The Great AI-Era Technology Disconnect: Leadership Words, Posture and Inaction

by Stephen J. Andriole and Noah P. Barsky

Image Credit | Kiattisak

Digital-era leadership requires bold governance that drives meaningful innovation and competitive edge.

☑ **INSIGHT | FRONTIER**   30 Jun 2025

Many corporate leaders are sleepwalking into existential technology risk with a bewildering contradiction of proclamations and passivity. This happens when executives acknowledge technology's strategic importance while actively choosing organizational structures and tacitly supporting decisions that ensure technological stagnation.

RELATED CMR ARTICLES

Anne Gfrerer, Katja Hutter, Johann Füller, and Thomas Ströhle, "**Ready or Not: Managers' and Employees' Different Perceptions of Digital Readiness**," California Management Review, 63/2 (2021): 5-22.

Josh Morton, Patrick Stacey, Matthias Mohn, "**Building and Maintaining Strategic Agility: An Agenda and Framework for Executive IT Leaders**," California Management Review, 61/1 (2018): 94-113.

To learn more about the state of AI-era business practices, leadership perspectives and corporate investment plans, we surveyed business executives and received 151 responses across multiple vertical industries. The findings reveal a striking disparity between how leaders "see" versus "invest" in emerging technology, including AI – a disconnect that warrants immediate, widespread and top-level conversation, responses and action.

Rhetoric and Reality

The survey exposes a fundamental leadership contradiction: while 76% of executives characterize technology as "essential" to their competitiveness, they simultaneously make three dangerous technological choices that jeopardize their organizations' future.

First, leaders overwhelmingly preserve centralized control in a distributed technology world. Nearly 66% still manage technology through rigid corporate hierarchies, with another 15% maintaining "federated" oversight. By choosing centralization in a

technology landscape that rewards agility and experimentation, these leaders create structural barriers to innovation.

This centralized model persists despite overwhelming evidence that it impedes the speed, flexibility and experimentation necessary for digital transformation. Organizations that maintain these hierarchical structures artificially constrain technology adoption to follow traditional communication and approval channels – channels designed for stability rather than transformation.

Second, many leaders actively avoid AI despite its public prominence. While CEOs trumpet AI's importance in earnings calls and public statements, only 20% of organizations define AI initiatives as high priority. More revealing is that 77% of leaders have barely explored or completely ignore generative AI technologies – essentially selecting willful ignorance in the face of transformative change. This hesitation creates dangerous competitive vulnerabilities as more agile competitors develop AI capabilities and applications.

Third, leaders institutionalize technological obliviousness through their organizational practices. Over 55% choose not to track emerging technologies, while 51% maintain no defined processes for technology adoption. This isn't oversight – it's a conscious choice to navigate digital disruption with analog mindsets and outdated processes.

Boardroom Innovation Illusions

Corporate boards amplify these contradictions through their governance practices. While 73% of boards claim emerging technology oversight as part of their fiduciary duty, they demonstrate startling passivity in practice. Only 27% proactively engage with technology strategy, while 49% react only to problems or crises. Most troubling, nearly a quarter show little to no interest in technology decisions whatsoever.

This boardroom disconnect is particularly pronounced in sectors where technology drives core business operations. The financial services sector reports some of the lowest board engagement levels, with only 22% of boards taking proactive technology oversight roles. This governance gap creates leadership vacuums where critical technology decisions occur without appropriate strategic oversight.

Perhaps most revealing is how leaders approach innovation funding. Despite universal acknowledgment of technology's strategic importance, only 17% maintain well-funded, well-defined innovation programs. Nearly half operate with partially funded initiatives, while 34% have no formal innovation process whatsoever. This conscious underfunding of innovation goes beyond fiscal conservatism – it represents a leadership choice to preserve current operations at the expense of future viability.

Industry Blindspots and the Requirements Trap

The survey's most troubling findings emerge from sectors that should demonstrate technology leadership. Financial services and technology consulting firms – whose very existence depends on digital capability – often exhibit the worst technology governance patterns.

Financial services firms overwhelmingly maintain centralized control, with 71% clinging to command-and-control structures while two-thirds lack formal innovation programs. More troubling, nearly 60% report purely reactive board oversight. In an industry facing massive fintech disruption, this failure to adapt technology governance creates existential risk.

Technology consulting firms do not fare much better. Despite selling digital transformation services to clients, over two-thirds remain trapped in requirements-first approaches to their own technology adoption. More than half report inadequate AI investment, and nearly half maintain no systematic tracking of emerging technologies. This disconnect between capability marketing and operational reality suggests deep institutional resistance to change.

The data exposes how leaders actively choose obsolete approaches to technology adoption. A stunning 72% of organizations still mandate requirements-first technology evaluation – essentially forcing tomorrow's solutions through yesterday's frameworks. This requirements-first mindset represents more than mere conservatism. It's an active choice to evaluate transformative technologies through industrial-age processes.

By insisting that technology initiatives start with defined requirements, organizations systematically prevent discovery of unexpected use cases while blocking organic innovation. This approach forces transformative technologies into incremental roles, creating artificial barriers to adoption that protect organizational comfort at the expense of competitive capability.

The Cybersecurity Paradox

Perhaps nothing better illustrates leadership's confused technology stance than cybersecurity governance. While 87% of boards claim active engagement with cybersecurity risks, only 27% demonstrate proactive interest in broader technology strategy. This selective attention reveals a fundamental misunderstanding of modern technology risk.

Leaders scrutinize cybersecurity while ignoring AI, focus on protection while neglecting innovation, and demand security without enabling adaptation – creating vulnerabilities no firewall can address. This security-without-strategy approach leaves organizations protected against yesterday's threats while remaining vulnerable to disruption from more technologically advanced competitors.

These leadership choices carry mounting costs. The survey reveals that organizations making these decisions fall behind in cybersecurity readiness, with 35% reporting inadequate or unknown funding levels. More than half self-identify as "late majority" or "laggards" in AI adoption, while 81% still maintain artificial barriers between business and technology strategy.

Fueling Shadow IT

The survey reveals that 54% of organizations report significant or moderate shadow IT influence on technology adoption. Rather than viewing this as a control problem, it signals systematic leadership failure to enable innovation. When business units bypass corporate

IT, they overwhelmingly pursue cost reduction opportunities and chase digital transformation goals. These "unauthorized" technology initiatives often succeed precisely because they evade the centralized control structures leaders consciously maintain.

Conventional wisdom suggests larger organizations, with greater resources and established technology experience, would demonstrate better technology governance. The data demolishes this assumption. Among companies with revenues exceeding $10 billion, over two-thirds maintain rigid centralized technology control while nearly three-quarters lack comprehensive innovation programs. Board oversight remains predominantly reactive, and AI initiatives go consistently underfunded.

This pattern suggests scale actually inhibits technology adaptation as leaders consciously choose organizational stability over competitive capability. The data implies that larger organizations don't learn from technology experience – they simply accumulate layers of control that ensure technological stagnation. The connection between organizational size and technology governance reveals another troubling pattern. Rather than becoming more sophisticated through experience, larger organizations often demonstrate worse technology practices than their smaller counterparts.

Companies with over $10 billion in revenue show higher rates of centralized control, more requirements-first approaches to technology, and lower innovation funding levels than the overall survey population. This scale-without-learning pattern suggests organizational growth often brings additional control mechanisms rather than enhanced technology capability.

As organizations grow, they tend to implement additional governance structures that prioritize risk mitigation over opportunity capture. These structures serve leadership's desire for control but simultaneously inhibit the experimentation necessary for effective technology adaptation. The resulting rigidity curtails necessary technology agility.

Digital Era Determination

The results indicate that transforming technology governance requires leaders to make fundamentally different choices. They must replace control with enablement by dismantling centralized technology governance and supporting organic innovation initiatives. Success demands measuring outcomes rather than compliance.

Funding must match strategic rhetoric. Leaders need to enable continuous technology experimentation while supporting shadow IT initiatives that deliver value. Most importantly, they must invest ahead of requirements rather than waiting for perfect clarity.

Governance demands modernization. Boards require genuine technology competence, not merely cybersecurity awareness. Business and technology strategy must integrate fully, supported by systematic technology tracking processes and distributed decision-making authority.

AI demands proactive engagement through comprehensive exploration and broad experimentation. Organizations must build internal AI capability while enabling organizational learning – before competitors make these capabilities their advantage.

Our survey data suggests technology governance problems stem not from ignorance but from real leadership choices that prioritize control over capability, stability over innovation, and comfort over competitiveness. Real transformation requires leaders to acknowledge their role in creating technology barriers while making uncomfortable choices that enable innovation. They must accept short-term disruption for long-term capability and lead technological change rather than simply manage it.

As technology increasingly determines competitive success, leaders face a stark choice: further technological stagnation or boldly rejuvenating and stewarding digital era governance. The survey data suggests most leaders understand what's at stake - 76% acknowledge technology's strategic importance. Yet, mere understanding without substantive action ensures failure.

The critical question isn't whether leaders comprehend technology's strategic importance – the data confirms they do. The question is whether they'll make the uncomfortable choices required to align their organizations with that understanding. When technology demands bold action, will leaders continue choosing comfortable constraint? The answer may determine which organizations thrive in an increasingly digital future – and which join the long list of case studies in technological obsolescence.

Stephen J. Andriole (Follow)

Stephen J. Andriole, PhD is the Thomas G. Labrecque Professor of Business Technology in the Villanova School of Business at Villanova University where he researches and teaches in the emerging technology, AI and machine learning.

Noah P. Barsky (Follow)

Noah P. Barskyl, PhD is an associate professor of accountancy at the Villanova School of Business at Villanova University, where he teaches courses in financial reporting, business risk management, and performance measurement.