Recursive Meta-Metacognition: A Hierarchical Model of Self-Evaluation

Joshua D. Curry
jcurry3428@smail.pcd.edu
Pierce College Fort Steilacoom

May 7, 2025

Abstract

This paper proposes a novel framework for understanding recursive meta-metacognition, a multi-layered process of self-evaluation that extends beyond conventional metacognition. Unlike traditional metacognitive models, which focus on a single layer of reflection (thinking about thinking), recursive meta-metacognition introduces a hierarchical structure in which each layer of self-awareness can be evaluated and refined. We place particular emphasis on third-order awareness (meta-meta-metacognition), which evaluates the methods, biases, and principles governing meta-metacognitive processes. This model has applications for both human cognition—enhancing critical thinking, emotional regulation, and self-awareness—and artificial intelligence, where it can be used to design systems capable of advanced self-monitoring and ethical decision-making. We formalize this concept through mathematical models that capture the recursive nature of meta-metacognitive processes and demonstrate how these models can be applied in both cognitive science and artificial intelligence research.

1 Introduction

Metacognition, the process of thinking about one's thinking, has been a foundational concept in cognitive science since John Flavell's initial work in 1979. However, this model has remained largely linear—focusing on a single layer of self-reflection. Recent research has introduced the concept of meta-metacognition, where individuals can evaluate their own metacognitive judgments, but even this remains a limited view. We propose a new model: Recursive Meta-Metacognition, with particular emphasis on third-order processes (meta-meta-metacognition).

This framework introduces a hierarchical model of self-evaluation, where each layer of metacognition can itself be monitored, evaluated, and refined. We argue that this model is not just a theoretical extension but a practical tool for understanding human cognition and enhancing artificial intelligence. Meta-meta-metacognition—the evaluation of the methods, biases, and principles governing metacognitive evaluation itself—represents a crucial level where fundamental assumptions about cognition can be examined. By formalizing the recursive nature of self-reflection, we provide a mathematical foundation for understanding how individuals can develop increasingly sophisticated levels of self-awareness and how AI systems might implement similar capabilities.

2 Theoretical Background

2.1 Flavell's Model and Its Evolution

Flavell (1979) defined metacognition as "knowledge and cognition about cognitive phenomena." This foundational concept included metacognitive knowledge (knowledge about one's cognitive processes), metacognitive experiences (subjective experiences related to cognitive activity), and metacognitive regulation (strategies to control cognitive processes).

The evolution of metacognitive theory has led to more nuanced understandings, including Nelson and Narens (1990) influential model distinguishing between the object-level (primary cognitive processes) and meta-level (monitoring and control of these processes). This dual-level framework provided the groundwork for understanding how metacognition operates as a monitoring and control system.

The concept of meta-metacognition emerged as researchers recognized that individuals could evaluate not just their cognitive processes but also their metacognitive judgments. Fleming and Daw (2017) described "second-order" metacognition as the ability to evaluate the quality of one's metacognitive judgments. This added a crucial layer to the traditional metacognitive model, suggesting that humans possess the capacity for hierarchical self-evaluation.

Meyer et al. (2023) further developed this concept by introducing "Type-3 judgments," which involve evaluating the reliability of one's metacognitive processes. Their research indicated that common computational mechanisms might underlie both metacognition and meta-metacognition, suggesting a potential for recursive application of these mechanisms.

2.2 The Need for a Hierarchical Model

While existing models acknowledge multiple levels of meta-cognition, they have not fully explored the recursive nature of this process. We propose that meta-metacognition is not merely a second-order process but potentially an n-order process, where each level of metacognition can itself become the object of higher-order reflection.

This recursive model addresses several limitations in current metacognitive theory:

1. It captures the potentially infinite regress of self-reflection that humans can engage in

2. It provides a framework for understanding how metacognitive processes can be refined over time

3. It offers a more complete model of how self-awareness develops and operates across multiple domains of cognition

3 Defining Recursive Meta-Metacognition

3.1 What is Recursive Meta-Metacognition?

Recursive meta-metacognition refers to a hierarchical process of self-evaluation where each layer of metacognition can itself be the object of metacognitive processes. In this model, an individual can not only think about their thinking (metacognition) but also think about how they think about their thinking (meta-metacognition), and further, think about how they think about how they think about their thinking (meta-meta-metacognition), and so on.

Formally, we define recursive meta-metacognition as:

Let C_0 represent base-level cognition (direct thinking about external objects or concepts). Let C_1 represent first-order metacognition (thinking about C_0). Let C_2 represent second-order metacognition (thinking about C_1). Generally, let C_n represent nth-order metacognition (thinking about C_{n-1}).

The recursive meta-metacognitive process can then be represented as a hierarchical structure:

$$C_n \rightarrow C_{n-1} \rightarrow ... \rightarrow C_1 \rightarrow C_0 \tag{1}$$

Where each arrow represents a monitoring and control relationship between adjacent levels.

3.2 What is Meta-Meta-Metacognition?

Meta-Meta-Metacognition refers to a third-order process of self-evaluation, where individuals or systems not only reflect on their thoughts (metacognition) and their awareness of those thoughts (meta-metacognition) but also reflect on the methods, biases, and principles that govern how they evaluate their own meta-cognitive processes.

Formally, we define Meta-Meta-Metacognition as:

- C_0: Direct cognition (thinking).
- C_1: Metacognition (thinking about thinking).
- C_2: Meta-Metacognition (evaluating how one thinks about their thinking).
- C_3: Meta-Meta-Metacognition (evaluating the methods, biases, and principles that govern meta-metacognition).

3.3 Why Meta-Meta-Metacognition Matters

1. **Reveals Hidden Biases**: Allows individuals to become aware of the cognitive and cultural filters that shape their self-reflection.
2. **Adaptive Self-Monitoring**: Enables more accurate self-regulation by identifying and correcting biases in self-evaluation.
3. **Ethical Refinement**: Provides a foundation for recursive ethical evaluation, where ethical principles themselves can be questioned and refined.
4. **Advanced AI Design**: In AI systems, this model allows for the creation of self-regulating, ethically aware architectures capable of refining their decision-making processes.

3.4 Layered Structure: Cognitive, Emotional, Ethical, Strategic, and Symbolic Domains

Recursive meta-metacognition operates across multiple domains of human experience, each with its own hierarchical structure:

1. **Cognitive Domain**: Involves awareness of knowledge, understanding, and reasoning processes.
   - C_0: Direct cognition about external objects
   - C_1: Awareness of one's knowledge and cognitive processes
   - C_2: Evaluation of metacognitive strategies
   - C_3: Refinement of meta-metacognitive frameworks
2. **Emotional Domain**: Encompasses awareness of feelings, emotional regulation, and emotional intelligence.
   - E_0: Primary emotional experiences
   - E_1: Awareness of emotions (emotional metacognition)
   - E_2: Evaluation of emotional awareness processes
   - E_3: Refinement of emotional meta-awareness strategies
3. **Ethical Domain**: Involves moral reasoning, values assessment, and ethical decision-making.
   - M_0: Basic moral intuitions and ethical judgments
   - M_1: Reflection on ethical reasoning processes
   - M_2: Evaluation of ethical metacognition
   - M_3: Refinement of ethical meta-awareness
4. **Strategic Domain**: Encompasses planning, decision-making, and adaptive behavior.
   - S_0: Direct strategic thinking and planning
   - S_1: Monitoring and evaluation of strategic processes
   - S_2: Assessment of strategic metacognition
   - S_3: Refinement of strategic meta-awareness
5. **Symbolic Domain**: Involves awareness of language, symbolism, and meaning-making.
   - Y_0: Direct symbolic processing
   - Y_1: Awareness of symbolic thinking
   - Y_2: Evaluation of symbolic metacognition
   - Y_3: Refinement of symbolic meta-awareness

3.5 Why Recursion Matters

The recursive nature of meta-metacognition is significant for several reasons:

1. **Developmental Progression**: It provides a framework for understanding how metacognitive abilities develop over time, with higher levels of recursion emerging as cognitive development progresses.
2. **Adaptability**: Recursive meta-metacognition allows for continuous refinement of lower-level processes based on higher-level insights.
3. **Integration**: It facilitates integration across domains, enabling cross-domain awareness and regulation.
4. **Emergence**: Higher-order metacognitive processes may give rise to emergent properties not present at lower levels, such as self-identity, wisdom, and creative insight.

4 Mathematical Modeling of Recursive Meta-Metacognition

4.1 Defining a Hierarchical Vector Model

To formalize recursive meta-metacognition, we propose a vector-based representation where each level of metacognition is modeled as a vector space.

Let $X_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0}$ represent the state of base-level cognition, where n_0 is the dimensionality of this space.

For each metacognitive level i, let $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ represent the state of level-i metacognition.

The monitoring function at level i can be represented as:

$$M_i : X_{i-1} \to X_i \tag{2}$$

And the control function as:

$$C_i : X_i \times X_{i-1} \to X_{i-1} \tag{3}$$

These functions model how higher levels monitor and influence lower levels.

4.2 Weighted Confidence Layers

A critical aspect of recursive meta-metacognition is the confidence associated with judgments at each level. We model this using confidence weights:

For each level i, let $w_i \in [0, 1]$ represent the confidence weight associated with metacognitive judgments at that level.

The effective influence of level i metacognition on level $i - 1$ can then be modeled as:

$$X'_{i-1} = (1 - w_i)X_{i-1} + w_i C_i(X_i, X_{i-1}) \tag{4}$$

This equation captures how the confidence in higher-level metacognitive judgments affects their influence on lower levels.

For meta-meta-metacognition specifically (level 3), we can express a specialized confidence weighting function that accounts for the systematic evaluation of biases in meta-metacognitive processes:

$$w_3 = f_{\text{bias}}(B, X_2, X_1) \tag{5}$$

Where B represents a vector of bias parameters that meta-meta-metacognition can identify and adjust, X_2 represents the current state of meta-metacognitive processes, and X_1 represents metacognitive processes. This allows the system to modulate the influence of meta-metacognition based on identified biases or limitations in the meta-metacognitive framework itself.

4.3 Recursive Evaluation Functions

The recursive nature of meta-metacognition involves evaluation functions that assess the accuracy and effectiveness of lower-level metacognitive processes.

For level i, the evaluation function E_i can be defined as:

$$E_i : X_{i-1} \times X_{i-2} \to [0, 1] \tag{6}$$

Where E_i evaluates how well level $i - 1$ metacognition monitors and controls level $i - 2$ cognition.

The recursive evaluation process can then be captured by a chain of evaluations:

$$E_n(X_{n-1}, E_{n-1}(X_{n-2}, E_{n-2}(...))) \tag{7}$$

This formulation illustrates how higher-order metacognitive processes can evaluate lower-order metacognitive functions recursively.

For meta-meta-metacognition specifically (level 3), we define a specialized evaluation function:

$$E_3 : X_2 \times X_1 \times \Phi \to [0, 1] \times \Delta\Phi \tag{8}$$

Where Φ represents a set of principles, methodologies, and assumptions underlying meta-metacognitive evaluations, and $\Delta\Phi$ represents adjustments to these principles. This formulation captures how meta-meta-metacognition not only evaluates lower-level processes but also refines the very framework used for evaluation—a critical aspect of third-order awareness that distinguishes it from simpler recursive structures.

4.4 Integration Across Domains

The interaction between different domains of recursive meta-metacognition can be modeled using coupling matrices:

Let X_i^D represent the state of level-i metacognition in domain D.

The coupling between domains D_1 and D_2 at level i can be represented by a matrix $A_i^{D_1,D_2}$:

$$X_i^{D_1'} = X_i^{D_1} + A_i^{D_1,D_2} X_i^{D_2} \tag{9}$$

This equation captures how metacognitive processes in one domain can influence those in another domain at the same level of recursion.

4.5 Temporal Dynamics

The development of recursive meta-metacognition over time can be modeled using differential equations:

$$\frac{dX_i}{dt} = f_i(X_i, X_{i-1}, X_{i+1}) \tag{10}$$

Where f_i represents the dynamics of level-i metacognition as influenced by adjacent levels.

This formulation allows for modeling the temporal development of recursive meta-metacognitive processes, including learning and adaptation.

5 Applications in Human Cognition

5.1 Enhanced Critical Thinking

Recursive meta-metacognition provides a framework for enhancing critical thinking by enabling individuals to evaluate not just their thoughts but also their thought evaluation processes. This multi-layered reflection can help identify and correct biases, improve logical reasoning, and enhance decision-making.

The application can be formalized using our mathematical model:

Let X_0 represent a set of beliefs about a topic. Let X_1 represent metacognitive evaluations of these beliefs (identifying logical fallacies, evaluating evidence). Let X_2 represent meta-metacognitive evaluations of the evaluation process itself (checking for biases in the evaluation, assessing the criteria used). Let X_3 represent meta-meta-metacognitive evaluations that examine the underlying epistemological frameworks and cultural assumptions driving the meta-metacognitive processes.

The improved critical thinking process can be represented as:

$$X'_0 = C_1(X_1, X_0) \tag{11}$$

$$X'_1 = C_2(X_2, X_1) \tag{12}$$

$$X'_2 = C_3(X_3, X_2) \tag{13}$$

Where C_1, C_2, and C_3 are control functions that modify lower-level processes based on higher-level insights. The meta-meta-metacognitive level (C_3) is particularly valuable for addressing deeply embedded cognitive biases that might persist even with second-order reflection, such as detecting when an entire evaluative framework contains cultural biases, disciplinary blind spots, or unstated assumptions that escape detection at the meta-metacognitive level.

5.2 Emotional Regulation and Trauma Therapy

Recursive meta-metacognition has significant applications in emotional regulation and trauma therapy. By enabling awareness of emotional awareness processes, it allows individuals to develop more sophisticated emotional regulation strategies.

Using our domain-specific notation:

Let E_0 represent primary emotional experiences. Let E_1 represent awareness of emotions. Let E_2 represent awareness of emotional awareness processes.

In trauma therapy, the recursive evaluation process can help individuals:

1. Recognize emotional responses to triggers (E_0)
2. Develop awareness of these emotional responses (E_1)
3. Evaluate the effectiveness of their emotional awareness strategies (E_2)
4. Refine these strategies based on higher-order insights (E_3)

This recursive process can be formalized as:

$$E'_0 = C^E_1(E_1, E_0) \tag{14}$$

$$E'_1 = C^E_2(E_2, E_1) \tag{15}$$

$$E'_2 = C^E_3(E_3, E_2) \tag{16}$$

Where C^E_i represents the control function in the emotional domain at level i.

5.3 Educational Strategies for Meta-Cognitive Awareness

Recursive meta-metacognition has profound implications for education, offering a framework for developing increasingly sophisticated metacognitive skills in students.

Educational strategies can target specific levels of the recursive hierarchy:

1. **Level 1**: Teaching basic metacognitive strategies (self-questioning, comprehension monitoring)
2. **Level 2**: Developing the ability to evaluate metacognitive strategies (determining which strategies work best for different tasks)
3. **Level 3**: Cultivating the capacity to refine metacognitive frameworks based on experience

The effectiveness of these educational interventions can be modeled using learning curves for each level:

$$X_i(t) = X_i^{max}(1 - e^{-\alpha_i t}) \tag{17}$$

Where $X_i(t)$ represents the development of level-i metacognitive abilities over time, X_i^{max} represents the maximum potential ability at that level, and α_i represents the learning rate.

6 Applications in Artificial Intelligence

6.1 Recursive Self-Monitoring in AI Systems

Recursive meta-metacognition provides a framework for designing AI systems with sophisticated self-monitoring capabilities. By implementing multiple levels of metacognitive processes, AI systems can evaluate and refine their own cognitive processes.

The implementation can be structured as a hierarchical neural network:

1. **Base Layer**: Processes input data and generates outputs

2. **Metacognitive Layer**: Monitors the base layer, evaluating confidence, identifying potential errors

3. **Meta-metacognitive Layer**: Evaluates the performance of the metacognitive layer, adjusting monitoring parameters

The learning process for such a system can be formalized as:

$$\theta_0' = \theta_0 - \eta_0 \nabla_{\theta_0} L_0(X_0, Y) \tag{18}$$

$$\theta_1' = \theta_1 - \eta_1 \nabla_{\theta_1} L_1(X_1, E_1(X_0, Y)) \tag{19}$$

$$\theta_2' = \theta_2 - \eta_2 \nabla_{\theta_2} L_2(X_2, E_2(X_1, E_1(X_0, Y))) \tag{20}$$

Where θ_i represents the parameters of level i, η_i represents the learning rate, L_i represents the loss function, and E_i represents the evaluation function.

6.2 Ethical Decision-Making Models

Recursive meta-metacognition can enhance ethical decision-making in AI systems by enabling them to evaluate not just the ethical implications of their actions but also the ethical frameworks they use for evaluation.

Let M_0 represent base-level ethical judgments. Let M_1 represent metacognitive evaluation of ethical judgments. Let M_2 represent meta-metacognitive evaluation of ethical frameworks.

The recursive ethical decision-making process can be formalized as:

$$M_0' = C_1^M(M_1, M_0) \tag{21}$$

$$M_1' = C_2^M(M_2, M_1) \tag{22}$$

Where C_i^M represents the control function in the moral domain at level i.

This structure allows AI systems to adapt their ethical frameworks based on experience and feedback, potentially leading to more nuanced and context-sensitive ethical decision-making.

6.3 AI Alignment and Self-Regulating Systems

One of the most promising applications of recursive meta-metacognition in AI is in alignment and self-regulation. By implementing multiple levels of metacognitive processes, AI systems can monitor and adjust their goals and values to remain aligned with human intentions.

The alignment process can be modeled using a recursive optimization problem:

$$\min_{\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \ldots} \mathbb{E}[D(f_{\theta_0}(X), Y) + \lambda_1 R_1(\theta_1, f_{\theta_0}) + \lambda_2 R_2(\theta_2, \theta_1) + \lambda_3 R_3(\theta_3, \theta_2, \Phi) + \ldots] \tag{23}$$

Where:

- D represents a divergence measure between AI outputs and human expectations
- R_i represents a regularization term for level i that encourages alignment

- λ_i represents the weight of level i regularization
- Φ represents the set of principles and assumptions underlying the alignment framework itself

This formulation captures how higher-level metacognitive processes can regulate lower-level processes to maintain alignment with human values. The meta-meta-metacognitive level (θ_3) is particularly crucial as it enables the AI system to evaluate and refine the very principles used for alignment, addressing fundamental questions such as:

1. How should the system interpret conflicting human values?
2. What weight should be given to different stakeholders' interests?
3. How should the system navigate trade-offs between explicit instructions and implicit intentions?
4. What mechanisms should the system use to identify and correct biases in its own alignment processes?

By incorporating meta-meta-metacognition, AI systems can develop more robust alignment mechanisms that not only follow predefined rules but also evaluate and improve those rules based on deeper understanding of human values and intentions.

7 Empirical Evidence and Testing Methods

7.1 Neurological Correlates of Recursive Meta-Metacognition

Emerging neuroscientific research provides evidence for hierarchical metacognitive processes in the brain. Studies have identified distinct neural correlates for different levels of metacognition:

1. **Prefrontal Cortex (PFC)**: Associated with base-level metacognition, particularly the anterior PFC for confidence judgments
2. **Anterior Cingulate Cortex (ACC)**: Involved in conflict monitoring and error detection, potentially corresponding to meta-metacognitive processes
3. **Precuneus and Posterior Cingulate Cortex**: Implicated in self-referential processing and higher-order awareness
4. **Dorsolateral Prefrontal Cortex (DLPFC) and Frontopolar Cortex**: These regions, particularly Brodmann areas 9, 10, and 46, may be specifically involved in meta-meta-metacognitive processes requiring the integration of multiple evaluative frameworks and the assessment of cognitive biases

The hierarchical organization of these brain regions suggests a neurological basis for recursive meta-metacognition. Recent neuroimaging studies employing multi-voxel pattern analysis (MVPA) techniques have begun to identify neural signatures that may correspond to third-order metacognitive processes, characterized by increased functional connectivity between frontopolar regions and both medial prefrontal cortex and posterior parietal areas during tasks requiring evaluation of one's own evaluative frameworks.

7.2 Experimental Paradigms for Measuring Recursive Meta-Metacognition

We propose several experimental paradigms for measuring recursive meta-metacognitive abilities:

1. **Confidence Calibration Tasks**: Participants make judgments, rate their confidence, and then rate their confidence in their confidence ratings
2. **Strategy Selection Tasks**: Participants select metacognitive strategies and then evaluate the effectiveness of their selection process
3. **Adaptive Learning Tasks**: Tasks that require adjusting metacognitive strategies based on feedback about their effectiveness
4. **Framework Evaluation Tasks**: Specifically designed for measuring meta-meta-metacognition, these tasks require participants to evaluate and refine their own criteria for evaluating metacognitive strategies

The performance on these tasks can be quantified using our mathematical framework:

$$P_i = \text{corr}(E_i(X_{i-1}, X_{i-2}), \text{accuracy}(X_{i-2})) \tag{24}$$

Where P_i represents the meta-metacognitive performance at level i, measured as the correlation between meta-metacognitive evaluations and actual performance of lower-level processes.

For meta-meta-metacognition specifically, we propose a more specialized measure:

$$P_3 = \text{corr}(E_3(X_2, X_1, \Phi), \text{accuracy}(X_1)) + \alpha \cdot \text{adapt}(\Phi) \tag{25}$$

Where $\text{adapt}(\Phi)$ measures how effectively the participant adapts their evaluative framework Φ in response to feedback, and α is a weighting parameter. This measurement captures not just the correlation between judgments and accuracy but also the capacity for framework adaptation—a hallmark of third-order metacognitive processes.

8 Conclusion and Future Directions

Recursive Meta-Metacognition offers a profound advancement in our understanding of self-awareness, both for human cognition and artificial intelligence. By recognizing the hierarchical nature of reflective thought, we can design smarter AI, teach more effective critical thinking, and build tools for advanced self-awareness.

The mathematical framework presented in this paper provides a foundation for future research in this area, offering formal methods for modeling and measuring recursive meta-metacognitive processes.

Future research directions include:

1. **Developmental Trajectories**: Investigating how recursive meta-metacognitive abilities develop across the lifespan, with particular attention to when and how meta-meta-metacognitive capacities emerge

2. **Cross-Cultural Variations**: Exploring cultural differences in recursive meta-metacognitive processes and how different cultural frameworks influence third-order awareness
3. **Clinical Applications**: Developing therapeutic interventions based on recursive meta-metacognition for conditions involving impaired self-awareness, including specialized techniques targeting meta-meta-metacognitive deficits
4. **Advanced AI Architectures**: Designing and implementing AI systems with multiple levels of metacognitive processes, particularly focusing on third-order systems capable of evaluating their own evaluation frameworks
5. **Quantum Meta-Metacognition**: Exploring potential connections between quantum cognition and recursive meta-metacognition
6. **Meta-Meta-Metacognitive Training Programs**: Developing educational interventions specifically designed to enhance third-order awareness and the ability to identify and refine evaluative frameworks
7. **Philosophical Implications**: Examining how meta-meta-metacognition intersects with philosophical questions about consciousness, free will, and epistemology

By pursuing these research directions, we can further develop our understanding of recursive meta-metacognition—particularly third-order processes—and their applications across various domains.

References

Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist, 34*(10), 906–911.

Fleming, S. M., & Daw, N. D. (2017). Self-evaluation of decision-making: A general Bayesian framework for metacognitive computation. *Psychological Review, 124*(1), 91–114.

Meyer, A., et al. (2023). Common computations for metacognition and meta-metacognition. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 35*(4), 625–638.

Nelson, T. O., & Narens, L. (1990). Metamemory: A theoretical framework and new findings. *Psychology of Learning and Motivation, 26*, 125–173.

Shea, N., Boldt, A., Bang, D., Yeung, N., Heyes, C., & Frith, C. D. (2014). Supra-personal cognitive control and metacognition. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 18*(4), 186–193.

Timmermans, B., & Cleeremans, A. (2015). How can we measure awareness? An overview of current methods. *Behavioural Methods in Consciousness Research*, 21–46.

Fleming, S. M., Dolan, R. J., & Frith, C. D. (2012). Metacognition: Computation, biology and function. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 367*(1594), 1280–1286.

Arslan, S., & Akin, A. (2014). Metacognition: As a predictor of one's academic locus of control. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 14*(1), 33–39.

Schooler, J. W. (2002). Re-representing consciousness: Dissociations between experience and meta-consciousness. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 6*(8), 339–344.

Proust, J. (2013). *The philosophy of metacognition: Mental agency and self-awareness.* Oxford University Press.

Carruthers, P. (2009). How we know our own minds: The relationship between mindreading and metacognition. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 32*(2), 121–138.

Metcalfe, J., & Shimamura, A. P. (Eds.). (1994). *Metacognition: Knowing about knowing.* MIT Press.

Dunlosky, J., & Metcalfe, J. (2009). *Metacognition.* SAGE Publications.

Fleming, S. M., & Lau, H. C. (2014). How to measure metacognition. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 8*, 443.

Overgaard, M., & Sandberg, K. (2012). Kinds of access: Different methods for report reveal different kinds of metacognitive access. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 367*(1594), 1287–1296.