

Looking For Divine Account On Psychological and Philosophical Intuition

Alya Mumtaza Hafidz

Universitas Darussalam Gontor, Indonesia

Email: alyamumtaza04@gmail.com

*Correspondence: alyamumtaza04@gmail.com

KEYWORDS

Intuition; philosophy;
psychology

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this study are to looking for divine account on psychological and philosophical intuition. In its history, intuition has a variety of spectrum of meaning from various fields of study. Most associate it with mystical things that are intervened by supernatural powers. Especially with knowledge that comes suddenly (Eureka/Ilham moment) makes intuition not infrequently connected with Divine Agents. As a process, debate about intuition often occurs in the field of philosophical and psychological studies. Both have a fundamental difference, both from the meaning of the process and knowledge they produce. However, regardless of these differences, philosophical intuition and psychological intuition have a fundamental equality that is far related to something that is mystical. This article will describe the intuition from two perspectives then analyze the differences and similarities of intuition in the study of philosophy and psychology to find the existence of divine interference

Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-SA 4.0)



Introduction

Some authors claim that the scientific study of intuition does not have much attention (Bastick, 2018). Nevertheless, the role of intuition has greatly influenced human life in various aspects; such as decision making in business (Burke & Miller, 2019), culture (Sadler-Smith, 2017), morality and even intuition play a major role in Nobel Prize winners who have made breakthroughs (Shavinina, 2014). Robin Hogarth says scientists pay little attention because it's hard to determine whether someone is using intuition or not. In addition, with the results of intuitive knowledge is also difficult to test and the various concepts and definitions it has make intuition more ambiguous (Hogarth, 2021).

Etymologically, The Oxford Encyclopaedic English Dictionary says the word intuition comes from Latin meaning "to look within" or "contemplation (Hawkins & Allen, 2019). While in The Shorter Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy defines intuition by understanding something without the need to go through a thought process such as deduction or induction. On the other hand, the meanings offered by psychologists and scientists are so diverse. Seymour Epstein mentions at least twenty different definitions for "intuition". Herbert A. Simon defined it as a bounded rationality, an idea

freed from reasoning sufficient for practical function. Dijksterhuis, Norgen and Gigerenzer liken it to a "gut-feeling". The definition that also mentions the characteristics of intuition comes from Tillmann Betsch and Andreas Glöckner who interpret intuition as an autonomous and automatic process. A similar notion of intuition is also referred to by Dane and Pratt as a rapid process. Another understanding comes from Bealer who calls intuition as follows:

“When you have an intuition that A, it seems to you that A. Here ‘seems’ is understood, not in its use as a cautionary or “hedging” term, but in its use as a term for a genuine kind of conscious episode. For example, when you first consider one of de Morgan’s laws, often it neither seems true nor seems false; after a moment’s reflection, however, something happens: it now just seems true.”

Although there are slight differences, the majority of psychologists agree that intuitive is fast, effortless, involuntary and associative. Because the process is fast, mysterious and elusive, many understand the instrument as justifying the influence of great forces (Järvillehto, 2015), or even quantum mechanics and extra-sensory perception sensors (Bradley, 2021). Sinclair and Ashkanasy also suggest that intuition can connect a person to supernatural consciousness. A similar mystification of intuition is shown by prominent Muslim Sufi philosophers, such as Suhrawardi in his philosophy of illumination and Mulla Sadra in Hikmah Muta'aliyah. Not only in the mysterious process, intuition is also usually associated with the insight of a solutive knowledge that suddenly appears (usually called the moment 'Eureka!' or 'Aha!').

Enigmas about the origins and workings and functions of intuition have also long been discussed in philosophical discourse. Starting from Plato, Rene Descartes, Immanuel Kant to Henri Bergson, philosophers tried to provide answers to this phenomenon of intuition. However, after the emergence of Charles Darwin to the surface with his theory of evolution, the puzzle of intuition began to be solved. Darwin has provided new avenues for the study of psychology to explain intuition. In this paper, intuition will be explained through the point of view of philosophy, psychology before then concluding the existence of the divine role in intuition (Alston, 2019).

Research Methods

This research was conducted using a qualitative approach. This study aims to find and explore potencies, problems, and strategies for developing culinary tourism in Kota Tua, Padang. This research method can help researchers interpret, record, and interpret the phenomena and problems that arise. Thematic analysis is one of the research methods used in qualitative research. Thematic analysis is a technique for analyzing data with the aim of identifying patterns and themes through the data obtained (Braun and Clarke, 2006 in Heriyanto, 2018). This analysis technique functions to examine in detail the qualitative data that has been obtained so that it can find the relationship between certain patterns in a phenomenon. In simple terms, it can be concluded that the thematic analysis technique is used to identify themes from the phenomenon being studied.

Results and Discussions

It is undeniable that some philosophers, both classical and contemporary, lean on intuition. In Philosophy Without Intuitions, Herman Cappelen coined the term Centrality for contemporary analytic philosophers who use intuition as evidence or source of their philosophical theories; among them are Alvin Goodman, George Bealer, and Jonathan

Weinberg. The discourse of intuition in philosophy can be traced back to Plato who introduced the Theory of Ideas. Thus Bertrand Russell explains the difference between opinion and knowledge in the theory:

Then we come to the conclusion that opinion is about the world that appears to the senses, while knowledge is about the supra-sensory eternal world... Opinion is concerned with beautiful particular objects, while knowledge is concerned with beauty itself (Russell & Griffin, 2022)

Plato considered the world to be illusory and volatile, whereas there is something stable and permanent called "Forms" or knowledge in Russell's terms, which is not bound by space and time. From this, it appears that Plato has implied that sense data alone is not sufficient for the attainment of true knowledge. Since it has nothing to do with space and time, philosophers consider this knowledge unattainable by experience. This idea then underlies a priori knowledge that would later be related to intuition by later philosophers, such as Rene Descartes, Immanuel Kant and Henri Bergson.

Before his views on metaphysics and epistemology changed in *Meditations*, Descartes defined intuition in *Rules for the Direction of the Mind* as the act of reason gaining knowledge without fear of being mistaken. In his attempt to discover unquestionable knowledge, Descartes proposed a knowledge of simple nature that is general and simple because it can no longer be reduced, such as shape. This knowledge can be accepted by reason by the process of abstraction, which is to remove irrelevant features in the object so that the object can be present in the form of simple nature. With its simple and general form, this knowledge is indubitable knowledge. The following is an explanation of intuition as a process of abstraction:

By 'intuition' I do not mean the fluctuating testimony of the senses or the deceptive judgement of the imagination as it botches things together, but the conception of a clear and attentive mind, which is so easy and distinct that there can be no room for doubt about what we are understanding.

He then considers intuition as justification for a statement that is self-evident:

Everyone can mentally intuit that he exists, that is he thinking, that a triangle is bound by just three lines, and a sphere by a single surface, and the like

Starting in 1628-1630, Descartes seemed to show his changes. The reason is still debated, but Kemp-Smith argues that the change was due to his meeting with Chandoux in 1628 which made Descartes inclined towards Augustinian metaphysics. Descartes began to rely his epistemology on God. This is reflected in the letter he wrote to Mersene, stating that he had received proof of God's existence:

I can boast of having found one myself [a proof of God's existence] which satisfies me entirely, and which makes me know that God exists with more certainty that I know the truth of any proposition of geometry; but I do not know whether I would be able to make everyone understand it the way I can.

Two decades later, after he discovered the principle of *cogito ergo sum* (I think then I exist), the same impression still lingered when he wrote a letter to Jean de Silhon in 1648:

You will surely admit that you are less certain of the presence of the objects you can see than of the truth of the proposition 'I am thinking, therefore I exist.' Now this knowledge is not the work of your reasoning or information passed on to you by teachers; it is something that your mind sees, feels and handles...a proof of the capacity of our soul for receiving intuitive knowledge from God.

In this sense, Descartes tended to interpret intuition as a product or knowledge, rather than a mechanism as in *Rules*. He no longer treated intuition as an independent way of

acquiring unquestionable knowledge, but he held God as an agent. In order to survive Cartesian doubt, Descartes postulated the existence of an Almighty God. Once His existence is proven, God will never deceive a person's senses and has made a person inclined to believe what he sees. This tendency is what Descartes called evidence of the intuitive knowledge of God.

Some three centuries later, seeing the stagnation of the metaphysics caused by the conflict between the rationalist epistemology of Descartes-Leibniz and the empiricist Locke-Hume, Immanuel Kant attempted to criticize both sides which can be summed up by his statement: "Thoughts without content are empty, intuitions without concepts are blind. Kant considered both to have erred in understanding that human knowledge depends entirely on the proper assimilation of appearances and categories. Therefore, both produce a flawed paralogism or syllogism.

Much like Descartes' simple nature, Kant postulated a priori knowledge freed from subjective frameworks bridged by intuition through mere contemplation. First, Kant divided the entry of knowledge in two; sensation and cognition. In cognition, it breaks back into direct intuition and concepts mediated by reason's interpretation of sensations from sensory capture. This concept will eventually result in understanding. However, Kant said that this understanding is only an interpretation of reason and not true knowledge. To attain true knowledge, it takes Pure Intuition that is not tied to sensation (space and time). This knowledge of Pure Intuition seemed to Kant a priori, because it precedes or does not precede through experience. Kant then describes how mere contemplation can lead one to Pure Intuition:

So if I separate from the representation of a body that which the understanding thinks about it, such as substance, force divisibility, etc., as well as that which belongs to sensation, such as impenetrability, hardness, color, etc., something from this empirical intuition is still left for me, namely extension and form. These belong to the pure intuition, which occurs a priori, even without an actual object of the senses or sensation, as a mere form of sensibility of the mind

After gaining this knowledge, Kant insists that pure knowledge must be expressed in strict rules of concept so that it does not become mere thought:

For if no intuition could be given corresponding to the concept, the concept would still be a thought, so far as its form is concerned, but would be without any object, and no knowledge of anything would be possible by means of it. So far as I could know, there would be nothing, and could be nothing, to which my thought could be applied.

Kant realized that the illusion of diverse categories would arise when pure knowledge (objective synthesis of appearances) was expressed through reason. Yet Daniel Robinson, in interpreting Kant's teachings, asserts that intuition would be blind without a conceptual framework because there is no support from the cognitive as the pure knowledge scaffolding that makes it possible.

The discussion of intuition in philosophical discourse continued, even after Charles Darwin published *On the Origin of Species*. It was Henri Bergson who again brought intuition as a method of attaining metaphysical knowledge (free will, causality, consciousness, self-conception, perception) that the intellect could not attain. Bergson defined intuition as "the direct vision of reason from reason which is not hindered by anything, there is no refraction of the prism, of which one facet is space and language." Approaching the explanation of the dual-process theory of thought in psychological discourse, Bergson presents a dualism between analysis (intellect) and intuition, where analysis is an act of knowing from outside the object, while intuition is knowledge

obtained from aligning one's position with the object, so that it seems as if it is the object. What the analysis process produces is relative, because it only sees from one side or outside an object (phenomenon). But what intuition produces is absolute, because it actually knows objects directly (nomena). Intuition will lead to metaphysical knowledge while intellect (analysis) will lead individuals to science.

By bringing back intuition and metaphysics, Bergson did not seek to denigrate the intellect or the method of science, but merely demonstrated another faculty of human beings capable of attaining knowledge. For the record, he also rejects the traditional metaphysical understanding of totality and dogmatics. Contrary to other philosophers, he argued that this metaphysical knowledge should focus on particular. For him, it is impossible for a person to explain a theory of everything because he will be directly dealing with the problem of language:

No matter what name you give to the 'thing itself,' whether you make of it the Substance of Spinoza, the Ego of Fichte, the Idea of Hegel, or the Will of Schopenhauer, it will be useless for the word to present itself with its well-defined signification: it will lose it; it will be emptied of all meaning from the moment it is applied to the totality of things

Much like Kant's concept mediated from Descartes' interpretation of reason or simple nature, Bergson also treated intuition as a method of revealing a concept made up by the intellect so that it reaches the true nature of concept. The difference is that Bergson had accepted Darwin's theory of evolution and used it as an explanation for the weakness of the intellect that had evolved to manipulate and use tools for fabrication. Therefore, he is worried about science and technology that is a manifestation of the intellect. In the process of seeking true truth, intuition is not just about revealing truth, eliminating ready-made concepts, but also creating new concepts that are broader and more flexible or even replacing them with better ones. In other words, Bergson argued that this intuitive knowledge could later be communicated through the intellect and could be verified just like scientific knowledge. From this explanation, Bergson's definition of intuition as direct vision has been well summarized by Heath Massey:

The "direct vision" of which Bergson speaks is not a simple, instantaneous knowing, but a process that begins with the clearing away of obstacles raised by conventional thought and language and must be followed by efforts to invent new concepts, acquire new habits, develop new images, and rearticulate the real.

Intuition in Psychological Discourse (Dual-Process Theory)

Plato and the analogy of the two horses and their coachman can be said to be the basis of the dual-process theory in psychological studies. However, despite its fundamental basis, the study of the conscious and unconscious mind only came to the fore in the 19th century. This concept has long been debated and misunderstood by many. Daniel Kahnemann notes ideas that were popular at the time:

First, people are generally rational, and their thinking is normally sound. Second, emotions such as fear, affection and hatred explain most of the occasions on which people depart from rationality (Kahneman, 2011)

The division of the debate about the natural state of man at that time was explained by Keith Stanovich into three different groups; Panglossians (rational), Meliorists (rational and irrational) and Apologists (purely irrational). Evans and Frankish also argued that German idealists, such as Hegel, Goethe and Schopenhauer, made intuition the basis of all reality by relating it to metaphysical notions, rather than an empirical postulate from psychological studies. This understanding soon changed in the 20th

century with the arrival of Sigmund Freud, who presented a new paradigm explanation and was soon widely accepted in psychological discourse; the dual-process theory of thought. Relying on this theory, Barret, Tugade and Engle explain how knowledge can enter through dual-processes to form an action:

1. Variety of objects around "grabbing" the individual's attention (stimulus-driven)
2. Individuals automatically create multiple representations at once
3. Individual attention passively focuses on these representations so that various concepts or knowledge structures are formed
4. This structure of knowledge initiates various actions, feelings or thoughts
5. The most powerful representations eventually arise as actions.
6. In this process, the individual may have a goal of concept formation or the concepts of the representation may conflict, so the individual may pay attention to several concepts and move on to conscious processes.

There are many terms that writers use regarding dual-process theory. Stanovich, West and Toplak note that at least 28 terms were coined from 1975 to 2006 (Stanovich et al., 2014). Stanovich suggested using a general term such as System 1-System 2, but he and Evans soon replaced it with Type 1-Type 2 (Evans, 2021). Kahnemann and Frederick with Intuition and Ratio. Using CEST: Cognitive-Experiential Self-Theory, Epstein halved the system; experiential-system and rational-analytic. Other authors refer to it as heat-cold systems, associative and rule-based systems, stimuli bound to higher-order systems and so on. This dual-systems theory has been used in many fields, such as learning, social cognitive, judgment and decision-making, and the psychology of reasoning. Apart from these various terms, it can be concluded that humans have two processes / models / types of thinking. The general characteristics that distinguish the two can be described as follows:

System/Type 1: Relatively fast, Automatic, Holistic, Parallel, Unknowing, Hard to phrase, Obtained from biology, exposure and personal experience, Universal to every human being, Has long evolved, Has similarities with animals

System/Type 2: Relatively slow, Serial, Controllable, Conscious, Acquired from culture and education, Expressable, Exclusive to humans, Relatively recently evolved

The illusion of the idea of "man always thinks and acts rationally" was soon broken by H. A. Simons who stated that this was impossible because there were limitations of the System/Type 2. Type 2 systems operate with working memory that requires attention. In other words, System/Type 2 needs to focus on a small portion of active memory (STM) in rotation so as to make it limited. Moreover, given its relatively recent evolution, it is difficult for System/Type 2 to be in control of all actions and sensations obtained from every sense. This system works better on step-by-step or decipherable activities such as mathematics, logic or hypothesis making. Tversky and Kahneman suggest that this limitation led the human brain to evolve to create shortcuts in judgment and decision-making. This assumption is called a heuristic that is equated with intuition or System/Type 1. Robin M. supports this statement by stating that people tend to choose System/Type 1 when situations are critical because the limitations of System/Type 2 do not capture details from an observation, thus making people worry about small errors of System/Type 2 that can result in improper judgments.

Although some researchers consider System/Type 1 to be biased and risky, one of the advantages of such systems is that they work quickly and in parallel, using multiple pieces of information at once. Betsch and Glöckner exemplify the comprehensive speed

of such systems by how quickly individuals perceive irony and sarcasm. Understanding irony and sarcasm is complex, individuals need to at least understand the literal meaning, context and detect the irony of statements and reality all at once. All of this is done unconsciously by using and activating long-term memory / LTM. The speed of the comprehension is estimated to be approximately 600-800 m/s., System Effectiveness / Type 1 can work well on things that cannot be parsed or expressed such as taste in art, taste of food, to moral values. This system is usually also associated with feelings that function as informers to the System/Type 2 regarding System/Type 1 activities. Although LTM is difficult to access or disclose, the system works independently of working memory, so it can cope with large amounts of information and make it an accurate "jury".

From the above, we can conclude that intuition in psychological discourse is a process, not an result or a priori knowledge itself. To distinguish intuition as a result of philosophy and processes in psychology, Lauri Järvillehto introduced Apprehensive Intuition and Generative Intuition, where Apprehensive Intuition deals with metaphysical notions and a priori basic knowledge, such as the belief in the truth of $1+1=2$, while Generative Intuition is an intuition that can be formed through habit. Both generative and apprehensive, many researchers agree that intuition is inherently dependent on experience. Furthermore, C. I. Lewis explains that a priori knowledge comes from experience and is influenced by subjective and cultural evolution. This knowledge is then accumulated in LTM and eventually becomes the basis of System/Type 1 or intuition.

Generative Intuition is unique in that it can be formed and learned from habits and practice. An activity that is repeated continuously eventually turns into an automated system that can work involuntarily or even produce comprehensive intelligence. In research conducted by Dane, Rockmann and Pratt, a hypothesis was proposed: "The effectiveness of intuition for decision making is greater when individuals have expertise in a particular field." The results showed a positive correlation between one's expertise and the effectiveness of intuition, which in the study was proven by someone who owned several designer bags was able to decide intuitively, whether a bag was real or fake. This positive relationship was also supported by Charles Darwin:

How unconsciously many habitual actions are performed, indeed not rarely in direct opposition to our conscious will! Yet they may be modified by the will or reason. Habits easily become associated with other habits, and with certain periods of time and states of the body. When once acquired, they often remain constant throughout life.

Meanwhile, to corroborate the claim of Generative Intuition, several studies in the field of neuroscience have confirmed the formation of new neurons, characterized by a cypnatic flame, when a neuron is given continuous stimulation (commonly called the process of neuroplasticity). If the habit—stimulus, which identifies changes in the neural system—has been well established as a skill, then over time the brain will tend to translate it as an action that does not require much energy (automatic). In other words, with enough time, one can form an intuitive system of habits that can lead to insightful knowledge.

Moment Eureka

Descartes' simple-nature, Kant's pure intuitive knowledge and Bergson's direct vision can be said to be fundamental knowledge produced by the process of intuition, that is, a conscious process of eliminating biases in the form of concepts, language, space and time until only pure knowledge remains without bias. The knowledge is a priori. In psychological discourse, the process of intuition is unconscious, and can lead a person to insight. Unlike philosophers, insight here is not fundamental knowledge, but a solution that suddenly comes to a problem. It is formed through the process of intuition, the

accumulation of the process of incubation which then comes into consciousness as the solution to a specific problem, unlike instinct.

The phenomenon of insight is usually associated with the reaction of Archimedes who exclaimed "Eureka!" (Greek: I have found it!) because he successfully solved the problem of King Hiero. Other contemporary examples can also be found in the discovery of mathematical formulas by Henri Poincaré or Friedrich August Kekulé von Stradonitz who discovered the shape of a circle in a benzene ring. From some of these examples, insight is characterized as knowledge that brings feelings of satisfaction, comes clearly, spontaneously, and generates confidence. This phenomenon of insight is not without explanation or is an intervention from supernatural things. Instead, Paul Thagard argues that insight is the result of mechanistic neural processes that can be explained. In fact, a study in 2019, a group of researchers stated that gamma frequencies of tACS (transcranial Alternating Current Stimulation) can increase the number of problem solutions derived from the Eureka phenomenon! (Santarnecki et al., 2019)

How can that be? Briefly, Stelan Ohlsson explained that the process of emerging insight begins with presenting a prominent mental representation of something. Then, the representation is reviewed or processed through previous experiences. This process occurs repeatedly, but does not make the individual walk in any direction, stagnating, so that the failure mounts. It is this set of failures that initiates individuals to see the problem from a different perspective. In other words, dead ends encourage unconscious processes (System/Type 1) to change points of view. A more detailed process is described by Graham Wallas's model in *The Art of Thought* (1926) which has been summarized by Eugene Sadler-Smith in *Inside Intuition*:

1. Immediate Problem: The individual drowns in problems
2. Impasse: Individuals fail to solve problems
3. Incubation: The individual abandons the problem, activating the unconscious system to work
4. Intimation: The individual "feels" knowing that a solution/insight is about to emerge
5. Insight: Individuals get solutions
6. Verification: Individuals verify knowledge insight

An important note was made by Järvillehto and Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, that insight can only arise if the individual has been struggling for a long time and has sufficient knowledge and experience in a field, especially to succeed in the incubation period. Therefore, breakthroughs that come from insight occur in people who are familiar with the problem, such as Kekule and Poincare. Another thing that distinguishes insight from the true knowledge of philosophers is the period of incubation which is completely unconsciously done by System/Type 1. Contrary to philosophers who suggest continuing to contemplate in order to achieve basic knowledge without bias, Ullrich Wagner and others, in the journal *Nature*, argue that insight can actually be initiated by sleep (Wagner et al., 2014).

Conclusion

From the above, there is a fundamental difference between intuition in philosophical and psychological discourse. Although both agree on interpreting intuition as a thought process, the impression obtained from Descartes' elaboration (in *Rules*), Kant and Bergson state that intuition tends to be done consciously. They assume a concept or representation of sensory data is not actual knowledge, that knowledge contains bias and

can be deceptive. They believed in a priori knowledge hidden in a concept, knowledge that Descartes could not doubt, Kant's pure intuition and Bergson's direct vision. Intuition is then presented as active contemplation by the intellect, though not at the analytic or intellectual level, to reveal and eliminate biases or layers from a concept until only general fundamental knowledge remains, where the truth is not only partial, but universal and absolute. Of the three, none attribute intuition to a rapid, sudden, or divine role in it. Although Descartes eventually postulated God and expressed his difficulty in expressing that knowledge, all three agreed that intuition is a time-consuming process. Just like the mechanism of intuition in psychology, Kant and Bergson assert that knowledge of this intuition needs to be revealed, although the process can lead to illusions and biases.

Unlike the study of philosophy, in the explanation of psychology intuition is defined as an unconscious process that is autonomous and automatic. Leaning on dual-process theory, intuition (System/Type 1) accompanies analytic ratios (System/Type 2) by utilizing a wider range of long-term memory. Intuition here is not used as a method of presenting a concept, but rather a backrest for various problems that do not involve step-by-step thought processes, such as problem solving, appetite, understanding sarcasm, and so on. Unlike philosophical intuition, this intuitive knowledge can simply exist without knowing how it is present. What is unique, intuition in psychology can be developed to such a degree that suddenly someone can come up with a solution (insight). This knowledge is completely different from Descartes' simple nature, because insight is the solution to a specific problem, not the true knowledge of the general. By constantly connecting with something (mathematics, physics, novel stories), one can arrive at Eureka moments! and made a breakthrough. Because of this explanation, many psychologists negate the relationship between intuition and the mystical and supernatural.

To conclude, the differences in intuition in philosophy and psychology can be elaborated as follows:

Philosophical intuition: the process of active contemplation, the search for universal basic knowledge, the results of which can be talked about

Psychological intuition: the process is unconscious, produces insight or instinct, the results of insight can be communicated while instinct is difficult to talk about.

Although there are differences between the two, the only bridge that can equate and unite intuition is that both rely entirely on past knowledge or experience. There is also no divine role in either. The basic concepts of philosophy cannot come except from diverse experiences that are then deduced while insight cannot possibly come to someone unfamiliar with the problem.

References

- Alston, W. P. (2019). *Divine nature and human language: Essays in philosophical theology*. Cornell University Press.
- Bastick, T. (2018). Evaluations of Quality Teaching for University Quality Assurance. *Reconceptualising the Agenda for Education in the Caribbean*, 511.
- Bradley, R. (2021). 17 Resolving the enigma of nonlocal intuition: A quantum-holographic approach. *Handbook of intuition research*, 197.
- Burke, L. A., & Miller, M. K. (2019). Taking the mystery out of intuitive decision making. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 13(4), 91–99.
- Evans, J. S. B. T. (2021). Dual-process theories of reasoning: Contemporary issues and developmental applications. *Developmental review*, 31(2–3), 86–102.
- Hawkins, J., & Allen, R. E. (2019). The Oxford Encyclopedic English Dictionary. (*No Title*).
- Hogarth, R. M. (2021). *Educating intuition*. University of Chicago Press.
- Järvillehto, L. (2015). *The nature and function of intuitive thought and decision making*. Springer.
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. macmillan.
- Russell, B., & Griffin, N. (2022). *My philosophical development*. Routledge.
- Sadler-Smith, E. (2017). *Inside intuition*. Routledge.
- Santarnecchi, E., Sprugnoli, G., Bricolo, E., Costantini, G., Liew, S.-L., Musaeus, C. S., Salvi, C., Pascual-Leone, A., Rossi, A., & Rossi, S. (2019). Gamma tACS over the temporal lobe increases the occurrence of Eureka! moments. *Scientific Reports*, 9(1), 5778.
- Shavinina, L. V. (2014). Explaining high abilities of Nobel laureates. *High Ability Studies*, 15(2), 243–254.
- Stanovich, K. E., West, R. F., & Toplak, M. E. (2014). Rationality, intelligence, and the defining features of Type 1 and Type 2 processing. *Dual-process theories of the social mind*, 80–91.
- Wagner, U., Gais, S., Haider, H., Verleger, R., & Born, J. (2014). Sleep inspires insight. *Nature*, 427(6972), 352–355.