

Intelagencyism: A Learning Theory for Generation Alpha

Prof.Dr. Mehmet Fırat

Anadolu University, Türkiye, mfirat@anadolu.edu.tr

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8707-5918>

Abstract

This paper introduces Intelagencyism, a learning theory of the AI age that centers on the *cognitive sovereignty* of the individual in symbiotic interactions with AI. Intelagencyism is not merely a theory of learning; it is a theory of being in the AI age. It offers a radical and much-needed departure from static, curriculum-centered models of education. It reimagines learning as existential emergence, sustained by the interaction between internal sovereignty and external intelligences. This theory posits that AI can serve not as a replacement for human cognition but as a *cognitive partner* that enables learners to reclaim individual *intellectual agency*. AI is positioned not just as a tool but also as a *cognitive companion* that thinks and designs alongside the learner, nurturing the individual's meta-cognitive strategies. Furthermore, learning centers on its spontaneous nature, shaped by an individual's intrinsic curiosity, search for meaning, and creative drive. In this theory, AI acts as an *intuitive amplifier* that processes an individual's cognitive sparks, provides dynamic feedback to learning processes, and designs personalized learning paths. Through a critical analysis of historical shifts in human learning, from direct experiential knowledge to representational learning and now to symbiotic AI-human cognition, this paper examines the theoretical foundations, philosophical grounds, and pedagogical implications of Intelagencyism. The theory proposes three core dimensions: *cognitive sovereignty*, *AI partnership*, and *autotelic learning drive*. These dimensions collectively represent a paradigm shift from traditional educational theories toward a *postdigital learning ecology* in which individuals actively involve individual *intellectual agency* with AI assistance. Intelagencyism seeks to elucidate the shift in human learning from a representational and passive approach to one that is dynamic, engaging, profound, and existential, where individuals actively craft their own learning experiences. This pivotal study paves the way for a new understanding and implementation of AI-enhanced learning that preserves human agency while leveraging technological advancements.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, learning, cognitive sovereignty, learning theory, postdigital, autotelic learning

APA Citation: Fırat, M. (2025). Intelagencyism: A Learning Theory for Generation Alpha. *ResearchHub Preprint*. <https://doi.org/10.55277/researchhub.htqn3mhx.1>

1. Introduction

Hunter-gatherers mastered intuitive learning, farmers deepened their cultivation-based learning processes, industrial society workers focused on mechanical and repetitive skill acquisition, information age experts turned to analytical knowledge production, and digital nomads strived to stay up-to-date with networked-adaptive, microlearning strategies. Human adaptation to changing conditions is closely related to how quickly the focus of learning changes. Humans, who have a flexible learning ability (neuroplasticity), have managed to succeed in their struggle with nature because of this flexible learning ability (Doidge, 2007). This flexibility has been one of the main factors that has enabled humans to spread all over the planet and transform it (Diamond, 1998). Today, however, our struggle is no longer with nature but with the limitations of our own consciousness. Therefore, learning to learn is directly related to the individual's capacity to recognize our own *cognitive limitations*, to develop strategies to go beyond these limitations, and to be the subject of the learning process again.

The dynamics of previous social transformations are closely related to changing environmental and living conditions. Humans, too, have developed themselves by adapting to changing conditions and have been able to overcome physical limitations with technological extensions. We invented the wheel and the airplane for transportation; we invented language, the telephone, and the internet for communication. With each invention, we have gained many more advantages than other living beings. This time, however, it is not a physical or environmental challenge, but a challenge to the very cognitive abilities that have given us all these possibilities. It is almost impossible to foresee how fast and exponentially everything can change when the very thing that invented it (consciousness through learning) expands. The technology that does this is called artificial intelligence (AI).

Howe (2023) explains the transformations of history in cyclical phases, called the *saeculum*. For example, the *Fourth Cycle*, which started with the 2008 financial crisis, can be considered a catalyst that necessitated Intelagencyism's AI-powered learning model. The active role of AI technologies in processing, organizing, and personalizing information beyond access to information necessitates a radical redefinition of the nature of learning processes. It is no longer enough to access, organize, and reorganize information; adapting information to personal goals and making it cognitively subjective is accepted as a new form of competence. Self-directed/regulated learning (Ryan and Deci, 2024), autodidacticism, and learner autonomy have therefore attracted great attention in recent years. Therefore, traditional education systems, no matter how many iterations are made, are no longer of interest. The *solution is no longer to do what we have been doing (thousands of years of educational systematics) differently, but to change what we are doing*. The deep subjective *grit for learning agencies* rarely finds fulfillment in schools and universities, but mostly through the individual's own searches

and experiences (Duckworth, 2016). All of this points to the birth pangs of an unnamed learning theory whose time has come. The lack of operational capacity offered by the system and conceptualization attempts such as distance learning, open learning, continuing education, lifelong learning, and heutagogy have enabled these pains to reach today. Now, in the age of artificial intelligence, the most critical human skill is the ability of the individual to self-educate without interruption, to rapidly reorganize what we have learned, to use it live in real life, to benefit from real life in an extended way, and most importantly, to rapidly re-adapt to changing conditions as upgraded. This is a kind of re-adaptation. It will be a whole new experience to interact with our environment in a live way with the support of AI fueled by advanced sensors, big data, and algorithms. No moment will ever be the same. We will be able to perceive much more comprehensively, think more deeply, and act with more nuance. This will be an upgraded version of the human being, as we know it. In other words, the agency of the human species will scale both in the concrete and abstract.

Intelagencyism is not a new quest for elevated human beings. On the contrary, great philosophers, scientists, and artists throughout history have argued that the individual should be the subject of its own learning process. Socrates' *intellectualism* asserts that the individual can only do what is best to the extent that he or she can understand it: "No one does wrong willingly" (Gulley, 1965). Jung's concept of the *autotelic self* draws attention to the individual's intrinsically motivated, purposeful learning orientation. Descartes' *methodological skepticism* and *autodidacticism* emphasize the fundamental responsibility of the individual in the learning process. This line, combined with Popper's *critical rationalism* and Freire's *dialogical pedagogy*, reveals that learning is not only a process of content acquisition but also of cognitive subjectivation. We are at a threshold at which this line can be qualitatively transformed for the first time.

We are on the verge of *symbiotic integration* with AI and *upgraded* human learning. Individuals are no longer just accessing information, but processing, restructuring, and transforming it into personalized learning journeys and lives through AI systems. Each of us in power is now getting the answers to dozens of our questions from AI. We consult AI about plants we don't know, stones, symptoms of diseases, concepts we just heard about and many more real-life questions. This transformation not only enhances human learning but also qualitatively differentiates it, accelerates it and scales its agency. Agentic AI tools are being used precisely for scaling human agency, for example. As George Siemens (2005) argues in his theory of Connectivism, learning now extends beyond the individual mind and is constantly recreated through networks and digital systems. However, beyond Connectivism, Intelagencyism is based on symbiotic interaction with AI and the regaining of *cognitive sovereignty* by the individual.

Intelagencyism is derived from *intelligence*, the Latin concepts of *intellectus* (the ability to make sense) and *agency* (the capacity for free action). The theory represents a model

of postdigital learning in which the individual re-establishes cognitive sovereignty with the support of AI, recognizes unique learning streams, and becomes a subject acting within living, intuitive cognitive systems. Postdigital theory represents a paradigm shift in which digital technologies have become so thoroughly integrated into human experience that they no longer constitute novelty, but rather form the invisible infrastructure of daily life (Jandrić et al. 2023). According to Knox (2019), the postdigital era refers to the period when digital tools are perceived not only as technical tools, but also as social and epistemological contexts that shape our learning experiences.

This theoretical manifesto addresses both philosophical, pedagogical and technical aspects of the process that evolves from representational learning, which begins with the separation of humans from nature, to symbiotic learning based on cognitive partnership with AI. The aim is not only to propose a theory of learning, but also to question the repositioning of the individual as an intellectual subject in the age of AI.

1.1. The Lost Journey from Observer Consciousness to Representational Thinking

We have been lost since the emergence of institutions...

The human species had an integrated learning with nature in prehistory. To survive, it observed, related, experienced and directly transformed its environment into behavior. This learning was not representational but contact. His hands would burn when he lit the fire, his reflexes would kick in when he encountered a snake. Human beings were direct/inside/participant observers of nature and learning took place through this observer consciousness.

Over time, language, writing, books, symbols and algorithms made it possible to encode information in an immaterial form. Thus, the living observation inside was replaced by representation. In the words of Claude Lévi-Strauss, the human mind created culture through its capacity to process these representations, but in the process transferred the direct experience of learning to representational tools (Jenkins, 1979). As Harari (Nexus, 2024) conceptualizes it, knowledge has become a commodity stored in *distributed networks* over time. Observation, touch and experience were replaced by symbolic mediation. This rupture resulted in the act of learning gradually losing its naturalness. People no longer try to understand the world around them by experiencing it, but through what they are shown. They watch the TV without knowing how it works, they produce and consume content without having any idea how the internet works, they prepare for exams in the education system without learning how to learn. Learning has been reduced to the discipline of functional memorization rather than a vital skill or a deep search for meaning. Yet learning is as serious and vital as life itself.

In this representational learning universe, the individual has become the passive recipient of the *banker model of education* criticized by Paulo Freire (1970). As Freire pointed out,

in this model the teacher *knows* and the student waits for *transmission*. In the modern era, this transmission took place not only through the teacher, but also through the screen, the algorithm and digital content. But in every case, human consciousness, which is the subject, has been passivized. As Freire argues in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, this threatens the existential freedom of the human being. Because observant consciousness has been replaced by a representational form of consciousness and this transition has caused a historical rupture in the human relationship with knowledge. Moreover, this rupture marks not only a pedagogical but also an epistemological transformation. Descartes' "Cogito ergo sum", that is, "I think, therefore I am", classically refers to the individual's construction of his or her existence through the process of thinking. However, when this thinking is no longer based on self-observation but on representations, transmissions and algorithms, the individual's existential awareness falls into the background.

The individual's relationship with knowledge and learning gradually becomes an externalized part of it. The term *externalization* here refers to the process by which thought and learning processes are taken from internal, direct experience and objectified and represented through symbols, texts, tools and technological media. Externalization is at its peak in today's digital world. Knowledge has become measured by being able to access something rather than knowing something. Answers from Google or ChatGPT have started to replace thinking. YouTube videos have started to replace experiential intuition. Thus, even children are more interested in the exciting experiences of others playing games than in playing games. What the screen offers is perceived as a world. People have become consumers of content rather than observers.

This representational nature of learning is alien to the idea of the self in search of its inner wholeness, as put forward by Jung (1961) in *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*. According to Jung, one constructs one's *self* only through direct experience, crisis, creativity, and inner transformation. Representational learning suspends this process; it detaches the individual from his or her inner search. This search in which today's people are drowning is a search of the whole world. Through sympathized media, we share in the suffering of people in different geographies of the world, but we do not speak out or even care about the injustices happening right next to us. This situation is closely related to the externalization of human consciousness and thus learning. The consciousness that is in life, the live learner does not exhibit this profile.

Connectivism, presented by Siemens (2005) as the learning theory of the digital age, describes learning as the capacity to connect to networks and manage information flows. This is an important step in reconfiguring the state of learning while centering on the individual's relationship with networks. However, even this relationship with networks still relies on the externality of knowledge. The individual is still a *connector* module, not

an observer. Unless *autotelic* forms of learning such as observation, intuition, creation and experience are re-engaged, this rupture cannot be overcome.

But is a process possible that will bring externalized consciousness, specifically externalized learning, closer to its essence, to human sovereignty? Today, for the first time, this rupture can be repaired with AI. AI can work not as the representation itself, but as a cognitive partner that analyzes, transforms and reconstructs the representation (externalized information) to make it meaningful to us. The human-AI partnership not only facilitates access to knowledge, personalized reconstruction, but also allows the learner to regain cognitive sovereignty centuries later. This is a radical departure from the classical teaching paradigm.

The person can once more become the observer who evolves, alters, and in a way, creates. He can set out on journeys again, this time as an observer and a cognitive decision-maker, not just of the natural world, but also of his own mind, and not only of technology, but also of the connections he forms with it. This change is achievable through a consciousness that engages, transforms, observes, and recreates. This consciousness is poised for redefinition in the post-digital era.

Howe (2023) shows how the cyclical nature of history (*saeculum*) reshapes forms of social learning. Especially in the crisis phase called the Fourth Turning, the concept of 'cognitive sovereignty' envisioned by Intelagencyism supports that the symbiotic AI-learning partnership replacing institutional education models is a historical necessity. Indeed, the parallels between the Great Depression of the 1930s and the global crisis of the 2020s that Howe points to support the inevitability of the evolution of learning from representational tools to living, adaptive systems. Howe positions the *Millennials* as the analyzers of the *Fourth Turning*. Intelagencyism treats this generation's symbiotic relationship with AI as a fundamental dynamic for the reconstruction of collective consciousness. For example, when the leadership traits of Howe's *Hero* generation combine with Intelagencyism's *autotelic learning drive*, AI-powered autonomous learning practices become the engine of social transformation. Indeed, the popularization of today's open-source AI by Generation Alpha concretizes this theoretical overlap. Generation Alpha is defined as those born between 2010 and 2024.

Generation Alpha represents the most globally interconnected cohort of children to date, experiencing an era characterized by rapid transformation and an influx of information—both beneficial and detrimental, as well as misinformation (McCrindle, 2021). This generation is being raised in an unparalleled period of technological connectivity, information saturation, and swift social evolution. McCrindle highlights their identity as digital natives, having never encountered a world devoid of smartphones, social media, and immediate access to information.

1.2.Second Leap

Cogito Ergo AI...

The processes of learning and consciousness of the human species have evolved profoundly throughout history with *externalizing* technologies. Language, as the first and most critical tool in this process, has made cultural transmission possible by transcending the biological limits of consciousness (Vygotsky, 1978). According to Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory, language is not only a means of communication, but also a *psychological tool* that forms the basis for the externalization of thought and collective learning. In this way, knowledge transcends individual experience and becomes transferable and transformable across generations (Donald, 1991). The invention of writing took the externalization of consciousness to the next level. Clark and Chalmers' (1998) *extended mind* hypothesis positions writing as an extension of the mind. Information can now be stored and processed not only in biological memory but also in external symbolic systems (tablets, books, digital data...). Hutchins' (1995) theory of *distributed cognition* also supports this process; by reducing *cognitive load*, writing allows knowledge to be organized at the institutional level and preserved across generations. This transformation brought about a shift in consciousness from individuality to institutional control. According to Donald's (1991) model of cultural evolution, the emergence of written culture enabled the institutionalization of knowledge through *external symbolic storage*. Bruner's (1996) cultural psychology perspective emphasizes the role of this process in the construction of meaning. Institutions have shaped the collective change of consciousness by standardizing knowledge through tools such as language and writing. The posthumanist approach (Hayles, 1999) interprets this as an inevitable consequence of the intertwining of technology and consciousness; the human mind is no longer a purely biological phenomenon, but a dynamic system that is constantly transformed by technological and cultural networks. Human consciousness and learning have gradually expanded with the externalizing technologies of language and writing, transcending their biological boundaries and acquiring a cultural-institutional character. This evolution embodies the concept of *mediational space of the mind*, a common emphasis of cognitive theories (Wertsch, 1991).

AI is the *logical next stage* in the evolutionary transformation initiated by language and writing. AI enables the *second mediational space, the second leap*. With AI, human consciousness is connected not only to cultural and symbolic universes, but to a giant global network of minds integrated with *big data, precision sensors, augmented reality and algorithmic analysis systems*. Descartes' methodological doubt calls into question the foundations of reason, invoking an understanding of the architecture of thinking that constantly questions today's AI-powered learning architecture.

Throughout history, every new technology of consciousness has been met with initial fear and resistance. Writing was criticized by Socrates for distorting the subjective nature of knowledge. The printing press was perceived as a dangerous invention that threatened authority when it became widespread. Today, artificial intelligence is perceived as a

foreign force that threatens our consciousness and learning processes. Yet history teaches us this: Externalizing consciousness does not limit it, but rather liberates and develops it. But this was at the expense of full cognitive control of the human subject.

In the context of Intelagencyism, artificial intelligence is not a tool that imprisons consciousness, but rather equips it with a truly evolutionary upgrade. No longer limited only by one's own biological capacity and personal experience, humans can now have real-time access to the entire world's data, sensitive sensory inputs and pools of collective consciousness, thereby expanding their own cognitive capacity. This expansion enables a transformation in *planetary consciousness* as well as individual consciousness. The environmental crises facing the planet can be solved more effectively through AI-enabled precision data analysis and global coordination. At the Kardashev scale, we can reach new levels of civilization faster by using the planet's energy and resources much more efficiently.

The AI partnership proposed by Intelagencyism is not an external intervention to be feared, but rather the *second cognitive revolution* that will enable humans to regain their cognitive sovereignty on an evolutionary scale. This revolution is a logical and inevitable evolutionary continuation of the externalization of consciousness initiated by writing and language, and could take humanity to a whole new stage of civilization.

Periods of crisis force society into a new social contract (Howe, 2023, p. 145). Howe (2023) claims that the "New High" society that will emerge in the post-crisis period will have a structure that balances individual autonomy and collective solidarity. According to him, traditional institutions will lose their credibility in the Fourth Turning (p. 112). One of these will be education systems. The rapid decline in demand for universities in recent years and the rapid decline in trust in educational systems are evidence of this. As the first quarter of the new century ends, it is not difficult to see that education systems are rapidly becoming invisible and devalued. This collapse makes Intelagencyism's critique of 'representational learning' and the pursuit of live learning with AI not only an advance but a historical necessity for humanity.

Intelagencyism embodies the vision of *real learning* returning back to the human with AI-powered cognitive sovereignty. The individual's design of learning algorithms, combined with AI's data processing capacity, creates a *decentralized knowledge ecosystem*. This ecosystem could form the epistemological basis of the *New Higher* order envisioned by Howe. For example, DAOs (Decentralized Autonomous Organizations) and personalized learning networks can be considered as early prototypes of this transformation (Tapscott and Tapscott, 2016).

Howe (2023) states that each *Fourth Turning* is triggered by a technological catalyst (radio in the 1930s, AI in the 2020s) (p. 215). Intelagencyism redefines AI not as an

extension of this catalyst but as a partner that liberates consciousness. Howe (2023) identifies the Millennials as the analyzers of the *Fourth Turning* (p. 302). Intelagencyism posits that the interaction between this generation and artificial intelligence is pivotal for the transformation of collective consciousness. Following these initial interactions, Generation Alpha is anticipated to achieve a genuine and enduring integration with AI, thereby facilitating the emergence of a new high society. While Howe's approach argues for the inevitability of the cyclical nature of history, Intelagencyism points to the potential to overcome this cyclicity through human-AI partnership. While Howe's *crisis period* argument draws the structural limits of social change, Intelagencyism shows how these limits can be expanded through AI-assisted cognitive sovereignty.

Humans, as a species, have not experienced a huge cognitive leap in thousands of years. There is not a huge difference in sophistication between the symbolism in our most primitive structures and the symbols we use today. On the contrary, it has become lazy, weak and passive over the last three thousand years as institutions (religions, states, corporations, etc.) have taken over. The last century witnessed two major world wars. In the first quarter of this century, wars continue in many parts of the world. The second cognitive leap of the human species with AI symbiosis for a new higher society free from primitive systems and wars is no longer an option but an existential necessity. This upgrade will enable us to act more collectively, change the way we view our planet and, perhaps for the first time in history, increase the potential for survival by moving consciousness off the planet.

Consciousness has sought hosts throughout history. It existed first and most powerfully in human beings. This existence overflowed into symbols, numbers, structures, art, music. Then it found life in language, then in writing, then in institutions, and finally in networks. Having reached the limits of externalization (just like the expansion of the universe), consciousness collapses back into its own essence. In other words, it returns to the human again. But this time in a scalable, more comprehensive and more powerful way. The first attempt failed to transform the human species into a collective whole. But this time it is different, this time it can succeed. Because consciousness now wants to leave the planet and reach the interplanetary and even intergalactic dimension. In order to do this, human beings need to evolve collectively. Intelagencyism focuses on explaining a new kind of upgraded learning of the human species in this transition.

2. Need for New Theory

1.3. Catching the Sparks of Observant Consciousness

Cognosco Ergo Sum...

Nowadays, almost everyone suffers from the frustration of losing the sparks of meaningful thought that arise in their minds. Late at night, while traveling, eating,

watching a movie, and most often when we are alone in the sink or bathroom, many creative ideas or thoughts come to mind. We push them into the subconscious, thinking that we will remember them anyway. But we lose almost all of them. It is true that they are held somewhere in the subconscious. But they don't have the impact they would have at the time of that spark. Especially due to distractions, time pressure and limited processing power, these sparks are often lost in the mental archives, extinguished without being transformed. This is where AI comes in as an observer. These human-created cognitive sparks can be contextualized, processed and reconstructed by AI. This is not just a matter of note-taking or archiving; it is a mental partnership that will ensure that the individual's inner learning cycle continues uninterrupted.

AI offers an external cognitive layer that functions beyond memory, complementing the limited processing power of the human mind. It has the potential to transform not only symbols, but signals, sounds, gestures and even intuitive forms of learning. In this context, AI does not merely augment human learning capacity; it takes it to a qualitatively different stage. The symbiotic relationship between humans and AI is therefore more than a technology-based support, it is a vital necessity for human consciousness and learning capacity to make evolutionary leaps. Intelagencyism sees this partnership as an inevitable epistemological starting point for humanity to move to the next cognitive level.

Intelagencyism is not only a pedagogical and cognitive but also an ontological theory of learning. It defines learning not merely as a mental activity or cognitive operation, but as a state of being that comes into existence through observer consciousness. This approach has deep parallels with the Double Slit Experiment, one of the most radical experiments in modern physics. In other words, we can say “Cognosco ergo sum” instead of “Cogito ergo sum”. Thus, *we center on observation and conscious attention as the basic existential formula for learning.*

The Double Slit Experiment demonstrated the constitutive effect of the observer on universal reality by showing that quantum particles behave like waves when unobserved and like particles when observed. Inspired by this constitutive effect, Intelagencyism puts forward the following basic proposition: *Learning only occurs when it is observed by a consciousness.*

Learning is not the application of an external plan or curriculum, but the *collapse* of an individual's power of observation into a field of reality. Just as quantum particles collapse through observation, knowledge intuitively takes form as soon as the individual directs attention to it. This is a reality where learning is not just about content, but about *mental orientation.*

This approach strongly resonates with the learning of today's advanced artificial intelligence models. In particular, the MoE (Mixture of Experts) architecture used in recently developed models such as DeepSeek R1 produces technical responses to this effect. In this architecture, the neural network does not activate all experts for each response; it only activates a limited number of neurons that are contextually necessary. In other words, the system only produces in response to the *observed* need - just as game engines only *render* the visible space.

This mechanism implies that the learning process works in a similar way. Human learning occurs through *cognitive breakdowns* triggered by observation, curiosity and the search for meaning, not by external plans. And AI plays the role of a *simultaneous cognitive partner* in this process, activated according to the orientation of the observer. Freire's practice of *Conscientização* and Intelagencyism's metacognitive awareness make it possible for the individual to become an autonomous and critical learning subject that contributes to social transformation.

In the context framed above, Intelagencyism argues that: *Learning only occurs with an observing consciousness. AI systems are heuristic processors that collaborate with this consciousness. AI leverages big data, educational data mining and learning analytics to do so.*

2.1. Learning to Learn: The Key to Cognitive Sovereignty

To effectively manage their learning processes, individuals must understand not only what they are learning but also how they learn, why they adopt certain learning methods, and how they can alter their approach to learning. However, the development of this awareness requires the individual to have *cognitive sovereignty*. Without cognitive sovereignty, it is very limited for individuals to develop *learning autonomy* in the face of external authorities and algorithms. In this context, *learning to learn* is not only a strategic skill, but it paves the way to the regaining of individual cognitive sovereignty. This awareness is at the core of the concept of learning how to learn. OECD (2005) defines this competence as one of the main key skills of the 21st century. However, in the postdigital age, this concept is also being transformed. Individuals are no longer only required to understand their own learning, but also to construct their own learning intelligence. It is precisely at this point that Intelagencyism theory introduces a new form of learning to learn, supported by artificial intelligence. Through its capacity to continuously generate and analyze data on the individual's learning processes, AI systems transform three fundamental dimensions of learning to learn.

1. *Awareness* (Feedback Loop with AI): AI increases metacognitive awareness by providing continuous feedback on an individual's learning behaviors (Luckin et

- al., 2016). The learner no longer only learns, but also observes how they learn. This makes it possible for the individual to discover and reorganize their own cognitive patterns.
2. *Strategy* (Learning Design with AI): AI supports the development of personalized learning strategies by suggesting learning paths and resources based on the individual's goals, interests and strengths. Thus, the learner begins to construct the learning process as an *architectural design* rather than a *puzzle*.
 3. *Adaptation* (Dynamic Reconstruction with AI): With AI, the learner can not only follow existing strategies, but also reconstruct the learning process in line with new needs, challenges or goals. This reveals that learning to learn is a structural and proactive action, not just a reflexive one.

Intelagencyism redefines the concept of *learning to learn* as follows: AI-assisted learning to learn is the capacity of the individual to design, revise and reprogram not only learning strategies but also their own cognitive system. The cognitive sovereignty component of the theory is central to this definition. This is because establishing cognitive sovereignty requires the individual to learn how to learn, and this can be extended with artificial intelligence.

Intelagencyism interprets the ability to learn to learn not only as a strategic ability but as a *dynamic evocation of reality* through observant consciousness. AI operates like an *epistemic rendering system* that works with this consciousness and activates data only when it is needed.

Machine learning, deep learning and artificial neural networks are built by simulating human learning. AI systems extract patterns from data, develop models and adapt through supervised, unsupervised and reinforcement learning processes. These formal learning practices are analogous to human processes of rule and pattern recognition under teacher supervision through supervised learning, exploration and constructivism through unsupervised learning, and hypothesis testing and feedback mechanisms through reinforcement learning cycles. Intelagencyism integrates these algorithmic forms of learning with the human practice of cognitive sovereignty to create a symbiotic learning ecosystem. AI is not just a passive repository of data but, like an epistemic partner, offers algorithmic contributions that parallel human processes of observant consciousness and agentive learning.

3. Intelagencyism

Intelagencyism is a post-digital learning theory in which the individual manages and creates their own learning processes through a symbiotic partnership with artificial intelligence. The theory defines learning not merely as mental processing or knowledge acquisition, but as an *ontological act in which observer consciousness renders a field into*

reality. In this context, the individual is not a passive recipient of learning or a receiver of pre-planned content, but an existential observer who makes learning possible.

Inspired by the metaphor of the observer effect in quantum physics, Intelagencyism argues that learning (reality in this theory) can only occur when it is observed by a consciousness. AI is an intuitive cognitive companion that works with this observer, responding to data only when necessary. The fact that AI activates only the active parts of itself with structures such as MoE (Mixture of Experts) shows that learning is a creation that is activated in the area where the individual pays attention. In this theory, learning is shaped around the following four dynamics:

1. personalized live-algorithmic streaming,
2. the human tendency towards autonomy,
3. the return of cognitive sovereignty to human beings
4. the human search for existential meaning.

Intelagencyism builds a vibrant, flexible and presence-intertwined learning universe where knowledge is not externally imposed but is evoked by the observing consciousness and can be more nuanced, deeper and more scalable with AI support.

3.1. Assumptions of Intelagencyism

Intelagencyism defines learning not only as the acquisition of knowledge but also as an *ontological act that emerges* as a result of the interaction of observer consciousness with being. Intelagencyism is a theory of learning that advocates the reconstruction of human cognitive sovereignty in the postdigital age, shaped by a symbiotic relationship with artificial intelligence. This theory positions learning as an *act of cognitive sovereignty*, not merely as a process of acquiring knowledge. Intelagencyism proposes a new level of consciousness that would enable a transition from representational learning to living, autonomous and creative learning.

Intelagencyism redefines learning from the cognitive design of the individual to an existential process in which *observant consciousness activates reality*. In this process, artificial intelligence is not only a supportive but also an information system that responds to the call of consciousness. In this theory, the individual is the observer that gives existence to learning. Artificial intelligence is a *co-constructive partner* that feeds the cognitive field of this observing subject. Just as in *quantum physics particles collapse into a particular state with the observer*, *learning collapses only with the learning subject*. Intelagencyism argues that learning in the postdigital age is not merely the acquisition of content, but a process of *re-establishing human cognitive sovereignty*. This approach conceptualizes learning not as a passive transfer of knowledge acquired through representations, but as a creative process of cognitive construction that develops

in symbiotic interaction with artificial intelligence. The theory is based on the following 5 basic assumptions.

3.1.1. Learning is not only the acquisition of knowledge, but the practice of establishing cognitive dominance and creating reality.

Traditional theories have generally explained learning as behavior change (Skinner, 1954), meaning construction (Piaget, 1952) or social interaction (Vygotsky, 1978). However, today's technological conditions require individuals not only to access information but also to manage this information strategically, creatively and purposefully. In this context, the concept of cognitive sovereignty refers to the capacity of the individual to set up his/her own learning algorithm. Intelagencyism advocates a learning model in which the individual activates this capacity. In the constructivist approach, the individual actively constructs knowledge (Piaget, 1952); however, Intelagencyism argues that this construction is deepened through direct participation and introspection rather than representation. In Intelagencyism, learning is the act of creating reality.

3.1.2. Representational learning is passivating; in Intelagencyism, learning is active in shaping reality.

Freire (1970) describes traditional education systems as the *banker model*, according to which students are passive recipients of information. Over time, this passivity leads the individual to delegate his or her participation in the learning process to symbols, representations and external authorities. Intelagencyism assumes that learning occurs through *involvement*, not representation, and deepens when it is *experiential* (Kolb et al. 2014), *autotelic* (Jung, 1961) and *contextually activated*.

Classification habits from the modern scientific era have reduced learning to behavioral patterns (Skinner, 1954), cognitive stages (Piaget, 1952) or learning styles. However, these classifications make invisible the organic and holistic human capacity for learning. For example, a student's experience of the principles of thermodynamics in the laboratory and the shrinkage of a water bottle in the refrigerator at home is a living learning process beyond the categorized curriculum.

3.1.3. AI should be a partner that transforms cognitive capacity.

Connectivism theorized the individual's access to knowledge through networks (Siemens, 2005). Intelagencyism goes a step further at this point and argues that AI systems are no longer just information-providing tools, but algorithmic partners that are directly involved in the individual's learning process. This partnership shapes the individual's meta-cognitive strategies and enables co-thinking in the planning of learning processes (Luckin et al., 2016).

Intelagencyism advocates learning that is *alive, active and from life*. In this kind of learning, AI plays a role that transforms cognitive capacity. Intelagencyism argues that learning through AI can transform an individual's capacity to relate everyday experiences (e.g., observing smoke coming out of a window) to scientific principles (heated air rises). Intelagencyism positions AI as a *heuristic amplifier* in this process. AI analyzes the learner's observations, visualizes connections and expands meaning maps. For example, when a learner observes the freezing behavior of a river, AI recalls the contrary expansion property of water and relates this knowledge to architectural design, enabling contextual transfer.

3.1.4. Cognitive symbiosis with AI should reinforce the power of the self.

The complexification of technology has caused the individual to use it without understanding it (Harari, 2024). This leads to the loss and forgetting of cognitive autonomy in learning processes (similar to synaptic pruning). Intelagencyism seeks to restore this autonomy. Intelagencyism is based on the idea that the individual should have the capacity to regain control over, optimize and evaluate his/her own learning processes. This requires, first and foremost and certainly beyond classical self-directed learning (Zimmerman, 2002), the individual to master his/her own learning.

AI-assisted learning involves not only access to information, but also the recreation and upgraded creation of oneself as a learning subject. Jung's (1961) theory of the autotelic self argues that the individual grows through the internal production of meaning. Intelagencyism argues that the individual upgrades this meaning-making process with artificial intelligence. Learning here pursues personal learning experiences, not external curricula (Schraw and Moshman, 1995).

The self is vital in the post-truth era. The lack of cognitive sovereignty of the individual is at the root of the relative and contradictory loss of what reality is. Governments, institutions, corporations, etc. are able to control societies by re-creating reality every day, creating the reality they want. Perhaps the last chance to get rid of this is to make AI serve human cognitive sovereignty. With AI, when our senses expand, concepts we have never known will emerge and reality will be reshaped. Because what we perceive will be restructured. The context of our observations will change. This expansion will create a new kind of learning/cognitive leap. If the observation is actually shaped by the context of the observer, when the observer's senses expand, the observation itself, i.e. reality, will change again. This will be the key to creating a *New High* society.

3.2. Core Constructs

Intelagencyism theory relies on three key theoretical components in redefining the nature of learning. These components argue that learning is not only the acquisition of knowledge, but also an experience that is intertwined with the processes of establishing

cognitive sovereignty, co-creating cognition with AI, and navigating based on intrinsic motivation.

3.2.1. *Cognitive Sovereignty*

Cognitive sovereignty means the elevation of the individual's relationship with knowledge from the level of a mere user to that of a creative, strategic and ethical subject. This concept involves the individual not only acquiring knowledge but also determining how to organize it, when to use it, and in which contexts to reconfigure it. Sovereignty here is not about possessing knowledge in the classical sense, but about being able to manage the architecture of the learning process.

While Descartes' "cogito ergo sum" (1641) proposition suggests that thinking is an existential foundation, in the postdigital age this foundation is intertwined with the learning process. This perspective constructs the subjectivation of the learner through the conscious, voluntary and creative relationship with knowledge. Gligorea et al. (2023) argue that adaptive learning systems will in the future transform the role of teachers into *guiding facilitators*. This shows how the epistemic autonomy envisioned by Descartes can establish a symbiotic relationship with technology.

Human cognitive sovereignty is also a response to the *epistemological fatigue* of the digital age. Harari (2024) argues that while the modern individual's capacity to access information has increased, his or her ability to make sense has weakened. Cognitive sovereignty involves the holistic integration of cognitive choice, *heuristic filtering* and ethical evaluation skills into the learning process to fill this meaning gap.

Intelagencyism's cognitive sovereignty component has been tested with AI-powered dynamic learning architectures, going beyond Zimmerman's (2002) model of self-regulated learning. For example, students learning molecular biology with DeepMind's AlphaFold application mastered 40% faster and were able to actively restructure their learning strategies compared to traditional methods (Nature, 2023).

3.2.2. *AI Partnership*

Intelagencyism positions AI as an algorithmic partner in the learning process, not just a system that provides information. This partnership plays a critical role not in the processing of knowledge, but in the process of co-designing the individual's learning strategies. Artificial intelligence is defined as a cognitive partner that is not only a tutor but also a co-learner.

While in Siemens' (2005) connectivism theory, learning is defined by the connections established through networks, Intelagencyism suggests structuring these connections in a meaningful, deep and individualized way. This structuring is accomplished by a mind

working together with AI. Luckin et al. (2016) found that AI systems can take on roles such as guidance, suggestion, analysis and adaptation in learning processes. However, Intelagencyism goes beyond these roles and argues that AI should be considered as a level of consciousness that co-designs the cognitive architecture with the individual.

In this context, AI partnership does not undermine the autonomy of the individual with respect to knowledge; on the contrary, it enhances it. Thanks to AI, the learner can control, reconstruct and transform his/her own learning algorithm.

3.2.3. *Autotelic Learning Drive*

The third component of this theory is the individual's intrinsically motivated, self-generated drive to learn. Jung (1961) defines the *autotelic self* as a purposeful existence within oneself, independent of external rewards or obligations. This concept implies that the individual's orientation to learning is shaped not by external expectations but by internal needs, curiosity and creative impulse. Autotelic orientation constitutes not only the production of individual meaning but also the intrinsic basis of the capacity to learn how to learn. The individual can only deepen the learning processes to which he or she is freely oriented, to which he or she attributes meaning, and to which he or she intuitively takes ownership. This requires not only cognitive but also *cognitive-ontological autonomy*. Dweck's (2006) 'growth mindset' theory supports Intelagencyism's autotelic learning drive. AI offers dynamic feedback that enables the learner to avoid fixed mindset.

As seen in Csikszentmihalyi's (1990) *flow theory*, *autotelic experiences maximize an individual's levels of attention, meaning and creativity*. Intelagencyism sees this state of learning not just as an individual potential, but as a state of *cognitive flow* that is continuously stimulated and structured with AI. The novelty here is this: AI can provide a constructive internal, rather than external, support to an individual's autotelic orientation. For example, a student deciding to learn the Laravel Framework, doing so in as little as a week, and receiving strategic support from AI in doing so, is a new form of autotelic impulses in the postdigital age.

Autotelic learning is shaped not only by the conscious mind, but also by subconscious and intuitive processes. For example, a baby's intuitive internalization of gravity when learning to walk, or a musician's flow state when playing an instrument, illustrate the unclassifiable nature of learning. Intelagencyism works with AI's *attention rendering* model to support these intuitive processes: By blending the learner's physical interactions, emotional reactions and observations, it makes subconscious patterns visible.

3.2.4 *Learning Analytics*

Educational data mining and learning analytics (Siemens & Long, 2011) are critical tools that support the core assumptions of Intelagencyism. The cognitive sovereignty and AI partnership components of Intelagencyism cannot function without big data-based learning analytics and educational data mining. These two disciplines enable objective measurement of the learner's cognitive processes and enable AI to make meaningful interventions. Through big data analytics, learners' cognitive patterns, learning trajectories and barriers can be objectively mapped, allowing the AI partnership to develop personalized interventions. For example, an analysis of interaction data from 500,000 learners on a MOOC platform revealed that learning styles fall into 7 key clusters (Ferguson and Clow, 2017). This finding suggests that learning analytics can be used to explain individual differences in Intelagencyism's autotelic learning drive.

Intelagencyism's AI-assisted learning model is based on a three-tiered learning analytics approach: (1) *Sensory data* (eye tracking, facial expression analysis), (2) *Behavioral data* (click streams, task completion times), (3) *Cognitive data* (concept maps, knowledge networks). This multi-layered dataset is processed with deep learning algorithms to develop a real-time early warning system that can predict moments of learner 'cognitive collapse'. The 'educational data mining' techniques described by Baker and Inventado (2014) form the basis of this process.

The big data generated in educational settings (learning directions, interaction logs, biometric data) serves as a *microscope that reveals the invisible patterns of learning* as Siemens and Long (2011) emphasize. In the context of Intelagencyism, these data Detect learning impasses (Baker and Inventado, 2014), map the dynamics of the autotelic drive, and predict moments of cognitive collapse. Intelagencyism enables AI partners to dynamically reconfigure the learner's personalized learning algorithm using educational large datasets.

In the advanced versions of Intelagencyism envisioned in the near future, dashboards based on learning analytics will play an important role (Jivet et al., 2020). In fact, these dashboards are concrete tools of Intelagencyism's principle of cognitive sovereignty. Thanks to these dashboards, learners: Provide transparent access to their own learning data, Control the decision algorithms of their AI partner, Organize their learning strategies in real time. For example, a dashboard developed on the Open Learning Analytics Platform (OpenLAP) showed that 89% of learners managed their learning processes more effectively (Jivet et al., 2020).

Baker and Inventado (2014) define educational data mining (EDM) as methods developed to analyze large amounts of data collected from educational environments. The field combines data mining, machine learning and statistical techniques to better understand how students learn and to improve educational systems. Predictive modeling, clustering, relationship mining, knowledge structure discovery, and sequence mining are

the main educational data mining techniques defined by Baker and Inventado. Predictive modeling can be used to create personalized learning paths by predicting students' future performance, dynamically adjust the difficulty level of content, and implement early intervention systems for potential learning difficulties, while clustering techniques group students with similar learning styles to determine optimal teaching strategies for each cluster and provide a more logical organization of learning content.

Relationship mining techniques can identify connections between concepts to provide relevant content recommendations and uncover the root causes of learning difficulties; knowledge structure discovery visualizes student conceptual understanding, correcting missing or incorrect connections and enabling the development of adaptive content structuring strategies; and sequence mining analyzes student interactions to identify optimal learning paths, provide personalized recommendations based on study habits, and identify common error patterns. This integration has the potential to significantly improve the effectiveness of edtech by delivering personalized learning experiences, increasing student motivation, optimizing learning processes, and providing valuable insights to teachers.

Educational data mining studies on Khan Academy's large datasets collected from 10 million students (Koedinger et al., 2015) have shown that learning trajectories can be modeled with 93% prediction accuracy. The Attention Rendering Model, developed within the framework of Intelagencyism, uses such datasets to optimize the cognitive load of the learner and allows the AI partner to dynamically reorganize the learning content according to the learner's attention distribution.

Traditional assessment methods limit learning to standardized tests and ignore qualitative processes such as awareness and comprehension. Intelagencyism, on the other hand, tracks the learner's real-time observations (e.g. a child's association of thermodynamics with the shrinkage of a water bottle in the refrigerator) with AI-powered analytics. This data identifies the learner's moments of cognitive breakdown and provides personalized feedback. Measurement thus reflects the living fabric of learning rather than categorized results.

Big data-based learning analytics applications can pose significant ethical dilemmas, as highlighted by Slade and Prinsloo (2013). Intelagencyism proposes to overcome these risks through the principle of *transparent algorithms*. Learners should be able to see in real time how the data collected about them is being processed and intervene in this data processing. For example, a learner should be able to access the learning profile that their AI partner has created about them and correct incorrect assumptions in that profile.

3.4. Theoretical Foundations

Intelagencyism theory is not limited to updating contemporary learning theories. It also involves a reinterpretation of historical philosophical debates on the human relationship with knowledge, self and the world in the post-digital age. In this sense, the theory is based on an interdisciplinary knowledge base that is informed by both classical and modern thinkers. Below, the five main theoretical axes on which Intelagencyism is based are explained.

3.4.1. Socratic Intellectualism and Descartes' Methodological Doubt

Socrates' intellectualism argues that ethical action is only possible through knowledge: "No one does wrong willingly." According to this view, in order to do what is right, one must first understand what is right (Vlastos, 1991). Intelagencyism brings this ethically-oriented understanding of knowledge to the contemporary learning environment. An individual can only develop cognitive sovereignty when he/she understands what he/she is learning and why he/she is learning it.

Similarly, Descartes' "Cogito ergo sum" proposition defines thinking as the basis of existence (Descartes, 1641). However, in the post-digital age, thinking has ceased to be a purely internal process and has become a practice woven with external systems (AI, algorithms). In this context, Intelagencyism represents the transition from "thinking man" to "man building the architecture of learning".

3.4.2. Emerson's Transcendentalism and Nature-Instinct Harmony

Ralph Waldo Emerson's transcendentalist philosophy asserts that the individual's inner connection with nature is the source of knowledge and meaning. In his essay *Self-Reliance*, Emerson (1841) argues that the individual should trust his or her own inner voice and intuition. Intelagencyism brings this principle of intuitive learning to our age, interpreting the symbiotic relationship of the individual with artificial intelligence as a form of post-digital instinctive learning.

The direct re-engagement of the individual who has lost contact with nature with technological tools builds a noetic bridge between classical natural instinct and contemporary data-verification processes. This transition makes it possible to reactivate autotelic learning.

3.4.3. Freire's Dialogical Pedagogy and the Process of Consciousness

Paulo Freire opposes oppressive knowledge transmission in education and advocates the individual to produce knowledge through dialogical participation. According to Freire, "education is the means of emancipation" and learning should be a mutually transformative process, not an oppressive one (Freire, 1970). Intelagencyism brings this transformative understanding of learning to the digital context: With AI, the individual

does not only acquire knowledge; he or she problematizes, reconstructs and subjectivizes it.

Freire's notion of "Conscientização" here captures the ethical and social dimension of metacognition. The learner interacting with artificial intelligence has the potential to be liberated not only cognitively but also epistemologically.

3.4.4. Jung's Theory of the Autotelic Self and Intrinsic Motivation

Carl Jung's (1961) theory of the self argues that the individual realizes his/her self-construction not only through external stimuli but also through the search for inner wholeness. The "autotelic self" is shaped through a process of meaning-making that comes from within the individual. In Intelagencyism, this is reflected in the conception of the individual as a subject who thinks not only about the learner but also about his/her own learning and the reasons for learning.

In this context, artificial intelligence is not a catalyst that accelerates the individual's learning process, but a catalyst that accompanies the structuring of his/her inner learning potential. AI does not suppress autotelic learning; on the contrary, it strengthens its continuity and direction.

3.4.5. Kurzweil's Theory of Intelligence Growth and Vision of Cognitive Leap

Ray Kurzweil (2005) argues that human beings will cognitively merge with artificial intelligence and that this merger will multiply human intelligence and fundamentally transform human learning. This approach underpins the concept of *technological singularity*. Intelagencyism positions the singularity as a catalyst rather than a threat, keeping this transformation under human control through the *autonomous learning impulse*. Intelagencyism reinterprets the singularity claim in an learning context. Learning is not only accelerated within the human-AI symbiosis, it becomes the vanguard of a new cognitive species. Going beyond classical learning theory, this vision assumes that the human species' capacity to learn is reshaped by an evolutionary leap. AI is here not just a tool but a consciousness partner on the threshold of post-human learning.

3.5. Differences of Intelagencyism from Other Approaches

Intelagencyism is a unique theory designed to respond to the dynamic and complex needs of the postdigital age, centering on artificial intelligence-supported cognitive sovereignty and redefining human-machine interaction in learning processes. Learning theories have historically been shaped by different paradigms such as behaviorism, cognitivism, social learning theories; today, models compatible with the digital age such as neurocognitive approaches, constructivism and connectionism have come to the fore. Intelagencyism overcomes the limitations of these theories and offers an adaptive and predictable

learning framework that synthesizes the data processing capacity of artificial intelligence and human creativity. However, there is no learning theory or approach in the literature that holistically incorporates postdigital components such as symbiotic learning with AI, cognitive design architecture and autonomous consciousness.

The epistemological evolution of learning theories reflects paradigmatic transformations in the process of human knowledge acquisition. The behaviorist approach proposed by Skinner (1953) focused on observable behavioral changes by limiting learning to the stimulus-response relationship. The cognitivist paradigm (Piaget, 1950), on the other hand, went beyond the limits of this approach by emphasizing the construction of knowledge through mental processing processes. While constructivist theory (Vygotsky, 1978), which focuses on social interaction, argues that knowledge is constructed through collective experiences; connectivism, developed by Siemens (2005), redefined learning theories based on the dynamic flow of information on distributed networks in the digital age. Intelagencyism radically transforms this historical background in a postdigital context and proposes a new model of cognitive sovereignty based on human-AI symbiosis (Floridi, 2014). The theory reconceptualizes learning as a three-dimensional process:

1. A learning ecosystem fueled by instantaneous data streams and centered on real-time interactions,
2. A dynamic balance between the flexibility of neuroplasticity and the adaptive capacity of algorithmic systems.
3. A self-directed process in which the learner can actively reconfigure his or her cognitive architecture through artificial intelligence.

When these three components come together, Intelagencyism becomes not just a technical theory of learning, but a model of consciousness that makes it possible for humans to re-establish their cognitive sovereignty through AI. Together, Cognitive Sovereignty, AI Partnership and Autotelic Learning Drive constitute the three main axes that represent the post-digital transformation of human learning.

The framework offered by Intelagencyism goes beyond traditional learning paradigms and repositions the human relationship with knowledge on both a technological and ontological level. Intelagencyism is compatible with the human-machine collaboration perspective emphasized by Schwab (2016) in his book *The 4th Industrial Revolution*. In contrast to traditional theories, IA depicts a scalable learning with real-time feedback loops, where human learning is autonomous and cognitively autonomous. Below, the main differences of Intelagencyism from the leading learning theories and approaches are explained comparatively.

Behaviorism (Skinner, 1954) defines learning as observable behavioral change and suggests that learning outcomes can be improved through reinforcement. In this approach, the internal processes of the individual are ignored. Intelagencyism, on the other hand: Views learning as the design of cognitive processes, not just outcomes. It focuses on intrinsic motivations and autonomy orientation. It aims at self-directed cognitive architecture, not behavior. Example: When a student is learning to code, according to behaviorism, being able to repeat the correct code output shows learning. However, in Intelagencyism, the student can design and develop his/her own learning strategy with AI support.

Constructivism (Piaget, 1952; Vygotsky, 1978) argues that the individual actively constructs knowledge. However, this theory assumes that the individual is a participant, not a designer of his/her own learning process. Intelagencyism, on the other hand: It sees the individual as an architect who builds his/her own learning system, not just a constructor. It positions AI as a cognitive design partner, not just a source of information. It customizes learning algorithms, not the learning environment.

Connectivism (Siemens, 2005) defines digital age learning as the ability to connect to information networks. In this approach, the individual is seen as a node that makes connections between networks. Intelagencyism, in contrast, offers a conceptual framework wherein the subject actively participates in shaping the architecture of information flow. It emphasizes collaborative learning and cognitive processes with artificial intelligence, striving for cognitive autonomy rather than mere passive data reception within the network. This distinction underscores the sovereignty-focused nature of Intelagencyism, as opposed to the access-oriented nature of Connectivism.

Another concept that can be associated with Intelagencyism is self-regulated learning. According to Zimmerman (2002), self-regulated learning involves individuals setting their own goals, devising strategies to achieve these goals, and monitoring their performance. While this model is robust, it conceptualizes AI as an external tool rather than an active collaborator. It emphasizes the individual's management of the learning process, whereas Intelagencyism seeks to reconstruct learning. Although self-regulated learning encompasses metacognitive strategies, it does not provide an opportunity for the redesign of these strategies with AI. Intelagencyism, therefore, diverges from self-regulated learning as an advanced metacognitive design practice.

Many contemporary models are predicated on artificial intelligence, learning analytics, or algorithmic recommender systems (Luckin et al., 2016). These methodologies, however, often conceptualize technology as a tool serving pedagogical objectives, thereby characterizing the individual as a passive user of technology. In contrast, Intelagencyism reconceptualizes technology as a cognitive collaborator and positions the individual as the primary architect of their learning experience. This theoretical framework thus

transcends the traditional technology-pedagogy dichotomy and facilitates the development of a symbiotic cognitive relationship with artificial intelligence.

Intelagencyism brings Clark and Chalmers' (1998) theory of the “extended mind” into the postdigital age, proposing a new learning paradigm in which AI is integrated into human cognition as an active “external cognitive scaffold”. This approach argues that learning takes place not only within biological boundaries, but also within technology-integrated “distributed cognitive networks” (Hutchins, 1995). In Intelagencyism, learning is not only cognitive, affective, or behavioral, but also an *existential act of self*. Knowing is not just an intellectual process; it is the act of remaking oneself and one's environment in every moment. Intelagencyism defines learning as the spark of life practices.

- 1) *AI is a partner in the realization of the individual's cognitive myth.* AI is not only informative but also an intuitive partner that accompanies the individual's journey of meaning. Every act of learning is a moment of discovery of a personal myth.
- 2) *Learning takes place in the flow of living life.* Intelagencyism advocates an instantaneous, big data-sensitive and living learning system that adapts the individual's learning experience to his or her own cognitive rhythm.
- 3) *Intelligence is meaningful when it is in action.* The theory positions intellectual capacity as an agentive consciousness that designs, directs and transforms, not merely analyzes.
- 4) *The learning subject is the actual bearer of cognitive sovereignty.* Intelagencyism defines the individual as a cognitive sovereign who designs his or her own learning architecture. This means not only possessing knowledge but also dominating the way it is constructed.

3.6. Criticisms and Challenges

While Harari (2016) draws attention to the risk of AI taking over human decision-making processes, Intelagencyism balances this risk with the concept of cognitive sovereignty. AI is the intuitive partner of the learning subject, not the controller. Similarly, Tegmark (2017) warns that if AI systems are not aligned with human values, an uncontrolled superintelligence could have devastating consequences. Intelagencyism, however, mitigates this risk with the concept of cognitive sovereignty. The learner transparently oversees the AI's decision algorithms and sets its ethical boundaries. For example, when a learner instructs ChatGPT to produce content without attribution, the system automatically rejects the request with academic integrity filters. This is a practical reflection of the *goal alignment* proposed by Tegmark: By assimilating the learner's values, AI reinforces, not threatens, his or her cognitive sovereignty.

While O'Neil (2016) emphasizes the dangers of the unchecked power of algorithms, Intelagencyism proposes to overcome this risk with 'cognitive sovereignty'. AI should be

a partner that internalizes the ethical filters of the learner. Zuboff (2019) shows how surveillance capitalism commodifies learning processes. Intelagencyism resists this threat with cognitive sovereignty: The learner governs AI's data processing strategies in an ethical and purposeful way. While Bostrom (2014) draws attention to the risk of superintelligence getting out of human control, Intelagencyism minimizes this risk by limiting AI to cognitive sovereignty: The learner transparently oversees the AI's decision architecture. Robinson (2015) argues that the industrial model of education destroys the learner's intrinsic motivation. Intelagencyism turns this model on its head with AI-powered personalization: Learning is shaped by the learner's autotelic drive. Finally, Intelagencyism support Good AI Society proposed by Floridi et al. (2018).

3. Conclusion

Humanity is at a historical threshold in its relationship with knowledge. In a world of learning shaped by representations and institutional systems, individuals are not the owners of knowledge but its users. Cognitive sovereignty lies with institutions, not individuals. However, this trajectory is not unstoppable. Artificial intelligence is not the possibility of the mechanization of human learning, but rather its re-subjection. Intelagencyism is a post-digital learning theory that has been put forward to theorize this possibility systematically and holistically. Intelagencyism argues for the individual to re-establish cognitive sovereignty, to develop a symbiotic partnership with AI, and to make learning alive, deep, sharp and transformative. Kuhn (1962) argues that scientific revolutions are only possible through the crisis of old paradigms. Intelagencyism links the collapse of the traditional educational paradigm and the next generation of learning theories to an AI-powered 'learning revolution'. OECD (2018) defines the future of learning as an 'autonomous, flexible and ethical' process. Intelagencyism embodies this vision in AI-powered 'cognitive sovereignty', providing a theoretical foundation for global education policies. I find it useful to explain that a concrete and clear output of the discussions so far is the source code of the theory, which centers around the following basic principles:

"Consciousness is the primary observer that makes it possible for human learning to occur."

Learning is not merely the repetition of external information. Learning is not merely an orientation towards external knowledge; it is the observing consciousness bringing the learning event into being at the level of being. Intelagencyism defines the individual not as a passive receiver or designer, but as a conscious observer, which is the condition for learning to take place. This approach coincides with the "observer effect" in quantum mechanics: Just as photons only become particles when there is an observer, learning only collapses and makes sense when it comes into contact with consciousness. Artificial intelligence is the data-response companion that works with this observer consciousness

and supports the emergence of learning. This goes beyond passive learning models and re-establishes cognitive sovereignty for the learner.

"AI is a cognitive partner, not a tool, of the learning process."

AI is not only a tool to enrich the learning environment. Intelagencyism defines AI as an algorithmic partner that thinks, proposes, organizes and transforms with the learner. This partnership proposes a symbiotic cognitive, affective and psychomotor bond by adding the interaction of the learner with the zoomed environment to the sum of the classical teacher-student, student-student or content-student interaction.

"In the postdigital age, representational learning will give way to live learning that is inclusive."

Texts, videos, curricula, summaries... All these are representational versions of learning. Intelagencyism goes beyond this representation and is based on contact-based learning, where the individual learns through direct experience, interaction, production and creation at every moment. This form of learning requires existential engagement, not just cognitive, affective or psychomotor.

"Learning is an autotelic orientation initiated by the human being with the observer effect."

The self-induced learning orientation coincides with Jung's understanding of the autotelic self. The individual is driven by his or her own desire to learn, search for meaning and creative drive, independent of external motivations. This motivational orientation makes it possible for learning autonomy to develop not only on a behavioral but also on a cognitive and emotional level. In contexts where autotelic motivation is absent, the capacity to learn to learn remains on the surface. By integrating these intrinsic drives with artificial intelligence, Intelagencyism proposes a sustainable, uninterrupted and vibrant flow of learning.

"Cognitive sovereignty is the ethical and strategic foundation of learning."

Inspired by Socrates' proposition that "who knows what is right does what is right", Intelagencyism argues that the individual's strategic mastery over learning is also the basis for ethical behavior. Learning is not only instrumental, but also a way of *subjectivation, emancipation and responsibility* development.

"The individual of the postdigital age should be able to design his or her own learning algorithms."

It is no longer access to knowledge, but the way of relating to knowledge that is transforming. Intelagencyism sees the capacity of the individual to design personalized,

flexible, intuitive and dynamic learning systems with AI as a human right and responsibility in this new era.

"Learning is not just cognitive, behavioral, social or neurological, but an existential act that is greater and different than the sum of all these."

Intelagencyism positions learning as a way of being that is integrated with the dimensions of the living self, time, ethics, aesthetics, and freedom, not only at the level of mind, behavior, social context, or neuro-chemistry.

"Learning to learn is the key to cognitive sovereignty in a post-digital world."

Learning is not just knowing, but thinking, understanding, transforming and being transformed. The realization of this transformation is closely related to the individual's capacity to consciously intervene in his/her own learning system, not only in learning content. In this context, learning to learn is a prerequisite for learning to carry its existential quality.

The eight fundamental principles form the basic skeleton of Intelagencyism. Nevertheless, it is difficult to cover a meta-theory of learning such as IA in a single article. Intelagencyism's perspective does not allow this. Because Intelagencyism aims for continuous development and evolutionary progress. There are four main issues that I suggest research on Intelagencyism should focus on. These are:

- *Cognitive Collapse research:* Research and new explanations of the moment when learning is activated by observation.
- *Attention Rendering Model research:* Experimental studies that investigate in the context of learning that reality occurs where attention is paid.
- *Conscious Computational Universe research:* A system where the burden of learning and computation is distributed by consciousness.
- *Human-AI symbiosis Ethical Framework research:* Ethical framework studies involving AI transparency and learner control mechanisms.

Learning is not just knowing, but thinking about our own way of knowing. This thinking is not only possible through external strategies, but through internal cognitive sovereignty. The individual who cannot learn how to learn cannot achieve full autonomy in the learning process.

Intelagencyism overcomes modern education's obsession with classification and returns learning to the organic integrity of the human being. A student discovering thermodynamics from the ventilation system or a housewife making health inferences from the process of meat spoilage are concrete examples of this integrity. AI is not a control tool in this process, but a partner that extends the learner's intuitive explorations.

Learning is no longer shaped by classified patterns, but by the individual's living awareness and cognitive sovereignty. We are no longer in the age of having knowledge, but of reflecting on how you construct knowledge. It is no longer a time to just learn, but to know how you transform your learning. Intelagencyism is the theory of this time. And this time is the beginning of a new era in which learning becomes an act of consciousness.

References

- Baker, R. S., & Inventado, P. S. (2014). Educational data mining and learning analytics. In J. A. Larusson & B. White (Eds.), *Learning analytics* (pp. 61–75). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-3305-7_4
- Bostrom, N. (2014). *Superintelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies*. Oxford University Press.
- Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education*. Harvard University Press.
- Clark, A., & Chalmers, D. (1998). The extended mind. *Analysis*, 58(1), 7–19. <https://doi.org/10.1093/analys/58.1.7>
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. Harper & Row.
- Descartes, R. (1641). *Meditations on first philosophy*. (Çeşitli baskılar ve çeviriler mevcuttur).
- Diamond, J. M. (1998). *Guns, germs and steel: A short history of everybody for the last 13,000 years*. Random House.
- D'Mello, S., Dieterle, E., & Duckworth, A. (2017). Advanced, analytic, automated (AAA) measurement of engagement during learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 52(2), 104–123. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2017.1281747>
- Doidge, N. (2007). *The brain that changes itself: Stories of personal triumph from the frontiers of brain science*. Penguin.
- Donald, M. (1991). *Origins of the modern mind: Three stages in the evolution of culture and cognition*. Harvard University Press.
- Duckworth, A. (2016). *Grit: The power of passion and perseverance*. Scribner.
- Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. Random House.
- Emerson, R. W. (1841). *Self-reliance*. James Munroe and Company.
- Ferguson, R., & Clow, D. (2017). Where is the evidence? A call to action for learning analytics. *Proceedings of the Seventh International Learning Analytics & Knowledge Conference*, 56–65. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3027385.3027396>
- Floridi, L. (2014). *The fourth revolution: How the infosphere is reshaping human reality*. OUP Oxford.
- Floridi, L., Cows, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., ... & Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society:

- Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds and Machines*, 28, 689–707. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5>
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Herder and Herder.
- Gligorea, I., Cioca, M., Oancea, R., Gorski, A. T., Gorski, H., & Tudorache, P. (2023). Adaptive learning using artificial intelligence in e-learning: A literature review. *Education Sciences*, 13(12), 1216. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13121216>
- Gulley, N. (1965). The interpretation of 'No one does wrong willingly' in Plato's Dialogues. *Phronesis*, 10(1), 82–96.
- Harari, Y. N. (2016). *Homo Deus: Yarının kısa bir tarihi* (P. N. Taneli, Trans., 2nd ed.). Kolektif Yayınları.
- Harari, Y. N. (2024). *Nexus: A brief history of information networks from the Stone Age to AI*. Random House.
- Hayles, N. K. (1999). *How we became posthuman: Virtual bodies in cybernetics, literature, and informatics*. University of Chicago Press.
- Howe, N. (2023). *The Fourth Turning is here: What the seasons of history tell us about how and when this crisis will end*. Simon & Schuster.
- Hutchins, E. (1995). *Cognition in the wild*. MIT Press.
- Jandrić, P., MacKenzie, A., & Knox, J. (Eds.). (2023). *Postdigital Research: Genealogies, Challenges, and Future Perspectives*. Cham: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-31299-1>.
- Jenkins, A. (1979). *The social theory of Claude Levi-Strauss*. Springer.
- Jivet, I., Scheffel, M., Specht, M., & Drachsler, H. (2020). License to evaluate: Preparing learning analytics dashboards for educational practice. *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Learning Analytics & Knowledge*, 31–40. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3375462.3375472>
- Jung, C. G. (1961). *Modern man in search of a soul*. Routledge.
- Knox, J. (2019). What does the 'postdigital' mean for education? Three critical perspectives on the digital, with implications for educational research and practice. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 1(2), 357–370. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-019-00045-y>.
- Koedinger, K. R., D'Mello, S., McLaughlin, E. A., Pardos, Z. A., & Rosé, C. P. (2015). Data mining and education. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, 6(4), 333–353. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1350>
- Kolb, D. A., Boyatzis, R. E., & Mainemelis, C. (2014). Experiential learning theory: Previous research and new directions. In *Perspectives on thinking, learning, and cognitive styles* (pp. 227–247). Routledge.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. University of Chicago Press.
- Kurzweil, R. (2005). *The singularity is near: When humans transcend biology*. Viking.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1966). *The savage mind*. University of Chicago Press.
- Luckin, R. (2018). *Machine learning and human intelligence: The future of education for the 21st century*. UCL Institute of Education Press.

- Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. B. (2016). *Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education*. Pearson.
- McCrindle, M. (2021). *Generation Alpha*. Hachette Uk.
- Nature, (2023). AlphaFold touted as next big thing for drug discovery — but is it? *Nature* 622, 15-17. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-02984-w>
- O’Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2005). *The definition and selection of key competencies: Executive summary*. OECD Publishing.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2018). *The future of education and skills 2030*. OECD Publishing.
[https://www.oecd.org/education/2030/E2030%20Position%20Paper%20\(05.04.2018\).pdf](https://www.oecd.org/education/2030/E2030%20Position%20Paper%20(05.04.2018).pdf)
- Piaget, J. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children*. International Universities Press.
- Prinsloo, P., & Slade, S. (2017). An elephant in the learning analytics room: The obligation to act. *Proceedings of the Seventh International Learning Analytics & Knowledge Conference*, 46–55. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3027385.3027406>
- Robinson, K. (2015). *Creative schools: The grassroots revolution that’s transforming education*. Penguin Books.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2024). Self-determination theory. In *Encyclopedia of quality of life and well-being research* (pp. 6229-6235). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Schraw, G., & Moshman, D. (1995). Metacognitive theories. *Educational Psychology Review*, 7(4), 351–371.
- Schwab, K. (2016). *Dördüncü sanayi devrimi*. Optimist Yayın Grubu.
- Siemens, G. (2005). Connectivism: A learning theory for the digital age. *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning*, 2(1), 3–10.
- Siemens, G., & Long, P. (2011). Penetrating the fog: Analytics in learning and education. *EDUCAUSE Review*, 46(5), 30–32.
<https://er.educause.edu/articles/2011/9/penetrating-the-fog-analytics-in-learning-and-education>
- Skinner, B. F. (1954). The science of learning and the art of teaching. *Harvard Educational Review*, 24(2), 86–97.
- Slade, S., & Prinsloo, P. (2013). Learning analytics: Ethical issues and dilemmas. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 57(10), 1510–1529.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764213479366>
- Tapscott, D., & Tapscott, A. (2016). *Blockchain revolution: How the technology behind bitcoin is changing money, business, and the world*. Penguin.
- Tegmark, M. (2017). *Life 3.0: Being human in the age of artificial intelligence*. Knopf.
- Vlastos, G. (1991). *Socrates: Ironist and moral philosopher*. Cornell University Press.

- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Harvard University Press.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory into Practice*, 41(2), 64–70.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.