M

MetaCog Learning

Metacognition · Intelligence · Productivity

QNM Theoretical Lab

Overview | 8 Pillars | Productivity model | Deep reading | Self-assessment | Reflect

Measuring the Metacognitive Prospects of Human Productive Potential

By Sidharta Chatterjee

Intelligence serves productivity as a bridge between latent human potential and outcome. If intelligence is optimized through deep reading, then productivity will exhibit a significant increase in neural efficiency.

Human productive potential 1

Noetics 2

Metacognition 3

Entrepreneurship 4

Core thesis

Intelligence is a **metacognitive reflection**—an emergent property of consistent self-monitoring.

Why it matters

Metacognition serves as the critical factor in **problem-solving** and effort translation.

Noetic Synergy

By aligning noetic energy with logic, we achieve a multiplier on **cognitive velocity**.

Research-Backed Insights

- Intelligence and productivity are directly linked.
- Deep learning protocols raise baseline general intelligence.
- Strategic reflection reduces "noetic noise" significantly.

Summary

"Metacognition is a cosmic clockwork, ticking in sync with the rhythm of focused will to action."

Research Article

Table of contents

Measuring the Metacognitive Prospects of Human Productive Potential

BY SIDHARTA CHATTERJEE

Founder, QNM Theoretical Lab

Visiting Researcher, School of Economics, Andhra University

Email: sidharta123@yahoo.com

April 28, 2026

Abstract

In this paper, we discuss the metacognitive aspects linked to human productive potential and examine how one affects the other. This being a theoretical research strives to build a framework which unifies several concepts of cognition and beyond—which commonly extends to metacognitive domains. Our primary notion is that human productivity as an outcome of the interactions of the modulatory variables like intelligence, wisdom, knowledge, experience and learning. We continue to put substantial effort through research on this frontier related to metacognition and intelligence to understand the basis of productivity linked to latent potential. Further studies are necessary for the deep exploration into the theoretical framework so that the findings and insights derived from such study could be readily applied to practice.

Keywords: *Human productive potential, noetics, metacognition, cognition, entrepreneurship, productive field, noetic potential*

1 Introduction

Anyone visiting an investor's summit or a gala event showcasing entrepreneurial talent of diverse business start-ups could see that there exist a number of pods—so-called individual "shells" showcasing their ideas and innovations to the interested visitors. One may feel a subtle sense of dynamism and environment's vibrancy in the podium, which is generally enhanced by the presence of numerous possibilities and productive opportunities offered by the growing minds of the fresh organisations occupying the shells. Such an ambience emerges from the sources of dynamism originating in dynamic capabilities (Salvato & Vassolo, 2018) that entrepreneurs bring with them. But what's behind the nature of dynamism? It's entrepreneurial human capital which is the key driver of firm dynamics (Queiró, 2022) in which innovation and technology adoption play an important role. Events similar in nature, in essence, reflect the power of entrepreneurial dynamism showcasing human productive potential (HPP). It is so because of the fact that it presents—rather offers a condensed kaleidoscope of higher dimensional intelligence at work, which we may describe as *co-intelligence* which is driving our conscious evolution (Atlee, 2008), and wisdom of action attached to the value being offered by the start-ups.

The wisdom, intelligence, and ideas are always in motion: i.e., ideas are formed, used up, and they lose value as it represents a vicious cycle of knowledge dynamics (Ammann, 2012; Bratianu and Bejinaru, 2026) in business segments—and yet presenting a vivid colour of organisational tableau in existence. Such knowledge dynamism is also reflected in the actions of knowledge creating firms who excel in transforming ideas into creative innovations (Nonaka, 2002), bringing knowledge to the forefront. In theory, highly productive ideas play the part of an infinite horizon tied up with the prospects of value that they possess, which could be realised only by tacit expenditure of noetic energy and explicit activities related to organised efforts on the part of the entrepreneurs. This kind of prospects are brought up by start-ups, which constitute the core and mantle of innovation and idea generation, utilising their limited resources and capabilities—by filling up unoccupied space. In fact, Paradkar, Knight, and Hansen, (2015) have studied innovation in start-ups, having questioned their intentions and capabilities in relation to the real value that they create. What really are they worth—in terms of value creation? In terms of—say, prospects? In terms of production function? Events that bring together, investors, innovators, and start-ups thus provide a platform to showcase organisational dynamism and value creation efforts.

According to Zook, (2004), such mediators who coordinate events like these act as knowledge brokers—bringing together on a single platform creators of value and evaluators, and who may consist of venture capitalists and angel investors in search of prospective investment opportunities. But all these value creating entities are instruments of capital (tangible and intangible) formation who employ deep metacognitive insights to surge forward with one dynamic intent—to survive, compete, and excel.

Hence, events like these come with "tacit prospects" which the start-ups present as they either gain value and prominence with time (De Bernardi & Azucar, 2019), or lose value and fail going forward. The most productive of these prospects—called unicorns, since I would prefer to call these acorns "prospects" not because of their productive potentials alone that they might hold, but because of the fact that some of them seem promising as they grow with time. In fact, according to a Harvard study conducted by (De Massis, Frattini & Quillico, 2016), big companies can learn a lot from the success of the unicorns and start-ups. With time, things change, become worn out, grow out of fashion, or grow bigger by becoming better. But it's time which we must have in our favour by the power of learning and productivity that can propel us forward ahead of others, in competition or in success.

2 The Age of Noetic Dominance

This is the age of speed and noetic dominance. Those who are fast, dynamic, and quick decision-makers know better what it is like to thrive in a faster world (Poscente, 2008) characterised by higher productivity and 'innovative intelligence'. We need to learn faster to do things at a faster rate—to stay ahead of others. Indeed, we can "gain time" by moving faster—as quantum mechanics has proven, which has a great analogical import tied to it. When we learn—and when we keep learning at a higher rate and more rapid pace than most others, we gain "productive" moments.

The pace of cognitive reflection increases, too, relative to the speed of thinking and learning (Marie, 2001). Actually, we gain "time" by learning faster—the moments characterised by new wisdom and innovative intelligence (II) that seem far ahead of the times. But do we really gain "time" by learning faster, or by knowing faster than others? This gain of time is a relative concept—in other words, we acquire better insights about the future which could make our future more prospective. Learning increases our knowledge and makes us better informed (Walberg, 1988). This is really a kind of innovation in prospective thinking.

On the other hand, the concept of "innovative intelligence" has been discussed previously by Weiss and Legrand (2011) in relation to sustainable innovation in organisations, and Ünay and Zehir, (2012) with regard to fashion industry—which thrives on innovation and creative instincts. However, innovation is the key mantra of existence of almost all kinds of businesses today as companies are quick to innovate in their ways of promoting, selling, and branding their inventories striving hard in offering new products at competitive prices. The time is ripe to acknowledge the power of innovation, which is grounded in creative thinking, powering human and firm productivity. Consequently, when things are observed in an economic sense, the trend rates of growth of capital and output (productivity) have become unpredictable—not fixed, as it was assumed to be in the past (See Solow, 1994).

We become farsighted and visionary by the power of our thought process. It is possible to bring about innovations in thought processes, which allows metacognitive developments through reflections. Our minds employ the power of metacognition (Overschelde, 2013) for imagination and enlightenment. We hover in the depth of metacognition from where the pinnacles are better viewed: according to Koriat, (1993), metacognition could be viewed as a recursive mechanism of knowing how things are known. Therefore, it allows us to explore prospects through the lens of productivity, rendering us better decision-makers by making us more informed about the processes of knowing things in much better ways.

This brief paper attempts to introduce the metacognitive concept of knowing beyond what's already known (Pintrich, 2002; Van Overschelde, 2013), and explore the theory of productive prospects in relation to learning and doing. Going forward, we shall have something new to say and something new to offer—the offering of which, we believe, would herald a new dawn in the domain of human potentiality research and productivity science.

Our inquiry and efforts are grounded in the realms of quantum noetic metaphysics (the QNM Theory)—which is a grounding framework supposed to hold the edifices of the presenting theory. In this small article, we have two things in mind: One is to integrate and unify metacognition, intelligence and habit formation to give a direction towards studying human potential in relation to productivity improvement. The other is the noetic factors in action—e.g., intelligence, wisdom of action, reasoning, thinking, and other deep metacognitive practices (Squalli and Wilson, 2014), for example, cognitive processes like deep reading and learning that are necessary to reorganise the brain's neural patterns and create more efficient patterns, which supposedly enhance intelligence, and boosts creativity and productivity (Squalli and

Wilson, 2014; Duhigg, 2016). Duhigg (2016), in particular, has elaborated on the fact how habits bring about changes in neural brain patterns of humans. This could be an important scientific deduction about human brain patterns, their formations, alterations, and obliterations, which could shed more light on evolving behaviors correlative to changing neural patterns.

Since productivity is regulated and controlled by cognition (besides many other exogenous factors), it wouldn't be so foolhardy to claim that metacognition—in this respect—acts as a multiplier of intelligent action—let alone intelligence, in determining productive performance and outcomes. Hence, we posit our ideas that seem more realistic and have practical significance, could be operationalized, and measured. The emerging role of metacognition (Hertzog and Robinson, 2005)—in this respect, seems important in the context of understanding human productivity and potential on a broader, futuristic scale.

3 Understanding the Relative Intelligence of Productive Prospects

The best creative minds are highly industrious in their habits (Covey, 1989). They nurture positive habits that contribute to their successes (Duhigg, 2012). They are part and parcel of the productivity circle, who understand productive behavior better than those who flourish on lax habits. They take time off their daily schedule to engage their minds in deep contemplation on new prospects. They engage in deep noetic activities that build contextual intelligence with the help of which they galvanize their productive vigour—the results of explicit imbedded cognition, deep practice of learning, and deep reading habits that they gradually inculcate. In simple words, they generate quality time for themselves in their engagement with exogenous intelligence. In conceptual terms, they cultivate patience and resilience. In a nutshell, they are highly "productive" beings. Intelligent beings.

In today's context of digital intelligence powering societies (Manasia, Pârvan & Ianos, 2018), empowering human minds have become an essential aspect of contemporary thought, and along with boosting productivity, it is all about strong AI doing most of the things in which humans excel—in fact, the pioneers of AI Technologies seem to have taken up the challenges of designing AI systems that are capable of doing and accomplishing all and everything that humans do (Conversano, 2026). This is akin to reframing metacognition in the age of digital intelligence and AI—according to Conversano, (2026). It presents a twin dilemma: what about *human innate potential*, and then, what about *human natural intelligence*?

Even the world's most informed and creative organisations have started to reckon the power of AI powering most social and cognitively demanding tasks. Today's AI-based systems have become highly complex in their algorithmic behavior—as it was quite correctly anticipated and prophesised by Roger Penrose (2016), who raised the mind-body problem of dualism in the context of Strong AI years ago. In fact, the rise of AI was predicted by many pioneers of AI thinking—Herbert Simon (1995), John McCarthy (1990; 2022), John Searle (1980), Daniel Dennett

(2012), and Ray Kurzweil (1990), among others. Concurrently, research of human intelligence, too, continued at a rapid pace, carried forward by experts like Sternberg (1983 and 2000), among others. Knowledge from the later contributed to the growth and progress of the former, as understanding human intelligence always remained a fascinating subject for the experts. These experts discovered new knowledge and new facts emerged from researches conducted in wet labs contributing immensely to the neuroscience frontiers. These findings furnished new knowledge about the human brain and understanding intelligence (Howard, 1993; Sternberg, 1983) progressed a step further.

Intelligence—as it appears, is a relative concept, while itself being a correlative one. Intelligence is gained by strong habits of learning, reading, and understanding—the metacognitive processes creating conditions that are absolutely necessary for creating new contexts, and reverse-engineering existing formations. However, sceptics like John Searle—one of the pioneers of AI Philosophical thought, believed that since AI is powered by electricity—and since electrical energy travels faster through wires than all other forms of energy except light, AI-based systems simply perform faster due to their enhanced capabilities of computing, organising, and presenting outputs faster than any other system conceived so far. But when one enters the quantum computing domain, one is forced to wonder at the intricacies and intriguing details of quantum relativity which employ the power of light and qubit—a unit of quantum information stored in two states of quantum system (Hayashi, 2017), to power quantum computers.

As much like Sternberg, who believes in the power of human intelligence, with all its limitations and advantages put together, we, too, believe that for any future system which would be reliant on synthetic intelligence, it wouldn't be an easy task for it to surpass human cognitive power and the capabilities of human thinking, imagination, and creative intelligence, without further advancement in the *philosophy of artificial cognition* and *metacognitive intelligence*. Although AI models are now capable of accomplishing most of the tasks that we humans do seamlessly, nevertheless, there's a general limit to artificial intelligence—as many authors claim, since it is actually a "programmed intelligence" whose intentional stance is controlled by human programming, intentions, and decisions. Of course, the synergy between AI and humans would create more dynamic, reflective, creative, and innovative environments under which, "productive prospects" would most likely increase. They would present as viable possibilities, but having the tag of scepticism tied to their outcomes.

We believe that intelligence is a universal footing for enriching the human mind, and that it's more potent than anything conceived insofar as technological breakthroughs could have offered humanity with. Hence, it has become necessary for us to develop clear conceptions about (human) intelligence, wisdom, and creativity—that nevertheless seem as beacons and drivers of human productivity. In this respect, we consider metacognition as an important variable which may augment human potential, learning (Pintrich, 2002), productivity, and intelligence. Metacognition can be measured simply using the given equation:

$$M = 1 - (C - A) \qquad \text{eq. 1}$$

Where, M denotes metacognition, C signify confidence level, and A=accuracy in solving problems and making a productive choice that has favourable outcome. Productivity, in such sense, could be measured as $h(w)$ multiplied by $A =$ accuracy :

$$P(s) = A \times 1/h(w)$$

Confidence levels of employees can be rated after completion of every successful projects. The formal philosophy of action in which we believe, and which aspire to operationalize using simple test metrics runs as follows:

Idea $\succ$ formal theory $\succ$ collaboration $\succ$ empirical tests $\succ$ product design $\succ$ development $\succ$ testing and evaluation

Here, metacognition is the cognitive architecture behind intelligent action and thinking, learning, and sustaining productivity (Nelson, 1999). Transforming ideas into usable and practical wisdom of action enables product development which can formulated simply as,

$$\boldsymbol{I\,(s) = K + R\,(a)}$$

Where, I=intelligence, K=knowledge audit, and R(a)=reasoning ability of the learner. By knowledge audit, we denote conceptualisation of the information acquired which is converted into knowledge. Since its smarter reasoning which leads to better results and outcomes, learning to reason well definitely helps in boosting productivity.

4 Theory of Intelligence in Action: Metacognition

There are three forms of intelligence which could be defined based on which it could be classified into three distinct categories: *Human Intelligence*, *Animal Intelligence*, and *Artificial Intelligence*. There are functional classification of intelligence, like emotional intelligence, fluid intelligence, etc. But we are denoting the core, fundamental there kinds of intelligence that exist in nature. Of these three, the first one (HI) and the last one (AI) are of major interest to our study. Animal intelligence belongs to a different domain, although we have gained much information from studying their behaviors, habits, and ways of responding to threats that lead to survival instincts (Tinbergen & Britain, 1942; Galef Jr & Aleen, 1995). The nature of human intelligence is unique, and is the only measurable behavioral trait that require psychometric testing to assess the level of practical wisdom that an individual owns (Sternberg, 2000).

We work with three loosely key terms—not explicitly defined in this sense, but which needs clarifications. These three terms are noetic potential, productive field, and the *force of the mind*—mental energy or willpower. By noetic potential, we mean the "capability" of the intellect in solving problems and using the wisdom of action for productive purposes. A "productive field"—by definition, is the vibrancy and dynamicity of an arena having a highly charged environment characteristic of

a fast-paced organisation in action or business, where operational efficiency and productivity means a lot. Metacognition comes to the scenario whenever the human brain aspires to create something unique (creative writing, researching, etc.), outperform others, compete with others, set a new standard, and engage with artificial intelligent agents in productive activities that relate to organisational operations, and many more other things (Kuhn, 2022), and which also reorganises neural networks. Research on neuroplasticity focuses on such transformative changes in the brain—following habit formation and acquisition of new skills (Duhigg, 2016). The force of the will (willpower) is a subjective concept having metaphysical implications which commands and directs the mind to engage in repetitive tasks that aims to enhance productivity.

Through all our research, QNM Theoretical Lab (QNMTL) proposes new theoretical frameworks that attempt to unify metacognition, intelligence, habit formation, and noetic potential to examine and understand the archetypal that characterises human productivity. We at QNMTL always insist on advise about the most efficient ways by which individuals can use their potential to be productive. We posit that deep metacognitive practice like deep reading reorganises the brain's neural patterns—as does habit formation, which according to research findings (Duhigg, 2016), induces formation of new patterns overriding the old ones. The changes brought about by such practice enhances intelligence and boosts productivity. The last statement is not even a strong defensible hypothetical claim—it is but a scientific *truth*.

Research in neuroplasticity points to the fact that deep reading habits reorganise neural patterns. Hence, we stress more on deep practices, by the power of which we aspire to remove conceptual confusions that may arise in the reader's mind. Herein, we clarify the concepts clearly so that it provides a definite directional stance on what we are aspiring to achieve.

5 Noetic Potential and Productive Intelligence

Let's provide conceptual definitions of the terms which we employ to develop a framework of deep metacognition. Indeed, as Sloman, (2011) describes, there are many forms of metacognition, and deep metacognition—according to us, perhaps belongs to that category which Sloman (2011) describes. Sloman (2011) also describes various kinds of natural and artificial metacognition that constitute an important supporting framework of this research. Now, the terms that needs to be clarified to remove theoretical clouding and confusion are *noetic potential*, *productive intelligence*, and *productive field*.

By *noetic potential*, we denote "the capacity to use and modulate higher order cognition, metacognition, reasoning, abstraction, etc., which optimises our goal-oriented behavior." *Productive intelligence*—in simple terms, defines "our ability to search, select, and execute actions that maximise outcomes of actions contingent upon evolving constraints." By *productive field*—it is meant "the vibrant ambience which develops in a fast-paced dynamic organisation in operation, creating an internal environment that promotes productivity, explores opportunities, and supports creativity and innovation drive."

It shall be kept in mind that the nature of organisational and functional complexities characterising cognitive machineries of the brain determine the nature of behavior, skillsets, and competence of an intelligent system—as well as its intelligence level, too, be it a machine of a human being. The intelligence of a cognitive system is determined, as usual, by a many myriad of factors, but mostly by learning competency, reasoning capacity, and problem-solving ability. Hence, habits that promote learning and augment problem solving ability (i.e., practice of solving problems), also boost productivity, for without actually knowing how to do or solve a problem, one couldn't move ahead, as lack of specific knowledge acts as a constraint on productivity.

5.1 The Model

Now, for the purpose of our study, we construct three functional layers to carry out our research on the science of human intelligence and human productive potential. These layers constitute the core fundamental edifices which support the noetic framework from the inside. The three layers correspond to:

- Empirical scientific layer

—which constitutes brain, reasoning, metacognition, learning, reading, understanding, etc.

- Theoretical Modelling layer

—which defines the laws of productivity and their applications, the decision-making model,

- Philosophical and Metaphysical layer

—which consists of the noetic apparatus that are employed to examine the meaning of intelligence and willpower.

Now given the five variables—Productivity (P), Metacognitive depth (M), Intelligence (I), Habit strength (H), ϵ effort counted in hours of work, and Willpower (W), we can formulate a simple functional model to test the hypothesis:

"Productivity is a decision outcome from the interactions of closely related variables of noesis, whose cumulative effects driven by willpower induces changes in a system producing activities that are meaningful."

Now, let's model an equation explaining productivity as an outcome of modulatory variables.

$$P(a) = \alpha_x + 1 - (\beta(M) \times (I) \times (H) \times (W) \times (\epsilon)) \times \varepsilon$$

The independent variable α_x is a constant function, whereas ε is the error term (constraint factor that depresses productivity). The equation provides a measurable framework under which outcomes can be measured and the effects of the variables could be ascertained using statistical regression analysis. This equation describes the power of productive dynamism which is considered an endogenous factor, which cre-

ates possibilities and opportunities that one could possibly tap for accruing potential gains. What could be more appropriate to describe such possibilities in none other way than ascribing them as "prospects?"

As it is evident from the above equation no.1 we have operationalized the primary variables that are most likely to have some effect on productivity/output. The logical progress with the argument stated as a hypothesis will allow us to gauge the importance of the noetic and Anoetic factors that affect productivity. The goal is not to allow the claims overreach evidence. We provide a strong theoretical claim, but which could be backed up by a test model to help clarify our core thesis. To be precise and testable, a good model is necessary, which could allow analysis of variables based on data obtainable from practice, or from the active field. This will help us to design a promising conceptual paper based on a theoretical model which would allow verification using empirical tests. Since our goal is to combine the variables into a unified framework, we must have good clarity on concepts to back our model and to render it internally consistent.

6 Results and Discussion

Our empirically testable model based on the theory of productivity stated as hypothesis above provides a good breadth for understanding productive potential in humans. We have taken a clear stance in measuring productivity on the basis of observable changes in several factors of productivity deemed important, since all of the independent variables vary to a great extent in individuals, across organisations, and regions or nations. Our theoretical groundings stand on practical relevance of the study. Here, optimism contributes as a motivational fuel, and noetic potential denotes internal capacity to work. Any use of cognitive tools would signify them as productivity multipliers—but not all tools contribute to productivity nor do they boost human potential. We have created a strong hypothesis to prove our point: tools that have significant impact upon productivity would be self-reflective, i.e., they are ascertainable through observable changes which could influence on productivity and output metrics.

Our model has several implications that are critical to understanding the stochastic variance in productivity much akin to the practical field and industrial sectors, as for individuals the influences could be significant as well. As for the central thesis, it remains as: *noetic potential* $\rightarrow$ *activation* $\rightarrow$ *higher productivity*. Here, optimism and self-realisation which are subjective conceptions (feelings) of the mind act as productivity trigger. We have attempted to model productivity as a latent internal capacity rather than a simple economic metric (output). The results may bear interesting facts on productivity when data obtained on such variables could be measured using the equation that unifies both noetic and noncognitive factors into one integral framework. It means that variables—including intelligence, metacognitive strength, and willpower could act as drivers of productivity, besides external factors like routines, habit strength and effort in hours that may improve productivity, since we believe that human productivity is a cognitively mediated outcome of human actions.

In the event of learning and education it is also necessary to evaluate the testable parameters that determine results—by using a metacognitive approach. This pertains to operationalization of a model of learning for effectiveness:

Teach Content reveals the "intelligence level" (I), *tracking thinking* could be ascribed to "metacognition" (M), *forcing application* denotes Willing (W), *measuring outcome* reveals productivity (P(s)), which create a formidable metacognitive engine of productivity.

One formula is undeniably effective: *learning* $+$*traning* $+$*practice* $\vdash$*improved productivity*. It could be summarised as follows:

$$Learn \rightarrow Predict \rightarrow Act \rightarrow Optimise \rightarrow Reflect$$

It creates a dynamic active environment that supports higher metacognitive activities, creativity, and productivity. Knowledge obtained from depth learning acts as metacognitive triggers or noetic boosters (Dokic, 2012). The primary objective is to develop a highly efficient productive learning system that functions on metacognitive triggers, which, in addition to this, provides the fundamental structure of a **Cognitive Control Index (CCI)**. The controlling elements are the constraining factors, i.e., lack of focus and attention, distraction, too many breaks in learning, poor quality teaching materials, multitasking, etc., that also act as systematic constraints to learning in terms of outcomes measured as productivity (output), innovation, creativeness, and new idea generation. These measurable factors—do indeed—override the theoretical elasticity associated with the problem of defining metacognitive abilities that are linked to human productive potential. However, such similar theoretical elasticity also contributes toward the development of metacognitive insights, as well. Hence, we, too, perceive metacognition as a principal competence—in line with other experts. The question of practical importance are these:

- What level of effort an individual could put in to achieve metacognitive competence?
- What's the degree of awareness of an individual regarding productivity and success?
- How can such competence be applied to Artificial Cognitive Systems (ACS) that now heavily depend on deep thinking and deep reasoning (Kawato and Cortese, 2021)?

These aspects will help us—going forward—in defining the architecture of the artificial mind in relation to the structural formalisation of metacognition necessary to develop intuitive capabilities of AI agents (Kawato and Cortese, 2021). These aspects, nevertheless, provide new opportunities for budding entrepreneurs who eagerly explore the domains of AI, Cognitive science, and neuroscience to search for new prospects that could be turned into profitable products and services. In this parlance, our research on Noetic Neurotechnology and Quantum Noetic Metaphysics provides us with a unique niche space for exploring new prospects and possibilities that aims to contribute towards understanding human productive potential (Chatterjee, 2026).

7 Conclusion

In this research we have touched upon the concepts that define and examine metacognition and its relation to intelligence and productivity. Without forgetting that fact that human potential and intentional stances constitute the power which boosts productivity, we also state the metacognition plays a significant role in controlling performance related to task, which provide for the provision of wisdom of productivity necessary to achieve success. Prospects are defined as pure possibilities which could be realised through optimisation of insights drawn from metacognitive pursuits of the mind—deep learning and reasoning. Our effort continues to innovate on this frontier to provide the readers with cutting age theoretical wisdom of action and inspiring thoughts and ideas that would help boost their productivity level manifold. Besides, our metacognitive insights are also directed towards supporting individuals to tap their hidden noetic potential for their own benefit. In this age of volatile prospects and uncertainties it is absolutely necessary to stay ahead of others through continuous deep reading and positive practice of deep learning. We help organisations and individuals to reach their full potential in relation to these noetic aspects.

References

Ammann, E. (2012). Organisational Learning Cycles by means of Knowledge Dynamics. IMECS Proccedings 2012.

Atlee, T. (2008). Co-intelligence, collective intelligence, and conscious evolution. Collective intelligence: Creating a prosperous world at peace, 5-14.

Bratianu, C., & Bejinaru, R. (2026). Knowledge dynamics. In Encyclopedia of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Spirituality (pp. 867-879). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.

Chatterjee, S. (2026). Unlocking Human Noetic Potential for Productivity Enhancement.

CHATTERJEE, S. A Framework for Deep Productivity: In Search of Practical Productive Wisdom.

Conversano, S. (2026). Can Machines Think About Thinking? Reframing Metacognition in the Age of Generative AI. Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Consciousness, 1-29.

De Bernardi, P., & Azucar, D. (2019). Startups and knowledge sharing in ecosystems: Incumbents and new ventures. In Innovation in Food Ecosystems: Entrepreneurship for a Sustainable Future (pp. 161-188). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

De Massis, A., Frattini, F., & Quillico, F. (2016). What big companies can learn from the success of the unicorns. Harvard Business Review, 1-5.

Dennett, D. C. (2012). Can machines think?. In Language and meaning in cognitive science (pp. 47-72). Routledge.

Dokic, J. (2012). Seeds of self-knowledge: Noetic feelings and metacognition. Foundations of metacognition, 6, 302-321.

Duhigg, C. (2016). Smarter faster better: The secrets of being productive. Random House.

Galef Jr, B. G., & Aleen, C. (1995). A new model system for studying behavioural traditions in animals. Animal Behaviour, 50(3), 705-717.

Hayashi, M. (2017). Quantum information theory. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Hertzog, C., & Robinson, A. E. (2005). Metacognition and intelligence.

Howard, R. W. (1993). On what intelligence is. British Journal of Psychology, 84(1), 27-37.

Kawato, M., & Cortese, A. (2021). From internal models toward metacognitive AI. Biological cybernetics, 115(5), 415-430.

Koriat, A. (1993). How do we know that we know? The accessibility model of the feeling of knowing. Psychological review, 100(4), 609.

Kuhn, D. (2022). Metacognition matters in many ways. Educational Psychologist, 57(2), 73-86.

Kurzweil, R., Richter, R., Kurzweil, R., & Schneider, M. L. (1990). The age of intelligent machines (Vol. 579). Cambridge: MIT press.

Manasia, L., Pârvan, A., & Ianos, G. (2018). Memories from the future. Is digital intelligence what matters in the forthcoming society?. In EDULEARN18 Proceedings (pp. 7899-7906). IATED.

Marie Barry, A. (2001). Faster than the speed of thought: Vision, perceptual learning, and the pace of cognitive reflection. Journal of Visual Literacy, 21(2), 107-122.

McCarthy, J. (2022). Artificial intelligence, logic, and formalising common sense. Machine Learning and the City: Applications in Architecture and Urban Design, 69-90.

Nelson, T. O. (1999). Cognition versus metacognition. The nature of cognition, 625-641.

Nonaka, I. (2002). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. The strategic management of intellectual capital and organizational knowledge, 437, 462.

Paradkar, A., Knight, J., & Hansen, P. (2015). Innovation in start-ups: ideas filling the void or ideas devoid of resources and capabilities?. Technovation, 41, 1-10.

Penrose, R. (2016). The emperor's new mind: Concerning computers, minds, and the laws of physics. oxford university press.

Pintrich, P. R. (2002). The role of metacognitive knowledge in learning, teaching, and assessing. Theory into practice, 41(4), 219-225.

Poscente, V. (2008). The age of speed: learning to thrive in a more-faster-now world. Ballantine Books.

Queiró, F. (2022). Entrepreneurial human capital and firm dynamics. The Review of Economic Studies, 89(4), 2061-2100.

Salvato, C., & Vassolo, R. (2018). The sources of dynamism in dynamic capabilities. Strategic management journal, 39(6), 1728-1752.

Searle, J. R. (1980). Minds, brains, and programs. Behavioral and brain sciences, 3(3), 417-424.

Simon, H. A. (1995). Artificial intelligence: an empirical science. Artificial intelligence, 77(1), 95-127.

Sloman, A. (2011). Varieties of Metacognition in Natural and Artificial Systems.

Squalli, J., & Wilson, K. (2014). Intelligence, creativity, and innovation. Intelligence, 46, 250-257.

Stephen, C. (1989). The seven habits of highly effective people. Simon arid Schuster.

Sternberg, R. J. (1983). Components of human intelligence. Cognition, 15(1-3), 1-48.

Sternberg, R. J. (Ed.). (2000). Handbook of intelligence. Cambridge university press.

Tinbergen, N. & Britain, G. (1942). An objectivistic study of the innate behaviour of animals. Leiden, Switzerland: Brill.

Ünay, F. G., & Zehir, C. (2012). Innovation intelligence and entrepreneurship in the fashion industry. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 41, 315-321.

Van Overschelde, J. P. (2013). Metacognition: Knowing about knowing. In Handbook of metamemory and memory (pp. 47-71). Psychology Press.

Walberg, H. (1988). Synthesis of research on time and learning. Educational leadership.

Weiss, D. S., & Legrand, C. (2011). Innovative intelligence: The art and practice of leading sustainable innovation in your organization. John Wiley & Sons.

Zook, M. A. (2004). The knowledge brokers: venture capitalists, tacit knowledge and regional development. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 28(3), 621-641.