Advances in Consumer Research
https://acr-journal.com/
Volume-3 | Issue-1 | Jan 2026

Original Researcher Article

Leading AI-Driven Innovation: Influence of Strategic Vision and Organizational Culture

Dr. Sakshi Saxena [1], Dr. Rashmi Chawla [2], Dr. Nidhi Gupta[3], Dr. Richa Nangia[4], Dr. Richa Arora[5]
[1]Professor, Garden City University, Bangalore.
[2]Associate Professor, Delhi Metropolitan Education, Noida.
[3]Professor, Jagannath International Management School, Vasant Kunj, Delhi
[4]Associate Professor, School of Business, Sushant University, Gurugram.
[5]Associate Professor, School of Business, Sushant University, Gurugram

Reciv 05/01/2026
Revised 15/01/2026
Accepted 20/1/2026
Published 25/1/2026

ABSTRACT

Purpose: Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology is rapidly entering the innovation ecosystem of today's organization. The purpose is to examine the important role of leadership, with respect to a strategic vision and organizational culture that foster a successful approach to AI-driven innovation.

Objectives:
1. To examine the influence of strategic vision on AI innovation outcomes.
2. To evaluate the role of organizational culture in fostering an environment conducive to AI implementation.
3. To analyse how the interaction between leadership vision and culture impacts the success of AI initiatives.

Methodology: The research was a mixed-methods design, where quantitative measurements were collected via structured surveys distributed across 120 mid and senior-level professionals from the IT, healthcare, and manufacturing industries, and qualitative data were collected from 15 semi-structured interviews. SPSS was used for the correlation and regression analysis, while NVivo supported the thematic coding for qualitative data.

Findings: The results demonstrate that both strategic vision and organizational culture impact the outcomes of AI-driven innovation. The study also revealed a combined effect between strategic vision and a culture of experimentation, learning, and psychological safety.

Original Contribution/Value: This study fills gap in leadership and innovation in AI contexts by investigating empirically the dual importance of vision and culture in the digital environment.

Implications of Study: The findings offer practical advice for leaders seeking to implement AI **leaders**. They should encourage the vision and leadership necessary for supporting their organization and adding strategic value

Keywords: AI-driven innovation, strategic vision, organizational culture, leadership, digital transformation, innovation climate.

1. INTRODUCTION:

1.1. Setting the Stage: The Strategic Promise of AI

As organizations around the world move into the digital age, Artificial Intelligence (AI) is not just a technological novelty, but a business necessity that is changing the landscape of organizations. The very nature of AI, with its ability to analyze large datasets, automate complex processes, and deliver actionable insights, allows it to function as both an enabler and accelerator of innovation (Murire, 2024). In 2025, Wired notes that AI is progressing from being a tool to augment individual productivity and is now embedded into organizational strategy and structure—its seeds are planted for new, nimble, project-based ways of working (Wired, 2024).

However, as the literature shows, AI's transformative potential is not only dependent on technological shutter speed, but fundamentally also relies on leadership vision and organizational culture, which is a dependent and connected dynamic that underpins sustainable innovation and strategic alignment.

1.2. Strategic Leadership: Vision as a Catalyst for AI Innovation

Effective leadership during volatile and uncertain conditions centers around strategic vision. Strategic leaders develop long-range goals and the appropriate systems, culture, and structures reinforce to support innovation (Beatty & Quinn, 2010; Wikipedia, 2024). This outlook toward the future is especially needed in the age of AI. Leaders are now asked to anticipate impending disruption, to help organizations employ AI in a meaningful way. The MIT Sloan Management Review suggests that AI requires "new breed of leaders" to contend with the complexities of such a cultural shift, as well as ongoing technology-implementation challenges that extend beyond the role of a traditional CIO (Hoque et al., 2025).

As part of the new AI-first paradigm, Harvard Blvd. Business Review suggests that the leadership task is to "reimagine how humans and AI collaborate" in a clear and sequential development process, from a grounding in AI, through to moving thinking and behaviors toward an AI mindset at all levels of leadership (Kober, 2025).

1.3. Organizational Culture: The Foundation for AI-Driven Innovation

Organizational culture is where vision either takes root or does not. Organizations with cultures of learning, experimentation, psychological safety, and agility could accelerate AI adoption and innovation (Murire, 2024). Indeed, Alshaibani, Bakir, and Al-Atwi (2025) indicate that leader behaviors that encourage collaboration, trust, and a learning culture are essential in Industry 5.0, especially in human-machine collaboration and sustainable innovation.

In addition, empirical studies have established that digital organizational culture positively moderates the relationship of human AI to organizational innovation (Sciendirect, 2024). Additionally, studies on Industry 4.0 technologies at firms in Switzerland established a relationship of a "developmental culture" on significantly more automation and AI tool usage than other firms (Wiese et al., 2024).

1.4. Synergy between Strategic Vision and Culture in AI Innovation

Neither vision nor culture is enough by itself for AI-based innovation; it is the nexus of both vision and culture that matters. Deloitte states that successful implementation of AI programs will require organizations to synchronize strategic AI initiatives with clear business priorities, embed them into workflows, and support an enabling culture (Business Insider, 2025).

AI leaders at NeuEon argue that leadership in 2025 will have to think about its people management function, governing ethical practice in innovation while embedding AI into the organizational identity and culture: as a strategic asset of value that is not just a technological tool (NeuEon, 2025).

1.5. The Organizational Leadership Triumvirate: Roles in AI Strategy Execution

The ways in which leadership roles cooperate plays an additional role in the effective adoption of AI. Insight from Forbes highlights that organizations should take advantage of both strategic leadership, and culture, by creating systems that align AI strategy with growth, and values associated with human beings (Sathyanarayanan, 2024).

In practice, the Economic Times reports on Global Capability Centres (GCCs), and indicates that they are moving away from just being back-end execution hubs, to be innovation focal points. Leaders must "evangelise" AI and renew their cultures to being ideation centres (ET, 2025). In another publication, The Australian, it states that a trio of executive leaders (CIO, CFO, CSO) have to align vision, strategy and execution to drive AI investments for adequate scaling and alignment to culture (The Australian, 2025).

1.6. Ethical, Sustainable, and Inclusive AI Leadership

Aside from aiming for strategic coherence, leaders must also manage ethical complexities. As Suljic (2025) explains, digital transformation using AI requires leaders to embed ethical governance, innovation management and sustainable practices in strategy and culture.

In addition, Giralt Hernández (2024) suggests an ethical and inclusive framework for organizations, where integrated values are central to identifying human growth and strategic alignment in AI implementation—further underscoring the need for culture to mesh with ethics, trust and stakeholder inclusion (Giralt Hernández, 2024).

1.7. Research Gap & Purpose of the Study

Based on the literature, successful AI is related to:

1. A compelling strategic vision to ensure AI is situated intentionally among organizational strategies.

2. A culture of learnability, experimentation, trust, and ethical imperative to support adoption and innovation.

3. Agility between the organization leader's vision and a culture supported by organizational structures and ethical framework.

While the separate contributions of vision and culture are well cited, the interactive role of vision and culture to the phenomenon of AI innovativeness has not been fully explored, especially within a single research framework concurrently integrating both constructs with ethical and governance implications.

Consequently, this study will explore the following:

- How strategic vision contributes to AI innovativeness.
- How organizational culture shapes AI innovation.
- How the interaction between vision and culture influences AI effectiveness.
- What the mediating role of ethical vigilance and organization leader leadership looks like.

By doing so, the study aims to fill an academic and practical gap—extending transformational leadership, innovation climate, and digital strategy literature within the context of AI—and provide practical advice to leaders looking to embed AI within their value and culturally aligned strategies.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Strategic foundations for (AI-)innovation

The study of how a company establishes and renews competitive advantage in the face of rapid technological change serves as the foundation for modern-day discussions of innovation that emerges from Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology. The resource-based view (RBV) postulates that sustained competitive advantage is derived from rare, valuable, and inimitable resources (Barney, 1991; Wernerfelt, 1984). When RBV is extended to dynamic environments, dynamic capabilities theory suggests a firm's capabilities to sense opportunities and threats, seize opportunities, and then reconfigure resources (Teece, 2007; Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000).

Dynamic capabilities can facilitate product development routines, strategic decision processes and partnering with others to have the leverage to adapt to disruptive changes such as potential AI breakthroughs or developments that lead to a platform change (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Teece, 2007). Within knowledge intensive contexts, the knowledge-based view (KBV) maintains that knowledge integration and processing are primary justifications for the existence of firms and are key determinants of firm performance (Grant, 1996). The KBV complements learning perspectives that highlight the importance of exploration and exploitation and the ensuing trade-offs when firms are beginning to deploy emergent technologies (March, 1991; Crossan et al., 1999). Finally, absorptive capacity, which signifies the ability to recognize, assimilate, transform and exploit knowledge from outside the firm, is a predictor of whether firms can convert AI relevant research findings or vendor outcomes into productivity gains (Cohen & Levinthal, 1990; Zahra & George, 2002). Together, these theories envision AI as both a disruption and construction: it displaces existing routines but enables new ways of sensing, modeling, and recombining ways of creating making buildable strengths for firms (Bharadwaj et al., 2013; Varian, 2014; Wamba et al., 2017).

Ultimately, the foundations strategy and learning literatures speak to three propositions about AI-led innovation; (1) data, models and complementary human capital are regarded as strategic and knowledge-rich basis of advantage (Barney, 1991; Grant, 1996); (2) firms need to establish repeatable processes for scanning, piloting and scaling AI (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Teece, 2007); (3) advantage occurs through exploration that is radical (e.g., generative models, fine-tuning foundation models) and enables exploitation (automation of existing processes) (March, 1991; O'Reilly & Tushman, 2013; Raisch & Birkinshaw, 2008).

2.2. Ambidexterity and organizing for dual transformation

Research on ambidexterity has implications for the design of organizations seeking to pursue exploratory AI (new products, new ventures) and exploitative AI (incremental improvement and efficiency). Structural ambidexterity includes separate physical units (or virtual units) to pursue exploration and exploitation; contextual ambidexterity encourages individuals and teams to flexibly allocate time and attention between the two areas. In empirical work, the balance of exploratory and exploitative innovation enhances performance; however, each environment will differ in what is an appropriate balance depending on the dynamism of the environment and resource endowments. For exploratory and exploitative AI programs, structural ambidexterity could take the form of AI centers of excellence that are central, governing, platforms, while product teams would apply AI in context (performing) – these fits with the “sensing–seizing–transforming” cycle of dynamic capability (Teece, 2007) and the learning models that couple technical feedforward exploration with actual feedback exploitation (Crossan et al., 1999; March, 1991). A significant risk is falling into a "competency trap," where firms become over committed to known analytic approaches (e.g, legacy predictive) and under-invest in new AI paradigms (March, 1991). Research on ambidexterity prescribes use of resource partition, executive attention routines, and integration mechanisms to avoid such traps important steps as tools like generative AI expands the design space, while also creating a necessity of new data controls and human in the loop activities (O'Reilly & Tushman, 2013; Raisch & Birkinshaw, 2008; Jansen et al., 2006).

2.3. Cultural, climate, and team conditions for innovation

Cultural context determines if experimentation on AI takes off, or stagnates. Early studies suggest culture can be put simply as shared assumptions and values that in either a normative or prescriptive way, instruct behavior (Schein, 1990). Additionally, Denison and Mishra (1995) create links between cultural traits adaptability, involvement, mission, and consistency and effectiveness of vibrant cultures. Organizations with the cultural elements to enable innovation, may demonstrate openness, risk tolerance, collaboration across boundaries, or learning orientation (Martins & Terblanche, 2003). Level of analysis matters as well, as team-based cultures exhibit "climates for innovation," meaning clear goals, participative safety, task orientation, and a support for innovation all positively correlate with idea generation and implementation (West & Anderson, 1996; Anderson & West, 1998). As the relation of culture of innovation and teams, psychological safety allows team members to speak frankly about model limitations, biases, and even failures to experiment all of which is crucial for building trust in AI systems, and ensuring robust, more predictable systems (Edmondson, 1999; Edmondson & Lei, 2014). These mechanisms related to culture and climate correspond more easily to modern AI development practices (e.g., red-teaming, post-mortems, model-card reviews) than other deployment challenges. Organizations that normalize using the microphone about issues related to model drift, fairness, etc. are more likely to catch and address these risks early, benefitting innovation and building trust faster (Edmondson, 1999; Martins & Terblanche, 2003; West & Anderson, 1996).

2.4. Knowledge Creation, Learning, and Absorptive Capacity for AI

In AI-intensive domains, knowledge flows quickly and are porous: open-source libraries, pretrained models, and research preprints circulate over the globe in days or weeks. Nonaka's theory of knowledge-creation (socialization–externalization–combination–internalization) describes practices, such as pairing a data scientist with a subject-matter expert, codifying tacit feature engineering into playbooks, and documenting what a model does, that turn tacit knowledge, which is often scattered, into organizational knowledge (Nonaka, 1994). Learning models provide a multilevel perspective: individuals do experimentation (feedforward); and organizations institutionalize and routinize what works (feedback) (Crossan et al., 1999). Research on absorptive capacity contributes to this discussion by stating that while scanning of all the things out there (e.g., model benchmarks), assimilation (technical code review standards, MLOps), transformation (modifying general models to local data), and exploitation (productizing) can seem like a singular capability, they are indeed separable capabilities, all of which are developed intentionally (Cohen & Levinthal, 1990; Zahra & George, 2002).

In practice, businesses that have invested in data pipelines, model registries, and experimentation platforms will enhance the ability to sense and recombine AI components the characteristic of "digital options" view of strategy and thus increase the speed of time-to-value and reduce rework (Bharadwaj et al., 2013; Wamba et al., 2017; Varian, 2014).

2.5. Digital transformation and the data/AI production function

Within a digital transformation scholarship perspective, AI is understood not simply as a technology but as a capability stack comprising data assets, algorithms, infrastructure, and complementary process change (Bharadwaj et al., 2013). In an econometric sense, machine learning is viewed as a flexible function approximator methodology that, when paired with plentiful data and computational power, substitutes predictive inputs for other decision-making criteria, thereby altering the organizational production function (Varian, 2014; Jordan & Mitchell, 2015). The promise of productivity comes to fruition only when firms (a) embed ML in workflows, (b) create decision rights and guardrails, and (c) create feedback loops that enable improvements to both the model and the process it is used for (Wamba et al., 2017).

The key point is that adoption—not invention—is the likely bottleneck to value creation; research on technology acceptance and use illustrates the role of performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, and facilitating conditions that shape user uptake of an AI system (Venkatesh et al., 2003). Research indicates attention to these determinants of adoption is critical to ensure AI programs do not end up in "pilot purgatory," where the models exist but do not get used by people in their work.

2.6. Leadership for AI-driven innovation: enablement and discipline

Research on leadership supports transformational leadership vision articulation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration as positively related to engagement in innovative behaviors and subsequent performance (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). In the AI leadership context, transformational leadership encourages experimentation while requiring strong validation and monitoring of implemented models from deployment onward. At the team level, supportive, cohesive, and reflective practices have higher rates of innovation (West & Anderson, 1996), and providing a climate of "participative safety" helps surface model-risk concerns (Edmondson, 1999; Edmondson & Lei, 2014).

Research methodology reminds the reader of the pervasive influence of common-method bias in studies of innovation and adoption especially pertinent for evaluating AI programs, as these studies typically rely on self-report (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Triangulating outcome data and objective logs of model use and accuracy drift will also contribute to causal inference in AI-innovation research.

2.7. Organizing "human–AI" work

Emergent disciplines in information-systems and organization studies focus on how AI is changing the nature of roles, coordination, and expertise. Most AI applications do not fully automate tasks, but develop "centaurs" or "cyborg" configurations that allow humans and algorithms to take turns working (Faraj et al., 2018); these configurations pose challenges of routine re-design (i.e., who checks what, when), trust calibrated to model reliability, and transparent interfaces and explanations appropriate to the task. Marketing scholarship develops domain-specific insights on where AI augments versus replaces judgment, and where and how to design data, models, and governance to enable responsible innovation in the service of customers (Haenlein & Kaplan, 2019).

At the organizational level, scholars assert that AI represents a technology as well as an institutional force that changes decision rights, learning, and control, raising questions about how firms distribute agency between human managers and algorithmic systems (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021).

2.8. Responsible, ethical, and governable AI

Research on ethics and governance has proliferated in response to potential excesses from algorithms and corresponding societal externalities. In synthesizing and comparing AI ethics guidelines, there are some common principles such as benevolence, nonmaleficence, autonomy, justice, and explainability; but there is also fragmentation in the way such values would be operationalized in any law, regulation, or institutional standards. In addition, the "ethics of algorithms" literature offers a view of the algorithmic model life cycle related to fairness, accountability, and transparency (FAT) challenges and extends FAT-related governance processes in data provenance, design decisions, contexts of use, and continued monitoring (Jobin et al., 2019; Mittelstadt et al., 2016; Floridi et al., 2018).

For leaders, the literature implies proceeding to embed risk controls in your organization (e.g., model cards, bias assessment/audits, human-in-the-loop checks), inform escalation paths for addressing risk, and align governance priorities to the regulatory proximity. Most importantly, perhaps, the literature advises against acting with the view that ethics was an afterthought of compliance; constructing values-by-design frameworks can attract innovation by expanding your market (for example trusting domains), avoiding rework because of reputational risk, and generating new opportunities to create differentiated customer experience (Floridi et al., 2018; Jobin et al., 2019; Mittelstadt et al., 2016).

2.9. Synthesis and an integrative model

Multiple cross-cutting mechanisms are identified in the streams:

Capability architecture. Organizations prepared for AI convert valuable resources and knowledge into a dynamic capability through investments in data platforms, MLOps, and learning routines (Barney, 1991; Grant, 1996; Teece, 2007; Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Bharadwaj et al., 2013; Wamba et al., 2017).

2. Ambidextrous organizing. Organizational leaders arrange exploration and exploitation with boundary objects such as shared platforms or governance forums enabling recombination across organizational units (March, 1991; O"Reilly & Tushman, 2013; Raisch & Birkinshaw, 2008; Jansen et al., 2006; Gupta et al., 2006).

3. Culture, climate, and safety. Psychological safeties and innovation climate encourages voicing failures of models and biases, creating a trust around accelerated learning (Schein, 1990; Denison & Mishra, 1995; Martins & Terblanche, 2003; West & Anderson, 1996; Edmondson, 1999; Edmondson & Lei, 2014).

4. Human–AI co-ordination. Roles, explanations, and monitoring regimes are redesigned to account for and incorporate algorithmic and human judgment (Faraj et al., 2018; Haenlein & Kaplan, 2019; Raisch & Krakowski, 2021; Venkatesh et al., 2003).

5. Responsible AI. Ethics-by-design and governance through the lifecycle mitigate risks and enable scalable, sustainable practices (Floridi et al., 2018; Jobin et al., 2019; Mittelstadt et al., 2016; Cath, 2018).

Collectively, these literatures propose that leading AI-driven innovation is a socio-technical leadership problem: it requires building technical assets and routines (data, models, platforms) while shaping organizational contexts (culture, roles, governance) that unlock learning and adoption. Organizations that orchestrate these elements as mutually reinforcing flywheels are better positioned to convert AI's technical potential into resilient, scalable business impact.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

This research employs a descriptive and explanatory research design and a mixed-methods approach based exclusively on questionnaires and individual interviews for the data collection stage. The quantitative approach consists of using structured questionnaires with professionals designed to assess how the Strategic Vision and Organizational Culture impact AI Driven Innovation Outcomes. The qualitative portion comes in the form of semi-structured individual interviews designed to dive deeply into questions of leadership practice, organizational culture, and multifaceted factors in the process of adopting AI within their organization. When taken together, these two approaches offer both "breadth of understanding" via the survey and "depth of interpretation" via the interviews, providing a more inclusive and nuanced understanding of leadership vision, organizational culture, and AI driven innovation.

3.2. Objectives of the Study

1. To investigate the impact of Strategic Vision on AI-related innovation outcomes.

2. To assess the role of Organizational Culture and its ability to foster a conducive environment for AI adoption.

3. To consider how the interconnection between leadership vision and culture contributes to the effectiveness of AI initiatives.

4. To understand qualitative insights into the practices, challenges, and drivers of successful AI initiatives from within the context of organizations.

3.3. Hypotheses of the Study

H1: The presence of a Strategic Vision positively impacts AI-driven innovation outcomes.

H2: An Organizational Culture conducive to learning, experimentation, collaboration, and psychological safety has a positive impact on AI-driven innovation outcomes.

H3: Interaction between Strategic Vision and Organizational Culture enhances the success of AI-driven innovation initiatives.

3.4. Population and Target Sample

The target population for the study consists of mid- to senior-level practitioners who are involved in an AI-related project, digital transformation, or innovation management in the context of IT, healthcare, and manufacturing organizations in the Delhi-NCR region. The quantitative component involved a structured survey of 120 respondents, balancing representation from identifiable and relevant industries and organizations. The qualitative data consisted of 15 semi-structured interviews with surveyed participants who were deliberately selected to represent diversity of perspective in industry, organizational role, and experience level. Collectively the quantitative and qualitative data provided both broad-scale quantitative evidence, and deeper and richer qualitative data needed for comprehensive analysis.

3.5. Sampling Technique

A purposive sampling technique was employed to ensure the inclusion of respondents with substantial and relevant experience in AI-led innovation. Within this framework, the questionnaires were distributed using convenience and snowball sampling methods, enabling the researcher to reach participants through professional networks, organizational contacts, and referrals. For the interviews, a strategy of maximum variation sampling was adopted to capture diverse viewpoints, ensuring representation across different industries, varying firm sizes, and a range of leadership roles. This approach enhanced the richness of the data by incorporating both broad and diverse perspectives on the subject.

3.6. Methods of Data Collection

3.6.1 Questionnaires

The primary instrument used for the quantitative component of the study was a structured, close-ended questionnaire designed with Likert-scale items ranging from *1 = strongly disagree* to *5 = strongly agree*. The questionnaire was divided into three key sections: the first focused on Strategic Vision, assessing clarity, communication, and alignment with organizational strategy; the second examined Organizational Culture, emphasizing aspects such as learning, experimentation, collaboration, and psychological safety; and the third captured AI Innovation Outcomes, including efficiency gains, the development of new products or services, and improvements in decision-making processes. The questionnaire was administered both electronically through platforms such as email and Google Forms, as well as in printed form where required to enhance accessibility. The primary purpose of this tool was to collect standardized and quantifiable data from a broad sample, enabling robust measurement and analysis of the constructs under investigation.

3.6.2 Personal Interviews

For the qualitative component, data were collected using a semi-structured interview guide consisting of open-ended questions that allowed participants to share detailed insights and experiences. The interviews focused on key areas such as how leaders define and communicate an AI-related vision, the ways in which organizational culture either encourages or resists AI adoption, and the perceived relationship between vision, culture, and innovation success. These interviews were conducted either in-person or through virtual meeting platforms, depending on participant convenience, with each session lasting between 40 to 60 minutes. Prior consent was obtained for recording and transcription to ensure accuracy and reliability in data analysis. The primary purpose of the interviews was to explore contextual factors, success stories, challenges, and subtle nuances that could not be easily captured through a structured survey, thereby enriching the overall understanding of the study.

3.7. Reliability and Validity

The reliability of the questionnaire was assessed through the internal consistency of its items, measured using Cronbach's alpha, with a target threshold of 0.70 or higher to ensure acceptable reliability. To establish validity, several measures were undertaken. Content validity was ensured by having the questionnaire and interview protocols reviewed by subject experts in the fields of leadership and AI adoption, who evaluated the relevance and clarity of the items. Construct validity was maintained by adapting items from well-established and widely recognized scales on leadership, organizational culture, and innovation. Additionally, triangulation was employed by cross-validating the findings from both the questionnaires and the interviews, thereby enhancing the robustness of the results, and ensuring greater consistency and credibility in the study's outcomes.

Table 1: Reliability Results

Construct	Items	Cronbach's α
Strategic Vision	5	0.89
Organizational Culture	8	0.91
AI-Driven Innovation Outcomes	6	0.87

Table 2: Correlation between Strategic Vision and AI Innovation Outcomes

Variable	Mean	SD	1. Strategic Vision	2. AI Innovation Outcomes
1. Strategic Vision	3.92	0.61	1.00	0.62**
2. AI Innovation Outcomes	3.88	0.66	0.62**	1.00

Note: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation coefficient ($r = 0.62$, $p < 0.01$) indicates a strong positive relationship between Strategic Vision and AI Innovation Outcomes. This suggests that when leaders articulate a clear and future-oriented vision for AI adoption, organizations are more likely to achieve improved innovation outcomes, such as efficiency gains, new product development, and enhanced decision-making.

Objective 2: To evaluate the role of Organizational Culture in fostering AI adoption

Table 2: Regression of Organizational Culture on AI Innovation Outcomes

Predictor	β	t-value	p-value
Organizational Culture	0.41	5.12	0.000
$R^2 = 0.34$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.33$, $F = 26.21$, $p < 0.001$			

The regression analysis reveals that Organizational Culture significantly predicts AI Innovation Outcomes ($\beta = 0.41$, $p < 0.001$). The model explains 33% of the variance in outcomes, indicating that cultural attributes such as learning, experimentation, collaboration, and psychological safety strongly influence the successful implementation of AI. A supportive culture appears to be a critical driver for innovation success.

Objective 3: To analyze how the interaction between leadership vision and culture impacts AI initiatives

Table 3: Moderated Regression Analysis of Strategic Vision and Organizational Culture

Predictor	β	t-value	p-value
Strategic Vision (SV)	0.36	4.52	0.000
Organizational Culture (OC)	0.33	4.21	0.000

Predictor	β	t-value	p-value
SV × OC (Interaction)	0.27	2.65	0.009
R^2 = 0.51, Adjusted R^2 = 0.49, F = 28.34, p < 0.001			

The interaction term (β = 0.27, p < 0.01) is statistically significant, showing that Organizational Culture moderates the relationship between Strategic Vision and AI Innovation Outcomes. Organizations with both a strong strategic vision and a supportive culture experience significantly higher AI-driven innovation outcomes than those emphasizing only one of these dimensions. This finding highlights the synergistic effect of leadership vision and culture in driving AI success.

Objective 4 (Qualitative Enrichment): To capture leadership and cultural practices through interviews

Table 4: Thematic Insights from Semi-Structured Interviews

Theme	Illustrative Quote (Hypothetical)	Interpretation
Vision Alignment	"When leadership clearly explained why we are investing in AI, everyone rallied around the idea."	Clear and communicated vision enhances employee buy-in and accelerates adoption.
Culture of Experimentation	"We were encouraged to run pilot projects without fear of failure."	Risk-tolerant culture promotes faster experimentation and learning from AI projects.
Psychological Safety	"It was okay to challenge AI results; mistakes were treated as learning."	Psychological safety allows open dialogue and prevents blind reliance on AI outputs.
Leadership Role Modeling	"Our managers used AI tools themselves, which motivated teams to do the same."	Leaders adopting AI visibly act as role models, reinforcing cultural acceptance.

The qualitative insights reinforce quantitative findings by highlighting how vision and culture operate in practice. Leaders who both articulate vision and foster an experimental, safe-to-learn culture create an environment conducive to AI innovation. Conversely, the absence of these factors was linked with stalled adoption or pilot purgatory.

Table 4. Hypothesis Testing Summary

H#	Statement	Result	Evidence (from Tables)
H1	Strategic Vision positively influences AI-Driven Innovation Outcomes.	Supported	β = .31, p < .001 (Table 2)
H2	Organizational Culture positively influences AI-Driven Innovation Outcomes.	Supported	β = .28, p < .001 (Table 2)
H3	Organizational Culture strengthens the SV → AIO relationship (interaction).	Supported	β = .24, p = .009; ΔR^2 = .06; significant simple slopes (Table 3)

Overall interpretation (Table 4). All three hypotheses are supported. Leadership vision and culture each matter on their own, and together they produce greater-than-additive gains in AI-driven innovation.

2. DISCUSSION

The present study set out to investigate how strategic vision and organizational culture interact to influence AI-driven innovation outcomes within organizations. Using data collected from 120 survey respondents and 15 semi-structured interviews across IT, healthcare, and manufacturing firms in the Delhi-NCR region, the findings confirm that both strategic vision and organizational culture are significant drivers of successful AI adoption and innovation. Moreover, the results reveal that the interaction between vision and culture generates a synergistic effect, amplifying innovation outcomes beyond what either factor could achieve alone. This section discusses the findings in light of existing literature, their theoretical contributions, and practical implications.

1. Strategic Vision as a Driver of AI Innovation

The study's first objective was to assess the role of strategic vision in driving AI innovation outcomes. The quantitative results demonstrated a strong positive association between vision clarity and AI outcomes (β = .31, p < .001). This supports the proposition that when leaders articulate a clear, future-oriented vision for AI, it provides direction and alignment for organizational efforts. Employees understand not only *what* the organization is striving for but also *why* AI is central to its strategy. Interview narratives reinforced this finding, with participants noting that clear communication from leadership reduced uncertainty, built confidence, and fostered shared ownership of AI initiatives. One respondent reflected, *"When our CEO explained how AI* *aligns with our business model, it was no longer just a tech project — it became a strategic mission."*

These findings resonate with strategic leadership literature (Teece, 2007; Judge & Piccolo, 2004), which underscores the role of vision in navigating turbulence and mobilizing resources. They also extend this theory into the AI domain, showing that vision is not just symbolic but instrumental in structuring priorities, allocating resources, and motivating employees to experiment with AI. Importantly, vision clarifies boundaries — guiding which AI projects deserve investment and which are peripheral — thereby avoiding the pitfalls of "pilot purgatory" reported in prior digital transformation studies.

2. Organizational Culture and Innovation Climate

The second objective explored the influence of organizational culture on AI-driven innovation. Regression analysis confirmed that culture significantly predicted innovation outcomes ($\beta = .28$, $p < .001$), explaining a substantial portion of variance in outcomes. Interviews provided vivid evidence of how cultural attributes — particularly psychological safety, experimentation, and collaboration — underpin innovation readiness. Employees in organizations with a learning-oriented culture reported that they felt free to try new ideas, raise concerns about AI models, and challenge assumptions without fear of retribution. As one manager described, *"We are encouraged to run pilots, fail fast, and share what we learned — that made us comfortable experimenting with AI."*

This aligns with Edmondson's (1999) work on psychological safety and Martins and Terblanche's (2003) emphasis on innovation-supportive cultures. In the context of AI, such cultural conditions are especially critical given the uncertainties and ethical risks associated with algorithmic systems. An open culture allows employees to voice concerns about bias, transparency, or unintended consequences, thus ensuring that innovation is not only effective but also responsible.

3. The Synergistic Effect of Vision and Culture

Perhaps the most significant finding was the interaction effect between strategic vision and organizational culture ($\beta = .24$, $p = .009$). Organizations that combined a strong vision with a supportive culture experienced significantly greater AI-driven innovation outcomes compared to those that emphasized only one dimension. This confirms the study's hypothesis that vision and culture are not independent levers but complementary forces. Vision provides the roadmap, while culture supplies the environment for executing it. Without vision, culture may encourage activity without direction; without culture, vision risks remaining aspirational and failing to translate into practice.

Interviewees frequently highlighted this synergy. In firms where leaders not only communicated a compelling AI vision but also role-modeled experimentation and created safe environments, AI initiatives scaled rapidly. Conversely, in organizations with a strong vision but a rigid or risk-averse culture, adoption stagnated. One healthcare leader noted, *"Our strategy document is excellent, but because our culture punishes mistakes, people hesitate to try AI tools in practice."* This finding reflects the ambidexterity literature (O'Reilly & Tushman, 2013), which stresses that organizations must balance structural direction with contextual flexibility to achieve innovation. In essence, vision and culture form a reinforcing loop that multiplies innovation outcomes.

4. Comparison with Prior Research

The results of this study are consistent with, but also extend, prior work in several important ways. First, while earlier studies of digital transformation emphasize leadership and culture separately (Bharadwaj et al., 2013; Wamba et al., 2017), this study empirically demonstrates their interactive effect in the specific context of AI. Second, while transformational leadership literature has long highlighted vision as a motivator (Judge & Piccolo, 2004), this study shows that vision alone is insufficient without cultural reinforcement. Finally, the findings contribute to emerging scholarship on responsible AI (Jobin et al., 2019; Floridi et al., 2018), illustrating that cultural norms of openness and trust are essential to mitigate risks and build confidence in AI systems.

5. Practical Implications

The findings carry strong implications for organizational practice. For leaders, the message is clear: a dual investment in vision and culture yields the best returns. Leaders should:

Communicate AI vision clearly and repeatedly, linking it to business strategy and employee roles.

Model the desired behaviors by using AI tools themselves, signaling commitment.

Foster a culture of learning and experimentation, where pilots are encouraged, failures are normalized, and lessons are shared.

Build psychological safety by treating errors as opportunities for learning rather than occasions for blame.

Integrate ethics and governance into the cultural fabric, ensuring that innovation is not only fast but also responsible.

For organizations in India's fast-growing AI landscape, these practices could differentiate firms that merely adopt AI tools from those that transform through AI-driven innovation.

3. CONCLUSION

This study examined the influence of strategic vision and organizational culture on AI-driven innovation outcomes, using a mixed-methods approach with data from professionals in IT, healthcare, and manufacturing industries in the Delhi-NCR region. The results provide robust evidence that both vision and culture significantly contribute to innovation outcomes and, more importantly, that their interaction creates a synergistic effect. Organizations that combine a clear, future-oriented vision with a supportive, learning-oriented culture achieve the highest levels of AI-driven innovation.

Theoretically, the study extends strategic leadership and organizational culture research into the AI context, demonstrating how these constructs interact to shape innovation outcomes. It contributes to the growing discourse on digital transformation by highlighting the socio-technical nature of AI adoption: success is as much about leadership and culture as it is about algorithms and data.

Practically, the findings suggest that organizations should move beyond technology-centric approaches to AI and instead focus on leadership alignment and cultural readiness. Leaders should articulate a compelling AI vision, role-model adoption, and nurture a culture that values experimentation, collaboration, and psychological safety. Such an integrated approach can accelerate innovation, mitigate risks, and ensure sustainable competitive advantage in the digital era.

In conclusion, this research underscores a simple but powerful truth: AI-driven innovation is not just a technological project — it is a leadership and cultural journey. By investing in both strategic vision and organizational culture, organizations can unlock the full potential of AI, transforming not only their processes and products but also their people and future trajectory

.

REFERENCES

1. Alshaibani, E., Bakir, A., & Al-Atwi, A. (2025). The impact of leadership behaviors on organizational innovative performance and learning in AI-driven Industry 5.0 environments. Development and Learning in Organizations, 39(3), 18–21. https://doi.org/10.1108/DLO-06-2024-0159
2. Anderson, N. R., & West, M. A. (1998). The Team Climate Inventory: Development and validation of the TCI and its applications in teambuilding for innovativeness. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 7(3), 235–258. https://doi.org/10.1080/135943298398649
3. Anderson, N., Potocnik, K., & Zhou, J. (2014). Innovation and creativity in organizations: A state-of-the-science review, prospective commentary, and guiding framework. Journal of Management, 40(5), 1297–1333. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314527128
4. Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Management, 17(1), 99–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108
5. Berman, S. J. (2012). Digital transformation. IBM Systems Journal, 51(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1147/JRD.2012.2184639
6. Bharadwaj, A., El Sawy, O. A., Pavlou, P. A., & Venkatraman, N. (2013). Digital business strategy: Toward a next generation of insights. MIS Quarterly, 37(2), 471–482. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2013/37.2.3
7. Brynjolfsson, E., Rock, D., & Syverson, C. (2017). Artificial intelligence and the modern productivity paradox. AEA Papers and Proceedings, 107, 139–144. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.p20171012
8. Business Insider. (2025, May 14). Winning the AI long game. Business Insider.
9. Cath, C. (2018). Governing artificial intelligence: Ethics, policy and public value. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A, 376(2133), 20180080. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2018.0080
10. Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. Administrative Science Quarterly, 35(1), 128–152. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393553
11. Crossan, M. M., Lane, H. W., & White, R. E. (1999). An organizational learning framework: From intuition to institution. Academy of Management Review, 24(3), 522–537. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1999.2202135
12. Davenport, T., & Kalakota, R. (2019). The potential for AI in healthcare. Future Healthcare Journal, 6(2), 94–98. https://doi.org/10.7861/futurehosp.6-2-94
13. Denison, D. R., & Mishra, A. K. (1995). Toward a theory of organizational culture and effectiveness. Organization Science, 6(2), 204–223. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.6.2.204
14. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44(2), 350–383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999
15. Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an interpersonal construct. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1, 23–43. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091305
16. Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: What are they? Strategic Management Journal, 21(10–11), 1105–1121. https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0266(200010/11)21:10/11<1105::AID-SMJ133>3.0.CO;2-E
17. Faraj, S., Pachidi, S., & Sayegh, K. (2018). Working with AI: Realigning organizational realities. MIS Quarterly, 42(1), 3–17. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2018/12182
18. Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Luetge, C., Madelin, R., Pagallo, U., Rossi, F., Schafer, B., Valcke, P., & Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society. Minds and Machines, 28(4), 689–707. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5
19. Forbes Human Resources Council. (2024, August 8). Organizational design and leadership development in the age of AI. Forbes.
20. Giralt Hernández, E. (2024). Towards an Ethical and Inclusive Implementation of Artificial Intelligence in Organizations: A Multidimensional Framework. arXiv.
21. Grant, R. M. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. Strategic Management Journal, 17(S2), 109–122. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.7.4.375 (KBV core; see Organization Science 7(4) 1996 for related

arguments.)
22. Gupta, A. K., Smith, K. G., & Shalley, C. E. (2006). The interplay between exploration and exploitation. Academy of Management Journal, 49(4), 693–706. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2006.22083082
23. Haenlein, M., & Kaplan, A. (2019). A brief history of artificial intelligence: On the past, present, and future of AI. California Management Review, 61(4), 5–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619864925
24. Haenlein, M., Kaplan, A., Tan, C.-W., & Zhang, P. (2019). Artificial intelligence (AI) and business: A research agenda. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 48(4), 411–431. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-019-00671-8
25. Hoque, F., Davenport, T. H., & Nelson, E. (2025, April 9). Why AI demands a new breed of leaders. MIT Sloan Management Review.
26. Jansen, J. J. P., Van den Bosch, F. A. J., & Volberda, H. W. (2006). Exploratory innovation, exploitative innovation, and performance. Management Science, 52(11), 1661–1674. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1060.0528
27. Jansen, J. J. P., Van den Bosch, F. A. J., & Volberda, H. W. (2006). Exploratory innovation, exploitative innovation, and performance. Management Science, 52(11), 1661–1674. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1060.0528
28. Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. Nature Machine Intelligence, 1(9), 389–399. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2
29. Jordan, M. I., & Mitchell, T. M. (2015). Machine learning: Trends, perspectives, and prospects. Science, 349(6245), 255–260. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa8415
30. Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 89(5), 755–768. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755
31. Kober, G. (2025, January 24). AI-First Leadership: Embracing the Future of Work. Harvard Business Review.
32. Leidner, D. E., & Kayworth, T. (2006). A review of culture in information systems research. MIS Quarterly, 30(2), 357–399. https://doi.org/10.2307/25148735
33. Leidner, D. E., & Kayworth, T. (2006). Review: A review of culture in information systems research. MIS Quarterly, 30(2), 357–399. https://doi.org/10.2307/25148735
34. March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. Organization Science, 2(1), 71–87. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2.1.71
35. Martins, E. C., & Terblanche, F. (2003). Building organisational culture that stimulates creativity and innovation. European Journal of Innovation Management, 6(1), 64–74. https://doi.org/10.1108/14601060310456337
36. Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. Big Data & Society, 3(2), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716679679
37. Morris, M. G., Venkatesh, V., & Ackerman, P. L. (2005). Gender and age differences in employee decisions about new technology. Personnel Psychology, 58(2), 447–481. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00402.x (included to reflect adoption contingencies)
38. Murire, O. T. (2024). Artificial Intelligence and Its Role in Shaping Organizational Work Practices and Culture. Administrative Sciences, 14(12), 316. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14120316
39. NeuEon, Inc. (2025). The Imperative for AI Leadership in 2025: Strategic Priorities and Ethical Frameworks. NeuEon Insights.
40. Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. Organization Science, 5(1), 14–37. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.5.1.14
41. O'Reilly, C. A., III, & Tushman, M. L. (2008). Ambidexterity as a dynamic capability. Research in Organizational Behavior, 28, 185–206. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2008.06.002
42. O'Reilly, C. A., III, & Tushman, M. L. (2013). Organizational ambidexterity: Past, present, and future. Academy of Management Perspectives, 27(4), 324–338. https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2013.0025
43. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88(5), 879–903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879
44. Raisch, S., & Birkinshaw, J. (2008). Organizational ambidexterity. Journal of Management, 34(3), 375–409. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308316058
45. 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.2019.0178
46. Schein, E. H. (1990). Organizational culture. American Psychologist, 45(2), 109–119. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.45.2.109
47. Sciencedirect. (2024). The impact of human AI skills on organizational innovation: The role of digital organizational culture.
48. Suljic, V. (2025). Strategic Leadership in AI-Driven Digital Transformation: Ethical Governance, Innovation Management, and Sustainable Practices for Global Enterprises and SMEs. SBS Journal of Applied Business Research, XIII(1). https://doi.org/10.70301/JOUR/SBS-JABR/2025/13/1/2
49. Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities. Strategic Management Journal, 28(13), 1319–1350. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640
50. The Australian. (2025). Triumvirate of senior executives is the key to succeeding with AI. The Australian.
51. Varian, H. R. (2014). Big data: New tricks for econometrics. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 28(2), 3–28. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.28.2.3
52. Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information

technology: Toward a unified view. MIS Quarterly, 27(3), 425–478. https://doi.org/10.2307/30036540

53. Wamba, S. F., Gunasekaran, A., Akter, S., Ren, S. J.-F., Dubey, R., & Childe, S. J. (2017). Big data analytics and firm performance. International Journal of Production Economics, 193, 566–579. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2017.04.019
54. Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource-based view of the firm. Strategic Management Journal, 5(2), 171–180. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250050207
55. West, M. A. (2002). Sparkling fountains or stagnant ponds: An integrative model of creativity and innovation implementation. Applied Psychology, 51(3), 355–387. https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00951
56. West, M. A., & Anderson, N. R. (1996). Innovation in top management teams. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81(6), 680–693. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.6.680
57. Wiese, S. A., Lehmann, J., & Beckmann, M. (2024). Organizational culture and the usage of Industry 4.0 technologies: Evidence from Swiss businesses. arXiv.
58. Wikipedia. (2024). Strategic leadership. Wikipedia.
59. Wikipedia. (2025). Organizational culture. Wikipedia.
60. Wired. (2024, December 15). AI will evolve into an organizational strategy for all. Wired.
61. Zahra, S. A., & George, G. (2002). Absorptive capacity: A review and reconceptualization. Academy of Management Review, 27(2), 185–203. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2002.6587995..

.