

THE EMBODIED SPIRAL OF MEANING: REIMAGINING LEADERSHIP THROUGH SYMBOLIC, REFLECTIVE, AND SOMATIC INTEGRATION

D. ASLAMAZISHVILI

Dina Aslamazishvili

Georgian American University, Georgia

E-mail: dinaaslamazishvili@gau.edu.ge

Abstract: *Contemporary organizations face a paradox: symbolic communication, digital information, and narrative complexity are rapidly increasing, while the lived experience of meaning, coherence, and embodied presence is diminishing. This paper introduces The Embodied Spiral of Meaning as a philosophical–organizational framework that reimagines leadership through the integration of symbolic, reflective, and somatic dimensions. Building on Cassirer’s Homo Symbolicus and extending it through Homo Cognoscens (reflective awareness) and Homo Somaticus (embodied presence), the paper develops the Symbolic Spiral of Leadership as an evolving field of meaning-making rather than a fixed competency set. Drawing on phenomenology, developmental theory, and contemporary leadership scholarship, it traces the shift from heroic, control-based models toward relational and embodied forms of leadership. The paper argues that leadership effectiveness depends on aligning symbolic coherence, reflective insight, and somatic grounding, and concludes that organizational evolution requires not more information but deeper integration of meaning and being.*

Keywords: *embodied leadership; symbolic management; Homo Symbolicus; organizational evolution; leadership development; well-being*

Introduction

Organizations today operate in an environment marked by accelerating technological change, hybrid work, and intensified uncertainty. The pandemic and the rapid rise of artificial intelligence have not only altered structures, processes, and communication formats; they have also brought to the surface what might be called the “reptilian” foundations of organizational life: basic survival-oriented patterns in culture, structure, and behavior. Against this backdrop, a central question arises: what are the realms of leadership and organizational evolution in this new landscape?

At first glance, contemporary organizations seem rich in meaning. They articulate visions, values, and missions; they invest in branding, narratives, and internal communication. Yet, at the same time, many leaders and employees report fragmentation, fatigue, and a sense of symbolic disconnection. Information expands, but meaning contracts. Digitalization, remote work, and hybrid communication have multiplied the symbolic codes through which organizational life is mediated – emails, metrics, dashboards, AI-driven reports – while reducing the density of embodied, co-present interaction.

This creates a paradoxical configuration in which doing and being begin to lose contact. Managers strive to sustain meaning through organizational mission and vision statements, but the lived experience of those meanings often fails to reach the everyday realities of work. As a result, organizations experience cognitive overload, cultural dissonance, and what might be called an *embodiment deficit*: it becomes increasingly difficult to feel in one’s body what the organization claims to stand for.

THE EMBODIED SPIRAL OF MEANING: REIMAGINING LEADERSHIP THROUGH SYMBOLIC, REFLECTIVE, AND SOMATIC INTEGRATION

This paper proposes that understanding this condition requires a shift in how leadership is conceptualized. Rather than treating leadership primarily as a set of cognitive competencies or behavioral styles, it suggests approaching leadership as a *symbolic–embodied field*: a dynamic interaction of symbolic narratives, reflective awareness, and somatic presence. To articulate this field, the paper develops the model of the Symbolic Spiral of Leadership, grounded in three anthropological figures: *Homo Symbolicus* (the meaning-maker), *Homo Cognoscens* (the reflective knower), and *Homo Somaticus* (the embodied being).

These three dimensions are not simply categories; they correspond to fundamental philosophical questions of human existence:

- How do we process and understand the world? (cognitive–reflective)
- How do we assign meaning to the world within and around us? (symbolic)
- How do we embody this meaning through presence and action? (somatic)

Their integration gives rise to an emergent figure, *Homo Integralis* – an integrated mode of leadership in which meaning, reflection, and embodiment cohere.

The aim of this paper is therefore twofold:

1. To propose a philosophical–organizational model of leadership evolution from primarily symbolic–cognitive paradigms toward embodied and integrative forms; and
2. To outline a conceptual framework for studying how this evolution manifests in organizational life, leadership development, and well-being.

1 Spiral of Integrated Leadership and Organizational Evolution

1.1 Shifts and Spiral Points in Leadership and Organizational Evolution

1.1.1 From Heroic Leadership to Relational and Embodied Forms

The history of leadership thought can be read as a series of qualitative spirals – moments in which meaning, practice, and consciousness undergo a fundamental reconfiguration. For much of the early 20th century, leadership was conceptualized in heroic, control-based terms. “Great man” theories (Carlyle, 1840; Galton, 1869) portrayed leaders as exceptional individuals endowed with superior traits and rational authority. Leadership symbolized stability, certainty, and top-down control; followers were primarily recipients of decisions made elsewhere.

Even later human-relations perspectives, which emphasized motivation and interpersonal skills, largely preserved the image of the leader as a benevolent figure positioned above others, guiding them from an elevated vantage point. Although the language softened, the underlying symbolic pattern remained: leadership as dominance, control, and rational supervision.

A major spiral point emerged in the late 20th century. Greenleaf’s (1970) concept of servant leadership inverted the traditional hierarchy by presenting the leader as one who serves first. Burns’ (1978) theory of transformational leadership reframed leadership as a process of mutual elevation through shared values and moral purpose. Subsequent work on authentic, humble, **and** emotionally intelligent leadership (e.g., Goleman, 1995; Owens & Hekman, 2012) further emphasized empathy, self-awareness, and relational presence.

These developments marked a symbolic inversion:

- from control to empowerment,
- from dominance to serving,
- from authority to authenticity,
- from certainty to reflection,
- from separation to relationality,
- from abstraction to embodiment.

In contemporary contexts shaped by digitalization and hybrid work, leadership is increasingly understood as distributed, co-created, and relational. The heroic figure of the single decisive leader gives way to a more human image: the leader as participant in a field of meaning, relationships, and embodied interaction. This historical transition provides the background for the Symbolic Spiral model.

1.1.2 Leadership as a Symbolic Function

This spiral in leadership theory can be fruitfully interpreted through Ernst Cassirer's notion of *Homo Symbolicus* – the human as a meaning-making being who inhabits symbolic worlds rather than merely reacting to physical stimuli. For Cassirer (1944), language, myth, art, and ritual are not decorative additions to reality; they constitute the frameworks through which reality becomes intelligible.

From this perspective, leadership is intrinsically symbolic. Before it becomes a set of techniques or results, leadership operates as a process of creating, sustaining, and transforming meaning. Leaders work with stories, metaphors, rituals, and values; they shape the symbolic environment in which organizational life unfolds. Jeffrey Pfeffer's work on symbolic management (Pfeffer, 1981) highlights how leadership actions often function less as technical interventions and more as visible gestures that stabilize uncertainty, affirm identity, or signal change.

Peter Drucker's (Drucker, 2006) description of the manager as a "social architect" reinforces this view. Managers design and maintain the cultural architecture – norms, expectations, and interpretive frames – within which people make sense of their work and relationships. Leadership, therefore, can be seen as a symbolic act that organizes experience and coordinates collective action.

Yet the same symbolic power that enables leadership to orient meaning (Schein E. H., 2010); (Schein & Schein, 2018) can also generate abstraction and distance. In contemporary organizations, symbolic content has multiplied: mission statements, value lists, dashboards, branding campaigns, and digital communication platforms create dense symbolic environments. As these symbols proliferate, they can become detached from the embodied realities of work, resulting in symbolic saturation and cognitive overload.

This tension invites a crucial question: What happens when leadership remains rich in symbols but poor in embodiment?

1.2 Theoretical Foundations: Developmental, Cultural, and Integral Perspectives

1.2.1 Graves' Spiral Dynamics and Developmental Complexity

Clare W. Graves' work, later developed as Spiral Dynamics (Beck & Cowan, 2005), conceptualizes human and organizational evolution as a sequence of expanding value systems and worldviews. Each level represents a distinct way of assigning meaning, managing complexity, and responding to life conditions.

Within this framework, leadership evolution can be understood as movement through increasingly complex symbolic and cognitive configurations. The transition from heroic to humble, from controlling to collaborative, mirrors broader cultural developments toward empathy, pluralism, and systemic thinking. Importantly, Spiral Dynamics suggests that higher levels of development are not only cognitively more complex but also potentially more integrated in terms of values and relational awareness.

1.2.2 Culture and "Tribes": Leadership as Stage-Shifting

Logan, King, and Fischer-Wright's (2008) Tribal Leadership adds a cultural lens by proposing that organizations naturally form into "tribes" bound by shared language and narratives. Leadership effectiveness, in this view, depends on the ability to shift the cultural

THE EMBODIED SPIRAL OF MEANING: REIMAGINING LEADERSHIP THROUGH SYMBOLIC, REFLECTIVE, AND SOMATIC INTEGRATION

stage of the tribe: to move from self-focused and competitive narratives toward more collaborative, purposeful, and trusting ones.

Here again, leadership is primarily a symbolic–cultural function. The leader works with the language through which people interpret themselves and others. Elevating the tribe’s stage means transforming the symbolic patterns that structure relationships and identity.

1.2.3 Wilber’s Integral Theory: All Quadrants, All Levels

Ken Wilber’s Integral Theory (Wilber, 2000) offers a multidimensional map for understanding leadership and organizational life. The AQAL framework (“all quadrants, all levels, all lines, all states, all types”) emphasizes that any phenomenon has at least four irreducible dimensions:

- **Interior–Individual (I):** thoughts, emotions, intentions, meaning, consciousness.
- **Interior–Collective (We):** culture, shared values, worldviews, meaning-making systems.
- **Exterior–Individual (It):** observable behaviors, skills, biological processes.
- **Exterior–Collective (Its):** social systems, structures, institutions, technologies.

Leadership, in this perspective, cannot be reduced to behavior or personality alone. It emerges at the intersection of subjective meaning, shared culture, observable action, and systemic structures. Development unfolds through levels of complexity (e.g., egocentric → ethnocentric → worldcentric → integral), and along multiple “lines” such as cognitive, emotional, interpersonal, moral, somatic, and spiritual development. Leaders may be advanced cognitively but underdeveloped somatically, or emotionally mature yet symbolically constrained.

Integral approaches thus resonate strongly with the Symbolic Spiral, which also insists that leadership be understood across symbolic (meaning), cognitive–reflective (understanding), and somatic (embodied being) dimensions.

1.3 The Symbolic Spiral of Leadership: Conceptual Framework

1.3.1 The Homo Triad: Symbolic, Reflective, and Somatic

Bringing these theoretical strands together, the Symbolic Spiral of Leadership conceptualizes leadership as an evolving interaction among three modes of human existence:

- *Homo Symbolicus* – the meaning-maker who constructs reality through symbols, narratives, and rituals.
- *Homo Cognoscens* – the reflective knower who interprets, questions, and reorients those symbolic systems.
- *Homo Somaticus* – the embodied being who senses, attunes, and inhabits meaning through the body.

These three are not stages to be passed through once and for all; they are dimensions that continually interact in a spiral movement. Each addresses a distinct philosophical question:

1. How do I process and understand the world? (cognitive–reflective)
2. How do I assign meaning to the world within and around me? (symbolic)
3. How do I embody this meaning through presence and action? (somatic)

The ongoing integration of these dimensions gives rise to *Homo Integralis* – a mode of leadership in which meaning, reflection, and embodiment mutually reinforce each other.

1.3.2 Homo Symbolicus: Leadership as Meaning Construction

In the organizational context, *Homo Symbolicus* appears where leaders act as constructors of shared meaning. Drawing on Cassirer (1944), we can say that leaders do not simply operate in a material environment; they inhabit and shape symbolic worlds. Vision

statements, cultural rituals, metaphors for change, and the everyday language used in meetings all contribute to a symbolic architecture that orients people's experience.

Leadership in this dimension includes:

- articulating purpose and identity,
- crafting narratives that make sense of uncertainty,
- designing rituals that embody values,
- curating the language through which success and failure are interpreted.

Symbolic leadership gives organizations psychological coherence and a sense of direction. Yet, as noted above, when symbols proliferate without deeper grounding, they risk becoming abstractions. The Symbolic Spiral therefore insists that symbolic activity must be complemented by reflective and somatic dimensions.

1.3.3 Homo Cognoscens: Leadership as Reflective Awareness

The second dimension, *Homo Cognoscens*, captures the capacity for critical awareness and double-loop learning (Argyris & Schön, 1996). Here leadership is not only about constructing meaning but also about examining how meaning is constructed. Leaders ask:

- Do our narratives still correspond to lived experience?
- Which assumptions shape our strategies and relationships?
- How do our symbolic systems include or exclude different perspectives?
- What values are genuinely enacted, rather than merely proclaimed?

This reflective dimension draws on Schön's (1983) notion of the *reflective practitioner*, who engages in ongoing inquiry into their own practice. It is the hinge that connects symbolic expression with embodied awareness (Paul, 2021). Without reflective alignment, symbolic leadership can drift into cynicism or manipulation; with it, symbolic systems become more ethically grounded and responsive to reality.

1.3.4 Homo Somaticus: Leadership as Embodied Presence

The third dimension, *Homo Somaticus*, refers to the human being as a sensing, moving, and relational body. Merleau-Ponty's (1962) phenomenology emphasizes that perception and cognition are rooted in bodily experience; Gendlin (1978) speaks of the "felt sense" as a pre-conceptual bodily knowing that guides meaningful action. Porges (2022) views the somatic dimension of human being and doing in the polyvagal theory.

In leadership, the somatic dimension includes:

- grounded presence and nervous system regulation,
- emotional awareness and self-management,
- relational attunement and resonance,
- authenticity expressed through congruent gestures and behavior,
- the capacity to sense subtle dynamics in teams and contexts.

Leadership becomes not only a matter of *what* is said, but *how* it is lived in posture, tone, timing, and relational rhythm. In this sense, embodiment is not an add-on practice but a foundational condition for trust and coherence.

1.3.5 Homo Integralis and the Embodied Spiral

When *Homo Symbolicus*, *Homo Cognoscens*, and *Homo Somaticus* interact as one system, they generate the field of *Homo Integralis* – leadership as embodied meaning. In this integrative mode:

- Symbols provide meaning (vision, values, narratives).
- Reflection provides understanding (awareness, critique, ethical orientation).
- Embodiment provides coherence (alignment between words, actions, and being).

THE EMBODIED SPIRAL OF MEANING: REIMAGINING LEADERSHIP THROUGH SYMBOLIC, REFLECTIVE, AND SOMATIC INTEGRATION

Leadership then appears as a spiral movement rather than a static identity. Leaders cycle through symbolic construction, reflective examination, and embodied integration. Over time, this rhythm deepens coherence between what the organization proclaims and how it is actually lived.

2 Main Title (Results)

2.1 From Meaning to Embodiment in Organizational Evolution

2.1.1 The Gap Between Symbolic Articulation and Lived Reality

Many contemporary organizations have invested heavily in the symbolic dimension: values lists, mission statements, leadership messages, and corporate storytelling. Yet, a recurring pattern emerges in practice:

- Symbolic overload – values and narratives accumulate faster than they can be enacted.
- Cognitive saturation – information flows multiply, but integration lags behind.
- Embodiment deficit – people understand organizational meaning cognitively but do not feel it somatically.
- Cultural dissonance – proclaimed values diverge from experienced behavior and emotional climate.

The Symbolic Spiral of Leadership suggests that meaning becomes truly transformative only when it is embodied. The movement from meaning to embodiment requires conscious integration of symbolic, reflective, and somatic dimensions.

2.1.2 Reconnecting Symbolic and Somatic Realities

Organizational theory has often treated symbolic and somatic realities separately. Symbolic approaches focus on culture, vision, and discourse; somatic approaches arise in discussions of well-being, mindfulness, and stress management. Yet, organizational evolution depends precisely on their convergence. Symbols shape meaning; bodies anchor meaning in experience.

Graves' developmental view supports this convergence. Higher stages of organizational evolution involve not only greater cognitive complexity but also richer emotional and embodied coherence. When symbolic meaning aligns with somatic reality – when people can feel in their bodies what the organization stands for – cultures become more resilient and trustworthy.

In practical terms, reconnecting symbolic and somatic dimensions involves:

- noticing when organizational narratives produce tension or dissonance in the body;
- allowing embodied feedback (fatigue, anxiety, enthusiasm) to inform reflective sense-making;
- adjusting symbolic messages to be more congruent with lived realities;
- creating spaces where people can speak from experience, not only from role.

2.1.3 Organizational Functions Across Three Dimensions

The Symbolic Spiral clarifies how the three dimensions correspond to core organizational functions:

- Symbolic dimension → identity and meaning
 - vision, values, cultural narratives, collective stories;
- Cognitive dimension → reflection and adaptation
 - learning systems, inquiry, strategic sensing, feedback loops;
- Somatic dimension → presence and well-being
 - trust, emotional regulation, psychological safety, embodied climate.

Organizations thrive when these three systems operate not as separate domains but as an integrated field. Strategic change, for example, becomes more sustainable when new narratives (symbolic) are co-constructed through dialogue (cognitive) and supported by practices that regulate stress and build trust (somatic) (Shusterman, 2008).

2.1.4 Embodied Leadership in Practice

Insights from teaching, coaching, and organizational observation (Edmondson, 2019) show that leaders make different decisions when they reconnect with their felt sense. Ricoeur (1992) discusses these symbolic and embodied fields in his work “Oneself as Another”.

In leadership development sessions, when participants are invited to pause, inhabit their bodies, and notice sensations before responding, they often shift from automatic reactivity to more grounded and ethical choices.

Similarly, teams that integrate brief somatic practices – such as collective breathing, attention to posture, or embodied check-ins – report higher levels of trust and psychological safety. Hybrid meetings become less draining when leaders intentionally cultivate presence rather than treating interaction as a purely cognitive exchange.

These patterns indicate that organizational evolution is not merely structural or strategic; it is experiential. The Embodied Spiral of Meaning provides a language for understanding and designing these experiences.

2.2 Implications for Leadership Development and Organizational Learning

2.2.1 Beyond Cognitive Mastery

Most leadership programs still emphasize cognitive mastery: frameworks, models, analytical tools, and strategic thinking. While these are necessary, they activate only part of human leadership capacity. The Symbolic Spiral suggests that leadership development must expand to include:

- Symbolic literacy – understanding how meaning is created, communicated, and culturally encoded.
- Reflective intelligence – the capacity to examine assumptions, narratives, and systemic patterns.
- Somatic awareness – the ability to sense, regulate, and embody presence in relational contexts.

These three forms of intelligence underlie *Homo Integralis*. Without them, leaders struggle to navigate complexity or sustain meaning under pressure.

2.2.2 Reflective and Somatic Pedagogies

Educational design that aims to cultivate integrated leadership needs to go beyond lectures and case studies. It should incorporate reflective and somatic pedagogies (Shusterman, 2021), such as:

- grounding and centering practices;
- mindful pauses and embodied awareness exercises;
- reflective journaling and inquiry-based dialogue;
- movement-based inquiry and somatic metaphor work;
- embodied storytelling, where values are expressed through gesture and presence;
- decision-making processes that explicitly engage the felt sense.

Such pedagogies invite learners to engage with leadership not only as an intellectual topic but as a lived experience. They support the alignment of symbolic language with embodied integrity.

THE EMBODIED SPIRAL OF MEANING: REIMAGINING LEADERSHIP THROUGH SYMBOLIC, REFLECTIVE, AND SOMATIC INTEGRATION

2.2.3 Organizational Development as Tri-Dimensional Integration

From an organizational perspective, development initiatives often focus on strategy, structure, or culture design. The Symbolic Spiral suggests that durable transformation depends on tri-dimensional integration:

- Symbolic: clarification and renewal of narratives, values, and purpose.
- Cognitive: creation of learning infrastructures – feedback systems, reflective spaces, and cross-level dialogue.
- Somatic: cultivation of emotional climate, trust, and well-being as strategic priorities.

Organizations that attend to all three dimensions tend to display greater resilience and adaptive capacity. They can hold complexity without collapsing into chaos or rigid control because meaning, reflection, and embodiment support each other.

Conclusions

Leadership today stands at a threshold. Digital acceleration, hybrid communication, and existential uncertainty have undermined the sufficiency of traditional foundations such as symbolic authority, rational control, and purely cognitive dominance. At the same time, the proliferation of organizational narratives and information flows has intensified a sense of fragmentation and disembodiment.

The Embodied Spiral of Meaning proposed in this paper offers a conceptual framework for reimagining leadership and organizational evolution. It brings together Homo Symbolicus, Homo Cognoscens, and Homo Somaticus as interdependent dimensions of human existence that must be integrated rather than prioritized in isolation. Leadership becomes an ongoing movement between meaning, reflection, and embodiment – a spiral rather than a straight line.

In this view, the next stage of leadership evolution is not upward into further abstraction, but inward toward deeper coherence between meaning and being. Symbols remain essential, but they must be continually tested through reflective inquiry and grounded in embodied presence. Reflection remains vital, but it must be connected to lived experience, not only to conceptual analysis. Somatic awareness becomes not a peripheral wellness practice but a central capacity for ethical, relational, and sustainable leadership.

For organizations, this implies that evolution is an experiential process. Values cannot remain at the level of discourse; they must be enacted in emotional climate, relational rhythm, and everyday gestures. Strategic adaptability cannot rely on data alone; it must include reflective insight and somatic sensing. Well-being cannot be outsourced to HR; it must be woven into the ways leaders inhabit their roles and relationships.

By articulating leadership as a symbolic–reflective–somatic field, the Embodied Spiral of Meaning offers both a philosophical lens and a practical orientation. It invites leaders, educators, and organizations to treat integration itself as a form of wisdom: the capacity to unite meaning, reflection, and embodied presence in the ongoing creation of organizational life.

REFERENCES

1. Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1996). *Organizational learning II: Theory, method, and practice*. Addison-Wesley.
2. Beck, D. E., & Cowan, C. C. (2005). *Spiral dynamics: Mastering values, leadership and change*. Wiley-Blackwell.
3. Burns, M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.
4. Carlyle, T. (1840). *Chartism and an essay collection, Critical and Miscellaneous Essays*. (Vols. 1–4). Brown and Taggard.
5. Cassirer, E. (1944). *An essay on man: An introduction to a philosophy of human culture*. Yale University Press.

6. Drucker, P. F. (2006). *The effective executive*. HarperCollins.
7. Edmondson, A. C. (2019). *The fearless organization: Creating psychological safety in the workplace for learning, innovation, and growth*. Wiley.
8. Galton, F. (1869). *Hereditary genius*. Macmillan.
9. Gendlin, E. T. (1978). *Focusing*. Bantam.
10. Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. Bantam.
11. Graves, C. W. (2005). *The never ending quest: Clare W. Graves explores human nature*. ECLET Publishing.
12. Logan, D., King, J., & Fischer-Wright, H. (2008). *Tribal leadership: Leveraging natural groups to build a thriving organization*. HarperCollins.
13. Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *Phenomenology of perception* (C. Smith, Trans.). Routledge.
14. Owens, B. P., & Hekman, D. R. (2012). Modeling how to grow: An inductive examination of humble leader behaviors, contingencies, and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(4), 787–818.
15. Paul, A. M. (2021). *The extended mind: The power of thinking outside the brain*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
16. Pfeffer, J. (1981). *Management as symbolic action: The creation and maintenance of organizational paradigms*. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 3, 1–52.
17. Porges, S. W. (2022). *Polyvagal safety: Attachment, communication, self-regulation*. W. W. Norton.
18. Ricoeur, P. (1992). *Oneself as another* (K. Blamey, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.
19. Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books.
20. Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
21. Schein, E. H., & Schein, P. A. (2018). *Humble leadership: The power of relationships, openness, and trust*. Berrett-Koehler.
22. Shusterman, R. (2008). *Body consciousness: A philosophy of mindfulness and somaesthetics*. Cambridge University Press.
23. Shusterman, R. (2021). *Aesthetics and the soma: Essays on somaesthetics and embodiment*. Brill.
24. Wilber, K. (2000). *Integral psychology: Consciousness, spirit, psychology, therapy*. Shambhala.