The Neuronal Determinism of Freedom in Education: Conditioned Cognition, Perceived Subjectivity and the Neuroscientific Paradox

Ayhan Aksakallı
Bayburt University, Bayburt, Türkiye

Abstract

The paradox of education as both a space of cognitive freedom and a conditioning mechanism raises fundamental questions about intellectual autonomy. By examining the tension between neurological determinism and cognitive agency, this paper asks whether education encourages independent thought or directs individuals towards predefined ideological structures. Drawing on philosophical, psychological and neuroscientific perspectives, it explores how knowledge production, pedagogical frameworks and social conditioning shape cognition. While neuroplasticity suggests cognitive adaptability, institutionalized education often channels intellectual inquiry into rigid epistemological categories. Psychological theories emphasize how reinforcement mechanisms and implicit biases shape learning and reinforce norms rather than foster genuine intellectual emancipation. Consequently, this study argues that education needs to be restructured from being merely a means of ideological reproduction. A transformative model of education should center on critical inquiry, self-reflection and metacognitive adaptability. The hope is that education will cease to be a conditioning tool by encouraging independent thinking and become a space where individuals can critically explore and transform their cognitive worlds.

Keywords: *Cognitive Freedom, Conditioning, Educational Philosophy, Neuroplasticity, Pedagogy*

Introduction: Cognitive Freedom or Neurological Determinism?

The question of whether education promotes individual autonomy or functions as a mechanism of cognitive conditioning has long been debated in both philosophy and psychology. Traditional educational discourse often presents learning as an empowering force, envisioning individuals taking action and thinking critically (Dewey, 1938, p. 27). Late modern critiques, such as those by Foucault (1977), however, suggest that education operates within predetermined cognitive frameworks that limit the potential for genuine autonomy. This dialectical tension between perceived subjectivity and neuroscientific determinism raises fundamental questions about the extent to which students can exercise free will in structured learning environments. If education is truly about fostering independence, why do rigid curricula and standardized assessment models remain central to formal education? Rather than a simple paradox, this reflects a deeper epistemological collision—between the promise of emancipation and the persistent reality of ideological conditioning (Biesta, 2022). Across different political and economic governance models—from neoliberal democracies to postcolonial nation-states—education has often been instrumentalized to either reproduce labor-capital hierarchies or consolidate state ideology (Tikly, 2004; Carnoy, 1974). For instance, while Western capitalist systems promote high-stakes testing and economic alignment, educational policies in postcolonial contexts are frequently shaped by dependency structures inherited from colonial administrative legacies (Mclaren, 2005).

Moreover, the issue is further complicated by the role of technological

mediation in education, where AI-driven learning platforms and algorithmic recommendation systems now shape how students access, prioritize, and internalize information (Holmes, Bialik, & Fadel, 2019; Williamson & Piattoeva, 2019). This disparity is particularly visible in the Global South, where digital infrastructures are often externally imposed, and curricular content aligns with international metrics, rather than local epistemologies or socio-cultural relevance (Batra, 2005; Alatas, 2006). In contrast, Global North systems tend to present algorithmic education as 'personalized' while reinforcing class-based differentiation through technological privilege (Selwyn, 2013).

From a philosophical perspective, Kant (1781/1998, p. 312) argues that autonomy arises from rational self-determination and suggests that education should cultivate reason in order to free individuals from the constraints of ignorance. Nietzsche (1886/1966, p. 143) criticizes this notion, arguing that education often reinforces social norms that prevent the individual from transcending himself. Foucault (1975/1995, p. 199) takes this criticism further and sees education as a disciplinary apparatus of power that shapes individuals through mechanisms of surveillance and normalization that go unnoticed and are maintained through hegemonic consent, as Gramsci (1971) describes in his theory of cultural hegemony, where dominant ideologies become internalized and appear 'natural' to the subjects themselves. Taking an existentialist approach, Sartre (1943/2007, p. 267) argues that freedom is not something bestowed by education but something that individuals must actively construct despite external limitations. These perspectives illuminate the conflict in education: does learning produce autonomous thinkers, or does it serve as a sophisticated form of intellectual regulation? The distinction between true autonomy and the illusion of choice becomes even more salient given contemporary findings in neuroethics, where advances in cognitive

neuroscience suggest that decision-making processes may be less conscious and more neurologically programmed than previously assumed (Churchland, 2019).

From a psychological perspective, behaviorists such as Skinner (1953, p. 87) argue that learning is essentially a process of conditioning, where reinforcement structures shape behavior rather than innate free will. Piaget (1950, p. 231) challenged this view by emphasizing cognitive development and argued that learners actively construct knowledge through interaction with their environment. Extending this theory, Vygotsky (1978, p. 156) suggests that social and cultural interactions mediate learning, implying that some degree of cognitive freedom is externally supported. While these classical models still hold theoretical value, recent research emphasizes the role of social-emotional learning and implicit bias in shaping agency in the classroom (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020). Neuroscientific developments further complicate the debate, with studies showing that decision-making processes are influenced by neural predispositions (Libet, 1985). If cognitive processes are significantly shaped by neural activity prior to conscious awareness, does this undermine the notion of genuine autonomy in learning? Recent work in educational neuroscience demonstrates that motivation, affect, and even digital context impact how students make sense of information, raising further questions about the boundaries of agency in the educational environment (Thomas et al., 2019; Immordino-Yang & Darling-Hammond, 2021).

These contrasting views raise fundamental research dilemmas. Do educational systems foster cognitive subjectivity, or do they shape minds within predetermined schemas? Does neuroplasticity support the idea that education can be an emancipatory tool, or does it instead suggest that the brain's structural adaptability is fully compatible with the constraints of neural determinism? Are learning processes an expression of free will or the product of unconscious

cognitive programming? The interplay between genetic predispositions and environmental stimuli suggests that although education promotes cognitive flexibility, it does so within the limits of neural and social conditioning. Thus, the idea of a fully autonomous student may be less a lived reality than a normative ideal. Furthermore, research in cultural psychology highlights how social structures and collective memory play an important role in learning, further complicating the discourse of individual autonomy versus structured assimilation (Markus & Kitayama, 2010).

Recent research in the field of cognitive neuroscience has revealed that decision-making and learning are not only the result of conscious deliberation but are also significantly influenced by preconscious neural activities (Haggard, 2008). The concept of readiness potential (Bereitschaftspotential), first explored by Libet (1985), suggests that the brain initiates actions before the individual is aware of making a decision. This finding has profound implications for education. Namely: to what extent can education claim to develop truly independent thinkers if students' cognitive choices are neurologically predetermined? Some thinkers argue that educational interventions primarily serve to reinforce existing neural circuits rather than foster genuine autonomy, thus limiting the emergence of truly original thinking. New predictive processing models further indicate that perception itself is shaped by prior neural templates, challenging the very notion of spontaneous thought (Friston et al., 2021). Even self-directed learning may occur within the bounds of entrenched cognitive schemas.

Neuroplasticity, however, offers a perspective against rigid determinism. Studies on the adaptability of the brain show that learning experiences physically alter neural pathways, suggesting that cognitive structures, although initially conditioned, are fluid and capable of transformation (Doidge, 2007, p. 78).

Recent findings expand this view by highlighting the social plasticity of cognition—how collective rituals, digital platforms, and peer dynamics influence neural rewiring in learning environments (Davidson & McEwen, 2012). This raises another epistemological tension: if the brain can reconfigure itself in response to structured input, does this mean autonomy can be designed, or does it imply new forms of subtle control through pedagogical engineering? Moreover, the effects of neuroplasticity extend beyond the individual to the societal level, as large-scale educational reforms often shape collective thought processes and influence the intellectual trajectory of future generations. The question thus shifts from whether autonomy exists, to who defines its parameters. In addition, emerging research in digital education reveals that algorithmic curation and AI-based feedback loops may reinforce deterministic cognitive habits despite appearing personalized (Williamson & Piattoeva, 2019).

Institutional education, structured through curriculum, assessments and pedagogical norms, functions as both a facilitator and a constraint of autonomy. Standardized tests, for example, reinforce behaviorist principles, training students to respond to stimuli (grades, rewards, punishments) rather than engage in inner intellectual exploration (Kohn, 1999, p. 92). Meanwhile, advocates of critical pedagogy such as Freire (1970, p. 114) argue that education should serve as a dialogical process, encouraging students to critically engage with and question dominant narratives rather than passively internalizing them. However, even in student-centered learning models, there is a basic structure that shapes how and what individuals learn (Bruner, 1996, p. 203). Thus, despite its claims to foster independence, formal education remains bound by institutional parameters that ultimately determine the limits of intellectual freedom. Recent debates have also emphasized how data-driven policy-making in education may subtly reinforce ideological conformity under the guise of evidence-based

pedagogy (Lynch, 2014). This further blurs the line between education as a space of transformation and a tool of cognitive orchestration.

In sum, education simultaneously enables and constrains cognitive autonomy. Philosophical and psychological perspectives emphasize the dual nature of learning: it is a process of self-construction but also a subtle field of conditioning. Neuroscientific insights further complicate this picture, suggesting that the dynamic between freedom and constraint is embedded not only in educational structures but also in the architecture of the brain. Understanding the boundaries and possibilities of cognitive agency therefore requires more than interdisciplinary analysis; it demands a political stance on what education is for and whom it ultimately serves.

Theoretical Framework

Freedom and Subjectivity in Philosophical Thought

The relationship between education and freedom has played a central role in philosophy, with different perspectives on whether learning facilitates individual autonomy or reinforces structured norms. Kant's concept of rational autonomy argues that individuals can only achieve freedom by using their own reason and positions education as a means of developing independent thought and self-government (Kant, 1781/1998, p. 312). However, this framework assumes that education exists as a neutral process, devoid of ideological influence. In reality, education often functions within sociopolitical structures that embed predefined paradigms of knowledge and subtly dictate the cognitive frameworks within which individuals operate. This creates a deep tension: does education truly liberate the individual, or does it equip them with institutionalized reasoning that conforms to dominant worldviews?

Nietzsche's critique of traditional education makes this debate even more complex. Nietzsche's concept of the will to power asserts that true intellectual development does not occur through the passive acquisition of knowledge, but through the constant transcendence of limitations and existing norms (Nietzsche, 1886/1966, p. 143). From this perspective, education is often a mechanism of constraint rather than empowerment, reinforcing social values rather than fostering genuine self-creation. Instead of enabling individuals to construct their own truths, standardized education systems codify knowledge within rigid frameworks, leaving little room for the spontaneous intellectual rebellion that Nietzsche sees as necessary for self-realization. The tension between education as a means of self-transcendence and education as a means of social containment raises critical concerns about the ways in which structured learning environments facilitate or inhibit individual development.

Sartre's existentialism takes this critique further, emphasizing the radical freedom of the individual to define his or her own essence (Sartre, 1943/2007, p. 267). However, Sartre recognizes that social conditioning has a strong influence on personal choices, leading to the concern that freedom itself is shaped by pre-existing conditions. If education imposes a framework through which knowledge is filtered, can individuals act with true autonomy? Sartre argues that while education provides the means for critical engagement, it also limits the scope of available options and creates the illusion of a free will constrained by predefined curricular and epistemological boundaries. This unresolved tension reflects ongoing concerns about institutionalized learning, where even progressive pedagogies exist within systems that establish what counts as acceptable intellectual inquiry.

Foucault's analysis of disciplinary power offers the most radical critique of education as an instrument of intellectual freedom. Foucault argues that

educational institutions function not as spaces of individual emancipation but as systems of regulation and normalization, transforming individuals into compliant subjects within larger networks of power (Foucault, 1975/1995, p. 199). This perspective argues that education is fundamentally disciplinary, structuring knowledge in a way that reinforces existing social hierarchies rather than challenging them. Through mechanisms such as grading, standardized tests and diploma awarding, students internalize institutional expectations, leading to self-regulation of their behavior and thinking. Instead of fostering autonomy, educational systems produce docile intellectual subjects who operate within set parameters, rarely questioning the underlying assumptions that structure their understanding of reality.

The fundamental question, then, is whether education is a means of subject formation or a means of individual emancipation. Kantian ideals position education as a path to autonomy, while Nietzschean and Foucauldian critiques reveal its potential as a means of control. Sartre adds to this complexity by arguing that even within structured constraints, individuals retain the capacity to define themselves, but that this capacity is mediated by the frameworks within which knowledge is produced and disseminated. The dilemma remains: education both enables and constrains—cultivating critical thinking while also establishing its epistemic limits. Understanding the true role of education in shaping subjectivity and freedom requires a reassessment of the structures that govern knowledge, ensuring that pedagogy does not only reflect dominant norms, but allows space for intellectual agency.

Conditioning and Cognitive Agency in Education

The role of psychological conditioning in education raises fundamental questions about whether learning environments cultivate autonomous thinkers

or reinforce predetermined cognitive frameworks. Behaviorist theories, especially those developed by B.F. Skinner (1957, p. 64), emphasize the role of operant conditioning, in which reinforcement mechanisms such as rewards and punishments shape learning behaviors. This perspective suggests that students are subjects conditioned to respond to stimuli rather than autonomous agents, leading to concerns that standardised tests and performance-based rewards can reduce intrinsic motivation and restrict cognitive freedom (Deci & Ryan, 1985, p. 39). Moreover, empirical studies show that the overuse of extrinsic reinforcement in educational settings can lead to learned helplessness, where students become dependent on external validation rather than developing intrinsic curiosity (Seligman, 1972, p. 43). This suggests that while behavioral techniques may optimize short-term performance, they risk eroding long-term cognitive independence, raising ethical concerns about their widespread application in contemporary education.

In contrast to behaviorist determinism, Piaget's constructivist approach (1950, p. 231) argues that learning is an active process in which individuals engage in cognitive construction to develop knowledge. However, even within this framework, questions arise about the extent of true autonomy in the learning process. While Piaget suggested that learners construct their understanding through assimilation and accommodation, cognitive development is still shaped by environmental inputs, raising concerns about whether individual agency is a fundamental aspect of learning or merely a product of structured cognitive scaffolding (Flavell, 1963, p. 112). Recent studies in educational psychology emphasize the importance of metacognitive strategies and self-regulated learning in fostering student autonomy, suggesting that learners who actively monitor and control their cognitive processes exhibit greater independence and adaptability in educational settings (Efklides, 2008, p. 281). This raises a fundamental dilemma: if cognitive freedom depends on educational design, how

can pedagogical approaches be reconfigured to promote genuine intellectual independence?

Vygotsky (1978, p. 156) extends this discussion with his sociocultural theory, emphasizing that learning and knowledge acquisition take place in a socially constructed context mediated by cultural and linguistic interactions. The concept of Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) suggests that cognitive potential is not merely an individual trait, but rather a dynamic process influenced by guidance and collaboration. This challenges traditional notions of autonomy in education by raising the question of whether cognitive agency is an intrinsic capacity or constructed through collective experience (Rogoff, 1990, p. 87). Contemporary research supports this view, indicating that autonomy-supportive teaching practices, which provide students with choices and encourage self-initiation, significantly enhance motivation and engagement (Reeve & Cheon, 2021). Furthermore, studies have shown that such practices not only improve academic outcomes but also contribute to the development of self-determined and resilient learners (Cheon et al., 2022). However, this interdependence also implies that individual autonomy is paradoxically socially mediated, complicating the debate between cognitive freedom and structured conditioning.

Neuroscientific research provides further insights into this paradox, with studies showing that decision-making processes in learning environments are influenced by subconscious neural mechanisms (Damasio, 1994, p. 147). If learning is neurologically preconditioned, the question arises as to whether educational structures cultivate free thinkers or merely reinforce cognitive patterns encoded by prior conditioning (Kolb & Gibb, 2011, p. 235). Recent findings in educational neuroscience suggest that the brain's neuroplasticity allows for significant adaptability in response to learning experiences,

indicating that well-designed educational interventions can promote the development of neural pathways associated with critical thinking and problem-solving skills (Thomas et al., 2022). These competing perspectives suggest that education is a complex interplay between psychological conditioning, cognitive development, and neurobiological predispositions, emphasizing the need for an integrated approach to understanding autonomy in learning.

In sum, the relationship between education and cognitive agency remains complex. While behavioral approaches emphasize the role of external reinforcement, constructivist theories highlight the active role of learners, and sociocultural perspectives underscore the influence of social mediation. Neuroscientific evidence further complicates this landscape by demonstrating that learning is both self-directed and neurologically conditioned, suggesting that the pursuit of cognitive freedom is neither entirely internal nor externally imposed (Immordino-Yang & Damasio, 2007, p. 7). This highlights the importance of rethinking educational paradigms to ensure that learning environments not only reinforce predetermined cognitive patterns but actively encourage critical engagement and intellectual independence.

Neural Determinism and Cognitive Flexibility in Education

The intersection of neuroscience and education has sparked significant debate over whether learning is a deterministic process governed by neural mechanisms or a flexible system shaped by experience and adaptation. This debate raises foundational questions about free will, decision-making, and cognitive agency in educational settings. If cognitive processes are biologically predetermined, to what extent can education promote independent thought? On the other hand, if neuroplasticity enables the brain to rewire itself in response to

experience, then education may have the potential to reshape cognitive autonomy.

Libet's (1985, p. 201) experiment on readiness potential lies at the heart of neural determinism. His research revealed that neuronal activity precedes conscious decision-making, implying that what we perceive as voluntary choices may already be initiated by the brain. This challenges traditional conceptions of agency in learning—if students' cognitive processes are unconsciously preconditioned, can they be truly autonomous? Supporting this, Soon et al. (2008, p. 543) demonstrated that prefrontal cortical activity predicts decisions seconds before conscious awareness. These findings suggest that the conscious mind may act more as a rationalizing agent than a true initiator, complicating the concept of intentional learning.

Despite these findings, other studies criticize the rigidity of determinist conclusions. The prefrontal cortex, associated with executive function and higher-order cognition, is critical in conscious decision-making (Miller & Cohen, 2001, p. 169). This implies that while subconscious processes may influence initial responses, structured learning environments can strengthen conscious control over cognition, promoting intellectual agency. Furthermore, research on mindfulness and cognitive training shows that metacognitive practices can enhance prefrontal cortex function and learning outcomes (Zeidan et al., 2010, p. 1150), thus challenging strict neurological determinism by emphasizing trainable cognitive control.

A central concept in this debate is neuroplasticity—the brain's ability to reorganize itself in response to learning. Studies in synaptic plasticity show that learning alters neural architecture over time (Pascual-Leone et al., 2005, p. 381). Rather than being static, neural networks adapt continuously, indicating that

education can reshape the cognitive pathways underpinning autonomy. This reframes learning as a dynamic process rather than a mechanistic function, supporting the idea that cognitive freedom can be enhanced through targeted educational strategies. However, this adaptability also raises concerns: if educational design can reshape neural function, then education may also serve as a subtle mechanism of cognitive control, steering thought in predetermined directions.

Studies exploring the relationship between neurobiology and social environments further suggest that although genetic predispositions influence cognition, educational interventions, cultural contexts, and social interactions significantly shape cognitive function (Diamond, 2009, p. 65). This reinforces the view that cognitive development arises from the interplay between neural mechanisms and lived experience. As such, learning cannot be framed as entirely innate or environmental but as an emergent process shaped by both biology and pedagogy.

Recent research in educational neuroscience supports this integration, demonstrating how well-structured instructional design activates neural systems responsible for attention, memory, and reasoning. For example, Thomas, Ansari, and Knowland (2019) emphasize the role of adaptive teaching in promoting neural growth and flexible cognition. Similarly, Howard-Jones (2014) highlights how the application of neuroscientific insights in classrooms can improve learner engagement and metacognitive development. These findings point to a nuanced perspective, in which neurobiological predispositions do not negate educational autonomy but rather set the parameters within which it may be cultivated.

In conclusion, while neural determinism challenges traditional notions of free will in education, evidence from neuroplasticity and educational neuroscience indicates that cognitive agency is both constrained and empowered by neural architecture. The extent to which learning fosters intellectual independence depends largely on how educational structures are designed—either reinforcing pre-existing cognitive patterns or actively supporting the development of flexible, autonomous thought.

Methodology

This study adopts a theoretical and conceptual approach to explore the interplay between neuronal determinism, cognitive agency, and education. Given the philosophical and psychological dimensions of the research, a qualitative, interdisciplinary (integrating theoretical insights across cognitive neuroscience, philosophy, and educational psychology) framework has been employed. The methodology integrates perspectives from philosophy, cognitive neuroscience, and psychology to assess whether education fosters genuine intellectual autonomy or merely reinforces predetermined ideological frameworks.

Research Design and Rationale

The study employs a critical and comparative analysis of theoretical literature, drawing from philosophical, psychological, and neuroscientific sources. The choice of a qualitative theoretical framework is justified by the complexity of cognitive freedom, which cannot be easily quantified but requires deep conceptual exploration. By integrating insights from different disciplines, the research provides a comprehensive understanding of how cognitive conditioning and educational structures interact.

To investigate the extent to which neuronal determinism influences cognitive agency within educational settings, this study synthesizes existing theoretical models and evaluates their implications for learning processes. The approach allows for a nuanced examination of the ideological and neurological constraints placed on learners, shedding light on the tensions between structured knowledge dissemination and the cultivation of independent thought. The theoretical framework also enables an exploration of how cognitive conditioning might shape individuals' perceptions of autonomy and decision-making within institutionalized education.

Theoretical Framework and Analytical Approach

The research is based on critical analysis and synthesis of existing literature. The study incorporates philosophical perspectives from Kant, Nietzsche, Foucault, and Sartre to examine the ideological dimensions of education. Additionally, psychological theories such as behaviorism (Skinner), constructivism (Piaget), and social cognitive theory (Vygotsky) provide insight into how conditioning mechanisms shape learning and intellectual development. Neuroscientific findings, particularly those related to neuroplasticity and the prefrontal cortex's role in decision-making, are analyzed to assess the extent of cognitive agency within structured learning environments.

This study also considers the implications of deterministic and anti-deterministic theories within cognitive neuroscience, particularly in relation to the neural basis of free will. The extent to which neural mechanisms preconfigure decision-making processes is a crucial point of analysis, especially in the context of structured educational paradigms. By synthesizing philosophical discourse with contemporary neuroscientific research, the study aims to provide a

comprehensive assessment of whether cognitive agency is an inherent feature of human cognition or a malleable construct shaped by external influences.

Data Collection and Sources

Since this is a theoretical study, it does not involve empirical data collection. Instead, it relies on a systematic review of peer-reviewed articles, books, and interdisciplinary research. The selection criteria for sources include relevance to the research question, credibility, and contribution to ongoing debates on education, cognitive freedom, and conditioning.

Analytical Techniques

The analysis follows a dialectical approach, contrasting perspectives that support educational autonomy with those suggesting cognitive conditioning. A comparative method is employed to juxtapose traditional educational paradigms with emerging insights from cognitive neuroscience and psychology. The study also incorporates a phenomenological perspective to explore how cognitive conditioning is experienced within structured learning environments.

Ethical Considerations

As a conceptual and theoretical study, this research does not involve human participants or experimental trials. However, ethical rigor is maintained by ensuring an unbiased and thorough review of the literature, accurate representation of different academic perspectives, and critical self-reflection to avoid unsubstantiated claims.

Analysis and Findings

Freedom and Conditioning in Learning: A Philosophical and Ontological Analysis

The ontological question of whether human cognition and behavior are fundamentally free or conditioned is central to the philosophy and psychology of education. Throughout history, education has been either an emancipatory force that encourages independent thought or a regulatory mechanism that conditions individuals to conform to pre-existing social, economic and ideological structures. This tension between autonomy and conditioning raises critical concerns about the true nature of intellectual freedom and the extent to which education can foster genuine self-determination.

From a neurophilosophical perspective, some argue that cognition is governed by neural predispositions, implying that learning is inherently structured by pre-existing neurological pathways.

Changeux (1985, p. 218) suggests that the development of cognition is closely linked to synaptic selection, where neural circuits are shaped and refined through environmental interactions. This perspective challenges the notion of absolute autonomy in learning, as cognitive patterns are at least partly determined by biological constraints. However, research on neural adaptation and cognitive plasticity (Merzenich, 2013, p. 56) shows that initial learning structures are highly malleable, albeit constrained, and suggests that education has the potential to reshape cognitive pathways and increase intellectual agency. This neuroplastic potential suggests an alternative view that education is neither entirely deterministic nor entirely emancipatory, but rather a dynamic process that structures and reconfigures cognitive frameworks. Furthermore, studies on

the interaction between cognitive adaptability and external stimuli emphasize that while brain structures provide a starting blueprint, environmental factors such as pedagogical design, cultural context and technological mediation significantly influence the extent to which education can promote true cognitive autonomy (Greenough et al., 1987, p. 540).

In contrast, existential and critical pedagogical approaches advocate learning as a form of self-creation and emphasize the role of individual agency in shaping intellectual freedom. Freire (1970, p. 77) criticized traditional education as a "banking model" in which students are treated as passive recipients of knowledge rather than as active participants in their own intellectual development. This model, he argues, serves to maintain existing power structures by conditioning individuals to accept knowledge as immutable and predefined. Instead, Freire proposes a dialogical approach in which students actively engage in critical thinking, thus promoting an epistemological break with oppressive educational structures. In this view, education becomes an arena where individuals challenge inherited assumptions and create a space for intellectual autonomy to emerge. However, it is debatable whether this epistemic independence is fully achievable, as social structures inevitably impose certain limitations on individual cognition. Moreover, work in the field of social cognition suggests that implicit biases and internalized social norms play a critical role in shaping thought patterns, raising questions about whether intellectual freedom is truly self-generated or merely the product of socially mediated cognitive conditioning (Devine, 1989, p. 16).

Psychological discourse further complicates this analysis. Behavioral theories, such as those developed by Bandura (1977, p. 93), suggest that learning is fundamentally a process of social modeling, whereby individuals acquire behaviors and cognitive patterns through observational learning and

reinforcement. If cognition is shaped by external influences, does this mean that intellectual freedom is merely an illusion rather than a realized reality? Cognitive psychologists challenge this deterministic framework by introducing the concept of self-regulated learning in which individuals exercise metacognitive control over their thought processes (Zimmerman, 2000, p. 66). In this view, education promotes autonomy not by removing constraints but by providing individuals with the tools to navigate and reinterpret these constraints in new ways. Recent research on executive functioning and metacognitive reflection suggests that students who use structured self-regulation techniques develop greater cognitive flexibility and are able to resist environmental conditioning and develop independent thinking (Kuhn, 2000, p. 181). This is in line with constructivist models of education that emphasize student agency and critical engagement as mechanisms for overcoming pre-conditioned structures of thought.

The philosophical dimension of educational freedom can also be analyzed through the dialectic of idealism and materialism. While idealists argue that education is a means of developing rational autonomy and moral agency (Noddings, 2012, p. 145), materialist perspectives claim that intellectual freedom is always mediated by socio-economic conditions, making absolute autonomy an unattainable goal (Bowles & Gintis, 1976, p. 29). This materialist critique is in line with critical theory, which argues that education serves a dual function: while it can be a tool for individual empowerment, it also functions as a mechanism for ideological reproduction (Apple, 2004, p. 38). The reality of contemporary education is thus shaped by the competing forces of emancipation and control, making the achievement of true intellectual freedom an ongoing process rather than a static ideal. Moreover, the increasing commodification of education under neoliberal policies has led to concerns that intellectual autonomy is being subordinated to market-driven imperatives, with students

increasingly conditioned to identify with economic productivity rather than self-directed intellectual inquiry (Giroux, 2014, p. 84).

In light of these perspectives, the question of whether education promotes true autonomy or reinforces cognitive conditioning remains complex. Neuroscientific findings suggest that cognitive flexibility allows for adaptability, but biological constraints shape basic cognitive processes. Existential and critical pedagogical theories defend education as an emancipatory force, while recognizing that social structures inevitably impose epistemological limits. Psychological perspectives also argue that learning involves both external conditioning and internal self-regulation, making absolute freedom a paradoxical concept. The tension between these competing forces highlights the dialectical nature of educational freedom, suggesting that while education can foster intellectual autonomy, it also operates within structural constraints that shape its outcomes. Recent findings suggest that adaptive learning environments informed by neuroscience can significantly affect how students internalize autonomy and agency (Lodge, Kennedy, & Lockyer, 2021). As technology and pedagogical methods continue to evolve, future research should explore how emerging educational paradigms such as AI-driven personalized learning and neuro-educational interventions may redefine the boundaries of cognitive freedom and conditioning.

Cognitive Control of Education under Capitalism

Education in capitalist societies has a dual function: it is both a means for intellectual development and a mechanism for social and economic reproduction (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990; Bowles & Gintis, 1976). The extent to which education fosters genuine cognitive autonomy or directs individuals into predefined economic roles remains a critical concern in contemporary

discourse. While traditional models of education emphasize the development of independent reasoning and knowledge acquisition, structural critiques highlight that modern educational systems often function as instruments of cognitive standardization, reinforcing labor market demands and economic imperatives rather than promoting intellectual freedom (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990, p. 127). This tension becomes even more pronounced in the context of global digitisation. Recent critical scholarship argues that transnational capitalist forces have leveraged digital education technologies not merely for pedagogical innovation, but as tools for cognitive regulation and ideological reinforcement (Zuboff, 2019). AI-driven platforms, algorithmic assessment systems, and predictive analytics subtly direct student learning in ways that align with neoliberal productivity metrics and commercial datafication imperatives. In this sense, education becomes a conduit for soft indoctrination, operating through invisible structures of influence that sustain capitalist expansion under the guise of digital progress (Selwyn, 2016; Couldry & Mejias, 2019).

Cognitive engineering mechanisms in education can be observed through curriculum design, assessment structures and pedagogical approaches. Standardized testing, for example, prioritizes the production of quantifiable knowledge, shaping students' cognitive frameworks to align with economic productivity rather than critical inquiry (Au, 2009, p. 55). Similarly, the hidden curriculum- the unspoken norms and values embedded within educational institutions- instills habits of discipline and obedience, conditioning students to operate within predefined social and professional hierarchies (Bowles & Gintis, 2011, p. 42). These mechanisms suggest that while education claims to promote critical thinking and intellectual independence, its structural constraints often serve to reinforce existing power dynamics and align cognitive development with economic stratification.

A central question arises from this critique: does education develop cognitive agency, or does it function as a means to shape adaptive economic subjects? From a psychological perspective, cognitive flexibility and self-regulation are often seen as indicators of intellectual autonomy (Dweck, 2006, p. 78). However, research in institutionalized learning environments suggests that these capacities are often constrained by external incentives and performance-based learning models, limiting the development of true cognitive independence (Deci & Ryan, 2017, p. 93). As a result, students are often conditioned to prioritize external validation, economic utility, and credentialing over intrinsic curiosity and intellectual risk-taking (Giroux, 2010, p. 119). This raises concerns about the commodification of knowledge, where learning is increasingly valued for its exchangeability in labor markets rather than its intrinsic intellectual value. Moreover, research suggests that an overemphasis on extrinsic motivation reduces deep learning, reinforces rote learning over critical thinking, and further complicates the idea of education as an emancipatory force (Ryan & Deci, 2020, p. 42).

Moreover, the corporatization of education has accelerated the integration of technological surveillance and data-driven learning platforms, reinforcing cognitive standardization through algorithmic conditioning (Williamson, 2017, p. 82). Adaptive learning systems, while promising personalized education, often operate within algorithmically determined cognitive pathways, guiding students towards predetermined intellectual outcomes rather than encouraging open-ended exploration (Selwyn, 2019, p. 157). This shift towards digital cognitive engineering suggests that education is increasingly shaped by economic and technological forces, further limiting the scope for genuine intellectual autonomy. Studies on AI-driven learning algorithms suggest that personalized learning pathways reinforce existing biases rather than encourage

independent inquiry, challenging the assumption that technology inherently democratizes education (Zuboff, 2019, p. 319).

Despite these criticisms, alternative pedagogical models continue to question the structural determinism of capitalist education. Models of democratic education, participatory learning frameworks and critical pedagogy approaches seek to counter cognitive standardization by prioritizing dialogue, reflexivity and intellectual agency (Hooks, 1994, p. 99). These models emphasize the role of education as a site of resistance where students can actively engage in epistemic disobedience and challenge dominant knowledge paradigms (Mignolo, 2011, p. 147). However, the viability of such alternatives is questionable as institutional and economic constraints continue to shape the wider educational landscape. In addition, emerging anti-capitalist educational experiments have demonstrated the potential for alternative knowledge production, but have struggled with established economic and political structures that perpetuate traditional pedagogical models (Caffentzis, 2010, p. 88).

This paradox is further deepened by insights from neuroscience, which suggest that cognitive agency is shaped not only by social systems but also by neural constraints. If education operates under capitalist logic while neural plasticity remains conditioned by repetitive stimuli and reward-based inputs, then the possibilities for autonomous thought become doubly restricted—both biologically and economically. This reinforces earlier arguments that educational freedom is a structurally bounded phenomenon, one that cannot be fully understood without integrating neurocognitive dynamics with institutional critique (Lodge, Kennedy, & Lockyer, 2021).

Consequently, the cognitive engineering of education in capitalist societies presents a paradox: education has the potential for intellectual emancipation, while at the same time it is structured by economic imperatives that shape cognitive outcomes. The question of whether education fosters autonomous thinkers or conditioned economic actors remains central to current debates, requiring a constant critical engagement with the intersections of pedagogy, power and knowledge production. Future research should assess whether emerging post-capitalist educational paradigms can successfully challenge cognitive standardization and create new spaces for intellectual emancipation.

Cognitive Conditioning and the Limits of Subjectivity

One of the fundamental paradoxes in education is whether individuals are truly free to construct their identities through learning or whether they are unconsciously conditioned by the ideological and cognitive structures that shape their thinking and behavior. This contradiction lies at the heart of educational philosophy as it questions notions of subjectivity and self-determination. Does the individual actively participate in an autonomous process of knowledge acquisition, or does education subtly reinforce the existing social, political and ideological frameworks that govern thought?

From a phenomenological perspective, Husserl (1931, p. 217) argues that cognition always occurs through pre-existing structures of meaning, which implies that learning is never completely autonomous, but rather shaped by inherited conceptual frameworks. This raises concerns about whether education facilitates true freedom of thought or merely channels subjectivity into pre-defined ontological structures. Derrida (1976, p. 92) further complicates this by arguing that meaning itself is postponed and constructed through language systems, implying that education does not promote independent cognition, but

instead draws individuals into pre-established semiotic networks that determine how information is interpreted.

Cognitive psychology helps us understand how individuals unconsciously assimilate cultural and ideological assumptions through repeated exposures in educational settings. Studies on implicit bias and cognitive heuristics reveal the workings of this process. For example, Fazio and colleagues (1995) conducted a “sequential firing” study in which participants' reaction times to stereotypes were measured after exposure to social group labels. The results showed that specific group names automatically triggered the stereotypic traits associated with them. This finding demonstrates how individuals' unconscious prejudices are formed and reinforced through repeated cultural exposures.

Although modern educational models encourage critical thinking, empirical research reveals that students often internalize dominant epistemological frameworks rather than question them. Stanovich (2011) highlights the difficulties students face in developing critical thinking skills and argues that educational systems fall short in this regard. This cognitive conditioning operates through both formal curricula that emphasize certain historical narratives over others and informal pedagogical interactions in which educators often unconsciously reinforce cultural norms that align with broader socio-political ideologies. Jost et al. (2003) have shown how educators and students are exposed to these dynamics by examining the impact of ideological beliefs on cognitive processes.

The paradox of freedom and discipline in education is particularly evident in Michel Foucault's (1975, p. 165) analysis of disciplinary institutions. Foucault argues that modern education operates through subtle mechanisms of surveillance and normalization, training individuals to conform to cognitive and

behavioral expectations without direct coercion. This disciplinary form of power does not completely suppress intellectual autonomy, but instead channels it into predefined forms of knowledge production and social integration. This idea is reflected in contemporary critiques of high-stakes testing and standardized curricula that often serve to reinforce existing socio-economic stratifications and ideological commitments while promoting meritocratic ideals (Giroux, 1983, p. 201).

Moreover, the interplay between ideology and cognition shows that even self-directed learning is not completely independent of external influences. Althusser's (1971, p. 128) theory of ideological state apparatuses emphasizes that education serves as the primary site of ideological reproduction by embedding certain values, norms and power structures into individuals' cognitive frameworks. While students may believe they are engaging in autonomous intellectual inquiry, their epistemological assumptions are often subtly shaped by hegemonic discourses that dictate what knowledge is considered valid, rational and legitimate (Apple, 1993, p. 67).

These theoretical frameworks become particularly visible in the everyday micropractices of education—such as classroom management strategies, teacher feedback, or curriculum selection—where subjective cognition is subtly shaped by institutional routines. For example, the repetition of culturally dominant historical narratives, the privileging of standardized language norms, or the implicit reward of conformity over creativity all reinforce conditioned subjectivities while presenting them as neutral educational practices.
Such subtle modes of reproduction reveal how ideological structures are embedded not only in what is taught but in how knowledge is framed and experienced (Giroux, 2011).

Despite these limitations, critical pedagogy offers a counterpoint to the deterministic view of conditioned cognition. Freire (1970, p. 104) argues that education, when structured around dialogue, self-reflection and participatory learning, can create possibilities for epistemic rupture, enabling individuals to question and transcend pre-existing ideological frameworks. This is in line with research in transformative learning theory, which emphasizes that critical self-reflection can disrupt cognitive conditioning and create new pathways for independent thought (Mezirow, 2000, p. 55). However, as new epistemic frameworks often emerge within rather than outside structured pedagogical settings, the extent to which individuals can completely break away from their conditioned thinking remains an open question (Brookfield, 2012, p. 176).

Consequently, the contradiction between conditioning and subjectivity in education underscores the complexity of cognitive autonomy. While education has the potential to produce independent thinkers, it also operates within sociopolitical, linguistic and cognitive constraints that shape how knowledge is acquired, processed and internalized. The challenge, then, is not simply to dismantle existing cognitive frameworks, but to engage critically with them so that education remains a site of intellectual resistance rather than ideological reproduction.

Conclusion: Between Autonomy and Conditioning

The paradox of education as both a site of cognitive emancipation and a conditioning mechanism raises deep philosophical and psychological concerns. If learning is shaped by neurobiological predispositions, ideological structures and cognitive frameworks, then to what extent is education truly autonomous and self-determining? While the interplay between neurological determinism

and cognitive flexibility defines the limits of intellectual freedom, the actual impact of education on individual agency remains an ongoing debate.

The potential of education to foster critical inquiry and self-determination depends on the extent to which it allows for epistemic diversity and self-reflective learning. Formal learning environments often claim to foster independent thinking, while at the same time structuring cognition through predefined epistemological lenses, subtly guiding individuals towards particular ways of thinking. The act of learning, then, is never completely independent of pre-existing ideological conditions, a tension that challenges the romanticization of education as a space of unlimited intellectual freedom.

At the heart of this contradiction lies the question of whether education fosters cognitive agency or reinforces conditioned thought patterns. While contemporary pedagogical frameworks increasingly emphasize student-centered, inquiry-based learning, the degree to which such models truly escape the pull of socio-political conditioning is questionable. A student may be encouraged to question authority and challenge conventional wisdom, but the frameworks within which such questioning takes place are often shaped by dominant discourses and institutional expectations.

If education is to be reconceptualized as a space of genuine cognitive freedom, it must move beyond rote memorization, standardization and performance-based assessment models that often limit intellectual creativity. Instead, education should embrace fluid, adaptive and transformative learning processes that prioritize metacognitive awareness, self-regulation and genuine intellectual risk-taking. This will require a fundamental rethinking of how knowledge is produced, structured and disseminated, challenging the dominance of utilitarian, market-oriented and ideologically fixed educational paradigms.

From a philosophical perspective, an ideal educational model should balance structured guidance with cognitive openness and ensure that students have the tools to navigate complex intellectual terrain without being confined to rigid ideological or disciplinary boundaries. The key lies in fostering an active dialectic between discipline and intellectual freedom, where structured learning provides a foundation for critical exploration, but is never an endpoint.

Psychologically, education should prioritize intrinsic motivation over extrinsic control, cultivating a learning environment in which individuals are engaged in self-directed intellectual development, not merely sensitive to reinforcement. This requires a shift towards adaptive pedagogies that empower learners to construct their own cognitive pathways, recognizing that true intellectual autonomy is developed through iterative engagement, self-reflection and epistemic humility rather than through narrowly defined, externally imposed criteria.

Ultimately, the tension between education as an instrument of freedom and education as a conditioning mechanism is unlikely to be fully resolved. However, through a critical interrogation of its role, education can be conceived not as a repetitive cycle of indoctrination, but as a dynamic space in which individuals develop the capacity to recognize, navigate and, where necessary, resist the structures that seek to define their cognitive landscape. The challenge is not simply to claim that education can be emancipatory, but to actively construct educational environments that resist the pressures of intellectual standardization and ideological reproduction. The future of education must therefore be envisioned as a delicate negotiation between cognitive structure and freedom, ensuring that individuals are not only shaped by inherited knowledge paradigms, but also equipped with the tools to question, deconstruct and reconstruct them. Whether education remains a tool of conditioning or

evolves into a space of genuine intellectual liberation depends on our willingness to adopt pedagogical models that prioritize questioning over obedience, creativity over conformity, and transformation over passive assimilation.

This analysis ultimately suggests that education must be consciously designed as a site of epistemic resistance—one that empowers learners to question inherited ideologies rather than silently reproduce them. Future research should focus on identifying concrete pedagogical strategies that integrate cognitive science with emancipatory educational models, ensuring that cognitive agency is not a rhetorical ideal but a lived educational reality.

References

Alatas, S. H. (2006). *Alternative discourses in Asian social science: Responses to Eurocentrism*. Sage.

Althusser, L. (1971): *Ideology and ideological state apparatuses*. Verso. https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/althusser/1970/ideology.htm?utm

Apple, M. W. (1993): *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203814383

Apple, M. W. (2004): *Ideology and curriculum* (3rd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203487563

Au, W. (2009): *Unequal by design: High-stakes testing and the standardization of inequality*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203892046

Bandura, A. (1977): *Social learning theory*. Prentice-Hall. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/105960117700200317?utm

Batra, P. (2005). Voice and agency of teachers: Missing link in national curriculum framework 2005. *Economic and Political Weekly, 40*(40), 4347–4356.

Biesta, G. (2022). *World-centred education: A view for the present*. Routledge. https://www.routledge.com/World-Centred-Education-A-View-for-the-Present/Biesta/p/book/9780367565527?srsltid=AfmBOooVr7-FJc4KEYLGMBBEU6QDcT59w64ZP4iVDXZBOBBdWHxPSXF7

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990): *Reproduction in education, society, and culture* (R. Nice, Trans.). Sage.

https://monoskop.org/images/8/82/Bourdieu_Pierre_Passeron_Jean_Claude_Reproduction_in_Education_Society_and_Culture_1990.pdf?utm

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. Basic Books.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976): *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. Basic Books. https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=243763

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (2011): *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life* (2nd ed.). Haymarket Books. https://www.haymarketbooks.org/books/1377-schooling-in-capitalist-america?utm

Brookfield, S. (2012): *Teaching for critical thinking: Tools and techniques to help students question their assumptions*. Jossey-Bass. https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Teaching+for+Critical+Thinking%3A+Tools+and+Techniques+to+Help+Students+Question+Their+Assumptions-p-9780470889343

Caffentzis, G. (2010): *In letters of blood and fire: Work, machines, and the crisis of capitalism*. PM Press. https://pmpress.org/index.php?l=product_detail&p=424&utm

Carnoy, M. (1974). *Education as cultural imperialism*. Longman.

Changeux, J. P. (1985): *Neuronal man: The biology of mind* (L. Garey, Trans.). Princeton University Press. https://press.princeton.edu/books/paperback/9780691026664/neuronal-man

Cheon, S. H., Reeve, J., & Ntoumanis, N. (2022). A teacher-focused intervention to enhance students' motivation: The motivating style training program. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 114(1), 57-76. https://selfdeterminationtheory.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/InPress_CheonReeveMarsh_Autonomy-Supportive.pdf

Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). *The costs of connection: How data is colonizing human life and appropriating it for capitalism*. Stanford University Press.

Damasio, A. (1994): *Descartes' error: Emotion, reason, and the human brain*. Putnam. https://archive.org/details/antonio-damasio-descartes-error?utm

Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 24(2), 97–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791

Davidson, R. J., & McEwen, B. S. (2012). "Social influences on neuroplasticity: Stress and interventions to promote well-being." Nature Neuroscience, 15(5), 689–695. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22534579/

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985): *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-2271-7

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2017): *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*. Guilford Press. https://www.guilford.com/books/Self-Determination-Theory/Ryan-Deci/9781462538966

Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology* (G. C. Spivak, Trans.): Johns Hopkins University Press. https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3310497

Devine, P. G. (1989): *Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56(1), 5-18. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.56.1.5

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. Macmillan. https://www.schoolofeducators.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/EXPERIENCE-EDUCATION-JOHN-DEWEY.pdf

Diamond, A. (2009): *The interplay of biology and the environment broadly defined*. Developmental Psychology, 45(1), 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014601

Doidge, N. (2007): *The brain that changes itself: Stories of personal triumph from the frontiers of brain science*. Viking. https://www.bookpassage.com/book/9780143113102

Dweck, C. S. (2006): *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. Random House. https://www.amazon.com/Mindset-Psychology-Carol-S-Dweck/dp/0345472322

Efklides, A. (2008): *Metacognition: Defining its facets and levels of functioning in relation to self-regulation and co-regulation*. European Psychologist, 13(4), 277-287. https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040.13.4.277

Fazio, R. H., Jackson, J. R., Dunton, B. C., & Williams, C. J. (1995): Variability in automatic activation as an unobtrusive measure of racial attitudes: A bona fide pipeline? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(6), 1013-1027. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1996-13343-001

Flavell, J. H. (1963): *The developmental psychology of Jean Piaget*. Van Nostrand. https://doi.org/10.1037/11449-000

Foucault, M. (1975): *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Vintage Books. https://monoskop.org/images/4/43/Foucault_Michel_Discipline_and_Punish_The_Birth_of_the_Prison_1977_1995.pdf

Foucault, M. (1995): *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Vintage. (Original work published 1975). https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3053074

Freire, P. (1970): *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). Continuum. https://envs.ucsc.edu/internships/internship-readings/freire-pedagogy-of-the-oppressed.pdf

Friston, K., Parr, T., & de Vries, B. (2021). The graphical brain: Belief propagation and active inference. *Network Neuroscience*, 5(4), 999–1041. https://doi.org/10.1162/netn_a_00192

Giroux, H. A. (1983): *Theory and resistance in education: Towards a pedagogy for the opposition*. Bergin & Garvey. https://typeset.io/pdf/theory-and-resistance-in-education-a-pedagogy-for-the-4c4y46147d.pdf

Giroux, H. A. (2010): *Youth in a suspect society: Democracy or disposability?* Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.18192/jpp.v19i1.5229

Giroux, H. A. (2011). *On critical pedagogy*. Bloomsbury Academic**.** https://www.bloomsbury.com/us/on-critical-pedagogy-9781350144989/

Giroux, H. A. (2014): *Neoliberalism's war on higher education*. Haymarket Books. https://www.haymarketbooks.org/books/1386-neoliberalism-s-war-on-higher-education

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Edited and translated by Quintin Hoare & Geoffrey Nowell Smith. International Publishers.

Greenough, W. T., Black, J. E., & Wallace, C. S. (1987): *Experience and brain development*. Child Development, 58(3), 539-559. https://doi.org/10.2307/1130197

Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995): *Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes*. Psychological Review, 102(1), 4-27. https://faculty.washington.edu/agg/pdf/Greenwald_Banaji_PsychRev_1995.OCR.pdf

Haggard, P. (2008): *Human volition: Towards a neuroscience of will*. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 9*(12), 934-946. https://www.nature.com/articles/nrn2497

Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). *Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning*. Center for Curriculum Redesign. https://curriculumredesign.org/wp-content/uploads/AI-in-Education-Promises-and-Implications.pdf

Howard-Jones, P. A. (2014). Neuroscience and education: Myths and messages. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 15*(10), 817–824. https://www.nature.com/articles/nrn3817?utm

Husserl, E. (1931). *Cartesian meditations: An introduction to phenomenology* (D. Cairns, Trans.): Martinus Nijhoff. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-4952-7

Immordino-Yang, M. H., & Damasio, A. (2007): *We feel, therefore we learn: The relevance of affective and social neuroscience to education*. Mind, Brain, and Education, 1(1), 3-10.

Immordino-Yang, M. H., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2021). *Whole child development, learning, and thriving: A dynamic systems approach*. Harvard Education Press. https://hepg.org/hep-home/books/whole-child-development,-learning,-and-thriving

Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2003): *A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo*. Political Psychology, 25(6), 881-919. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00402.x

Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sulloway, F. J. (2003): Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(3), 339-375. https://psycnet.apa.org/buy/2003-00782-003

Kant, I. (1998): *Critique of pure reason* (P. Guyer & A. W. Wood, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1781). https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511804649

Kohn, A. (1999): *Punished by rewards: The trouble with gold stars, incentive plans, A's, praise, and other bribes*. Houghton Mifflin. https://www.abebooks.com/book-search/title/punished-by-rewards-the-trouble-with-gold-stars-incentive-plans-a%27s-praise-and-other-bribes/author/alfie-kohn/

Kolb, B., & Gibb, R. (2011): *Brain plasticity and behavior*. Annual Review of Psychology, 62, 235-261. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.43

Kuhn, D. (2000): *Metacognitive development*. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 9(5), 178-181. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20182660 .

Libet, B. (1985): *Unconscious cerebral initiative and the role of conscious will in voluntary action*. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 8*(4), 529-566. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00044903

Lodge, J. M., Kennedy, G., & Lockyer, L. (2021). Educational neuroscience and the science of learning: A review. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(4), 1119–1142. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12423

Lynch, K. (2014). "New managerialism, neoliberalism and ranking." Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics, 13, 141–153. https://www.int-res.com/abstracts/esep/v13/n2/p141-153/

Mclaren, P. (2005). *Capitalists and conquerors: A critical pedagogy against empire*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Merzenich, M. M. (2013): *Soft-wired: How the new science of brain plasticity can change your life*. Parnassus Publishing. https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=2474537

Mezirow, J. (2000): *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress*. Jossey-Bass. https://www.amazon.com/Learning-Transformation-Critical-Perspectives-Progress/dp/0787948454

Miller, E. K., & Cohen, J. D. (2001): *An integrative theory of prefrontal cortex function*. Annual Review of Neuroscience, 24, 167-202. https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev.neuro.24.1.167

Nietzsche, F. (1966): *Beyond good and evil* (W. Kaufmann, Trans.). Vintage. (Original work published 1886). https://archive.org/details/nietzsche-beyond-good-evil-kaufmann

Noddings, N. (2012): *The ethics of care: Personal, political, and global*. University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/0195180992.001.0001

Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1984): *Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities*. Cognition and Instruction, 1(2), 117-175. https://doi.org https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690xci0102_1

Pascual-Leone, A., Amedi, A., Fregni, F., & Merabet, L. B. (2005): *The plastic human brain cortex*. Annual Review of Neuroscience, 28, 377-401. https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev.neuro.27.070203.144216

Piaget, J. (1950): *The psychology of intelligence* (M. Piercy & D. E. Berlyne, Trans.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203164730

Reeve, J., & Cheon, S. H. (2021). Autonomy-supportive teaching: Its malleability, benefits, and potential to improve educational practice. *Educational Psychologist*, 56(1), 54-77. https://selfdeterminationtheory.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/2021_ReeveCheon_AutonomySupportive.pdf

Rogoff, B. (1990): *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. Oxford University Press. https://archive.org/details/apprenticeshipin0000unse/page/n5/mode/2up

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020): *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation and personality*. Guilford Press. https://www.guilford.com/books/Self-Determination-Theory/Ryan-Deci/9781462538966

Sartre, J.-P. (2007): *Being and nothingness* (H. Barnes, Trans.). Routledge. (Original work published 1943). https://www.routledge.com/Being-and-Nothingness-An-Essay-in-Phenomenological-Ontology/Sartre/p/book/9780367461409

Seligman, M. E. P. (1972): *Learned helplessness*. Annual Review of Medicine, 23, 407-412. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.me.23.020172.002203

Selwyn, N. (2013). *Education in a digital world: Global perspectives on technology and education*. Routledge.

Selwyn, N. (2016). *Education and technology: Key issues and debates* (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury.

Skinner, B. F. (1953): *Science and human behavior*. Macmillan. https://archive.org/details/dli.ernet.448915

Skinner, B. F. (1957): *Verbal behavior*. Appleton-Century-Crofts. https://archive.org/details/verbalbehavior0000skin_f5o1

Soon, C. S., Brass, M., Heinze, H. J., & Haynes, J. D. (2008): *Unconscious determinants of free decisions in the human brain*. Nature Neuroscience, 11(5), 543-545. https://www.nature.com/articles/nn.2112

Stanovich, K. E. (2011): *Rationality and the reflective mind*. Oxford University Press. https://global.oup.com/academic/product/rationality-and-the-reflective-mind-9780195341140?cc=tr&lang=en&

Stanovich, K. E. (2011): *Rationality and the Reflective Mind*. Oxford University Press.

Thomas, M. S. C., Ansari, D., & Knowland, V. C. P. (2019). "Annual Research Review: Educational neuroscience: Progress and prospects." Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 60(4), 477–492. https://static.portaldaindustria.com.br/media/filer_public/7c/15/7c153322-d2e7-44e3-86b1-aeaecfe8f894/neuroscience_and_learning_pdf_interativo.pdf?utm

Thomas, M. S. C., Ansari, D., & Knowland, V. C. P. (2022). Educational neuroscience: Progress and prospects. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 63(4), 385-397. https://educationalneurosciencehub.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/thomas-m.-annual-research-review-educational-neuroscience-progress-and-prospects-2018-1.pdf

Tikly, L. (2004). Education and the new imperialism. *Comparative Education, 40*(2), 173–198. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305006042000231347

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978): *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press. https://www.hup.harvard.edu/books/9780674576292

Williamson, B., & Piattoeva, N. (2019). "Objectivity as standardization in data-scientific education policy, technology and governance." Learning, Media and Technology, 44(1), 64–76. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331025663_Editorial_the_datafication_of_education

Zeidan, F., Johnson, S. K., Diamond, B. J., David, Z., & Goolkasian, P. (2010): *Mindfulness meditation improves cognition: Evidence of brief mental training*. Consciousness and Cognition, 19(2), 597-605. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20363650/

Zimmerman, B. J. (2000): *Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective*. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 13-39). Academic Press.

https://ssrlsig.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/zimmerman-2005-attaining-self-reg-a-soc-cog-perspective.pdf

Zuboff, S. (2019): *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs. https://www.amazon.com.tr/Age-Surveillance-Capitalism-Future-Frontier/dp/1610395697

Author Details

Ayhan Aksakallı is at the *Department of Medical Services and Techniques,* Bayburt University, Bayburt, Türkiye. His research interests include philosophy of education, philosophy of science, quantum philosophy, polytechnic education and Marxist theory.

Email: Ayhan Aksakalli <ayhanaksakalli25@gmail.com>