UDC 101:316.3:316.6+005.32:004
DOI https://doi.org/10.32782/hst-2026-26-103-06

A META-ANALYSIS OF THE PHENOMENON OF LEADER CONSCIOUSNESS IN THE CONTEXT OF CONTEMPORARY DIGITAL TRANSFORMATIONS

LEPSKYI, MAKSYM[1]

Abstract

This article examines the theoretical and methodological foundations for understanding the phenomenon of leader consciousness in the context of contemporary digital transformations. Leader consciousness is conceptualized as an integrative cognitive and meaning-making capacity through which interpretation, decision-making, and coordination are realized within a socio-technical environment that combines human and digital elements. The study aims to define leader consciousness as a form of socio-cognitive mediation that enables leaders to navigate complexity, uncertainty, and distributed agency in digitally saturated environments. The research is grounded in an interdisciplinary framework integrating social philosophy, sociology, organizational studies, and digital transformation research. To achieve this aim, the following objectives are defined: to carry out a conceptual synthesis of classical philosophical and sociological approaches to understanding consciousness; to analyze the evolution of managerial thinking in modern organizational theory; to identify the impact of digitalization on the transformation of the cognitive structure of leadership; to substantiate a model of leader consciousness as an integrative mechanism of interaction between human beings, knowledge, and the technological environment.The findings suggest that leader consciousness functions not merely as an individual psychological attribute but as a relational and processual phenomenon emerging within networks of human–technology interaction. This reconceptualization allows leadership to be understood as a dynamic meaning-making process embedded in socio-technical systems. The article demonstrates that leader consciousness becomes a key factor in shaping adaptive governance, organizational resilience, and collective sensemaking under conditions of rapid technological change. In sum, the study argues for a reconceptualization of leadership as a phenomenon situated at the intersection of technological change, epistemological evolution, and the transformation of human subjectivity. Understanding this intersection is essential for explaining the character of leadership in the twenty-first century and for developing theoretical frameworks capable of addressing the challenges of increasingly complex digital societies.

Keywords: leader consciousness; digital transformation; meta-analysis; distributed cognition; sensemaking; socio-technical systems.

Problem Statement. An analysis of the contemporary scholarly field demonstrates that the study of leadership under conditions of digital transformation unfolds at the intersection of several disciplinary traditions that historically developed relatively autonomously but increasingly interact today. Their convergence forms a theoretical horizon within which the phenomenon of leader consciousness can be interpreted as a specific form of social subjectivity that transforms together with changing types of knowledge, rationality, and technological mediation of action.

Contemporary scholarship thus indicates that leadership research in the digital era emerges precisely through this interdisciplinary convergence, which creates a new analytical framework for understanding leader consciousness not merely as an individual psychological attribute but as a historically evolving mode of socio-cognitive organization shaped by transformations in epistemic structures and technological environments.

Classical socio-philosophical approaches laid the ontological foundations for such an analysis. In Edmund Husserl's phenomenology, consciousness is understood as an intentional process of constituting the meaning of experience (Husserl, 1913/19837). Let us recall Husserl's classic statement: «The fact that pure phenomenology is not psychology is in no respect altered by the fact that phenomenology has to do with4 "consciousness," with all sorts of mental processes, acts and act correlates. What with the prevailing habits of thinking, to achieve an insight into that indeed requires no little effort» (Husserl, 1913/1983, p. XIX). Max Weber's sociology of meaningful social action demonstrates that any action is oriented toward others through its subjective meaning (Weber, 1922/1978). The further development of this logic in George Herbert Mead's symbolic interactionism shows that the self is formed through processes of communicative interaction (Mead, 1934). Thus, already in classical theories leadership is implicitly understood as

[1] Zaporizhzhya National University (Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine)
E-mail: waysensey@gmail.com
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5604-641X

a phenomenon of meaning production rather than merely a position of authority.

In modern organizational theory these insights acquire an applied dimension. Herbert Simon's concept of bounded rationality demonstrates that managerial decisions are made under conditions of uncertainty and cognitive limitation (Simon, 1947/1997). Developing the theory of sensemaking, Karl Weick interprets the organization as a continuous process of explaining events, in which the leader performs the role of an interpreter of complexity (Weick, 1995). In this context, leadership appears as a cognitive-interpretive activity.

Postmodern social theory radicalized this perspective. Michel Foucault demonstrated the historical variability of forms of knowledge and subjectivity (Foucault, 1969/1982), while Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann substantiated the social construction of reality as the result of institutionalized meanings (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Within this framework, the unity of the subject is no longer regarded as given, which opens the possibility of analyzing leadership under conditions of multiple interpretations.

The transition to the digital age has provided these theoretical positions with new empirical specificity. Manuel Castells's theory of the network society showed that social structure is increasingly organized around flows of information (Castells, 1996). Studies of digital transformation in organizations demonstrate that leadership shifts from control to the coordination of distributed knowledge (Westerman et al., 2014).

Recent scholarship on algorithmic and AI-mediated management indicates that digital systems assume part of the analytical functions but cannot replace human interpretive judgment and responsibility (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). Studies of leadership in a digitalized context emphasize the transition toward network-based forms of decision-making and collective cognition (Westerman et al., 2014; Лепський, 2025).

At the same time, cognitive science has developed the concept of extended and distributed cognition. Edwin Hutchins substantiated the model of distributed cognition as a process occurring within the system "human – environment – artifacts" (Hutchins, 1995), while Andy Clark described thinking as extending beyond the brain and realized through interaction with technological structures (Clark, 2010). «extended consciousness» These approaches make it possible to explain the transformation of leader consciousness in the digital era.

Thus, contemporary research demonstrates a consistent evolution–from classical theories of consciousness to concepts of distributed cognition–yet a methodological gap persists between these directions. Most studies analyze either technological change or organizational practices, leaving aside the transformation of the very structure of the managerial subject's consciousness. Overcoming this theoretical fragmentation constitutes the central scholarly problem of this article.

At the same time, classical socio-philosophical approaches allow these transformations to be interpreted not as a radical rupture but as a new stage in the historical development of social consciousness. Within the Ukrainian socio-philosophical tradition, it is emphasized that a human being appropriates the world not only practically but also spiritually, and that social consciousness represents "a totality of ideal forms… that reflect social being while simultaneously performing a prognostic, anticipatory function" (Воловик та ін., 2011, с.181). This position makes it possible to interpret digital leadership as a new form of realization of historically developed mechanisms of meaning production.

The aim of the article is a meta-analytical interpretation of the phenomenon of leader consciousness under conditions of contemporary digital transformations as a specific form of socio-cognitive mediation that ensures the integration of distributed knowledge, the interpretation of complexity, and the coordination of action in socio-technical systems.

To achieve this aim, the following objectives are defined:

– to carry out a conceptual synthesis of classical philosophical and sociological approaches to understanding consciousness;

– to analyze the evolution of managerial thinking in modern organizational theory;

– to identify the impact of digitalization on the transformation of the cognitive structure of leadership;

– to substantiate a model of leader consciousness as an integrative mechanism of interaction between human beings, knowledge, and the technological environment.

Methodology of the Study. The methodological framework of this research is grounded in an interdisciplinary synthesis combining socio-philosophical reflection, organizational theory, and contemporary approaches in cognitive science. Such a synthesis makes it possible to analyze leader consciousness not merely as an individual psychological phenomenon

but as a historically conditioned form of socio-cognitive mediation.

The philosophical basis of the study derives from phenomenology and social constructivism. Phenomenology interprets consciousness as an intentional process of constituting meaning within experience (Husserl, 1913/1983), whereas social constructivism demonstrates that reality is produced and stabilized through institutionalized patterns of interpretation (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). «Consciousness is always intentional; it always intends or is directed towards objects. We can never apprehend some putative substratum of consciousness as such, only conscious ness of something or other» (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p.34). These approaches allow leadership to be examined as a dynamic process of meaning formation embedded in social interaction.

The sociological dimension relies on interpretive sociology and theories of communicative action, according to which social order is reproduced through meaningful orientation toward others (Weber, 1922/1978). Symbolic interactionism further develops this perspective by emphasizing that the self emerges through communicative processes and shared symbols (Mead, 1934). Consequently, leadership can be conceptualized as a form of mediated coordination of interpretations within collective contexts.

Organizational theory provides the analytical tools for understanding how such processes unfold in managerial practice. The concept of bounded rationality shows that decision-making is always constrained by incomplete information and cognitive limitations (Simon, 1947/1997). Sensemaking theory, in turn, interprets organizing as an ongoing interpretive accomplishment through which actors construct plausible meanings in situations of uncertainty (Weick, 1995; Weick et al., 2005). These perspectives position the leader as an interpreter who reduces ambiguity rather than as a purely directive authority.

The transition to digital environments requires integrating insights from studies of technological transformation. Research on digitalization demonstrates that contemporary organizations operate through distributed informational flows and networked structures (Castells, 1996; 18). Within such environments, leadership increasingly involves coordinating knowledge that is dispersed across human and technological agents.

Cognitive science contributes the concept of distributed cognition, according to which thinking is not confined to the individual but is realized through systems of interaction among people, artifacts, and environments. For example, «The chart is the positional consciousness of the ship: the navigation fix is the ship's internal representation of its own location» (Hutchins, 1995, p.26). The theory of the extended mind further argues that technological instruments function as integral components of cognitive processes. «The dispositional beliefs, cognitive processes, perceptual mechanisms, and moods considered above all extend beyond the borders of consciousness, and it is plausible that it is precisely the nonconscious part of them that is extended» (Clark, 2010, p. xiv). These ideas provide a theoretical explanation for the transformation of managerial subjectivity under conditions of digital mediation.

Finally, contemporary management studies emphasize the growing interaction between artificial intelligence and human judgment, describing this relationship not as replacement but as augmentation, where technological systems enhance analytical capacities while responsibility for interpretation remains human (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). This methodological insight supports the interpretation of leader consciousness as an integrative mechanism linking algorithmic processing and human reflexivity.

Thus, the methodological strategy of this article may be defined as a meta-analytical integration of classical theories of consciousness, sociological interpretations of action, organizational studies of decision-making, and cognitive approaches to distributed intelligence. This integration enables a comprehensive analysis of how leadership is reconfigured within socio-technical environments of the digital age.

Results and Theoretical Integration. The conducted meta-analysis makes it possible to interpret the transformation of leadership in the digital age not as a replacement of traditional managerial functions but as a reconfiguration of the cognitive architecture through which coordination, interpretation, and decision-making are realized.

Classical theories of consciousness emphasized intentionality, meaning, and intersubjectivity as the foundations of social action (Husserl, 1913/1983; Mead, 1934; Weber, 1922/1978). In these approaches, consciousness functioned as the medium through which actors constituted reality and oriented themselves toward others. Organizational theory translated this insight into the language of management, demonstrating that decision-making always unfolds under

conditions of bounded rationality and interpretive uncertainty (Simon, 1947/1997; Weick, 1995). Thus, leadership historically emerged as a mechanism for reducing complexity through shared interpretation.

Digital transformation alters the conditions under which this interpretive function operates. Network structures reorganize social interaction around flows of information rather than stable institutional hierarchies (Castells, 1996). As a result, authority becomes less associated with positional control and more with the capacity to integrate distributed knowledge and coordinate meaning across heterogeneous actors (Westerman et al., 2014).

At the same time, contemporary technological systems increasingly participate in analytical and organizational processes. Research on artificial intelligence in management demonstrates the emergence of an "automation–augmentation" relationship, in which digital tools extend rather than eliminate human cognitive capacities (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). This shift requires reconsidering leadership not as individual command but as a hybrid configuration of human judgment and technological mediation.

Insights from cognitive science provide a conceptual language for understanding this shift. The theory of distributed cognition shows that thinking is enacted through systems that include individuals, artifacts, and environments (Hutchins, 1995). The extended-mind thesis further explains that technological infrastructures function as components of cognitive activity itself (Clark, 2010). Consequently, managerial consciousness must be understood as partially externalized and embedded in socio-technical networks.

From this perspective, leader consciousness acquires an integrative character. It operates as a mediating interface that connects symbolic interpretation, organizational memory, and algorithmic processing into a coherent orientation for action. Rather than exercising unilateral control, the leader coordinates multiple epistemic sources and transforms fragmented data into collectively meaningful narratives.

This transformation corresponds to broader changes in the structure of modernity described in social theory. The shift toward fluid, reflexive, and knowledge-based social forms requires new mechanisms of coherence capable of operating under conditions of uncertainty and constant change (Floridi, 2014). Leadership thus becomes a process of maintaining interpretive continuity within dynamically evolving environments.

The meta-analytical synthesis therefore suggests that digitalization does not abolish the classical functions of consciousness identified in phenomenology and sociology but redistributes them across networks of humans and technologies. Leader consciousness persists as a central organizing principle, yet it now operates through distributed cognitive ecologies rather than isolated individual agency.

Conceptual Model of Leader Consciousness in the Digital Era. On the basis of the conducted meta-analysis, leader consciousness in the context of digital transformation can be conceptualized as a multi-layered integrative formation that performs a mediating function between human interpretive capacities, organizational structures, and technological infrastructures.

At the foundational level, leader consciousness retains the intentional and meaning-constituting character described in phenomenological philosophy, where consciousness is directed toward the constitution of experience and the ordering of reality (Husserl, 1913/1983). This intentional orientation is socially articulated through communicative interaction, within which shared meanings and identities are constructed (Mead, 1934; Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Thus, even in technologically saturated environments, leadership remains rooted in intersubjective processes of understanding.

At the organizational level, this interpretive function becomes operationalized through decision-making under conditions of bounded rationality and uncertainty (Simon, 1947/1997). Leadership here manifests as the capacity to organize sensemaking processes that enable collective orientation in complex situations (Weick, 1995; Weick et al., 2005). The leader does not eliminate ambiguity but structures it into actionable interpretations.

Digital transformation introduces a new structural dimension. Network-based forms of social organization redistribute knowledge across interconnected nodes rather than concentrating it within hierarchical authority (Castells, 1996). Consequently, leadership increasingly involves coordinating distributed informational resources and facilitating collaboration across hybrid human–technological systems (Westerman et al., 2014).

From the perspective of cognitive science, this shift corresponds to the emergence of distributed and extended cognition, in which thinking processes unfold through interactions between individuals, artifacts, and environments (Hutchins, 1995; Clark, 2010). Technological systems therefore function not

merely as external tools but as components embedded within cognitive activity itself.

At the socio-cultural level, these transformations reflect broader changes associated with the transition to reflexive and fluid forms of modernity, where stability is replaced by continuous reinterpretation and adaptation (Floridi, 2014). Under such conditions, leadership acquires the role of sustaining coherence across dynamically changing contexts.

Finally, the interaction between artificial intelligence and managerial practice demonstrates that contemporary organizations increasingly rely on augmentation models, where algorithmic analysis supports but does not replace human judgment (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). Leader consciousness thus emerges as an interface that integrates computational outputs with ethical responsibility and contextual interpretation.

In summary, the proposed model represents leader consciousness as an *integrative socio-cognitive mechanism characterized* by five interrelated dimensions:

Intentional–interpretive, grounded in phenomenological constitution of meaning (Husserl, 1913/1983);

Communicative–intersubjective, formed through social interaction and shared symbolic frameworks (Mead, 1934; Berger & Luckmann, 1966);

Organizational–sensemaking, enabling coordinated action under conditions of uncertainty (Simon, 1947/1997; Weick, 1995);

Distributed–technological, embedded in networked and digitally mediated cognitive systems (Castells, 1996; Hutchins, 1995; Clark, 2010).

Reflexive–integrative, ensuring coherence between human responsibility and algorithmic augmentation (Floridi, 2014; Raisch & Krakowski, 2021).

These dimensions should be understood not as separate stages but as simultaneously operating layers of a unified process through which leadership is enacted in contemporary socio-technical environments.

The meta-analytical investigation conducted in this article demonstrates that the phenomenon of leadership in the digital era should not be interpreted as a rupture with classical socio-philosophical understandings of consciousness but rather as their transformation under new socio-technical conditions.

Classical phenomenological and sociological theories established that consciousness functions as a meaning-constituting and intersubjectively mediated process through which social reality is interpreted and coordinated (Husserl, 1913/1983; Mead, 1934; Weber, 1922/1978). Organizational theory translated this insight into the analysis of managerial activity, showing that leadership historically operated as a mechanism for reducing uncertainty and enabling collective sensemaking (14; 16).

Digital transformation has altered not the essence of these functions but the environment in which they are realized. Networked structures redistribute knowledge across informational flows (Castells, 1996), while technological systems increasingly participate in analytical processes without eliminating the need for human interpretation and responsibility (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). Cognitive science confirms this shift by demonstrating that thinking is distributed across human and technological components (Hutchins, 1995; Clark, 2010).

As a result, leader consciousness today should be understood as an integrative socio-cognitive mechanism that connects intentional interpretation, communicative interaction, organizational coordination, and technologically mediated cognition into a unified process of orienting action within complex environments. Leadership thus becomes less a matter of hierarchical authority and more a function of maintaining coherence across distributed systems of knowledge and decision-making.

The study therefore substantiates the thesis that digitalization does not replace the human dimension of leadership but reconfigures its mode of realization. Leader consciousness persists as the central coordinating instance of meaning, yet it now operates within hybrid socio-technical constellations characterized by reflexivity, networkedness, and cognitive externalization.

Conclusions and Directions for Further Research. The conducted meta-analysis has demonstrated that the phenomenon of leader consciousness cannot be adequately explained within the boundaries of traditional leadership studies focused primarily on behavioral competencies or managerial techniques. Instead, leadership must be understood as a historically evolving form of socio-cognitive organization that reflects broader transformations in knowledge systems, technological environments, and structures of social interaction.

The study has shown that the evolution of leader consciousness unfolds through several epistemological configurations. Classical philosophy conceptualized consciousness as an intentional and rational center of action responsible for the constitution of meaning and the maintenance of social order. Modern organizational theory introduced the recog-

nition of bounded rationality and uncertainty, redefining leadership as a process of interpretation and coordination rather than control. Postmodern social thought destabilized the idea of a unified subject, revealing the multiplicity of discursive frameworks within which leadership operates. Finally, the digital era has materialized this plurality through technological infrastructures that distribute cognition across human and non-human actors.

Within this context, leader consciousness emerges as an integrative mechanism that connects heterogeneous sources of knowledge, mediates between algorithmic analytics and human judgment, and ensures the transformation of distributed information into meaningful and responsible action. The research substantiates that digital transformation affects not only managerial instruments but also the anthropological model of leadership itself, shifting its foundation from possession of knowledge to the capacity for integration, reflexivity, and coordination under conditions of complexity.

The scientific novelty of the study lies in reorienting leadership analysis from functional or behavioral descriptions toward an examination of consciousness as a socio-historical form of subjectivity. Leadership is thus interpreted not as a fixed set of competencies but as a dynamic mode of organizing experience that evolves together with technological and cultural change.

The findings also indicate that digitalization does not eliminate the role of the human subject; rather, it redefines leadership as a responsibility for aligning technological possibilities with social meaning, ethical evaluation, and collective action. In this sense, the leader functions as a mediator between distributed cognition and normative orientation within socio-technical systems.

Directions for Further Research. Further research may develop this perspective along several interrelated trajectories:

Empirical Operationalization of Leader Consciousness.

Future studies may elaborate methodological tools for analyzing how integrative cognitive functions are manifested in real organizational and digital environments.

Interdisciplinary Dialogue between Leadership Studies and Cognitive Science.

The concept of distributed cognition opens possibilities for integrating sociological, philosophical, and neurocognitive approaches to leadership.

Ethical and Normative Dimensions of Algorithmically Mediated Decision-Making.As digital systems increasingly participate in governance processes, the question of responsibility, accountability, and human judgment requires deeper theoretical elaboration.

Comparative Analysis of Leadership Models across Socio-Technical Contexts.

Different institutional and cultural environments may produce distinct configurations of leader consciousness in response to digital transformation.

Theoretical Development of Leadership as a Form of Social Subjectivity in Complex Societies.

This direction involves further refinement of the conceptual language linking leadership theory with broader socio-philosophical analyses of contemporary transformations.

In sum, the study argues for a reconceptualization of leadership as a phenomenon situated at the intersection of technological change, epistemological evolution, and the transformation of human subjectivity. Understanding this intersection is essential for explaining the character of leadership in the twenty-first century and for developing theoretical frameworks capable of addressing the challenges of increasingly complex digital societies.

Table 1

Comparative historical configurations of leader consciousness

Stage	Understanding of Consciousness	Type of Rationality	Role of the Leader	Nature of the Environment
Classical	Intentional unity of the subject	Substantive	Source of decisions	Stable order
Modern	Interpretive capacity	Bounded	Interpreter of complexity	Institutional uncertainty
Postmodern	Multiple construction of meanings	Discursive	Moderator of meanings	Pluralization of realities
Digital	Integrator of distributed cognition	Hybrid	Coordinator of human–technological action	Algorithmic complexity

Table 2

Transformation of the functions of consciousness across historical paradigms

Function	Classical	Modern	Postmodern	Digital Era
Meaning-making	Centralized	Interpretive	Contextual	Data-mediated
Identity	Stable	Role-based	Fragmented	Adaptive
Knowledge	Authoritative	Limited	Relativized	Networked
Decision-making	Individual	Organizational	Discursive	Socio-technical
Responsibility	Personal	Institutional	Symbolically distributed	Reflexive-integrative

Table 3

Forms of social consciousness and their transformation in the digital era

Form of Social Consciousness	Theoretical Content (According to the Source)	Textual–Conceptual Verification	What Changes in the Digital Era
Moral Consciousness	Regulates behavior through norms, values, and conceptions of the proper	Consciousness functions as a spiritual mode of appropriating reality through historically developed cultural forms	Ethics shifts toward digital responsibility: algorithmic ethics, issues of trust in AI, and new norms of online interaction
Religious Consciousness	Interprets the world through transcendental meanings and symbolic systems	Forms of consciousness reflect different modes of comprehending human activity	Emergence of mediatized spirituality: digital rituals and online communities of faith
Political Consciousness	Interprets power, interests, collective goals, and mechanisms of governance	Social activity is reflected in a plurality of forms of consciousness with distinct social functions	Formation of networked politicality: digital participation, platform governance, informational influence
Legal Consciousness	Reflects the normative-regulatory dimension of social life	Forms of consciousness differ by their object of reflection and social function	Transition toward digital law: regulation of data, cyberspace, and algorithmic decision-making
Aesthetic Consciousness	Comprehends reality through imagery, the value of form, and cultural symbols	Consciousness reflects activity in the full diversity of its manifestations	Dominance of visual-digital culture: interface design, media reality, and creative industries
Scientific Consciousness	Oriented toward the systematic production of knowledge and reflexive awareness of its own capacities	Its structure includes scientific self-consciousness as an evaluation of the subject's role in cognition	Development of data-driven cognition: big data analytics and human–algorithm co-thinking
Philosophical Consciousness	Generalizes the relation of thought to being and performs worldview reflection	Consciousness is not only reflection but also a relation to the world	Emergence of a meta-reflection on digital civilization: interpretation of artificial intelligence and techno-anthropology

References

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Penguin Books.

Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Castells, M. (1996). *The rise of the network society*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Clark, A. (2010). *Supersizing the mind: Embodiment, action, and cognitive extension*. Oxford University Press.

Floridi, L. (2014). *The fourth revolution: How the infosphere is reshaping human reality*. Oxford University Press.

Foucault, M. (1982). *The archaeology of knowledge* (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). Vintage. (Original work published 1969)

Husserl, E. (1983). *Ideas pertaining to a pure phenomenology and to a phenomenological philosophy* (F. Kersten, Trans.). Kluwer Academic Publishers. (Original work published 1913)

Hutchins, E. (1995). *Cognition in the wild*. MIT Press.

Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.

March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1993). *Organizations*. Wiley-Blackwell. (Original work published 1958)

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society*. University of Chicago Press.

Polanyi, M. (1966). *The tacit dimension*. University of Chicago Press.

Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation–augmentation paradox. *Academy of Management Review, 46*(1), 192–210. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0072

Simon, H. A. (1997). *Administrative behavior* (4th ed.). Free Press. (Original work published 1947)

Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology*. University of California Press. (Original work published 1922)

Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Sage.

Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the process of sensemaking. *Organization Science, 16*(4), 409–421. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1050.0133

Westerman, G., Bonnet, D., & McAfee, A. (2014). *Leading digital: Turning technology into business transformation*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Volovyk, V. I. (Ed.). (2011). *Sotsialna filosofiia* [Social philosophy]. Prosvita.

Voronkova, V., & Burashnikova, O. (2024). Synerhetychna metodolohiia doslidzhennia tsyfrovykh instrumentiv efektyvnoho funktsionuvannia podatkovoi systemy. *Tsyfrova ekonomika ta ekonomichna bezpeka, 1*(10), 60–66.

Voronkova, V., Kahanov, Y., Nikitenko, V., & Vasylchuk, H. (2022). Digital humanity paradigm 2.0. *Humanities Studies, 13*(90), 15–26.

Voronkova, V., & Nikitenko, V. (2022). *Filosofiia tsyfrovoi liudyny i tsyfrovoho suspilstva: teoriia i praktyka* [Philosophy of digital human and digital society: Theory and practice]. Liha-Pres.

Lepskyi, M. (2025). Osmyslennia poniattia "lider" u dydzhytalizovanomu sviti. *Humanities Studies, 22*(99), 57–67.

МАКСИМ, ЛЕПСЬКИЙ – доктор філософських наук, професор,
професор кафедри соціології Запорізького національного університету,
голова дослідницького комітету соціального прогнозування Соціологічної асоціації України,
академік Європейської академії наук України,
академік Української академії наук (Запоріжжя, Україна)
E-mail: waysensey@gmail.com
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5604-641X

МЕТААНАЛІЗ ФЕНОМЕНУ СВІДОМОСТІ ЛІДЕРА В УМОВАХ СУЧАСНИХ ЦИФРОВИХ ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЙ

Анотація

У статті досліджуються теоретико-методологічні засади осмислення феномену свідомості лідера в умовах сучасних цифрових трансформацій та його значення для інтерпретації нових форм соціальної дії. Свідомість лідера концептуалізується як інтегративна когнітивно-смислотворча здатність, через яку здійснюються інтерпретація, ухвалення рішень і координація в соціотехнічному середовищі, що поєднує людські та цифрові елементи. Метою дослідження є визначення свідомості лідера як форми соціально-когнітивної медіації на перетині філософії свідомості, соціології дії, організаційної теорії та студій цифрового врядування. Методологія ґрунтується на міждисциплінарному підході, що інтегрує метааналіз наукової літератури з феноменологічною, герменевтичною, соціально-конструктивістською та когнітивно-системною перспективами. Така рамка дає змогу розглядати лідерство не лише як управлінську функцію, а як процес смислотворення в складних соціальних реальностях. Свідомість лідера постає як динамічна структура, сформована у взаємодії індивідів, організаційних практик і цифрових технологій, у межах якої розподілене знання інтегрується в узгоджену дію. У дослідженні виявлено зсув від раціонально-центричних моделей лідерства до мережевих і розподілених форм когнітивної координації, що засвідчує зростаючу потребу в інтерпретації інформаційних потоків, рефлексивності та узгодженні гетерогенних смислів у процесі цифровізації. Свідомість лідера виступає медіаційним механізмом, який поєднує технологічні можливості з людською відповідальністю в ухваленні рішень. Підсумовуючи, дослідження стверджує про необхідність переосмислення лідерства як феномену, розташованого на перетині технологічних змін, епістемологічної еволюції та трансформації людської суб'єктивності. Розуміння цього перетину є важливим для пояснення характеру лідерства у XXI столітті та для розробки теоретичних основ, здатних вирішувати виклики дедалі складніших цифрових суспільств. Отримані результати

роблять внесок у сучасні дискусії щодо трансформації лідерства, цифрового врядування та переосмислення суб'єктності в мережевих суспільствах.

Ключові слова: свідомість лідера, цифрова трансформація, метааналіз, розподілена когніція, sensemaking, соціотехнічні системи.

Received date 15.12.2025
Accepted date 15. 01.2026
Published date 15.02.2026

How to cite: **Lepskyi, Maksym**. A meta-analysis of the phenomenon of leader consciousness in the context of contemporary digital transformations. HUMANITIES STUDIES: Collection of Scientific Papers / Ed. V. Voronkova. Zaporizhzhia: Publishing house «Helvetica», 2026. 26(103). P. 55–63
doi: https://doi.org/10.32782/hst-2026-26-103-06