Commentary

Context Matters: A Note on the Special Conditions for Effective AI Adoption in Organizations

Victor Frimpong[1]

1. Management Department, SBS Swiss Business School, Switzerland

This research note argues that successful AI integration is not solely a matter of technological capability but depends on a constellation of *special conditions* determining whether organizations can deploy AI ethically, strategically, and sustainably. These conditions include leadership commitment, ethical governance, data ecosystem readiness, cultural adaptability, sectoral and institutional constraints, and strategic alignment. Drawing on recent interdisciplinary studies across healthcare, finance, and public administration, the note demonstrates that AI adoption often remains superficial or problematic without addressing these contextual enablers and constraints. The note emphasizes that responsible AI implementation is a socio-technical process requiring tools and the right conditions for trust, capability, and alignment. By providing a framework for identifying and cultivating these conditions, the paper contributes to ongoing efforts to guide inclusive, reflective, and context-sensitive AI adoption across diverse organizational environments.

Correspondence: papers@team.qeios.com — Qeios will forward to the authors

1. Introduction

Organizations adopt Artificial Intelligence (AI) in diverse ways, with outcomes heavily shaped by what can be termed *special conditions*—a combination of internal capacities, cultural dynamics, and external constraints[1]. The success of AI implementation depends on technological availability and an organization's readiness to integrate these systems into its operational, ethical, and strategic frameworks[2]. In the healthcare sector, for example, adoption is frequently hindered by infrastructural limitations and professionals' skepticism toward AI technologies[3]. Even potentially beneficial tools are

 doi.org/10.32388/S7IRH1

unlikely to gain traction without adequate training, stakeholder engagement, and institutional support[4].

Moreover, concerns over the alignment between AI systems and ethical standards increasingly influence adoption outcomes[5]. Integrating ethical frameworks, promoting user engagement, and tailoring AI tools to existing workflows are critical for ensuring operational acceptance and long-term sustainability[6][7][8]. This research note argues that successful AI integration requires a contextual approach that addresses the infrastructural, ethical, and cultural factors shaping organizational adoption. By identifying and analyzing these *special conditions*, the note offers a conceptual framework to guide more inclusive, reflective, and effective AI deployment strategies across sectors and settings[9].

2. Leadership Commitment and Vision

AI adoption requires strong leadership that views AI as a strategic asset rather than a technical upgrade. Effective executive support is crucial for legitimizing AI investments, promoting collaboration across departments, and encouraging organizational learning to create a favorable environment for AI integration[10]. Leaders who understand AI can navigate implementation complexities and align operational priorities with value-driven goals, reducing associated risks[11]. In contrast, leaders lacking AI knowledge may underestimate risks or exaggerate potential returns, leading to disillusionment, mismanagement, or ethical issues[12]. It is vital to communicate the potential and challenges of AI clearly to stakeholders[10].

Strategic leadership also plays a key role in fostering internal alignment by ensuring that AI goals are shared across departments, responsibilities are distributed, and cross-functional collaboration is encouraged throughout the adoption process. Strategic guidance must cover AI integration's operational, ethical, and social aspects[13]. Coaching leadership styles can reduce job stress during AI transitions, highlighting the importance of supportive leadership in easing the impact of new technologies[13]. Additionally, promoting AI literacy among all employees enhances their engagement with AI tools, leading to better outcomes and ethical practices[14].

Successful AI adoption requires informed leadership with a clear vision of AI as a transformative tool. Organizations can align implementation with their goals and societal values by prioritizing ethical considerations and promoting AI literacy, leading to sustainable adoption[15].

3. Ethical and Governance Infrastructure

AI systems present several risks, including algorithmic opacity, bias, and a lack of accountability. To address these challenges, organizations must develop robust ethical governance frameworks—such as AI ethics committees, bias assessments, and impact reviews—that guide responsible design, deployment, and oversight[16]. These structures ensure that AI implementations align with organizational values and societal expectations.

In highly regulated sectors, such as healthcare and finance, compliance with frameworks like the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) is essential to maintain legal accountability and public trust[17]. However, legal compliance alone is insufficient. Ethical oversight must also address broader concerns such as fairness, transparency, and social impact, particularly for vulnerable populations who may be disproportionately affected by flawed algorithms[18][19].

Research suggests that flexible, participatory governance structures that actively involve stakeholders throughout the AI lifecycle are more effective in ensuring that ethical principles are embedded into organizational practice[20]. Algorithmic transparency and proactive impact assessments help identify risks early, reduce reputational threats, and foster trust among users and regulators[21].

Ultimately, ethical governance is not a peripheral concern but a central pillar of sustainable AI adoption. Organizations that invest in adaptable, transparent, and inclusive governance mechanisms are better positioned to mitigate ethical risks and promote responsible innovation[22].

4. Data Ecosystem Readiness

A mature data ecosystem characterized by high quality is crucial for effective AI. This includes access to reliable, interoperable, and ethically sourced data. Many organizations misjudge their data maturity, risking model inaccuracy, unfair outcomes, and systemic bias. Key components for scaling AI successfully include robust data governance, secure storage infrastructure, and seamless cross-platform integration[23][24].

Interoperability is particularly critical, as it ensures that data can flow across departments and systems, enhancing the utility and accuracy of AI applications. For example, in the U.K.'s 2020 A-Level grading fiasco, an AI-based algorithm used for student assessment was widely criticized for relying on incomplete and biased historical data. The failure to ensure data representativeness and transparency

resulted in widespread public backlash and policy reversal—highlighting how flawed data practices can undermine trust and performance in high-stakes contexts.

Establishing ethical data governance that is aligned with legal standards such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) is equally important. This involves clear policies on data quality, access, and usage, contributing to stakeholder trust[25]. Enhanced data interoperability can significantly improve safety and efficiency, particularly in sectors like healthcare[26].

To build scalable and trustworthy AI systems, organizations must continually assess the maturity of their data ecosystems. Doing so allows them to identify gaps, enhance data stewardship, and ensure that AI initiatives are grounded in reliable, context-appropriate information.

5. Cultural Adaptability and Workforce Preparedness

AI adoption often faces challenges due to cultural resistance within organizations. Employees may fear job loss or distrust algorithmic decisions, creating barriers to effective deployment[27]. To counter this, fostering a culture of digital openness, which includes critical discussions and ongoing skill development, is essential[28]. Initiatives focused on re-skilling, participatory design, and strong internal communication can help align AI tools with human values, leading to a more positive attitude towards AI[29].

AI should enhance human capabilities rather than replace jobs. Building trust through transparency and employee involvement in AI's design and implementation can improve perceptions[30]. Mistrust negatively impacts engagement in technological integration[30].

Organizations must prioritize participatory design to empower employees, foster ownership, and reduce anxiety about job displacement[28]. Continuous skill development initiatives can instill confidence in employees to work with new technologies, alleviating fears of obsolescence.

Overcoming cultural resistance requires a strategy focused on digital openness, stakeholder involvement, and skill enhancement. Organizations can leverage AI effectively while minimizing employee resistance by creating a supportive environment that values human-centered principles[31].

6. Sectoral and Institutional Constraints

AI readiness is significantly affected by external factors like regulations, available resources, and geopolitical issues. For example, financial institutions must often deal with strict rules regarding explainability and auditability, which necessitate strong governance frameworks. These frameworks help organizations maintain compliance and build trust with their stakeholders. Organizations in developing regions face inadequate digital infrastructure and reliance on foreign technology, hindering their AI adoption[32].

Organizations need tailored adoption strategies to address these challenges that account for their specific external conditions. For example, having a solid IT infrastructure greatly influences successful AI integration, so investment in technology is crucial[32]. Organizations must also understand their settings' cultural and technological nuances to maximize AI's potential[33].

Tailored strategies should address infrastructure gaps and involve stakeholders to ensure solutions match local contexts and regulatory requirements. Engaging the community can enhance AI solution adaptability by considering unique industry challenges[34]. In healthcare, prioritizing explainability can ensure AI systems are effective and accepted by both practitioners and patients[35].

Understanding the impact of external factors on AI readiness enables organizations to develop successful adoption strategies. Considering local regulations, available resources, and geopolitical influences allows organizations to navigate the complexities of AI integration more effectively, leading to improved outcomes[36].

7. Strategic Alignment and Long-Term Value

Adopting AI without a clear organizational purpose can lead to misalignment, resource wastage, and ineffective outcomes. It is essential to ensure that AI initiatives are aligned with the organization’s core mission, stakeholder expectations, and ethical commitments[37]. Studies have shown that vague or misdirected AI strategies often fail to deliver the anticipated value, particularly when they lack internal coherence or responsiveness to end-user needs[38].

Strategic alignment also involves iterative planning, stakeholder engagement, and continuous assessment of impact[39]. Without such alignment, AI systems risk becoming detached from the organization's evolving priorities, reducing their adaptability and sustainability. Engaging cross-

functional teams in the design and evaluation phases ensures that multiple perspectives are integrated into the system, strengthening legitimacy and operational fit[40].

Incorporating feedback loops and stakeholder-centered development processes can help organizations maintain relevance, trust, and functionality throughout the AI lifecycle[41]. Moreover, ongoing strategic evaluation allows for the ethical recalibration of AI objectives as organizational contexts and societal expectations evolve.

Ultimately, AI strategies that are ethically anchored and strategically aligned are more likely to yield sustainable, long-term value. Organizations that foster this alignment are better positioned to innovate responsibly while preserving public trust and operational coherence.

8. Conclusion

This note has emphasized that AI adoption in organizations is not merely a technological shift but a deeply contextual, strategic, and ethical undertaking. AI integration success depends on cultivating *special conditions*—leadership vision, ethical governance, data ecosystem readiness, cultural adaptability, sectoral awareness, and strategic alignment. These conditions interact to either enable or hinder meaningful and responsible AI deployment across various organizational contexts.

Organizations that ignore these factors risk superficial or fragmented adoption, resulting in wasted resources, ethical failures, or long-term operational misalignment. Recognizing and managing these internal and external conditions is essential for transforming AI from a novelty into a sustainable driver of organizational value.

Future research should use comparative case studies and mixed-method approaches to investigate how these conditions manifest differently across sectors, regions, and organizational types. Policymakers, meanwhile, should consider incentivizing ethical and inclusive AI readiness—particularly for organizations in under-resourced sectors—by supporting training, infrastructure development, and transparent governance frameworks. Advancing scholarly and practical understanding of these special conditions is vital for promoting equitable and resilient AI integration in the years ahead.

References

1. ^ *Al-Amin KO, Ewim CP, Igwe AN, Ofodile OC (2024). "AI-Driven end-to-end workflow optimization and aut omation system for SMEs." International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research. 6(11):3666*

–3684. doi:10.51594/ijmer.v6i11.1688.

2. ^Singh A, Pandey J (2024). "Artificial intelligence adoption in extended HR ecosystems: enablers and barrier s. An abductive case research." Frontiers in Psychology. 14.
3. ^Shinners L, Aggar C, Grace S, Smith S (2019). "Exploring healthcare professionals' understanding and expe riences of artificial intelligence technology use in the delivery of healthcare: An integrative review." Health I nformatics Journal. 26(2):1225–1236. doi:10.1177/1460458219874641.
4. ^Alowais SA, Alghamdi SS, Alsuhebany N, Alqahtani T, Alshaya AI, Almohareb SN, Aldairem A, Alrashed M, Bin Saleh K, Badreldin HA, Al Yami MS, Al Harbi S, Albekairy AM (2023). "Revolutionizing healthcare: the r ole of artificial intelligence in clinical practice." BMC Medical Education. 23(1):1–15. doi:10.1186/s12909-023-04698-z.
5. ^Fredberg T, Schwarz GM (2024). "What AI Knows: Shaping Work and Pushing Ideas on Changing Organiz ations." The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science. 60(4):581–588. doi:10.1177/00218863241285218.
6. ^Kashyap S, Morse KE, Patel B, Shah NH (2021). "A survey of extant organizational and computational setu ps for deploying predictive models in health systems." Journal of the American Medical Informatics Associa tion. 28(11):2445–2450. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocab154.
7. ^Tulk Jesso S, Kelliher A, Sanghavi H, Martin T, Henrickson Parker S (2022). "Inclusion of Clinicians in the D evelopment and Evaluation of Clinical Artificial Intelligence Tools: A Systematic Literature Review." Frontie rs in Psychology. 13. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2022.830345.
8. ^Cai CJ, Winter S, Steiner D, Wilcox L, Terry M (2019). "\"Hello AI\": Uncovering the Onboarding Needs of Me dical Practitioners for Human-AI Collaborative Decision-Making." Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Com puter Interaction. 3(CSCW):1–24. doi:10.1145/3359206.
9. ^Trenerry B, Chng S, Wang Y, Suhaila ZS, Lim SS, Lu HY, Oh PH (2021). "Preparing Workplaces for Digital Tr ansformation: An Integrative Review and Framework of Multi-Level Factors." Frontiers in Psychology. 12. d oi:10.3389/fpsyg.2021.620766.
10. a, bKurup S, Gupta V (2022). "Factors Influencing the AI Adoption in Organizations." Metamorphosis: A Jour nal of Management Research. 21(2):129–139. doi:10.1177/09726225221124035.
11. ^Larsson I, Svedberg P, Nygren JM, Petersson L (2025). "Healthcare leaders' perceptions of the contribution of artificial intelligence to person-centred care: An interview study." Scandinavian Journal of Public Health. 53(1_suppl):72–80. doi:10.1177/14034948241307112.
12. ^Curtis C, Gillespie N, Lockey S (2022). "AI-deploying organizations are key to addressing 'perfect storm' of AI risks." AI and Ethics. 3(1):145–153. doi:10.1007/s43681-022-00163-7.

13. ^a, ^b*Jeong J, Kim BJ, Lee J (2024). "Navigating AI transitions: how coaching leadership buffers against job stress and protects employee physical health." Frontiers in Public Health. 12. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2024.1343932.*

14. ^*Dilek M, Baran E, Aleman E (2025). "AI Literacy in Teacher Education: Empowering Educators Through Critical Co-Discovery." Journal of Teacher Education. 76(3):294–311. doi:10.1177/00224871251325083.*

15. ^*Dubey A, Sharma SK, Karsoliya S (2024). "A novel Conceptualization of AI Literacy and Empowering Employee Experience at Digital Workplace Using Generative AI and Augmented Analytics: A Survey." Journal of Electrical Systems. 20(2):2582–2603. doi:10.52783/jes.2031.*

16. ^*Akbar MA, Khan AA, Mahmood S, Rafi S, Demi S (2023). "Trustworthy artificial intelligence: A decision-making taxonomy of potential challenges." Software: Practice and Experience. 54(9):1621–1650. doi:10.1002/spe.3216.*

17. ^*Bouhouita-Guermech S, Gogognon P, Bélisle-Pipon JC (2023). "Specific challenges posed by artificial intelligence in research ethics." Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence. 6. doi:10.3389/frai.2023.1149082.*

18. ^*Ness S, Singh N, Volkivskyi M, Phia WJ (2024). "The Application of AI and Computer Science in the Context of International Law and Governance "Opportunities and Challenges."" American Journal of Computing and Engineering. 7(1):26–36. doi:10.47672/ajce.1878.*

19. ^*Lottu A, Jacks S, Ajala A, Stefano E (2024). "Towards a conceptual framework for ethical AI development in IT systems." World J Adv Res Rev. 21(3):408–415. doi: 10.30574/wjarr.2024.21.3.0735.*

20. ^*Samuel G, Chubb J, Derrick G (2021). "Boundaries Between Research Ethics and Ethical Research Use in Artificial Intelligence Health Research." Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics. 16(3):325–337. doi:10.1177/15562646211002744.*

21. ^*Cole M, Cant C, Ustek Spilda F, Graham M (2022). "Politics by Automatic Means? A Critique of Artificial Intelligence Ethics at Work." Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence. 5. doi:10.3389/frai.2022.869114.*

22. ^*D'Souza FR, Mathew M, Mishra V, Surapaneni KM (2024). "Twelve tips for addressing ethical concerns in the implementation of artificial intelligence in medical education." Medical Education Online. 29(1):2330250. doi:10.1080/10872981.2024.2330250.*

23. ^*Thompson M, Burger K, Kaliyaperumal R, Roos M, da Silva Santos LOB (2020). "Making FAIR Easy with FAIR Tools: From Creolization to Convergence." Data Intelligence. 2(1-2):87–95. doi:10.1162/dint_a_00031.*

24. ^*Retrialisca F, Chotijah U (2020). "The Maturity Measurement of Big Data Adoption in Manufacturing Companies Using the TDWI Maturity Model." Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Business Intelligence. 6(1):70–78. doi:10.20473/jisebi.6.1.70-78.*

25. ^Affleck E, Sutherland E, Lindeman C, Golonka R, Price T, Murphy T, Williamson T, Chapman A, Layton A, F raser C (2024). "Human Factor Health Data Interoperability." HealthcarePapers. 21(4):47–55. doi:10.12927/hc pap.2024.27272.

26. ^van Reisen M, Stokmans M, Basajja M, Ong'ayo AO, Kirkpatrick C, Mons B (2020). "Towards the Tipping P oint for FAIR Implementation." Data Intelligence. 2(1-2):264–275. doi:10.1162/dint_a_00049.

27. ^Braganza A, Chen W, Canhoto A, Sap S (2021). "Productive employment and decent work: The impact of A I adoption on psychological contracts, job engagement and employee trust." Journal of Business Research. 1 31:485–494. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.08.018.

28. a, bPaesano A (2021). "Artificial intelligence and creative activities inside organizational behavior." Internati onal Journal of Organizational Analysis. 31(5):1694–1723. doi:10.1108/ijoa-09-2020-2421.

29. ^Giuggioli G, Pellegrini MM (2022). "Artificial intelligence as an enabler for entrepreneurs: a systematic liter ature review and an agenda for future research." International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Rese arch. 29(4):816–837. doi:10.1108/ijebr-05-2021-0426.

30. a, bWang Q (2023). "The Impact of AI on Organizational Employees: A Literature Review." Journal of Educat ion, Humanities and Social Sciences. 19:45–53. doi:10.54097/ehss.v19i.10955.

31. ^Rožman M, Oreški D, Tominc P (2023). "Artificial-Intelligence-Supported Reduction of Employees' Workloa d to Increase the Company's Performance in Today's VUCA Environment." Sustainability. 15(6):5019. doi:10.3 390/su15065019.

32. a, bBrillianto B, Ruldeviyani Y, Sidiq D (2024). "Making AI Work for Government: Critical Success Factor Anal ysis Using R-SWARA." Jurnal RESTI (Rekayasa Sistem dan Teknologi Informasi). 8(3):438–446. doi:10.2920 7/resti.v8i3.5813.

33. ^Kar S, Kar AK, Gupta MP (2022). "Modeling Drivers and Barriers of Artificial Intelligence Adoption: Insight s from a Strategic Management Perspective." Intelligent Systems in Accounting, Finance and Management. 28(4):217–238. doi:10.1002/isaf.1503.

34. ^Oliveira J, Murphy T, Vaughn G, Elfahim S, Carpenter RE (2024). "Exploring the Adoption Phenomenon of Artificial Intelligence by Doctoral Students Within Doctoral Education." New Horizons in Adult Education a nd Human Resource Development. 36(4):248–262. doi:10.1177/19394225241287032.

35. ^Dashti M, Londono J, Ghasemi S, Khurshid Z, Khosraviani F, Moghaddasi N, Zafar MS, Hefzi D (2024). "Attit udes, knowledge, and perceptions of dentists and dental students toward artificial intelligence: a systematic review." Journal of Taibah University Medical Sciences. 19(2):327–337. doi:10.1016/j.jtumed.2023.12.010.

36. ^Younis HA, Eisa TAE, Nasser M, Sahib TM, Noor AA, Alyasiri OM, Salisu S, Hayder IM, Younis HA (2024). "A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Artificial Intelligence Tools in Medicine and Healthcare: Applications, Considerations, Limitations, Motivation and Challenges." Diagnostics. 14(1):109. doi:10.3390/diagnostics14010109.

37. ^Maestro S, Rana P (2024). "Variables Impacting the AI Adoption in Organizations." International Journal of Science and Research Archive. 12(2):1055–1060. doi:10.30574/ijsra.2024.12.2.1329.

38. ^Moghayedi A, Michell K, Awuzie B, Adama UJ (2024). "A comprehensive analysis of the implications of artificial intelligence adoption on employee social well-being in South African facility management organizations." Journal of Corporate Real Estate. 26(3):237–261. doi:10.1108/jcre-09-2023-0041.

39. ^Manwani R (2025). "Exploring the Impact of AI on HRM: Insights from the IT Sector." Journal of Informatics Education and Research. 5(1). doi:10.52783/jier.v5i1.2110.

40. ^Byambaa O, Yondon C, Rentsen E, Darkhijav B, Rahman M (2025). "An empirical examination of the adoption of artificial intelligence in banking services: the case of Mongolia." Future Business Journal. 11(1). doi:10.1186/s43093-025-00504-y.

41. ^Takeuchi H, Oyama Y, Yamamoto K (2020). "Adoptability Assessment of AI Service Systems." In: Knowledge-Based Software Engineering: 2020. p. 84–95. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-53949-8_8.

Declarations

Funding: No specific funding was received for this work.

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.