

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Productivity Maximization and Human Productive Potential

[Sidharta Chatterjee](#) *

Posted Date: 31 December 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202512.2724.v1

Keywords: productivity; productive potential; productivity maximisation; anti-productivity



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](#), which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Article

Productivity Maximization and Human Productive Potential

Sidharta Chatterjee ^{1,2}

¹ Quantum Noetic Metaphysics Lab

² School of Economics, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam; sidharta123@yahoo.com

Abstract

This paper discusses the theory of productivity maximisation in relation to human productive potential. If productivity is considered as means to attain certain outcomes, it must have practical implications. Herein, human productive potential is considered as a neurocognitive concept having its significance felt in personal and professional frontier, for human beings are always in search to maximise their productivity by tapping untapped potential latent within. This paper addresses this issue, while at the same time, it examines of the role of cognitive constraints in constraining human potential, which has important implications for the individual and industrial frontiers. In this respect, we have also discussed, in brief, the concept of anti-productivity, its nature, and practical implications.

Keywords: productivity; productive potential; productivity maximisation; anti-productivity

1. Introduction

We are already on the edge of productivity maximisation frontier being powered by advanced digital technologies, including AI-based systems, where Artificial Intelligence is considered as the next digital frontier (Chui & Francisco, 2017). But what about natural, human intelligence, and how it is linked to productive potential? To many a die-hard scientist, to whom concepts like *power potential*, *productive energy*¹, *productive potential*, and *latent subconscious potential* may seem outright pseudoscientific notions, it is, nevertheless, true that many of the concepts at the borderline of science and fallacy may seem too eccentric, for these concepts do make great stories, ignite passions, and motivate our *will* to action, but cannot be readily reduced to their definitive scientific terminologies. Why? Because these concepts lack concrete experimental evidences. An outright reductionist approach toward understanding these subjective states of the mind would be too futile to be fraught with utter disappointment, or even be filled with total disappointment.

Despite such, we consider the term “*productivity maximization*” a productive concept having widespread practical implications, which is an outcome of effort given to promote productivity growth and sustenance (Chatterjee, 2025b). It is a technique by which individuals and organisations tend to maximize their level of output from a fixed amount of inputs. It is virtually an attempt to raise productivity to the highest possible point—a step-up increase in intensity of activities devoted to achieve certain goals, including organisational objectives. To make the most of a given productive principle based on which one can maximize outcomes, it is necessary to nurture good productive conscience and possess a superior sense of productivity. Individuals are free to utilise the productive potential which exist in latent form, and could be triggered by appropriate stimulus which acts a booster. These may be in the form of incentives, motivation, spur or inducements to help us unleash the true potential required to become productive. According to the general postulates of productivity (Chatterjee & Samanta, 2025), not all individuals are equally productive. But under organisational settings, efficient management of tasks determine the productivity level of the workers, which is

¹ See Pokrovski, (2003).

streamlined for maximum efficiency targeting a given level of output—a requirement for achieving business goals as well as meeting short-term deadlines and long-term objectives. Both these two factors help determine organisational competence. A competent organisation grows by acquiring new deals, customers, and markets. There may exist constraints that impede productivity or prevent human productive potential from being fully unleashed. Besides, it has been repeatedly observed that productivity can be extracted from individuals who were previously idle and unproductive. This proves the notion that the right stimulus and adequate motivation can trigger productive potential which is inherent to us.

2. Productivity Maximization and Productive Potential

Belenkova *et al* (2019) among others, including Chatterjee (2025a & 2025b), consider human creative (productive) potential as a capital—a key resource in the development of productive activities contributing toward advancement of a technocratic society—the basis of a technogenic civilisation. Pokrovski, (2003), too, has referred to similar kinds of thought on productivity by stressing the role of energy in the theory of production, albeit, in economic contexts that make sense. Pokrovski, (2003) investigated the theory of production with the aid of concepts like *productive energy*, besides conventional inputs like labour and production equipment to study the factor of production. In a typical sense, the author has studied in detail to explain the growth of output—the result of productivity. In this research, we too maintain a similar position on productivity and productive potential, with an eye on the constraining factors that delimit or impede productivity. Today, energy-driven equipment and machineries drive productivity, but behind all the actions, there is human power and productivity that drive growth in output.

But again, look at the terms I have mentioned above: “will”, “passion”, “motivation”, and all such that are nothing but subjective concepts that are unique to human beings alone. These are, again, borderline concepts discreetly acknowledged by the intransigent scientific communities. Of course, scientific experiments have been conducted upon and definitions and understandings have been offered to explain the concept of the *theory of motivation* by Herzberg (2015) and Maslow’s *hierarchy of needs* (Maslow, 1954; Huitt, 2007), but that at all cost doesn’t prevent us from casting a sceptic glance at these impenetrable states of the mind. Productive capabilities, however, are widely acknowledged by most industry experts and considered a tool by management practitioners, in such sense where education and learning contribute to a greater degree towards development of soft skills (Sumra and Katabaro, 2016). Nübler (2014) explains the theory of capabilities with regard to productive transformation where learning and training play a greater role in it. Empirical analysis of productive capabilities and their drivers have been examined, too, in good detail by Daude *et al* (2016). Previously, the subjective concept of motivation and its role in promoting higher productive has found favour with Srivastava and Barmola (2011). These studies do indicate the decisive role of concepts like productive capabilities, motivation, and productive transformation in promoting productivity among individuals in diverse settings, and which indicate that not all idiosyncratic phenomena concerning mental aspects of productivity are fallacies. But as all is said and done, if we recall *William Shakespeare*, we may appreciate better what he meant by saying:

“There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your philosophy.”

Isn’t it true that we human beings having all these subjective states of feeling inherently intrinsic to us have certain objective states that drive us to action, and make us more capable and productive? Indeed, even the most die-hard intransigent scientist of today can hardly deny the claim that *one can slowly but gradually develop and nurture productive capabilities*—abilities that make individuals more “skilled and apt”. In fact, Zeff (2007) noted the importance of making the right choice about creating a positive, innovative, creative, and productive work-life. This theory has been strongly supported and carried forwards in the field of productivity studies by Chatterjee (2025a, 2025b) with regard to motivations in productive space, and yet again, by Chatterjee and Samanta (2025), with regard to the value of noetic (intellectual) capital and its role in promoting economic productivity. Slowly but

gradually, these concepts are gaining acceptance in mainstream scientific research and practice, where the border is being continuously redrawn to accept new ideas that are readily contributing towards understanding the science of productivity and human productive potential.

Undeniably, each of us is endowed with the power and potentiality to become highly productive and successful individuals. Our productive potential is a latent force that remains dormant in many of us, and yet we have no clue as to its power that when it is unleashed, it can turn ourselves into highly accomplished individuals (Robbins, 2008). Fundamentally, it is *the* force which is necessary for us to become productive, creative, and ingeniously inventive. It is the “power potential” necessary to become productive. It is often triggered by purest and most inspiring events, the passion of which is felt when we feel motivated by wisdom of action and productivity that stir within us the will to become something or somebody. It’s our productive potential. Now, it is in our choice to be productive, potent, influential, and powerful if we really want to be so. We face—and let’s say we assume risk and uncertainty to engage ourselves in productive ventures. As we continuously deal with risk and uncertainty, the “degree” of it varies according to our individual capacity to assume risk, and that too, is based on certain expectations that we hold.

This *degree* of uncertainty is related to our productive expectations, but for which we still do not have any formal efficient framework that explains its underpinnings. What we do have is a formal structure for dealing with risks, uncertainty, and expectations which is effective as being “partly” *normative* in nature (Kahneman and Tversky, 1977). But there are no prescriptive rules that could be set as guidelines to follow in order to make it permanently effective. However, this structural framework is a useful aid to solving organisational strategic and tactical problems related to productivity, people and process management, and production management.

With regards to its implications to personal wellbeing, its application involves formal analysis to problems of decision making concerning not just individual productivity, but many other aspects of our lives, e.g., investments, consumption pattern, buying decision, recreation, pleasure, and choices that we make to improve our professional frontier. It also involves making decisions about maintaining and upholding personal wellbeing. Not that these all are “fixed decisions”, nor that they involve any risk taking. Decision analysis from the perspective of cognitive behavioral science indicates that almost all advanced technologies and tools in use or are being developed for organisational decision making involve a high degree of proficiency, expertise, and risk taking (Lebiere & Anderson, 2011). This issue has been highlighted with regard to the productivity factor by Stigler (1961) who perceived productivity not just as a “toolkit” for measure of performance, but talked about the *index of productivity* which takes into account different factors like average products of factors—based on which we can determine the *average productivity factor*. Productivity is, therefore, the result of decisive actions that produces outcomes, with a variable amount of risk, which is always associated with it. Therefore, modelling of decision situations under risk and uncertainty has become a norm of the present day (Kahneman and Tversky, 1977), unlike what it had been in the not so distant past.

It might be noteworthy to highlight the fact that wrong decisions that we often make do influence our productivity levels in a negative way. It needs be taken care of. What we decide and how we chose to certain things determine our future course of actions, based on which our (rational) expectations about outcomes are shaped (Rötheli, 2007). But this isn’t anything new: it is purely old stuff. What seems more interesting is that, we must strive hard to make decisions about improving our productivity and efficiency, for these two vital things take us forward to the doorstep of success. According to Tangen (2005), productivity is a multidimensional term the meaning of which vary among individuals and with context. We do have the potential within, but the problem is that, many of us do not possess the power to stir our passions so as to propel our will to set itself free and become active. Unless the will is set free and active, we can’t become productive, even if we possess vast potentiality. In this paper, we attempt to highlight these philosophical principles underpinning the concept of productivity, and how the potential latent within us is explicitly related to it, and how it helps us deal effectively with constraints that impede our potential to become more productive.

3. Choice of Actions, Decision, and Uncertainty

The decision to become productive is left to us, but it is generally enforced as a routine task in almost all organisations, big or small. Indeed, human beings have the freedom to choose their activities, profession, and make decisions that they *think* are optimal, often fraught with risk and uncertainty (Kahneman and Tversky, 1977). But the decision to become active —i.e., *productive* is often fraught with constraints, precincts, and risks. It is our choice of activities which determines our productivity level.

Productivity differs in many respect among individuals, organisations and firms, and even among nations. Concerning productivity of the people or productivity of a nation, we may ask, what it is that makes a country more productive than other? Answer: The collective effort and output of all the industrial sectors, factories, and individuals put together measured as gross domestic product (GDP) of a country. High productivity of the workforce is required for R&D, innovation, product design, and creativity (Amours and Guinet, 2003). Creativity is essential because product development is a creative process. In addition to these, industries must have critical goals to drive their productivity levels. The level of activity and economic output of a nation, however, varies constantly in relation to others: but this is true in *economic* sense. In such sense, it would be pertinent to know about the amount of effort allocated to work, levels of market expertise, wages to ask in return for work (Stigler, 1961), and the level of market expenditure (Stafford and Cohen, 1974). According to the theory of wages, wage potential depends on the productivity level and allocation of effort by workforces in action (Stafford and Cohen, 1974). If individual workers chose to allocate more effort beyond what’s required, they may go for fringe incomes. Studies of workforce performance conducted by industrial psychologists (Baumann et al., 2016) point to the fact that outputs vary considerably over the work period, which align well with the theoretical implications underpinning work effort and productive consumption.

Although this paper is not devoted to new ideas on (economic) productivity, it is explicitly concerned with productive potential of individuals, and elements that power or hinder it. When we observe closely people, things, and systems in action, we are bound to detect certain *patterns* as well as constraining factors that either impede or reduce (delimit) productivity. The idea is to explore and then explain their significances. This is more plausible when we gain productive experiences under organisational settings. Special case studies on organisational productivity could shed more lights on this issue, as they often do, which is readily encouraged. Fundamentally, we undertake a study on the cognitive constraints that impede human productivity. We also undertake a methodological discussion of the issues concerning *human productive potential*.

One maxim which comes to the mind is as follows:

| “Be in action to become more productive.”

Activities and actions are the things that make people more productive, but what actually drives human actions? Goals, aims, and objectives. Now, if you have a goal to achieve, you must fashion a path to achieve it, and there you might face obstacles on the path. Having goals makes us more productive. Human productivity is manifested in many different ways, and many kinds of obstacles act as *constraints* to productivity. Constraining limitations delimit the power of productivity that need be unleashed when it is often needed most. Theoretical explanation of impediments to productivity is one of the primary goals of this research, with an eye to the domain of expertise that characterise a productive field and its influence on the human mind. If one becomes an astute observer of (industrial) productivity, one notices the obstacles, bottlenecks, and constraints that hinder it as well. The goal is to identify such constraints and deal effectively with them so as to boost productivity and performance.

4. Ideas on Productivity

Let us fix our ideas on productivity first: The foundational basis of a general principle of productivity stands on the very grounds of reason that strategic tools and techniques can be adopted to increase one’s capacity to do more. To this, is linked the role of *intelligence* in augmenting human

productive potential. Intelligence in the tune of productive wisdom always play a positive role in helping us to do more and achieve higher goals. But this a very candid outline of the concept of productivity, and unless one can fully grasp the ideas that drive human productivity at the organisational level, it would be rather difficult and inexplicable in general to realise its full extent and powers. This brings the role of production management and management practice at the forefront, as both these interventional aspects help in enhancing productivity in organisations (Siebers *et al.*, 2008). There exist deep interrelationships between adoption of certain management practices and strategies that do well in improving productivity level, for any effective practice brings improvement in human productivity level. Siebers *et al.* (2008) have studied these aspects, and also those that assess the impact of management practices upon productivity of firms.

All these raise an important question with regard to productivity: is productivity a practice, an art, or a science? Peter F. Drucker² believed that management practice is neither a *science* nor an *art*, but a *practice* (Radim Vlcek et al., 1997). In fact, management of productivity is a practice, and more it is done well, better it is for the firm, for firms prosper through enterprising productivity. Of relevance here is the philosophy of production management, since metacognitive choices have practical importance in production, product design and development, and production management (Koskela and Kagioglou, 2005). According to Koskela and Kagioglou (2005), metaphysics constitutes the basis of ideation in the science of production, for the reason that metaphysical assumptions tend to equate with the core theory of production management and practice. But it is also true that metaphysics is not a science of production. Science is something which has more technical things tied to it than imaginary assumptions to consider. Production, however—as considered by Drucker (Radim Vlcek et al., 1997), is literally a *practice*, which has “scientific principles” rooted in it through design and development. Ideation, more or less, is tagged to metaphysics, which constitute the “basis” of the science of productivity and production. A ground is simply a ground, which can be made firm upon which one may construct great wonders using advanced technology. These two things must be clearly distinguished from each other so as to help us grasp their meanings without much confusion.

Theory of Productive Capability

The prospective capability of an individual is called into question, to seek possible answers to the question of productivity, productiveness, and *productive will* and intent. These aspects are related to the theory of productivity, as well as the *theory of productive capability*. The will to become productive is implicitly linked to human capability.

“It is the choice between taking actions and doing nothing.”

Active “intentions” give meaning and “purpose” to productivity, as much as they denote the significance of productivity and human capability (Srivastava & Barmola, 2011). Productivity is much reliant on the capacity to do certain tasks efficiently or achieve specific goals proficiently. It is not just a concept, but a practical tool of activities.

It isn't just a concept that defines a being who isn't a being who's productive or unproductive, but the very idea of dynamicity... and activeness of that being who's doing some action...!

It distinguishes between ostensive purposes and real goal for which productivity is a necessity. Productivity directs the attention of others to what someone is doing or producing. It is, in reality, a state of dynamicity which lay grounded on principles—i.e., *productive principles*. To understand this art and science of productivity, it would be germane to consider it as a dynamic, wilful state of the mind, which is stimulated to perform certain actions having outcomes tied to them. At the individual level, however, the psychology of human productivity is a sort of *approximation* to the study of mind in active state of cognition—the mindset, the attitude of the individual in question, which attempts to answer what productivity really means to a person. That is, how productivity is perceived by

² See Vlcek, R., Trunecek, J., Nový, I., & Drucker, P. F. (1997). Peter F. Drucker on management. *Journal for East European Management Studies*, 2(1), 79-96.

individuals at the decision science level. This is the reason behind decision research being considered as a branch of perceptorics.

It would be unreasonable for anyone to expect that one can work continuously for so long a time happily afflicted with cognitive and physical constraints. It would, without doubt, impede the productivity of anybody engaged in such works. Besides, one can only exercise one's ability worthily in full fledge if one gets a suitable ambience for continuing the work. Hence, to realise one's own capability or incapability, it is necessary to make good choices regarding one's occupation and employment. Same goes for professional studies. Only then one can fit appropriately in a job for which one would be able to sacrifice one's well-being to work and duty. Only then would one be able to unleash the full productive potential latent within. Thus, it is often said that one should chose a profession or career for which one possesses some talent (Ozcan, 2017). For talented and gifted individuals, this isn't much of a problem, since by virtue of their talents, they tend to be highly "productive" beings. In fact, career development is linked to productivity as much as productivity determines competency level, which, too, is heavily influenced by education. This paradox of education, productivity, and career development has been examined by (Soesilowat & Salim, 2010). Otherwise, several kinds of constraints can arise which can impede the productivity level of individuals in question.

The modern role of human resource management and practice is to identify such constraints and remove those considered necessary to make things become easier for the working professionals. It involves effective training of and reasoning the intents of the incumbents to enable them to fit appropriately for a job for which they are to hold respective positions. Hence, it is pertinent to know about and identify the constraints that constrict and impede workforce productivity under organisational settings. In this paper, we discuss the possible methods of identifying *constraints* to workforce productivity. As there are many paths to productivity, so there exists different sorts of obstacles, constraints, and impediments that prevent people from setting free their full productive potential. HRM professionals should remain attentive and aware about the emerging and evolving eccentricities concerning human productive potential. Here, we must differentiate between the terms economic productive potential (EPP) and human productive potential (HPP), as we are more or less concerned with the concept of human productive potential in this paper. We take aid of some simple thought experiments that aims to prove as productive adventures into the realms of human productive potential.

5. Cognitive Constraints to Productivity

This section goes beyond a superficial, provisional perspective of productivity and the constraints that impede it. Constraints that appear as endogenous ones are those that present as cognitive limitations to realising full our potentiality. As mentioned above, the idea of productivity must lay grounded on *principles*. Productiveness may be highly heterogeneous among different individuals—as much as it exhibits heterogeneity among different sectors of the economy, or even among firms in a particular sector of an economy. Leaving aside the "economic productive potential", we concentrate on the human aspects of it. We may call it *productive heterogeneity*. Heterogeneity and productivity with relation of human productive capabilities have been examined thoroughly by Ashraf, Galor and Kemp (2015). Previously, Roger and Wasmer (2011) acknowledged the role of heterogeneity as they indicated that it matters with respect to labour productivity differentiated by age, skills, and competence level.

Also, such heterogeneity can vary widely among different geographic regions showing unique types of potentialities that are intrinsic to a particular group of people, which varies so greatly within and among different regions. What are the reasons for these variations? How can they be understood in the lights of modern theories of productivity? Production heterogeneity may have different reasons behind it that have economic implications, but we are more concerned with the aspects of the variations in *human productive potential*—and it is this that makes one become more productive and useful to others than those who are not. We propose that different types of constraining factors—both

cognitive and non-cognitive factors, act as bottlenecks towards achievement of full potentiality intrinsic to individuals. What are these constraints? How can these be overridden? Rantala *et al* (2018) mentioned the evolution of obstacles restraining improvement in productivity. Others—including the pioneering work of Rainer (2005) widely and meticulously discussed productivity and constraints on productivity, whereas Chatterjee (2013) discussed the constraints in organisational learning in relation to cognitive load by showing how it impedes and effects productive behavior of employees in organisations. About finding solutions and remedial measures to such constraints, it has been suggested by Aniemene (2017) that strategies for increased productivity could be devised through control of process constraints. A cognitive and neuroeconomic approach to solving such issues has been considered previously by Westbrook & Braver, (2015), which concerned the cognitive, affective states of the mind in addressing the problem of constraints. Recent work aligning to the role of Artificial Intelligence in boosting productivity and harnessing the power of AI in boosting business process management (BPM) have been conducted by Kokala (2024), which indicates that at the organisational and firm level, new challenges, new roles, and new capabilities must be accepted and adopted to tap the human potential as a potent resource (Lengnick-Hall & Lengnick-Hall, 2002) to complement the knowledge economy for smooth functioning.

We must take *cues* from our “intelligence” to deal effectively with evolving constraints to productivity. It brings us to the forefront of human intelligence and wisdom that are linked to human potential, and which must be addressed adequately with care to remove the constraining factors preventing us from unleashing our full productive potential. It is true that both individuals and organisations face different categories of constraints that tend to impede their productivity levels. This is the prime area of study of this paper: *constraints* to productivity having cognitive implications. But it is not what we may call “anti-productivity”, for it is entirely a different concept that has a different meaning. Anti-productivity (Aşçı, 2020) is the result of a state of unproductiveness due to various reasons, both endogenous as well as exogenous. The killers of productivity are those factors that prevent individuals from becoming productive, e.g., poor habits, lack of skills and abilities, absence of aims, goals and objectives, actions having little or no purpose, lack of willpower and determination to become proactive, restricted field of opportunities to avail, poor hindsight and foresight, both having negative effects on the mind rendering the individual unproductive. Among other facts, psychological states like anxiety and depression can both affect productiveness of an individual. Social and economic factors, too, may also prevent people from fully realising their productive potentials. The unwillingness to do what’s necessary to achieve one’s goals and objectives is a form of anti-productivity. The prime question whether constant business and search for efficiency are always beneficial is a matter to consider as well, which challenges the traditional concept of being productive. One needs to reevaluate the priorities and embrace some degree of idleness to allow build-up of productive energy, which itself is a powerful tool often embraced by experts who emphasize the importance of inner strength and self-control as a mechanism to “reset” the button to allow the mind and body to rejuvenate and reenergise itself for better performance. The book by Tom Hodgkinson, titled “*How to be Idle*” explores the art of idleness and rejuvenation for a more relaxed view of a productive life. Also, unrestrained performance to achieve higher productivity can lead to stress and anxiety. Besides, the fear of failure, and to cope with societal pressure to perform, all could adversely affect work-life balance to a certain degree. The concept of *anti-productivity*, however, could offer fresh thoughts on productivity, in a way showing how to lead a life which one desires, and how to work more intentionally to perform better. It is a question of context and perspective: i.e., how one perceives anti-productivity, whether as an enabler or disabler of performance is what really matters.

Herein, we have set a higher, fundamental value for productivity, and consequently, on the constraining factors that define practical productive thinking about human productive potential and “noetic”—meaning *intellectual* capabilities. In most organisations and firms, productivity works on the concept of a *value* which to set their target to achieve. Targets may often seem apparently unachievable to many, but to guarantee its attainability, sheer productive efforts must be put in, and individuals are motivated, trained, and oriented towards attaining such targets. But even with best

of the things backing individuals, they often fail. Several different kinds of cognitive constraints arise which prevent people from realising their full productive potentialities.

The Nature of Cognitive Constraints

The nature of cognitive constraints is both interesting to study, and important to understand, given that we need to identify these and use proactive strategic steps to overcome them. Cognitive constraints can present in various forms. Lebeire and Anderson (2011) examines cognitive constraints in relation to decision making under risk and uncertainty. Cognitive constraints are also important factors to consider in relation to learning, which provide a useful framework for educators to design and streamline educational contents for the students (Talanquer, 2009). A simple categorisation of the nature of cognitive constraints is as follows:

- Cognitive biases can affect decision making owing to limited working memory capacity of an individual,
- Mental fatigue, too, has a role to play that delimits our productive capabilities, decreasing productivity, and increasing errors, as studied in historical context by Balyne (2011),
- Multitasking is challenging for human beings, but easier for computers, since the human brain can focus on a limited amount of information at a time, and can handle one task at a time. These aspects can put cognitive load on the mind to impede performance and thwart productivity. This is the reason why we should be using tools to automate tasks, minimize load, and break high-priority tasks into manageable chunks.

The decreased ability to work due to cognitive load and mental fatigue was first studied by Thorndike (1900), which presents a beautiful and stimulating work on the psychology of work and mental fatigue. Indeed, much work has been done on the problem of cognitive load, task stressors, and mental fatigue, as is evident from relevant literature on the subject (See, for example, Thorndike, 1900; Bills, 1937; Boksem & Tops, 2008; Hockey, 2013; Blayney, 2019).

6. Human Productive Potential

Human productivity creates wonders, and it is mostly wonderfully constructive. The productive potential is innate and inherent to all of us, and needs triggers to bloom in force to unleash its full power. The great merit that we acquire and the skills and capabilities that render us productive also make us expert thinkers and doers. We become illustrious by virtue of meritorious actions which make us productive in many different aspects of life, in many different ways. The productive behavior of highly successful individuals take their shape as a result of the realisation of full potential inherent within. The potential to become productive is, indeed, in our hands and our will commands the mind towards actions to realise the power of human productive potential.

Human productive potential has been previously examined by Chatterjee (2025b) in relation to the foundations of productive potential. It is factual that the *productivity* of a “productive system” varies on account of different factors to which we can attribute the nature of outcomes. In industrial setting, there are various criteria and standards to maintain productive synchronism. This is based on the principle of constancy of the rate of productivity momentum of a unit producing goods per unit of time, consuming certain amount of resources, and employing specific means, methods, and processes. To some extent, this may also be true for defining productivity of human beings. Under organisational settings, streamlining tasks for achieving speed and efficiency is the general rule, which must be strictly followed by workers. But this isn't all and everything; organisations manage human capital, and bring out the best that is within its employees in the form of productivity, output, and efficiency.

7. Conclusions

This paper discusses productivity maximization and human productive potential, by addressing the issue concerning cognitive constraints that impede our productivity levels. Several solutions have been advised to deal with the constraints that lead to impairment of productivity and performance,

to allow us to work more efficiently and effectively, achieving our goals and objectives that matter most. In this respect, the role of productivity in maximising human potential has been examined.

References

- Aniemene, F. (2017). *Strategies for increased productivity through control of process constraints* (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University).
- Aşçı, M. S. (2020). Analyzing the effects of organizational trust and organizational commitment in anti-productivity behaviours in managerial approach dimension to achieve a strategic competitive advantage. In *Strategic Outlook for Innovative Work Behaviours: Interdisciplinary and Multidimensional Perspectives* (pp. 253-273). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Ashraf, Q., Galor, O., & Klemp, M. (2015). *Heterogeneity and productivity* (No. 2015-4). Working Paper.
- Baumann, C., Hamin, H., Tung, R. L., & Hoadley, S. (2016). Competitiveness and workforce performance: Asia vis-à-vis the "West". *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(10), 2197-2217.
- Belenkova, O. A., Vanchukhina, L. I., & Leibert, T. B. (2019). Creative potential of the human capital as the key resource of development of the techogenic civilization. *Espacios*, 40(10), 1-10.
- Bills, A. G. (1937). Fatigue in mental work. *Physiological Reviews*, 17(3), 436-453.
- Blayney, S. (2019). Industrial fatigue and the productive body: the science of work in Britain, c. 1900–1918. *Social History of Medicine*, 32(2), 310-328.
- Boksem, M. A., & Tops, M. (2008). Mental fatigue: costs and benefits. *Brain research reviews*, 59(1), 125-139.
- Chatterjee, S. (2013). Constraints in organizational learning, cognitive load and its effect on employee behavior.
- Chatterjee, S. (2025a). Motivations in the Productive Space: Overcoming Mental Fatigue and Cognitive Constraints.
- Chatterjee, S. (2025b). The Foundations of Productive Potential.
- Chatterjee, S., & Samanta, M. (2025). Noetic Capital and the Economics of Productivity.
- Chui, M., & Francisco, S. (2017). Artificial intelligence the next digital frontier. *McKinsey and Company Global Institute*, 47(3.6), 6-8.
- D'Amours, S. (2003). *Intelligent agent-based operations management*. Kogan Page Science.
- Daude, C., Nagengast, A., & Perea, J. R. (2016). Productive capabilities: An empirical analysis of their drivers. *The Journal of International Trade & Economic Development*, 25(4), 504-535.
- Herzberg, F. (2015). Motivation-hygiene theory. *Organizational behavior* 1, 61-74.
- Hockey, R. (2013). *The psychology of fatigue: Work, effort and control*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hodgkinson, T. (2007). *How to be Idle*. Penguin UK.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (2013). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. In *Handbook of the fundamentals of financial decision making: Part I* (pp. 99-127).
- Kokala, A. (2024). Harnessing AI for BPM: Streamlining complex workflows and enhancing efficiency. *Authorea Preprints*.
- Koskela, L., & Kagioglou, M. (2015, October). On the metaphysics of production. In *13th Annual Conference of the International Group for Lean Construction*.
- Lebiere, C., & Anderson, J. R. (2011). Cognitive constraints on decision making under uncertainty. *Frontiers in psychology*, 2, 305.
- Lengnick-Hall, M., & Lengnick-Hall, C. (2002). *Human resource management in the knowledge economy: New challenges, new roles, new capabilities*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Maslows-hierarchy, A. (1954). Hierarchy of needs.
- Nübler, I. (2014). A theory of capabilities for productive transformation: Learning to catch up. *Transforming economies: Making industrial policy work for growth, jobs and development*, 113-149.
- Ozcan, D. (2017). Career decision-making of the gifted and talented. *South African journal of education*, 37(4), 1-8.
- Pokrovski, V. N. (2003). Energy in the theory of production. *Energy*, 28(8), 769-788.
- Rainer, F. (2005). Constraints on productivity. In *Handbook of word-formation* (pp. 335-352). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.
- Rantala, T., Pekkola, S., Rantanen, H., & Hannula, M. (2018). Evolution of obstacles restraining productivity improvement. *International Journal of Productivity and Quality Management*, 25(1), 64-89.

- Robbins, T. (2008). *Unlimited power: The new science of personal achievement*. Simon and Schuster.
- Roger, M., & Wasmer, M. (2011). Heterogeneity matters: labour productivity differentiated by age and skills. *Institut National de la Statistique et des Études Économiques Working Paper*, (G2011/04).
- Rötheli, T. F. (2007). Expectations, rationality and economic performance: models and experiments. In *Expectations, Rationality and Economic Performance*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Siebers, P. O., Aickelin, U., Battisti, G., Celia, H., Clegg, C., Fu, X., ... & Peixoto, A. (2008). Enhancing productivity: the role of management practices. *Submitted to International Journal of Management Reviews*, Forthcoming.
- Soesilowat, E. S., & Salim, Z. (2010). The paradox of education, productivity and career development. *Journal of Indonesian Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2, 69-94.
- Srivastava, S. K., & Barmola, K. C. (2011). Role of motivation in higher productivity. *Management Insight*, 7(1), 63-82.
- Stafford, F. P., & Cohen, M. S. (1974). A model of work effort and productive consumption. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 7(3), 333-347.
- Stigler, G. J. (1961). Economic problems in measuring changes in productivity. In *Output, input, and productivity measurement* (pp. 47-78). Princeton University Press.
- Sumra, S., & Katabaro, J. (2016). *Education foundations of the development of skills and productive capabilities*. Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF).
- Talanquer, V. (2009). On cognitive constraints and learning progressions: The case of “structure of matter”. *International Journal of Science Education*, 31(15), 2123-2136.
- Tangen, S. (2005). Demystifying productivity and performance. *International Journal of Productivity and performance management*, 54(1), 34-46.
- Thorndike, E. (1900). Mental fatigue. I. *Psychological Review*, 7(6), 547.
- Vlcek, R., Trunecek, J., Nový, I., & Drucker, P. F. (1997). Peter F. Drucker on management. *Journal for East European Management Studies*, 2(1), 79-96.
- Westbrook, A., & Braver, T. S. (2015). Cognitive effort: A neuroeconomic approach. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 15(2), 395-415.
- Zeff, J. (2007). *Make the right choice: Creating a positive, innovative and productive work life*. John Wiley & Sons.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.