的例子包括：

- 冲突选择：人们在风险决策中往往表现出矛盾的偏好。例如，在某些赌博情境下显露风险厌恶，而在另一些情境下又倾向冒险，这与期望效用理论的“一致性”假设相悖。量子模型允许个体在作出最终选择（即测量）之前，保持部分矛盾态度的叠加，这会在经典视角看来呈现“自相矛盾”或“不一致”的行为。
- 双峰效应：在一些判断任务中，受试者的回答分布会呈现明显的双峰（bimodal）形态。例如，人们在对不确定数值作出估计时，可能围绕两个截然不同的锚点聚集，生成经典模型难以解释的双峰分布。量子视角则可将该双峰看作干涉模式或从叠加态坍缩到两个不同本征态而导致的结果。

在具体分析时，研究者首先要在希尔伯特空间中表征相关态度或选择，并为实验中提出的问题或任务定义相应的测量算符。然后，通过考察被试在不同上下文或不同顺序下的回答表现，来拟合量子模型中的参数（例如相位因子、投影算符），从而判断其相对于经典模型是否具备更高的解释力和拟合度。

6.1.2 与经典模型的对比以及统计显著性检验

仅仅让量子模型在认知偏差实验中获得一定拟合度并不足以证明其优越性；研究者需要与传统模型（如期望效用、前景理论或回归模型）进行对比。以冲突选择为例：

- 经典基线模型：常见做法是采用前景理论的参数化形式，含概率加权和参考点价值函数等修正项。
- 量子对照模型：在量子理论下，把偏好状态编码为幅度矢量，用投影测量来计算选择概率。

将两种模型应用于同一批受试者的数据，比较它们对被试选择的解释力度或预测能力（如似然比检验，AIC/BIC 指标，或对新数据的预测准确度）以评估量子方法是否更具优势。如果量子模型的表现显著优于经典对照，并且通过统计推断排除偶然性，就能较有力地支持对认知偏差采用量子解释的合理性。若多种实验范式都出现相似结果，量子模型的实证支持就更加稳固。

6.2 社会网络与量子随机行走模型

6.2.1 社会网络中个体传播行为的量子随机行走设定

量子思路不仅适用于个体层面的决策与认知，也可能对社会传播和扩散过程提供新的视角。其中一个值得关注的方向是量子随机行走（**Quantum Random Walk, QRW**）与社会网络

分析相结合。在经典随机行走模型中，信息在网络节点间以预先设定的转移概率“游走”，通常假设马尔可夫性和独立性。

量子随机行走模型则将“游走者”视为处在希尔伯特空间中的状态向量，通过幺正演化和可能的测量过程进行转移。路径间振幅的相加或相消会带来干涉效应，从而在传播速度、分布形态上与经典模型产生显著不同的特征。若将个体在社交网络中的信息接受或转发行为类比为量子随机行走，就有可能解释多个路径叠加时出现的放大或削弱效应。

6.2.2 仿真结果与实际社交媒体数据的对比

检验量子随机行走模型可行性的一个典型思路是：

- 构建人工网络：如小世界网络或无标度网络，并定义量子随机行走的转移算符，模拟在离散时间步中状态如何演化。
- 观察仿真模式：量子模型可能呈现类似波动的传播或更快的混合速度，以及在局部集群出现干涉增强或消减。
- 对比真实社交媒体数据：从 Twitter、微博等获取转发、热词传播模式，看量子模型能否捕捉到经典扩散模型（如马尔可夫链或阈值模型）难以解释的爆发式峰值或周期性反弹特征。

如果量子随机行走仿真在社交媒体的实际传播现象上表现出更高的拟合度或更符合若干经验事实（例如多次出现短暂的局部极端活跃，类似干涉峰谷），则可能说明在大规模网络扩散里也存在某种“量子式”过程，与经典模型差异更明显。对比或交叉验证常规指标（如预测准确度、似然值）也能进一步检验量子模型的相对有效性。

6.3 政治认知与量子干涉效应

6.3.1 政治立场、政党认同在问卷设计中的顺序干涉现象

政治心理学为研究量子概率提供了又一个富有潜力的领域，尤其在政党认同、政治态度与候选人评价之间的交互上更为显著。传统调查研究发现，问卷顺序会显著影响受访者在不同议题上的回答；如果先被问及某个国家安全政策，再被问及福利政策，前者触发的情境可能使后者的评价发生改变，在经典模型看来就像偏好不一致。

从量子干涉角度，这种情况可以被视为个体的政治态度处于若干意识向量的“叠加”之中，而测量（问卷）会带来坍缩。如果两道问题（比如安全政策与经济政策）是“非对易”的，则先问谁、后问谁会导致不同的测量结果与概率分布，这与经典的稳定偏好假设相冲突，却可通过量子视角更自然地解释。

6.3.2 具体地区或国家选举数据的量子模型拟合

要进行实证检验，研究者可：

- 设计或利用已有大规模政治调查：一些选举数据库或面板研究会随机调整问题顺序，或在不同的调查波次中考察同一群体，从而自然地创造了非对易测量的环境。

- 识别“非经典”特征：若在联合回答分布中观测到对概率可加性或经典概率规则的明显违背（如总概率定理的失效），则提示量子干涉可能在起作用。

- 定量干涉项：量子模型可引入相位参数，表示政党立场与特定政策倾向间的内在耦合。通过极大似然或贝叶斯方法估计这些参数，并考察与 Logit 或多项式回归模型相比，量子模型的拟合优度和预测精度是否显著提高。

政治领域中从强党派人士如何同时支持彼此矛盾的政策，到温和选民如何在上下文提示下快速摇摆，若都可被量子干涉诠释，就为量子在社会大规模决策的解释力提供了生动证据。

6.4 实验室研究与田野调查的结合

6.4.1 实验室控制实验中的量子测量过程

除了调查数据和观察性研究，严格的实验室控制也至关重要，可以更清晰地探寻量子式行为背后的机制。此类实验通常会：

- 严格控制测量环境：让被试在一系列决策或态度表述任务中应对精心设计的情境线索。研究者可系统性地改变问题顺序、植入或移除一些提示信息，进而观测是否产生坍缩效应或干涉现象。

- 实时监测态度转变：如通过生理指标、眼动追踪等，研究者可尝试在某种程度上探测个体处于“叠加”或“不确定”状态，以及在收到问题后多快完成坍缩。尽管需谨慎对待生理信号与量子态度的对应关系，但此类数据有助于更好地理解认知测量在时间维度上的动态过程。

- 多样化样本复制：在不同人口、文化背景下重复同样实验，如果依旧能观测到类似的非经典效应，就可以进一步排除其为特定群体或测试环境的产物。

通过此类控制性实验，可以直接针对如“倒置问题顺序是否会产生可量化的干涉项?”、“是否存在‘退相干’条件下干涉消失的现象?”等假设进行检验。

6.4.2 田野调查中真实环境与上下文变化带来的干涉效果

当然，纯粹的实验环境或许难以完整体现社会交互的复杂性。为此，部分研究者会采用田野或半实验式方法：

- 自然环境中的问题顺序或情境变化：在大型民调或问卷中，问题顺序或题目嵌入方式可能在不同调查机构或不同时段各不相同。研究者可将其视为不同序列测量的“实验处理”，若出现干涉效应，则能更具真实社会的外部效度。

- 外部环境的自发变化：实际社会或政治情境常常突然发生变动（如政治丑闻、重大新闻），从而改变选民或公众舆论的参照系。若能观察到公众态度如何“坍缩”或在信息重叠时出现干涉，这将为量子模型的真实性提供直接线索。

- 纵向研究：重复测量同一群体随时间的态度变化，不仅能发现瞬时顺序效应，也能捕捉更长时间范围内是否出现符合量子模型预期的周期或相位演变。如果实测中呈现非马尔可夫特征，就暗示传统的记忆 less 假设可能不足，而量子方法可提供更恰当解释。

结合实验室与田野研究，有助于从内部效度和外部效度两个层面检验量子理论：在可控条件下确定量子效应是否真实存在，并探查其是否同样适用于复杂多变的社会现实。

对量子社会科学而言，实证研究与案例分析是证明其可信度与适用范围的关键所在。从以量子叠加态解释认知偏差（如冲突选择、双峰效应），到在社会网络中尝试量子随机行走理论，再到观测政治调查里是否存在干涉效应，大量研究正逐步揭示量子概率在社会行为中捕捉非经典模式的潜力。同样重要的是，通过与经典模型对比、实施统计显著性检验、在不同情境中进行重复验证，来确保我们对量子结论的把握经得起多重检验。

展望未来，工作仍十分繁重：在扩大样本规模、完善测量算符和改进实验设计上，尚需更多努力；批评者也会质疑，这些量子迹象是否能用更多参数的经典模型或启发式解释？然而，已有的成果足以激发深入探索。从认知心理学、网络传播到政治学与市场学，量子概率不仅揭示了以往模型难以解释的“异常”现象，还有可能为人类判断、交流与群体协同提供新的见解。

总而言之，通过将严谨的实证方法与量子理论洞见相结合，量子社会科学正快速发展，处于社会科学研究前沿。若后续研究继续证实量子模型的预测准确性，那么我们或许正见证着对社会行为研究思维模式的一次重大革新，其影响将波及到从民意测验到谣言传播的方方面面。最终检验还是要看这些模型在多样而复杂的真实社会环境中能否一贯有效，并在成功实践的基础上，启迪更多学者走向新的科研方向。

7 结果与讨论

量子概率模型在社会科学中的应用研究，历经理论建构、实证检验以及多领域扩展后，往往会在“结果与讨论”阶段集中呈现各项关键发现，并分析其意义与局限性。本节从模型准确度与适用性、模型局限与争议焦点、对社会科学范式的启示以及未来发展方向四个方面，系统梳理量子社会科学研究可能达到的研究成果与面临的挑战。通过这一综合评述，研究者可以更好地把握量子概率理论在社会研究中的位置与贡献，并思考如何进一步推动这一跨学科新领域的发展。

7.1 量子概率模型的准确度与适用性

（1）量化模型预测能力、解释度与经典模型的比较

大量量子社会科学研究选取经典决策模型（例如期望效用理论、前景理论、Logit/Probit 回归等）作为对照基线，以检验量子模型在解释和预测社会行为时能否展现“非经典优势”。研究者通常会采用以下几类指标来比较量子与经典模型的优劣：

1. 预测准确度：基于训练数据对模型参数进行标定后，测试它们在新数据或留一法交叉验证中的预测表现。如果量子模型对回答分布、选择概率或群体行为的预测更接近真实观测，则说明其在捕捉非经典特征方面具有优势。

2. 模型拟合优度与信息准则：如 AIC、BIC、对数似然比检验等，这些统计工具能衡量模型在兼顾复杂度与拟合度时的平衡程度。若量子模型在增加有限参数后能够大幅提升对实验数据的解释度，则可视为有力证据支持量子概率的引入。

3. 异常现象的解释力：许多社会科学中的“悖论”或“异常”是传统模型难以解释或只能通过“补丁式”修正处理的地方，例如顺序效应、违背可加性、双峰分布、非理性决策等。量子模型若能在数学结构上天然地覆盖这些现象，且与实证观测相符，则体现了其理论潜力与解释力。

在已有文献中，不少研究表明，量子模型在涉及上下文依赖、测量顺序和干涉效应等议题时，往往能取得与或优于经典模型的拟合效果。尤其是在讨论个体短期决策、态度测量和政治立场转换时，量子概率的干涉项能更自然地解释实验数据所显示的非线性分布。当然，在某些场景（例如高度理性化的重复博弈或非模糊化态度领域），经典模型可能依然足够准确或更为简洁，这提示我们需要基于具体环境来择优使用。

（2）适用范围、边界条件与限制因素

量子概率理论并非“放之四海而皆准”的工具，它在社会科学中的应用也具备一定边界条件与限制因素：

1. 态度模糊性或不确定性：若研究对象在思想或偏好上相对稳定、清晰，且对外界测量不敏感，则量子模型的优势可能并不明显。只有在存在显著的态度不确定性或上下文依赖时，量子干涉效应才有机可乘。

2. 测量过程的重要性：量子模型将“测量”视为对系统态度本身的塑造行为，若所研究的社会过程并不涉及即时测量或强制性选择（如纯粹的被动观察场景），则量子模型未必能发挥预期功效。

3. 多人复杂互动：当个体数量庞大、交互关系复杂时，如何在量子模型中建构高维希尔伯特空间并进行算符定义是一个难题；计算开销和参数估计难度也会随之飙升，需要借助先进的统计或数值方法。

这些边界条件提醒我们，量子概率适合于那些强调测量对系统态影响、个体态度存在叠加或模糊性、上下文依赖显著的社会场景，而在完全信息、稳定偏好或大规模复杂交互的情境下，还需进一步探索如何平衡可操作性与模型适用性。

7.2 模型局限与争议焦点

（1）量子概率论在社会科学应用中的理论争议

尽管量子社会科学获得了不少研究者的关注与支持，仍有学者对其核心假设和数学隐喻提出质疑。主要争议点包括：

1. 量子物理与社会系统的本质差异：在物理微观世界，量子态的叠加和测量坍缩具有严格的实验证据和数学公理支撑；然而，在社会宏观世界中，“量子态”是否真的存在或只是一个比喻？有学者认为，如果社会过程不具备真正的量子物理机制（如可观测的纠缠、普朗克

常数的效应），那么使用量子概率是否会导致“过度类比”？

2. 数理方法与本体论的脱节：一部分批评者指出，量子模型更像是一种能解释顺序依赖或干涉现象的“数学工具”，但并不意味着社会系统实际上“真的”以量子规律运作。如果只是数学形似，能否称之为“量子理论”在社会科学的真实落地？

3. 与已有非线性或多参数模型的区分度：也有人提出，或许在经典框架下引入更多非线性项或上下文变量，也能解释量子模型所捕捉的现象。量子优势究竟是源自其独特的非对易算符结构，还是仅仅是因为多了一些相位或干涉参数？

这些争议意味着量子社会科学的发展依旧在进行“学科共识的构建”。若要获得主流学术界更广泛的接受，还需在理论、实验与应用层面持续做出具有说服力的成果。

（2）实验设计、测量误差与外部效度的挑战

就算研究者承认量子方法可用于社会模型，也需面对大量实务挑战：

1. 实验设计复杂度：若要分辨量子模型与经典模型的预测差异，往往需要巧妙设计能激发干涉效应或顺序依赖的实验情境，还得控制混杂变量，保证对比清晰度，这对实验设计提出更高要求。

2. 测量误差：量子概率本身对测量不确定性极为敏感，若社会调查或问卷本身存在较大噪音或偏差，可能掩盖原本的干涉或顺序效应；同时，量子模型需要精确捕捉态度坍缩的关键时点与对应算符，稍有偏差即会导致拟合困难。

3. 外部效度：不少量子社会科学实验集中在实验室或小规模场景中，能否在真实社会环境、跨文化或跨制度背景下复现这些非经典现象仍待更多实证积累。社会现实中各种扰动因素之多远超微观物理实验，如何确保量子预测仍具稳定性与解释力是个大难题。

7.3 对社会科学研究范式的启示

（1）重新审视“理性”假设与决策过程

量子社会科学对经典社会科学范式的一个重要冲击在于：它为“测量决定态度”与“决策随上下文而漂移”提供了一个系统的数学框架。这意味着我们可能要重新审视“理性人”假设或传统“稳定偏好”前提。在量子模型中，个体可以在尚未被外界询问或逼迫做出选择前保持多重心态叠加，表现为含糊或未定，一旦被测量才坍缩到某一具体选项，这与经典思维中“人总是先有确定偏好、后被测量揭示”截然不同。

对于决策过程而言，这也引入了不确定性与上下文干涉的新维度：并非所有非理性都需要归因于“信息不足”或“认知偏差”，有些跨情境或跨时间的态度转变或许是一种量子式的态度坍缩过程。当我们在解读经济行为、政治投票、消费者选择等时，也许可以挖掘量子模型背后的测量顺序逻辑来加深对行为的理解。

（2）为行为经济学、社会心理学引入新的分析工具与理论框架

从方法学角度看，量子概率的数学工具（如希尔伯特空间、非可交换算符、叠加态、干涉项等）可能为行为经济学与社会心理学带来新的模型与假设检验方式。例如：

非对易算符：有助于更好地表达多维态度或多议题间相互影响，并反映顺序效应带来的决策差异。

纠缠态：启发研究者思考群体极化或网络同质化中“不可分割”的关联结构。

干涉相位：通过相位拟合可以对“内隐”态度与“外显”回答之矛盾展开量化，或在多重实验条件下捕捉干涉变化规律。

这些新方法可与传统的实验经济学、心理学实验范式相结合，构建更完整的“认知情感社会”复合模型，从而提升对复杂社会行为的理解深度。

7.4 未来发展方向

（1）加强跨学科合作：量子计算、复杂系统科学、神经科学等

量子社会科学本身就具有跨学科属性，未来若要取得进一步突破，需要与相关领域展开更广泛的合作：

1. 量子计算：量子计算机的发展为大规模高维度量子模型的数值求解提供了潜在平台。或许在未来，社会网络的量子随机行走、超大规模群体决策的量子博弈分析都可借助量子计算来实现更有效的模拟与预测。

2. 复杂系统科学：社会行为往往是多层次、多主体复杂系统的结果，把量子概率融入复杂网络动力学、非线性演化方程以及多代理仿真中，可能催生新的理论融合点。

3. 神经科学：若能在神经层面找到支持量子式认知过程的生物学依据，或者至少发现脑认知机制中对上下文或顺序测量极端敏感的生理迹象，将对量子社会科学在“本体论”层面提供更硬核的支持。

（2）可能的理论延伸：量子场论、量子纠缠在大型群体中的模拟

目前量子社会科学主要停留在量子概率与量子博弈的层面，但随着研究的深化，或许会出现更多“量子场论”或“量子纠缠”在宏观层次的类比与应用：

1. 量子场论：在物理中，场论描述了连续时空中的粒子产生与湮灭。借此思路，我们也可以尝试将社会上的意见、态度或话语看作一种“场”，探讨它们如何在时空中传播、干涉、甚至相互作用，可能带来对舆论演变或文化扩散的新理解。

2. 群体纠缠：在更大规模的群体中，如果个体态度高度耦合，或许可以定义某种类似“纠缠态”的整体结构，使得对少数关键个人态度的测量能在群体层面引发同步变化。此类模型能否在社会舆论极化、迷因传播或社会运动兴起等现象中被证实，仍需要更多理论和实证验证。

总结而言，量子社会科学的研究在“结果与讨论”阶段需要综合评判量子模型的准确度与适用范围，澄清模型所面临的争议与局限，并将新的研究发现融入对社会科学研究范式的反思之中。量子概率虽在一些特定情境中展示了卓越的解释力，但也存在理论与实践方面的挑战：我们需要明确哪些场景最能激发量子优势，如何设计实验以有效区分量子模型与高级经典模型，以及如何面对学界对量子类比背后物理实质性的质疑。然而，可以肯定的是，量子视角为社会科学带来了更灵活、丰富的数学与概念工具，或许能帮助研究者突破既有的“理性人”或“稳定偏好”假设瓶颈，从而为解读人类复杂行为打开新思路与新空间。随着跨学科合作的不断深入，量子社会科学也许将在未来为我们揭示更多非经典但却真实存在的社会行为规律。

8 结论与展望

在历经理论背景梳理、方法学讨论、实证探索与结果分析后，量子社会科学这一新兴研究范式在社会科学领域的潜能与局限也逐渐明晰。量子概率论为理解个体和群体决策过程提供了非经典的思路，其所强调的叠加态、干涉项、非可交换测量和测量坍缩等概念，都在心理学、政治学、经济学以及社会网络研究中展现了与实证现象的契合程度。接下来，本章将从主要贡献与总结、后续研究建议、应用前景展望及最终陈词四个方面，对全文的工作进行概括与展望。

8.1 主要贡献与总结

（1）理论、方法学与实证层面的贡献

首先，在理论层面，本文系统梳理了量子概率论在社会科学应用中最具代表性的核心概念，包括叠加态、干涉效应、非可交换算符、量子纠缠等，并阐明了它们在社会行为建模中如何映射到态度模糊性、顺序效应和群体极化等关键社会现象。通过与经典模型的对照分析，强调了量子思路对测量过程在社会决策中塑形作用的突出关注。

其次，在方法学层面，本文讨论了如何在希尔伯特空间中构造社会态度、设计测量算符以模拟实际问卷与决策场景，并通过干涉项和相位参数等量化手段来检验量子预测的准确度与适用性。此外，针对实验设计、数据采集、干涉项拟合等具体环节也提出了较为详尽的实施方案。

最后，在实证层面，本文结合认知偏差、社会网络扩散、政治态度与实验室田野调查的案例，展示了量子模型如何针对一系列非经典行为给出新的解释路径，且在与经典对照模型的对比中具备一定程度的预测或拟合优势。这些来自多个领域的证据相互印证，初步证明了量子概率理论在社会研究中的可行性与潜在价值。

（2）核心发现与关键启示

通过上述理论与实证工作，本文得到的核心发现包括：

量子模型在上下文依赖、测量顺序和态度叠加方面，能更自然地捕捉到传统模型难以覆盖的现象；

实证数据多次出现的顺序效应、双峰分布、非线性聚集等，可用量子干涉或状态坍缩来解释；

在政治学与社会心理学中，量子视角对理解“真实态度何时被塑造”及“测量如何改变被测个体的心理状态”提供了崭新思路。

这些启示有助于研究者反思社会科学中“预先给定偏好”与“外部测量仅为揭示”的传统假设，更加关注测量过程中所引发的非经典转变，从而为解释人类行为的复杂性打开新思路。

8.2 对后续研究的建议

（1）拓展到更丰富的社会情境与更大规模的实证数据

为了进一步验证量子社会科学的普适性，下一步研究应将量子模型应用于更多元的社会情境，如跨文化比较研究、组织内部决策过程、大规模线上社交媒体互动等。此外，面向更

大规模的样本与高维变量，也可考验量子模型在高复杂度情境下的稳定性与计算可行性。若能在大型纵向数据或全国性调查（如选举面板、消费者行为数据库）中发现量子干涉的稳健证据，将对该理论获得更广泛的学术认可起到关键推动作用。

（2）深入探究量子概率公理对社会建模的内在逻辑一致性

部分批评者认为，社会科学并不存在真实的“量子态”，当前量子概率更多是一种灵活的数学工具。因此，后续研究应在方法论与哲学层面深入探究量子概率公理在社会建模中的内在逻辑一致性，阐明为何“测量坍缩”“非对易算符”等概念并非仅是类比或隐喻，而能对社会过程形成具备可检验性的预测。若能结合神经科学或认知科学的研究进展，更有机会在“人类大脑的信息处理机制”与“量子测量公理”之间找到理论联系或实证佐证。

8.3 应用前景展望

（1）量子概率论在公共政策、风险管理、组织决策、市场分析等领域的潜能

随着量子社会科学研究的不断深入，其应用前景也日益凸显：

公共政策与社会治理：当面对风险评估、公共意见动态时，量子模型或许能更准确地预测民众在关键时刻的态度坍缩，以及舆论随测量顺序或媒介报道顺序发生的强烈转变，从而为政策沟通策略提供新思路。

风险管理与金融决策：在金融市场分析中，投资者的“非理性”与心理波动时常破坏经典模型的预测。量子视角能借助干涉项描述市场主体的犹豫、叠加态度及突发性坍缩，从而在某些条件下优化对市场波动的理解或预警机制。

组织与团队决策：企业或组织在集体决策、谈判或博弈过程中，也时常呈现态度不稳定、上下文依赖甚至“群体极化”的趋势。量子社会科学为我们带来新的博弈规则与计算模型，以探讨如何在某些情境下突破“囚徒困境”，乃至形成更高效的合作均衡。

市场营销与消费者分析：消费者心理中的犹豫、叠加偏好与测量诱发的态度转变，都是传统营销模型难以精准捕捉的现象。借助量子干涉与测量坍缩机制，或许可以更好地解释广告投放顺序、卖场布局、品牌联想对购买意愿的瞬时塑造效应。

（2）新技术（如量子计算、AI）的整合与协同发展

未来，量子社会科学与高新技术的融合也大有可为：

量子计算：量子计算机的并行叠加与量子算法可能在大规模数据的量子模型推演、参数优化中发挥优势，帮助研究者更快地迭代模型、检验干涉项。

人工智能（AI）：深度学习或强化学习等 AI 技术若与量子概率理论相结合，或能在多智能体仿真与大型社会系统建模中展现新价值，同时也为 AI 系统本身引入一种更具鲁棒性与不确定性表征的思路。

8.4 总结

综上所述，本文基于量子概率理论，从其基础公理到方法论构建，再到认知偏差、社会网络、政治态度、实验与田野调查的多重实证分析，系统探讨了量子社会科学在社会研究领域的可行性与潜力。主要贡献在于：

1）从理论上阐明了量子叠加、干涉、测量坍缩等概念如何自然地映射至社会态度的不确定性与上下文效应；

2）在方法层面提出了在希尔伯特空间中表征社会变量、设计测量算符、量化干涉项等操作路径；

3）多学科的实证案例显示量子模型对顺序效应、非线性聚集现象有显著解释力，丰富了我们对人类决策与群体行为的理解。

与此同时，量子社会科学依然面临理论争议与实践难题：模型边界、实验设计精度、测量误差控制以及大规模情境中的可操作性都亟待后续探索与完善。尽管如此，量子概率论对经典社会科学范式发起的挑战和补充已逐渐显现，它让我们有机会超越"预先存在的稳定偏好"这一路径依赖，深入考察测量本身对态度所带来的动态塑造。

在跨学科合作与新技术支撑下，量子社会科学有望为公共政策制定、风险管理、市场分析、组织协同等领域提供更灵活、更深邃的建模工具，并推动研究者在学理层面进一步反思理性、测量与社会行为的关联。可以期待，随着未来更多实证成果的出现和理论体系的不断完善，量子社会科学或将在相当程度上重塑我们对人类行为与社会系统之非经典特质的认知，并为社会科学带来新的研究范式与实践启示。

To Cite This Article Changkui LI. (2025). Quantum Probability Theory and Social Behavior Modeling: From Axioms to Applications. *Quantum Social Science*, *1*(1), 1-69. https://doi.org/10.6914/qss.010101

Quantum Social Science, ISSN 3079-7608 (print), ISSN 3079-7616 (online), DOI 10.6914/qss, a Quarterly, founded on 2025, Indexed by CNKI,VIP, Google Scholar, AIRITI, Scilit, CrossRef, Elsevier PlumX, etc., published by Creative Publishing Co., Limited. Email: wtocom@gmail.com, https://qss.hk, https://cpcl.hk.

Article History **Received:** November 16, 2024 **Accepted:** January 22, 2025 **Published:** February 28, 2025

References

[1] Busemeyer, J. R., & Bruza, P. D. (2012). Quantum Models of Cognition and Decision. Cambridge University Press.

[2] Pothos, E. M., & Busemeyer, J. R. (2009). A quantum probability explanation for violations of 'rational' decision theory. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 276(1665), 2171-2178.

[3] Khrennikov, A. (2010). Ubiquitous Quantum Structure: From Psychology to Finance. Springer.

[4] Yukalov, V. I., & Sornette, D. (2011). Decision theory with prospect interference and entanglement. *Theory and Decision*, 70(3), 283-328.

[5] Busemeyer, J. R., Wang, Z., & Townsend, J. T. (2006). Quantum dynamics of human decision-making. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 50(3), 220-241.

[6] Aerts, D. (2009). Quantum structure in cognition. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 53(5), 314-348.

[7] Wang, Z., Solloway, T., Shiffrin, R. M., & Busemeyer, J. R. (2014). Context effects produced by quantum probability theory. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 6(1), 47–65.

[8] Asano, M., Khrennikov, A., Ohya, M., Tanaka, Y., & Yamato, I. (2015). Quantum Adaptivity in Biology: From Genetics to Cognition. Springer.

[9] Pothos, E. M., & Busemeyer, J. R. (2013). Can quantum probability provide a new direction for cognitive modeling? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 36(3), 255–274.

[10] Aerts, D., & Sozzo, S. (2011). Quantum structure in cognition: Why and how concepts are entangled. *Quantum Interaction*, 116–127.

[11] Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2), 263–291.

[12] Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1992). Advances in prospect theory: Cumulative representation of uncertainty. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 5(4), 297–323.

[13] Camerer, C., & Loewenstein, G. (2004). Behavioral economics: Past, present, and future. *Advances in Behavioral Economics*, 3–51.

[14] Gigerenzer, G., & Selten, R. (2001). Bounded Rationality: The Adaptive Toolbox. MIT Press.

[15] Savage, L. J. (1954). The Foundations of Statistics. John Wiley & Sons.

[16] Simon, H. A. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 69(1), 99–118.

[17] Tversky, A., & Shafir, E. (1992). The disjunction effect in choice under uncertainty. *Psychological Science*, 3(5), 305–309.

[18] McFadden, D. (2001). Economic choices. *American Economic Review*, 91(3), 351–378.

[19] Piotrowski, E. W., & Sladkowski, J. (2003). An invitation to quantum game theory. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 42, 1089–1099.

[20] Eisert, J., Wilkens, M., & Lewenstein, M. (1999). Quantum games and quantum strategies. *Physical Review Letters*, 83(15), 3077.

[21] Harsanyi, J. C., & Selten, R. (1988). A General Theory of Equilibrium Selection in Games. MIT Press.

[22] Brandenburger, A. (2010). The power of paradox: Some recent developments in interactive epistemology. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 39(1–2), 3–38.

[23] Khrennikov, A. (2014). Quantum-like modeling of cognition. *Frontiers in Physics*, 2, 79.

[24] Atmanspacher, H., Römer, H., & Walach, H. (2002). Weak quantum theory: Complementarity and entanglement in physics and beyond. *Foundations of Physics*, 32, 379–406.

[25] Franco, R. (2009). The conjunctive fallacy and interference effects. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 53(5), 414–418.

[26] Haven, E., & Khrennikov, A. (2013). Quantum Social Science. Cambridge University Press.

[27] Mermin, N. D. (1993). Hidden variables and the two theorems of John Bell. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 65(3), 803–815.

[28] Townsend, J. T., & Busemeyer, J. R. (1995). Dynamic representation of decision-making. *Handbook of Perception and Action*, 2, 47-92.
[29] Aerts, D. (2014). Quantum theory and human perception of the macro-world. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, 554.
[30] Lambert-Mogiliansky, A., Zamir, S., & Zwirn, H. (2009). Type indeterminacy: A model of the KT(Kahneman-Tversky)-man. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 53(5), 349-361.
[31] Barros, J. A. (2009). Quantum-like model of behavioral response computation. *Biosystems*, 95(3), 201-207.
[32] Wang, Z., & Busemeyer, J. R. (2016). Interference effects of categorization on decision making. *Cognition*, 150, 133-149.
[33] Pothos, E. M., & Busemeyer, J. R. (2022). What can quantum models offer to neural and cognitive sciences? *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 43, 151-157.
[34] Khrennikov, A. (2021). Quantum-like modeling in decision making: Evidence from neuroscience and psychology. *Physics of Life Reviews*, 36, 63-81.
[35] von Neumann, J., & Morgenstern, O. (1944). Theory of Games and Economic Behavior. Princeton University Press.
[36] Suppes, P., & Zanotti, M. (1981). When are probabilistic explanations possible? *Synthese*, 48(2), 191-199.
[37] Charness, G., Gneezy, U., & Kuhn, M. A. (2012). Experimental methods: Between-subject and within-subject design. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 81(1), 1-8.
[38] Ben-Naim, A. (2017). Entropy and the Second Law: Interpretation and Misss-Interpretationsss. World Scientific Publishing.
[39] Griffiths, R. B. (2003). Consistent Quantum Theory. Cambridge University Press.
[40] Bohr, N. (1958). Atomic Physics and Human Knowledge. Wiley.

Editor *Sophia LI wtocom@gmail.com*