

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Vision 2030 as a Natural Experiment of Collective Cognition Leadership: Evidence from Large-Scale National Transformation

[Abdulmohsen Alrohaimi](#) *

Posted Date: 28 February 2026

doi: 10.20944/preprints202602.2020.v1

Keywords: collective cognition leadership; Vision 2030; institutional transformation; sensemaking; identity continuity; distributed leadership; moral consciousness



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

Vision 2030 as a Natural Experiment of Collective Cognition Leadership: Evidence from Large-Scale National Transformation

Abdulmohsen Alrohaimi

College of Pharmacy, Shaqra University, Dawadmi 17462, Saudi Arabia; alrohaimi@su.edu.sa

Abstract

Leadership scholarship has traditionally emphasized individual leaders and organizational outcomes, offering influential models such as transformational and authentic leadership; however, these perspectives provide limited explanatory power in contexts characterized by prolonged, multi-level transformation involving distributed authority and complex coordination demands. This study examines Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030 as a natural experiment to explore leadership as collective cognition at national scale. Using a conceptual-analytical approach, the article interprets publicly available policy narratives and transformation dynamics through constructs derived from organizational cognition, sensemaking, and institutional theory. The analysis indicates that Vision 2030 operates through shared interpretive frameworks guiding institutional decision-making, collective historical cognition linking reform to national identity, and identity continuity mechanisms sustaining legitimacy during modernization. In addition, the findings suggest an emergent normative dimension—collective moral consciousness—reflecting shared values and purpose alignment that reinforce engagement and transformation coherence. These insights support the argument that leadership effectiveness in large-scale transformation contexts emerges from the alignment of cognitive and normative infrastructures rather than individual intervention alone. The study concludes that Vision 2030 provides empirical grounding for collective cognition leadership and establishes a foundation for future research examining leadership as a systemic phenomenon in national and societal transformation.

Keywords: collective cognition leadership; Vision 2030; institutional transformation; sensemaking; identity continuity; distributed leadership; moral consciousness

1. Introduction

Leadership research has generated a substantial body of theory explaining how leaders influence followers and organizational outcomes. Dominant approaches—including transformational, authentic, and leader-member exchange leadership—have emphasized individual agency, relational dynamics, and behavioral competencies as primary drivers of effectiveness [1–3]. While these perspectives have advanced understanding of motivation, trust, and performance within relatively stable organizational settings, their explanatory power becomes limited in contexts characterized by sustained, multi-level transformation involving distributed authority and extended temporal horizons. Increasingly, scholars have called for leadership frameworks capable of accounting for complex institutional environments in which influence is dispersed and coordination depends on collective sensemaking rather than individual intervention [4,5].

Parallel developments in organizational cognition and sensemaking research highlight the role of shared interpretive frameworks in shaping coordinated action under conditions of ambiguity and uncertainty [6,7]. Institutional theory further underscores how historically embedded narratives, norms, and belief systems stabilize behavior and legitimacy during periods of change [8,9]. Together, these perspectives suggest that leadership may be better understood as a systemic phenomenon

emerging from shared cognitive infrastructures that guide interpretation, decision-making, and identity continuity across institutional layers.

Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030 represents a large-scale national transformation initiative encompassing economic diversification, governance reform, technological advancement, and societal development [14]. The initiative's scope, temporal depth, and distributed implementation create coordination challenges that exceed the influence capacity of individual leaders, making it a suitable context for examining leadership as collective cognition. By aligning diverse actors through shared strategic narratives and institutional reforms, Vision 2030 provides an opportunity to explore how collective cognitive mechanisms enable coherent transformation at national scale.

This article builds on the conceptualization of leadership as collective cognition and positions Vision 2030 as a natural experiment demonstrating how shared interpretive frameworks, historical cognition, and identity continuity mechanisms sustain large-scale institutional change. The study further identifies an emergent normative dimension—collective moral consciousness—reflecting shared values and purpose alignment that reinforce legitimacy and engagement during transformation. In doing so, the article aims to extend leadership theory into macro-institutional contexts and provide a foundation for future empirical research on leadership as a systemic and societal phenomenon.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Research Design

This study adopts a conceptual–analytical research design aimed at extending leadership theory through contextual interpretation of large-scale institutional transformation. Conceptual research plays a critical role in theory development by synthesizing existing theoretical perspectives and applying them to complex real-world phenomena, particularly when constructs remain emergent and insufficiently operationalized for empirical testing [6]. Given the exploratory nature of collective cognition leadership at national scale, this approach is appropriate for identifying mechanisms and generating theoretical insights prior to empirical validation.

2.2. Natural Experiment Perspective

Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030 is examined as a natural experiment in which leadership dynamics unfold within a real-world transformation context without controlled intervention. Natural experiments provide valuable opportunities to observe distributed social processes across temporal and institutional dimensions, enabling theory development in settings where experimental manipulation is not feasible [Dunning, 2012]. The initiative's multi-level scope, extended timeframe, and distributed implementation render it analytically suitable for examining leadership as collective cognition.

2.3. Data Sources

The analysis draws on publicly available policy documents, strategic reports, and institutional narratives associated with Vision 2030, including the official Vision 2030 framework, Vision Realization Program reports, and national transformation strategies [14–18]. These documents provide insight into shared narratives, strategic priorities, and identity framing that shape institutional sensemaking and coordination during transformation. Secondary scholarly literature on leadership, organizational cognition, sensemaking, and institutional theory further informs the theoretical mapping process.

2.4. Analytical Procedure

The study employs theoretical mapping as an analytical strategy, interpreting transformation dynamics through constructs derived from collective cognition leadership. This process involves

identifying patterns of shared interpretive frameworks, historical narratives, and identity continuity mechanisms embedded in policy discourse and transformation initiatives. The analysis then examines how these mechanisms contribute to coordination, legitimacy, and engagement across institutional layers. Particular attention is given to the interaction between cognitive alignment and normative orientation, leading to the identification of an emergent construct—collective moral consciousness.

2.5. Methodological Contribution and Limitations

The conceptual-analytical design contributes to theory development by extending collective cognition leadership into macro-institutional contexts and generating propositions for future empirical research. However, the study does not employ primary empirical data, limiting causal inference and generalizability. Future research may build on this framework through qualitative interviews, longitudinal policy analysis, and survey-based measurement of shared cognitive and moral constructs. Such empirical approaches would enable operationalization of collective cognition leadership and further examination of its role in national transformation processes.

3. Results

3.1. Vision 2030 as a Collective Cognition Leadership Context

The analysis indicates that Vision 2030 exhibits key characteristics consistent with collective cognition leadership. The initiative's distributed implementation across governmental, economic, and societal domains reflects leadership processes that depend on shared interpretive frameworks rather than centralized authority. Policy narratives and strategic programs collectively provide cognitive templates guiding institutional behavior, enabling decentralized actors to align actions while maintaining operational autonomy. This pattern supports the interpretation of Vision 2030 as a leadership process embedded in shared meaning systems operating across institutional layers.

3.2. Implicit Decision Frameworks and Institutional Alignment

Evidence from policy discourse suggests that Vision 2030 establishes implicit decision frameworks shaping institutional prioritization and strategic direction. Narratives emphasizing diversification, innovation, and global competitiveness function as interpretive reference points guiding decision-making across ministries and organizations. These shared cognitive templates appear to facilitate coherence in reform implementation, reducing coordination costs and enabling autonomous decision processes to remain globally aligned.

3.3. Collective Historical Cognition and Transformation Legitimacy

The analysis further indicates that Vision 2030 integrates collective historical cognition by linking reform initiatives to national heritage and developmental trajectories. Historical narratives embedded in policy discourse provide interpretive continuity, framing transformation as an extension of national identity rather than a departure from it. This temporal integration appears to enhance legitimacy and reduce resistance, supporting sustained engagement across stakeholders.

3.4. Identity Continuity Mechanisms in Modernization

Vision 2030 demonstrates identity continuity mechanisms that maintain coherence between modernization and cultural preservation. Reform narratives consistently connect strategic change to enduring societal values, enabling adaptation without fragmentation. This continuity appears to stabilize collective interpretation and support transformation acceptance, highlighting identity maintenance as a central mechanism of collective cognition leadership.

3.5. Emergent Normative Dimension: Collective Moral Consciousness

Beyond cognitive alignment, the findings reveal an emergent normative dimension shaping engagement and legitimacy. Policy narratives emphasizing societal contribution, national responsibility, and intergenerational development suggest the presence of shared value orientations guiding institutional sensemaking. This pattern reflects collective moral consciousness, defined as the shared normative framework that provides ethical direction and purpose alignment within collective cognition.

The interaction between cognitive and normative mechanisms appears to reinforce transformation coherence by combining interpretive clarity with moral legitimacy. While collective cognition enables coordination and continuity, collective moral consciousness strengthens motivation and sustained engagement across institutional actors.

4. Discussion

The findings of this study provide conceptual support for interpreting Vision 2030 as a large-scale manifestation of collective cognition leadership. By examining transformation dynamics through shared narratives, policy discourse, and institutional alignment, the analysis suggests that leadership effectiveness in national transformation contexts may emerge from distributed cognitive infrastructures rather than from individual authority alone. This observation extends existing leadership theory by demonstrating how interpretive coherence can operate as a systemic mechanism enabling coordination across institutional layers [4,5].

A central insight concerns the role of implicit decision frameworks in guiding decentralized action. Vision 2030's strategic narratives appear to function as cognitive templates shaping institutional prioritization and reform implementation. Such frameworks allow actors to interpret policy objectives through shared meaning structures, reducing ambiguity and supporting coordinated decision-making. This finding aligns with organizational cognition and sensemaking research emphasizing the role of shared mental models in enabling collective action under uncertainty [6,7,11].

The analysis also highlights the importance of temporal integration through collective historical cognition. By linking reform initiatives to national identity and historical narratives, Vision 2030 appears to embed transformation within a broader developmental trajectory. This temporal continuity contributes to legitimacy and stabilizes interpretation during periods of rapid change, supporting institutional theory perspectives that emphasize the stabilizing role of historically embedded narratives [8,9].

Identity continuity mechanisms further reinforce transformation coherence by connecting modernization to enduring cultural values. Rather than generating identity disruption, Vision 2030's reform discourse appears to sustain a coherent collective identity, enabling adaptation without fragmentation. This finding suggests that identity continuity may represent a critical yet underexplored mechanism of leadership in large-scale transformation contexts [13].

Beyond cognitive mechanisms, the findings indicate an emergent normative dimension shaping engagement and legitimacy. Transformation narratives emphasizing societal contribution, national responsibility, and long-term development reflect shared value orientations that extend beyond interpretive alignment. This observation introduces collective moral consciousness as a complementary dimension of collective cognition leadership. While cognitive infrastructures provide interpretive coherence, moral consciousness appears to anchor transformation in shared purpose and ethical meaning, reinforcing legitimacy and motivational resonance [2,3].

The interaction between collective cognition and collective moral consciousness suggests that leadership in national transformation contexts may operate through the alignment of interpretive and normative infrastructures. Cognitive alignment enables coordination and continuity, whereas moral alignment supports engagement and legitimacy. This dual-layer dynamic contributes to transformation resilience by reducing uncertainty and strengthening collective commitment [5].

These insights have broader implications for leadership theory. First, they extend collective cognition perspectives into macro-institutional and societal contexts, demonstrating that leadership can operate as a systemic phenomenon stabilizing meaning across diverse actors. Second, the findings highlight narrative coherence as a potential substitute for hierarchical control in complex transformation settings. Third, the identification of collective moral consciousness suggests that normative alignment may represent a critical mechanism sustaining large-scale reform initiatives [10].

At the same time, the conceptual nature of this study imposes limitations. The analysis relies on theoretical interpretation of policy narratives rather than primary empirical data, limiting causal inference and generalizability. Future research should therefore empirically examine collective cognition and moral consciousness mechanisms through qualitative interviews, discourse analysis, and survey-based measurement of shared interpretive and normative frameworks. Comparative studies of national transformation initiatives may further clarify boundary conditions and enhance theoretical robustness [6].

Overall, the discussion suggests that Vision 2030 provides valuable conceptual grounding for understanding leadership as a systemic process embedded in shared cognitive and moral infrastructures. By illuminating the interplay between interpretive coherence, identity continuity, and normative alignment, the study contributes to emerging perspectives that reconceptualize leadership as a distributed and temporally embedded phenomenon operating beyond organizational boundaries [4,5].

5. Conclusions

This study positions Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030 as a natural experiment illustrating leadership as collective cognition in the context of large-scale national transformation. By examining policy narratives, institutional alignment, and transformation dynamics, the analysis suggests that leadership effectiveness in complex societal change processes may emerge from distributed cognitive infrastructures rather than from individual authority alone. These findings extend existing leadership research by demonstrating how shared interpretive frameworks can operate as systemic mechanisms enabling coordination across institutional layers [4,5].

The results highlight the central role of implicit decision frameworks in guiding decentralized action and shaping institutional prioritization. In addition, collective historical cognition appears to provide temporal continuity linking reform initiatives to national identity, thereby enhancing legitimacy and stabilizing interpretation during periods of rapid change. Identity continuity mechanisms further support transformation coherence by connecting modernization to enduring cultural values, reinforcing engagement and reducing resistance [8,9,13].

Beyond these cognitive mechanisms, the study identifies an emergent normative dimension—collective moral consciousness—reflecting shared value orientations and purpose alignment that strengthen legitimacy and motivational resonance. The interaction between cognitive and moral infrastructures suggests that leadership in national transformation contexts may depend on the alignment of interpretive and normative dimensions sustaining both coordination and engagement [2,3].

While the conceptual-analytical design limits causal inference, the findings provide a theoretical foundation for future empirical research examining collective cognition leadership at macro-institutional scale. Qualitative and quantitative studies exploring shared interpretive and moral frameworks may further clarify mechanisms of coordination and legitimacy in national transformation initiatives [6]. Overall, the study contributes to leadership theory by extending collective cognition perspectives beyond organizational boundaries and highlighting Vision 2030 as a context demonstrating leadership as a distributed and temporally embedded phenomenon [4,5].

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, A.H.A.; methodology, A.H.A.; formal analysis, A.H.A.; investigation, A.H.A.; resources, A.H.A.; data curation, A.H.A.; writing—original draft preparation, A.H.A.;

writing—review and editing, A.H.A.; visualization, A.H.A.; supervision, A.H.A.; project administration, A.H.A. The author has read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding. The APC was funded by the author..

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Acknowledgments: The author gratefully acknowledges the institutional support provided by Shaqra University. During the preparation of this manuscript, the author used ChatGPT (OpenAI) to assist with language editing and improving clarity of expression. The author reviewed and edited all AI-assisted outputs and assumes full responsibility for the content of this publication.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in this manuscript:

Abbreviation	Definition
CC	Collective Cognition
CCL	Collective Cognition Leadership
CMC	Collective Moral Consciousness
NTP	National Transformation Program
QoL	Quality of Life Program
VRP	Vision Realization Program
KSA	Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

References

1. Banks, G.C.; McCauley, K.D.; Gardner, W.L.; Guler, C.E. A meta-analytic review of authentic and transformational leadership. *J. Leadersh. Organ. Stud.* **2016**, *23*, 236–252. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051815590257>
2. Gardner, W.L.; Cogliser, C.C.; Davis, K.M.; Dickens, M.P. Authentic leadership: A review of the literature and research agenda. *Leadersh. Q.* **2021**, *32*, 101–159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2020.101405>
3. van Knippenberg, D. Leadership and identity. *Annu. Rev. Organ. Psychol. Organ. Behav.* **2020**, *7*, 235–260. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012119-044810>
4. Hannah, S.T.; Uhl-Bien, M.; Avolio, B.J.; Cavarretta, F. Leadership in extreme contexts. *J. Manag.* **2021**, *47*, 6–35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206320950583>
5. Petriglieri, G.; Ashford, S.J.; Wrzesniewski, A. Leadership under uncertainty. *Organ. Stud.* **2023**, *44*, 345–367. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01708406221133756>
6. Maitlis, S.; Christianson, M. Sensemaking in organizations: Taking stock and moving forward. *Acad. Manag. Ann.* **2014**, *8*, 57–125. <https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2014.873177>
7. Cornelissen, J.P.; Mantere, S.; Vaara, E. The contraction of meaning: The combined effect of communication, emotions, and materiality on sensemaking. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* **2022**, *47*, 209–231. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2020.0499>
8. Greenwood, R.; Oliver, C.; Lawrence, T.B.; Meyer, R.E. *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*, 2nd ed.; Sage: London, UK, 2017.
9. Suddaby, R.; Bitektine, A.; Haack, P. Legitimacy. *Acad. Manag. Ann.* **2020**, *14*, 451–478. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2017.0083>
10. Bolden, R. Distributed leadership in organizations: A review of theory and research. *Int. J. Manag. Rev.* **2011**, *13*, 251–269. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00306.x>
11. Hodgkinson, G.P.; Healey, M.P. Psychological foundations of dynamic capabilities. *Strateg. Manag. J.* **2011**, *32*, 1500–1516. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.964>

12. Kaplan, S.; Orlikowski, W.J. Temporal work in strategy making. *Organ. Sci.* **2013**, *24*, 965–995. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1120.0792>
13. Ravasi, D.; Tripsas, M.; Langley, A. Exploring the strategy–identity nexus. *Acad. Manag. Ann.* **2020**, *14*, 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0012>
14. Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *Saudi Vision 2030*; Council of Economic and Development Affairs: Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, 2016. Available online: <https://www.vision2030.gov.sa> (accessed on 27 February 2026).
15. Vision Realization Programs. *Annual Report 2022*; Vision 2030 Office: Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, 2023. Available online: <https://www.vision2030.gov.sa> (accessed on 27 February 2026).
16. Ministry of Economy and Planning. *Vision 2030 Progress Report*; Government of Saudi Arabia: Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, 2022. Available online: <https://www.mep.gov.sa> (accessed on 27 February 2026).
17. National Transformation Program. *Strategic Framework Document*; Government of Saudi Arabia: Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, 2021. Available online: <https://www.vision2030.gov.sa> (accessed on 27 February 2026).
18. Quality of Life Program. *Program Delivery Plan 2021–2025*; Government of Saudi Arabia: Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, 2021. Available online: <https://www.vision2030.gov.sa> (accessed on 27 February 2026).

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.