International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 • Website: www.ijfmr.com • Email: editor@ijfmr.com

Is a Failed Product Still a Product? Integrating Systematic Management Theory and Empirical Evidence on Organizational Learning in AI-Driven Enterprises

Dr. Uttiya Basu[1], Arnesh Samanta[2], Sayan Basuli[3], Ayan Basuli[4]

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Adamas University, Barasat, West Bengal
[2,3,4]Under Graduate Student (BBA), Department of Management, Adamas University, Barasat, West Bengal

Abstract

Introduction: Product failure has traditionally been interpreted as a negative market outcome signifying consumer rejection, financial underperformance, or strategic miscalculation. However, within the framework of the Systematic Theory of Management, organizations are understood as open systems characterized by continuous interactions among inputs, transformation processes, outputs, and feedback mechanisms (Katz & Kahn, 1978; von Bertalanffy, 1968). From this systemic perspective, a failed product is not merely an unsuccessful output but a functional element within a dynamic feedback loop that influences future organizational behavior. Organizational learning theory further suggests that errors and failures provide critical opportunities for adaptive improvement and double-loop learning (Argyris & Schön, 1978).

In AI-driven enterprises, where predictive analytics, machine learning algorithms, and automated decision-support systems are embedded in business operations, product development is increasingly data-intensive. Yet, despite algorithmic precision, product failures continue to occur, indicating that technological sophistication does not eliminate uncertainty. Contemporary research on dynamic capabilities and knowledge creation argues that learning from disruption and failure strengthens long-term adaptability (Teece, 2007; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). This raises a foundational question: does a failed product cease to be a product, or does it transform into a systemic input within the organizational learning architecture? Integrating systems theory with AI-enabled governance, this study reconceptualizes product failure as a feedback-generating mechanism within human–AI collaborative enterprises (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021).

Research Gap: Existing literature on product failure largely treats it as a market-performance issue rather than as a systemic organizational phenomenon. While organizational learning and dynamic capability theories acknowledge the value of failure, limited research integrates these perspectives with the Systematic Theory of Management in AI-driven contexts. Moreover, empirical studies rarely examine how human–AI synergy transforms product failure into structured feedback mechanisms. Thus, a gap exists in theoretically and empirically reconceptualizing failed products as recursive inputs within adaptive, AI-enabled organizational systems.

Objectives of the Study: The study aims to examine product failure through the lens of Systematic Management Theory and empirically validate its systemic function in AI-driven enterprises. Specifically, it seeks to analyze product failure as an organizational output that generates recursive feedback within an open-system structure (Katz & Kahn, 1978), to investigate the relationship between product failure and organizational learning capability, and to assess the mediating role of systematic managerial response—such as structured evaluation mechanisms and AI-assisted analytics—in transforming failure into adaptive knowledge. By synthesizing theoretical constructs with empirical evidence, the study bridges classical systems thinking with contemporary AI-integrated organizational contexts.

Methodology: The research adopts a theoretical–empirical design grounded in systems theory and supported by primary data analysis. Conceptually, the study builds on open-systems thinking (von Bertalanffy, 1968) and organizational learning frameworks (Argyris & Schön, 1978). Empirically, primary data were collected from 83 professionals employed in AI-driven enterprises, including technology startups, fintech firms, and analytics-based organizations. Respondents comprised product managers, AI analysts, and strategic decision-makers directly involved in AI-supported product evaluation processes.

A structured questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale measured four constructs: Product Failure Perception, Systematic Managerial Response, Human–AI Synergy, and Organizational Learning Capability. The construct of organizational learning draws from knowledge-creation and dynamic capability perspectives (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Teece, 2007). Reliability testing indicated acceptable internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha values exceeding the 0.70 threshold (Hair et al., 2019). Descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and mediation regression analysis were applied to test the proposed systemic relationships.

Analysis & Discussions: The empirical findings support the systemic reinterpretation of product failure. Descriptive analysis indicates that a substantial proportion of respondents perceive product failure as a source of actionable insight rather than as a terminal organizational event. Correlation results reveal a positive and statistically significant association between product failure perception and organizational learning capability, consistent with theoretical propositions on adaptive systems (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Mediation analysis demonstrates that systematic managerial response significantly strengthens the transformation of failure into learning. When structured feedback mechanisms—such as AI-generated diagnostics and cross-functional evaluation—are institutionalized, the relationship between product failure and learning capability becomes more robust.

Furthermore, enterprises characterized by higher degrees of human–AI collaboration exhibit stronger adaptive recalibration following product underperformance, aligning with contemporary arguments that AI augments rather than replaces managerial judgment (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). These findings empirically substantiate the theoretical claim that within an open-system paradigm, product failure operates as recursive feedback rather than systemic breakdown.

Future Scope of Research: While the present study provides empirical validation using 83 primary responses, future research may extend the framework through larger samples and structural equation modeling to enhance generalizability (Hair et al., 2019). Longitudinal studies could examine how repeated cycles of failure contribute to dynamic capability development over time (Teece, 2007). Comparative analyses across industries or cross-national contexts may further reveal cultural variations in interpreting failure within systemic organizational structures. Additionally, future inquiry may investigate how varying levels of AI autonomy influence feedback absorption and learning intensity in human–AI collaborative systems (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021).

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence; Human–AI Synergy; Organizational Learning; Product Failure; Systematic Management Theory; Systems Thinking.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

In contemporary business environments characterized by rapid technological advancement, product innovation has become a central driver of competitive advantage. However, alongside innovation comes an inherent risk of product failure, traditionally defined as the inability of a product to meet market expectations or achieve financial viability. Conventional management perspectives tend to treat product failure as a negative outcome, often associated with poor decision-making, inadequate market research, or strategic misalignment. This view, however, is increasingly challenged by systemic and learning-oriented approaches in management theory (Katz & Kahn, 1978).

The Systematic Theory of Management, rooted in general systems theory, conceptualizes organizations as open systems where outputs are not endpoints but components of a continuous feedback loop influencing future inputs and processes (von Bertalanffy, 1968). Within this framework, product failure can be reinterpreted not as a terminal outcome but as a critical feedback mechanism contributing to organizational adaptation and evolution.

1.2 Product Failure in the Context of Organizational Learning

Organizational learning theory provides a complementary perspective by emphasizing the role of experience, including failure, in enhancing organizational capabilities. According to Argyris and Schön (1978), learning occurs when organizations detect and correct errors, particularly through double-loop learning that challenges underlying assumptions. Similarly, the knowledge-creation model proposed by Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) highlights the transformation of tacit and explicit knowledge through continuous interaction, where failures serve as catalysts for innovation and knowledge accumulation.

In this context, product failure is not merely a reflection of inefficiency but a potential source of learning that can strengthen dynamic capabilities and improve future performance (Teece, 2007). Organizations that effectively internalize failure are more likely to develop resilience and adaptive capacity in uncertain environments.

1.3 AI-Driven Enterprises and Human–AI Synergy

The emergence of artificial intelligence has significantly transformed organizational decision-making processes. AI-driven enterprises utilize machine learning algorithms, predictive analytics, and data-driven insights to optimize product development, market targeting, and operational efficiency. Despite these advancements, product failures persist, suggesting that algorithmic precision alone cannot eliminate uncertainty and complexity.

Recent studies highlight the importance of human–AI synergy, where human judgment and AI capabilities complement each other in decision-making processes (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). In such hybrid systems, failures generate rich datasets that can be analyzed through AI tools while being interpreted within a broader strategic and contextual framework by managers.

1.4 Research Problem and Significance

Despite extensive research on product failure and organizational learning, limited attention has been given to integrating these concepts within the Systematic Theory of Management, particularly in AI-driven contexts. Existing studies often treat failure as a discrete event rather than as a recursive element within a systemic framework.

This study addresses this gap by reconceptualizing product failure as a functional component of the organizational system, emphasizing its role as a feedback-generating mechanism. By combining theoretical insights with empirical evidence, the research contributes to a deeper understanding of how AI-driven enterprises transform failure into learning, thereby advancing both management theory and contemporary organizational practice.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Systematic Theory of Management and Open Systems Perspective

The Systematic Theory of Management is grounded in the principles of general systems theory, which views organizations as complex, adaptive systems composed of interrelated components (von Bertalanffy, 1968). Katz and Kahn (1978) further developed this perspective by conceptualizing organizations as open systems that interact with their external environment through continuous input–process–output cycles. Feedback mechanisms play a crucial role in maintaining system equilibrium and enabling adaptation.

Within this framework, outputs are not final outcomes but inputs for subsequent cycles. This implies that even undesirable outputs, such as product failure, contribute to system functioning by generating information that can be used for corrective action and improvement.

2.2 Product Failure as a Learning Mechanism

Traditional literature on product failure primarily focuses on its causes, including market misfit, technological limitations, and managerial inefficiencies. However, more recent perspectives emphasize the learning potential embedded in failure. Argyris and Schön (1978) argue that organizations learn by identifying and correcting errors, while double-loop learning enables deeper transformation by questioning underlying norms and strategies.

Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) extend this argument by highlighting the role of knowledge creation in organizations, where failures facilitate the conversion of tacit knowledge into explicit insights. Empirical studies also suggest that firms that systematically analyze failure are better positioned to innovate and adapt (Teece, 2007).

2.3 AI, Data Analytics, and Decision-Making

The integration of artificial intelligence into organizational processes has introduced new dimensions to decision-making and performance evaluation. AI systems enhance predictive accuracy, identify patterns in large datasets, and provide real-time insights that support managerial decisions. However, research indicates that AI does not eliminate uncertainty but reshapes how organizations respond to it (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021).

Failures in AI-driven environments often produce detailed diagnostic data, enabling organizations to understand the underlying causes more precisely. This enhances the potential for learning but also requires effective integration of human judgment and technological capabilities.

2.4 Human–AI Synergy and Organizational Adaptation

Human–AI synergy refers to the collaborative interaction between human intelligence and artificial intelligence in organizational contexts. Rather than replacing human decision-making, AI augments it by providing analytical support and predictive insights (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). This synergy is particularly relevant in the context of product failure, where human interpretation is necessary to contextualize AI-generated data.

Organizations that successfully integrate human and AI capabilities are more likely to transform failure into innovation and strategic adjustment. This aligns with the concept of dynamic capabilities, which emphasizes the ability to sense, seize, and reconfigure resources in response to environmental changes (Teece, 2007).

2.5 Research Gap Identification

While existing literature acknowledges the importance of organizational learning and AI-driven decision-making, there is limited integration of these concepts within the Systematic Theory of Management. Specifically, few studies examine product failure as a recursive feedback mechanism within open systems, particularly in AI-enabled enterprises.

This study addresses this gap by combining systems theory, organizational learning, and AI-driven analytics to provide a comprehensive understanding of product failure as a systemic and learning-oriented phenomenon.

3. Objectives of the Study

To examine product failure as a systemic output within the framework of the Systematic Theory of Management, emphasizing its role as a feedback-generating mechanism in organizational systems.

To analyze the relationship between product failure perception and organizational learning capability in AI-driven enterprises.

To evaluate the mediating role of systematic managerial response, including structured feedback mechanisms and AI-assisted analytics, in transforming product failure into organizational learning.

To assess the influence of human–AI synergy in enhancing the effectiveness of converting product failure into adaptive and innovation-oriented outcomes.

4. Methodology

4.1 Research Design

The present study adopts a theoretical–empirical research design, integrating the conceptual foundations of the Systematic Theory of Management with primary data analysis. The study is explanatory in nature, as it seeks to examine the relationship between product failure and organizational learning within AI-driven enterprises, while also exploring the mediating and moderating mechanisms that influence this relationship. The research follows a quantitative approach supported by a structured survey instrument to empirically validate the proposed conceptual framework.

4.2 Theoretical Framework

The study is grounded in the Systematic Theory of Management, which conceptualizes organizations as open systems characterized by continuous input–process–output–feedback cycles (von Bertalanffy, 1968; Katz & Kahn, 1978). Within this framework, product failure is interpreted not as a terminal outcome but as a systemic output that generates feedback for future organizational adaptation. The model also incorporates insights from organizational learning theory (Argyris & Schön, 1978) and dynamic capability theory (Teece, 2007), along with the concept of human–AI synergy in decision-making environments (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). Based on this integration, the study proposes that product failure influences organizational learning, with Systematic Managerial Response acting as a mediating variable and Human–AI Synergy functioning as a moderating factor.

4.3 Data Source and Sample Design

The study is based on primary data collected from professionals working in AI-driven enterprises. A purposive sampling technique was employed to ensure that respondents possess relevant experience in product development, analytics, or decision-making processes involving artificial intelligence.

A total of 83 valid responses were collected from individuals employed in technology startups, fintech organizations, digital marketing firms, and analytics-based companies. The respondents included product managers, AI analysts, operations executives, and mid-level strategic decision-makers. This sample size is considered adequate for exploratory and mediation analysis in social science research (Hair et al., 2019).

4.4 Instrument Design and Data Collection

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire designed on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The questionnaire was divided into four major constructs:

- Product Failure Perception (PFP): Measures the extent to which product failure is perceived as a source of feedback and learning.
- Systematic Managerial Response (SMR): Captures the presence of structured feedback mechanisms, cross-functional coordination, and AI-assisted evaluation.
- Human–AI Synergy (HAS): Assesses the degree of collaborative interaction between human decision-making and AI-based analytics.
- Organizational Learning Capability (OLC): Evaluates the organization's ability to adapt, innovate, and improve based on past experiences and feedback.

The questionnaire was administered electronically, and responses were collected over a specified period ensuring confidentiality and voluntary participation.

4.5 Reliability and Validity

To ensure the reliability of the measurement instrument, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated for each construct. All constructs demonstrated acceptable internal consistency, with values exceeding the recommended threshold of 0.70 (Hair et al., 2019). Content validity was ensured through a thorough review of relevant literature and alignment of items with established theoretical constructs. Additionally, the questionnaire was reviewed for clarity and relevance before final data collection.

4.6 Analytical Techniques

The collected data were analyzed using statistical software. The analysis was conducted in multiple stages:

- Descriptive Statistics: To summarize respondent perceptions regarding product failure and AI-based evaluation mechanisms.
- Correlation Analysis: To examine the strength and direction of relationships among key variables, particularly between product failure perception and organizational learning capability.
- Mediation Analysis: To assess the mediating role of Systematic Managerial Response in the relationship between product failure and organizational learning using regression-based techniques.
- Moderation Analysis: To evaluate the moderating effect of Human–AI Synergy on the relationship between product failure and organizational learning.

The statistical significance of relationships was tested at the 1% level ($p < 0.01$), ensuring robustness of findings.

4.7 Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to standard ethical guidelines in research. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed about the purpose of the study. Confidentiality and anonymity of responses were strictly maintained, and data were used solely for academic purposes.

5. Analysis & Discussion

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics on Product Failure Perception and AI Analytics

Statement	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)
Product failure generates actionable performance data	72%	18%	10%
AI analytics identify failure causes more precisely than traditional methods	68%	20%	12%

Source: Author's own compilation

Interpretation:

A majority of respondents perceive product failure as a source of actionable insights. AI-driven diagnostics are also considered more effective than traditional evaluation approaches.

Table 2: Correlation Matrix

Variables	PFP	SMR	HAS	OLC
Product Failure Perception (PFP)	1.000			
Systematic Managerial Response (SMR)	0.52**	1.000		
Human–AI Synergy (HAS)	0.47**	0.55**	1.000	
Organizational Learning Capability (OLC)	0.49**	0.61**	0.58**	1.000

Source: Author's own compilation

Note: $p < 0.01$

Interpretation:

Product Failure Perception (PFP) shows a moderate positive correlation with Organizational Learning Capability (OLC) ($r = 0.49$), indicating that recognizing failure as feedback enhances adaptability.

Table 3: Mediation Analysis (Regression Results)

Relationship Tested	Beta (β)	t-value	Significance
PFP → OLC (Direct Effect)	0.49	4.85	$p < 0.01$
PFP → SMR	0.52	5.12	$p < 0.01$
SMR → OLC	0.46	4.67	$p < 0.01$
PFP → OLC (With Mediator SMR)	0.28	2.91	$p < 0.01$

Source: Author's own compilation

Interpretation:

The reduction in beta value from 0.49 to 0.28 after introducing Systematic Managerial Response (SMR) confirms partial mediation, indicating that structured feedback mechanisms strengthen learning outcomes.

Table 4: Moderating Role of Human–AI Synergy

Interaction Effect (PFP × HAS → OLC)	Beta (β)	t-value	Significance
Moderating Effect	0.31	3.45	$p < 0.01$

Source: Author's own compilation

Interpretation:

Human–AI Synergy significantly moderates the relationship between product failure and organizational learning, suggesting that collaborative intelligence enhances adaptive transformation.

Table 5: Model Summary

Model	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F-value	Significance
Direct Model (PFP → OLC)	0.24	0.23	23.52	$p < 0.01$
Mediation Model	0.38	0.36	31.87	$p < 0.01$

Source: Author's own compilation

Interpretation:

The increase in R^2 from 0.24 to 0.38 indicates improved explanatory power when mediation is included, supporting the systemic framework.

The results presented across the five tables collectively reinforce the systemic interpretation of product failure within AI-driven enterprises. The descriptive statistics indicate that a substantial proportion of respondents perceive product failure as a source of actionable insights, particularly when supported by AI-based analytics. The correlation analysis further establishes a positive and statistically significant relationship between product failure perception and organizational learning capability, suggesting that organizations adopting a feedback-oriented perspective demonstrate higher adaptability. The mediation analysis confirms that Systematic Managerial Response plays a crucial intermediary role, as the strength of the relationship between product failure and learning increases in the presence of structured feedback mechanisms, while the direct effect diminishes, indicating partial mediation. Additionally, the moderating effect of Human–AI Synergy highlights that collaborative decision-making between human judgment and AI systems enhances the transformation of failure into innovation-oriented outcomes. The improvement in model explanatory power further substantiates the robustness of the proposed framework. Overall, the findings validate that product failure, rather than being a terminal outcome, functions as a recursive feedback mechanism that contributes significantly to organizational learning within a systemic management context.

6. Conclusion

This study reconceptualizes product failure within the framework of the Systematic Theory of Management by positioning it as a feedback-generating mechanism rather than a terminal organizational outcome. Integrating theoretical insights with empirical evidence from AI-driven enterprises, the findings demonstrate that product failure contributes positively to organizational learning when supported by structured managerial responses and enhanced through human–AI synergy. The results highlight that in contemporary data-driven environments, failure serves as a critical input for adaptive transformation, enabling organizations to refine processes, improve decision-making, and strengthen innovation capacity. Thus, within a systemic perspective, a failed product continues to retain functional relevance by facilitating recursive learning and organizational evolution.

7. Future Scope of Research

While the present study provides empirical validation using 83 primary responses, future research may extend the framework through larger samples and structural equation modeling to enhance generalizability (Hair et al., 2019). Longitudinal studies could examine how repeated cycles of failure contribute to dynamic capability development over time (Teece, 2007). Comparative analyses across industries or cross-national contexts may further reveal cultural variations in interpreting failure within systemic organizational structures. Additionally, future inquiry may investigate how varying levels of AI autonomy influence feedback absorption and learning intensity in human–AI collaborative systems (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021).

8. References

1. Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1978). Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective. Addison-Wesley.
2. Brynjolfsson, E., Li, D., & Raymond, L. R. (2023). Generative AI at work. National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper Series.
3. George, G., Merrill, R. K., & Schillebeeckx, S. J. D. (2023). Digital sustainability and entrepreneurship: How digital innovations are helping tackle climate change and sustainable development. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 47(3), 999–1027.
4. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). Multivariate data analysis (8th ed.). Cengage.
5. Jarrahi, M. H., Memariani, A., & Guha, S. (2023). The principles of human–AI interaction: A synthesis of literature and future research directions. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 74(4), 468–482.
6. Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). The social psychology of organizations (2nd ed.). Wiley.
7. Keding, C. (2023). Understanding the interplay of artificial intelligence and strategic management: Four decades of research. Management Review Quarterly, 73(1), 91–134.
8. Kraus, S., Schiavone, F., Pluzhnikova, A., & Invernizzi, A. C. (2023). Digital transformation in healthcare: Analyzing the current state-of-research. Journal of Business Research, 154, 113379.
9. Lichtenthaler, U. (2022). Beyond artificial intelligence: Why companies need to focus on augmented intelligence. Journal of Business Strategy, 43(2), 83–90.
10. Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). The knowledge-creating company. Oxford University Press.
11. Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation–augmentation paradox. Academy of Management Review, 46(1), 192–210.
12. Ransbotham, S., Kiron, D., Gerbert, P., & Reeves, M. (2022). Reshaping business with artificial intelligence: Closing the gap between ambition and action. MIT Sloan Management Review, 63(1), 1–10.
13. Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of sustainable enterprise performance. Strategic Management Journal, 28(13), 1319–1350.
14. Verhoef, P. C., Broekhuizen, T., Bart, Y., Bhattacharya, A., Dong, J. Q., Fabian, N., & Haenlein, M. (2022). Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research agenda. Journal of Business Research, 122, 889–901.
15. von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). General system theory: Foundations, development, applications. George Braziller.
16. Wamba, S. F., Queiroz, M. M., Trinchera, L., & Raut, R. D. (2023). Big data analytics and firm performance: Effects of dynamic capabilities. International Journal of Production Economics, 255, 108688.