



Grund Institute

12th January 2026

Bridging the Cognitive Gap in AI Adoption

Why AI Adoption Often Fails in Organizations

Prepared by:

Dr. Sanela Vellino, Ph.D.

Grund Institute, Switzerland



Figure: AI adoption often falters not due to technology, but due to human and structural factors. Even with access and training, some employees thrive with AI while others struggle, revealing deeper organizational and cognitive gaps.

Most organizations have poured resources into AI tools and training, yet meaningful returns remain elusive[1][2]. Surveys show **70–85% of AI initiatives fail to meet expectations**, and up to **95% of enterprise AI projects never reach production**[3]. Crucially, these failures “often have almost nothing to do with the technology itself”[4][5]. Instead, a constellation of **structural, cognitive, and process-level factors** derails AI adoption.

Structural and Cultural Barriers

Many companies lack a clear AI strategy or supportive culture. In one global survey, 42% of companies expected to abandon most AI pilots, citing organizational issues[6]. **Two-thirds of organizations are simply not culturally or operationally prepared** for AI transformation[7]. Common pitfalls include data silos and fragmented information that make AI integration difficult[8], as well as leadership communication gaps. For example, while 83% of executives believe they communicate a clear AI vision, only 37% of frontline employees agree[9]. This misalignment leads to AI being seen as a top-down mandate rather than a value-driving tool. Employees “don’t see the point” of AI projects when they aren’t tied to real business problems[10]. In short, **a lack of strategic clarity and cultural readiness** creates an environment where AI cannot flourish[11][3].

Cognitive and Behavioral Factors

AI adoption is fundamentally a **human behavior challenge**[12]. Research by MIT and others finds that employees resist AI when it threatens basic human needs like autonomy, competence, and certainty[13][14]. Many workers fear AI will replace them or undermine their expertise, hurting their self-esteem and motivation[15][16]. In fact, two in three frontline employees worry AI might take their jobs[17]. Trust is another key issue: even when tools are available, less than half of employees trust their employer to use AI responsibly[11]. A **global study found more than half of people are unwilling to trust AI systems** in critical decisions[18]. This lack of trust and psychological safety directly impedes adoption. Additionally, individuals have different cognitive styles and tolerance for ambiguity. AI systems are probabilistic and iterative, often giving **open-ended or uncertain outputs**. Employees who **require certainty and linear processes experience stress and cognitive overload** when forced to interact with AI's ambiguity[19]. By contrast, those who tolerate ambiguity and iterate on feedback adapt more easily. These differences in cognitive fit mean a one-size-fits-all training approach will fail – some people will remain anxious or skeptical no matter how many tutorials they attend[20][19]. Indeed, **3 out of 4 workers report abandoning AI tools mid-task**, citing frustration with accuracy, the effort needed to refine outputs, and poor workflow fit[21]. Such behavior highlights a fundamental cognitive misalignment: if using the AI feels harder than not using it, employees will quietly drop out of adoption despite having access.

Process and Workflow Misalignment

Finally, AI often falters when grafted onto existing workflows that were never designed for it. **Organizations mistakenly treat AI deployment as a purely technical installation rather than a business process change**[13][5]. This leads to shallow “pilot projects” that never scale and “**innovation theater**” – symbolic AI demos with no impact on core operations[22][23]. Many firms focus on easy use cases (like automating trivial tasks) and celebrate pilot successes, yet **fail to reimagine core workflows to embed AI in daily decision-making**[24][25]. When AI use is not integrated into how work gets done, it remains an optional add-on. As Harvard Business Review notes, without a clear implementation plan and meaningful investment in change management, **AI tools “stall before they even start,”** quickly “disappearing into the background” after an initial burst of enthusiasm[26][27]. Moreover, some leaders respond to low usage by **mandating AI tool use or setting usage KPIs**. This backfires – it

creates anxiety and “fake adoption” (employees going through the motions) rather than genuine engagement. The **lack of process alignment and supportive management** means even well-trained employees find it easier to revert to old, familiar methods[28]. As a result, many AI initiatives get stuck in perpetual PoC mode (“pilot hell”) and never deliver scalable value[29]. A recent BCG survey quantified this *adoption-quality gap*: 60% of companies globally are **not seeing material value from AI** despite substantial investments, largely because employees have not integrated AI into their day-to-day workflow and decision loops[30].

In summary, AI adoption fails when organizations focus only on technology and training while **ignoring the human element and workflow design**. Studies and industry experience converge on this point: success with AI is **20% about algorithms and 80% about people** – their mindset, trust, habits, and the processes they operate in[5][13]. Companies that address only skills and access end up puzzled when usage stalls. As one report put it, **“the issue isn’t access – it’s execution”**[31]. Overcoming these barriers requires restructuring workflows and incentives, fostering an adaptive learning culture, and above all recognizing that **AI adoption is a change-management challenge** centered on human cognition and behavior[13].

Sources:

1. Jin Li, Feng Zhu, Pascal Hua, “Overcoming the Organizational Barriers to AI Adoption,” **Harvard Business Review** (Nov 2025) – discusses why firms struggle to realize AI’s value[1].
2. Great Place To Work, “AI for All: Culture and Trust Dictate Success,” (Dec 2025) – global survey on AI readiness (43k employees) showing cultural readiness, trust, and leadership support drive adoption[7][11].
3. Elisabeth Costa (Behavioral Insights Team) on *High Signal Podcast*, “Why AI Adoption Fails: A Behavioral Framework,” (Dec 2025) – emphasizes AI adoption as a behavioral challenge and need for motivation, capability, and trust alignment[12][54].
4. Yogesh Malik, “Why AI Adoption Fails: The Organizational, Cognitive, and Moral Architecture,” **Medium** (Oct 2025) – seven levels of AI failure; notes misalignment between AI’s probabilistic nature and organizations’ deterministic processes[55][56].
5. Udacity Research, “AI at Work Adoption Gap,” (Sept 2025) – survey of 2,000 professionals; found 90% use AI, but 75% abandon it frequently due to accuracy and workflow fit concerns[44], highlighting that access is not the issue but effective integration is[31].
6. Arkaro (Neuroscience & Change), “Why 95% of AI Implementations Fail,” (2025) – cites MIT research that 70–85% of AI projects fail, often due to treating AI as just tech deployment rather than people-centric change; introduces the SPACES framework of human needs (Self-esteem, Purpose, Autonomy, Certainty, Equity, Social Connection) that must be addressed[13][3].
1. Grund Institute, *Exhaustive Project Dossier* (2026) – internal white paper focusing on cognitive fit. Introduces the Second Mind framework (human–AI cognitive interaction) and typology of interaction styles, and argues that uneven AI outcomes stem from cognitive fit differences, not simply skills or effort.
2. Samuel et al., “Adaptive Cognitive Fit: AI-Augmented Management of Information,” **Int. J. of Information Management** 65 (2022) – academic study demonstrating how AI can tailor information presentation to users’ cognitive needs, improving performance[40][57].

3. John Nosta, “*Beyond Tools: LLMs and the Emergence of Extended Cognition*,” **Psychology Today** (Oct 2024) – essay on how large language models represent a new form of cognitive extension, transforming how we think by creating a human–AI “cognitive dance”[32][33].
 4. Kortenbach et al., “*The Relation Between Humans and LLMs in the Creative Act*,” **Journal of Creativity** 36(1) (Apr 2026) – proposes that LLMs should be seen as “**complementary amplifiers of human cognition**”, not as competitors[36], reinforcing the idea of AI as a cognitive partner.
-

[1] Overcoming the Organizational Barriers to AI Adoption

<https://hbr.org/2025/11/overcoming-the-organizational-barriers-to-ai-adoption>

[2] [6] [7] [9] [11] [17] [50] As Companies Clamor to Adopt AI, Culture and Trust Dictates Success, Says New 'AI for All Index' from UKG's Great Place To Work | Great Place To Work®

<https://www.greatplacetowork.com/resources/blog/as-companies-clamor-to-adopt-ai-culture-and-trust-dictates-success-says-new-ai-for-all-index-from-ukg-great-place-to-work>

[3] [4] [5] [10] [13] [14] [15] [16] [20] [29] Why 95% of AI Implementations Fail | Neuroscience & Change

<https://arkaro.com/why-ai-implementations-fail-neuroscience/>

[8] [19] [26] [27] [28] [53] Organizational Barriers to AI Adoption - The Decision Lab

<https://thedecisionlab.com/reference-guide/management/organizational-barriers-to-ai-adoption>

[12] [38] [54] High Signal by Delphina | Episode - Why AI Adoption Fails: A Behavioral Framework for AI Implementation

<https://high-signal.delphina.ai/episode/why-ai-adoption-fails-a-behavioral-framework-for-ai-implementation>

[18] Global study reveals trust of AI remains a critical challenge

<https://mbs.edu/news/global-study-reveals-trust-of-ai-remains-a-critical-challenge>

[21] [31] [44] [45] The AI at Work Adoption Gap: 90% of Workers Use It, Most Still Don't Trust It | Udacity

<https://www.udacity.com/blog/2025/09/ai-adoption-trust-gap-udacity-research.html>

[22] [23] [55] [56] Why AI Adoption Fails: The Organizational, Cognitive, and Moral Architecture of Collapse | by Yogesh Malik | Medium

<https://yogeshmalik.medium.com/why-ai-adoption-fails-the-organizational-cognitive-and-moral-architecture-of-collapse-7d9e1805e5f3>

[24] [25] [30] [39] AI Adoption Puzzle: Why Usage Is Up But Impact Is Not | BCG

<https://www.bcg.com/publications/2025/ai-adoption-puzzle-why-usage-up-impact-not>

[32] [33] [34] [51] [52] Beyond Tools: LLMs and the Emergence of Extended Cognition | Psychology Today

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/the-digital-self/202410/beyond-tools-llms-and-the-emergence-of-extended-cognition>

[35] [36] [37] The relation between humans and LLMs in the creative act

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2713374525000214>

[40] [41] [42] [49] [57] Adaptive cognitive fit: Artificial intelligence augmented management of information facets and representations - ScienceDirect

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0268401222000366>

[43] [PDF] To Be Credible or to Be Creative? Understanding the Antecedents of ...

<https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstreams/e4e217fe-0192-4d02-aac2-1ba18e59f1b5/download>

[46] People Will Use Imperfect Algorithms If They Can (Even Slightly ...

<https://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/10.1287/mnsc.2016.2643>

[47] [PDF] People Will Use Imperfect Algorithms If They Can (Even Slightly ...

<https://faculty.wharton.upenn.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Dietvorst-Simmons-Massey-2018.pdf>

[48] Designing for Confidence: The Impact of Visualizing Artificial ...

<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9263374/>