
Kitsune Ai システム / Physical Intelligence Lab

RESEARCH FRAMEWORK / BRAND PROMISE

PHYSICAL-FIRST INTELLIGENCE AND BRAND PROMISE

A PHYSICAL-FIRST INTELLIGENCE RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

Brand promise, human agency and accountable business practice

Life is how we know.

A research framework for responsible brand participation in human lived experience.

PROMISE · BUSINESS · LIVED EXPERIENCE

A System of Brand Things with the human at the centre

Published by Kitsune Ai System LLC

Kitsune Ai システム / Physical Intelligence Lab

Version 1.2 / Draft for scientific review / September 2026

Abstract

A brand's promise enters a person's life through a product, a service, another person's work or knowledge that helps them act. Its value depends on what that contribution makes possible in actual circumstances. A promise of ease, care, capability or reliability must encounter the intention, effort and experience of the human at hand before its practical meaning can be understood.

Physical-first intelligence places this lived relationship at the centre of a digital system. Human intent gives activity a purpose. Selected evidence makes effort and circumstance available for interpretation. A Perspective is an interpretation offered for human review; its application in a chosen action produces consequences that can inform further understanding. Authority over the account and its use remains with the people and roles responsible for that experience.

This paper extends the thesis into the relationship between people and brands. We propose a System of Brand Things that connects three tiers: the brand's story and promise; the business that enables delivery through products, services, staff and internal practices; and people encountering the promise in lived experience. The research concerns the bounded occasions for participation, or Moments, and the useful capabilities, or Utilities, that can make a particular promise practical. It asks how both parties participate within appropriate boundaries and how what happens informs an accountable response.

Journaling relates intent, selected effort and consequence through Before, During and After (BDA). L1 provides an entry to relevant capabilities; L2 supports their use. This sequence makes a particular application of the promise reviewable. A difficulty or useful adaptation can inform a change in a Method, product, service or the promise itself. The relationship becomes recursive when that response enters a later BDA cycle and its effect is examined. The person contributes intention, selected evidence and judgment. The business contributes relevant knowledge, practical support and responsibility for its response. Human benefit, business value and the burdens borne by each remain distinct objects of inquiry.

The proposed research approach begins with existing practices, identifies meaningful occasions for support and develops configurations suited to specific promises. Situated field studies and appropriate comparisons can then investigate whether the support improves practical possibilities, preserves agency and produces a useful return. Anthropology, psychology, studies of embodied experience and organizational learning inform those design questions and methods.

The framework proposes a way to study brands as responsible participants in human life. Its central test is whether a promise becomes useful in the moment and whether learning from that experience improves what each party can make possible next.

1 The position

Physical-first intelligence begins with human life as the setting in which purpose is formed, effort occurs and consequences are borne. Digital processing can help people interpret an experience or consider a possibility. That contribution becomes practical when someone understands it, judges its relevance and carries it into an action, decision, relationship or form of care.

We define physical-first intelligence as a governed relationship among human intent, situated effort, selected evidence, reviewed interpretation and later lived consequence. The person retains authority over the purpose and the account of their experience. A system supplies capabilities within that relationship and remains answerable to what its participation helps or hinders.

A brand introduces a particular commitment into this relationship. It promises that a product, service or body of knowledge can contribute something of value. The business supplies the means of delivery. The person encounters those means while pursuing a purpose of their own. What the brand intends and what the person needs may align, diverge or change during use.

The proposed extension is to make that relationship sufficiently explicit to investigate. A System of Brand Things connects the promise, the business responsible for supporting it and the person's lived application. Journaling connects Before, During and After: what the person intended, what occurred in the effort and what followed. A permitted finding can inform an accountable change that is then examined in a later application.

Central research question

How can a brand's promise become a practical system that supports the human at hand, makes its consequences reviewable and informs changes whose value can be tested in later lived experience?

Grönroos's conceptual account of marketing as promise management connects making promises with enabling and keeping them. It provides a foundation for relating brand expression to the functions through which a business delivers value. This framework develops an applied inquiry into that relationship through intentional activity, purpose-bound evidence and a return to subsequent use. [1]

The working proposition is that connecting these elements may make support more relevant and responsibility more actionable. The research must examine when that happens, what effort it requires and where the relationship fails. A useful outcome could be a better Method, a different service, a revised promise or a finding that a particular moment needs no additional brand participation.

2 Meaning within lived practice

A promise acquires meaning through the lives in which it is encountered. A product offered as convenient may help one person regain time and ask another to reorganize an already difficult routine. A service described as empowering may support a confident practitioner while leaving a beginner unsure how to begin. The wording belongs to the brand; its meaning in use also belongs to the person.

Anthropology provides a basis for investigating this relationship. McCracken's theoretical account describes the movement of cultural meaning through consumer goods and consumption practices. It gives the study a reason to examine how an object enters routines, relationships and occasions, alongside how it is represented. A stated brand meaning cannot stand in for what a participant says an experience meant. [2]

Fournier developed consumer-brand relationship theory through three in-depth case studies. The work supports attention to the different roles brands can occupy within a life. It does not establish that every customer wants an intimate relationship with a business. A dependable, occasional and unobtrusive contribution may be exactly the relationship someone values. [3]

For this programme, the practical implication is to begin with accounts of existing activity. What is the person trying to make possible? What does the product already help with? Which learned practices, obligations or material constraints shape its use? What does the person wish the brand understood? The answers may reveal a useful place for a Utility, a need for better product support or a situation where additional brand participation is unwelcome.

Suchman's account of situated action helps frame the difference between a Method and its application. Plans serve within activity that unfolds in particular social and material circumstances. A person may need to adapt instructions when a tool is missing, a colleague is unavailable or the intended occasion changes. Those adaptations can reveal useful knowledge about the promise and its assumptions. [4]

The study should preserve the participant's reasons for adapting, refusing or abandoning an activity. An unexplained departure from instructions is insufficient evidence of misuse. An accepted adaptation is insufficient evidence that the original Method was adequate. Investigators need to follow what changed and why, including whose work made the result possible.

This gives cultural and situated research a practical role in system design. It helps identify the Moment worth supporting, the knowledge a Utility needs and the assumptions the business must test. The objective is a configuration fitted to the promise and the people involved, with space for meanings that the brand did not anticipate.

3 Intent digitized effort and human agency

The relationship begins with what the person intends. A commercial objective may be relevant to that intention, but a purchase, scan or accepted recommendation cannot establish their alignment. Someone may buy a tool to become more independent, choose an ingredient to care for another person or seek a service to finish an obligation quickly. Each purpose gives a different meaning to useful support.

Intent can be declared, adopted from a relevant Method or framed with another person. It can also change. The system should preserve the attributable purpose under which effort began and record a revision without rewriting the earlier account. A spontaneous activity may be described afterward, provided the record makes clear that the intention was supplied retrospectively.

Digitized effort makes selected parts of that activity available for review. Through Journaling, Before establishes intent and starting conditions, During records selected effort and After examines consequence. A brief account, photograph or task result gains meaning through its place in that sequence. Its value depends on whether it clarifies the experience sufficiently to support the purpose. Recording more activity does not itself create greater agency.

Ryan and Deci's synthesis of self-determination theory identifies autonomy, competence and relatedness as important to motivation and wellbeing. It gives the proposed study a basis for examining whether support helps people act with understanding and choice, or makes participation feel controlled. The theory does not establish that a particular interface, incentive or AI agent supports those needs. [5]

In this field expression, agency must be exercisable. A person should be able to inspect how their experience is represented, correct an inaccurate account, reject a proposed interpretation and choose what may be retained or shared. They should understand the practical consequences of declining further participation. These are behaviors to demonstrate and examine, as well as commitments to state.

The corresponding business responsibility is to make its contribution legible. What support is being offered? What information is needed to provide it? Which part of the exchange is optional? Where does a commercial recommendation enter the proposed Method? A person cannot meaningfully direct an engagement whose purpose changes without their knowledge.

The research therefore follows intent through use and review. It asks whether the person gains a more useful understanding or capacity to act, and whether the system leaves the next decision in their hands. A favorable account of the brand may accompany that result. It cannot substitute for it.

4 The body and the circumstances of a moment

Brand experience occurs through bodies in circumstances. A person may be hungry, tired, occupied with care, working under time pressure or learning an unfamiliar movement. The significance of a product or service depends partly on what the person can perceive, understand and do at that time. The research should examine the conditions relevant to the selected promise without treating daily life as an invitation to measure everything.

Plassmann and colleagues' small laboratory study of wine tasting found that price information could alter reported pleasantness and associated neural activity. The finding shows that information presented about a product can affect an experienced response in the tested setting. It does not establish that a commercial claim improved the product's practical performance or that the same effect holds across everyday uses. [6]

This matters when defining evidence. Expectation, satisfaction, observable performance and later usefulness are different outcomes. A participant may enjoy an experience while the promised task remains difficult. A technically successful task may still impose an unwelcome burden. The study should ask which of these outcomes the promise concerns and measure them on their own terms.

Swami and colleagues followed 64 participants through 21 days of repeated self-report. Greater reported hunger was associated with more anger and irritability and less pleasure. The observational study offers a reason to consider bodily circumstances in a relevant food inquiry. It does not establish a physiological mechanism or justify inferring a person's state from their interaction with a brand. [7]

For a first study, a participant's voluntary account may supply enough context: "I needed something simple after work," or "I could not hold the device while doing this." Such accounts can help explain where a Utility fits and where it interrupts. A clinical or physiological endpoint would require a separate measurement plan, appropriate expertise and an adequately designed study.

Material circumstances also belong in the account. Time, money, available equipment, language, ability and responsibility for others affect what support can accomplish. A proposal that assumes an extra purchase or unpaid help may shift the cost of keeping the promise onto someone else. Investigators should make that transfer visible.

Biological and psychological research thus help formulate specific questions about timing, experience and capability. Their contribution is strongest when the selected promise makes those questions consequential. The system's task is to support the human purpose within the moment and preserve the limits of what its evidence can establish.

5 Three tiers of one relationship

A System of Brand Things connects the promise to the organization responsible for it and to people encountering it in practice. We describe three tiers to make those responsibilities inspectable. They are related views of one engagement, with information passing under declared purpose and authority.

Tier	Contribution	Accountability in the study
Brand story and promise	The commitment, its expression and the expectations it invites	Define what is promised, to whom, under which conditions and how the claim may be revised
Business delivery and support	Products, services, staff, knowledge, resources and internal operations	Supply useful support, review permitted findings and implement an attributable response
People in lived experience	Human purpose, situated effort, practical knowledge and accounts of consequence	Exercise participation choices and review what the system says about the experience

The first tier asks whether the promise is intelligible and appropriate. The second asks whether the business has the means to deliver it. The third asks whether that delivery helps the person in actual circumstances. A weakness in any tier can prevent useful participation even when the other two appear coherent.

The tiers are not permanent categories of people. A member of staff can be responsible for a service while also bearing the burden of a poorly designed process. Their account may reveal why a customer's difficulty recurs. The study should preserve staff experience and authority alongside the customer's, rather than treating employees as an invisible delivery mechanism.

A finding needs a path to someone able to act. If instructions omit preparation time, a content owner may revise the Method. If the product requires resources absent from the intended setting, product or service management may need to change delivery. If the promise itself is unrealistic, the brand must reconsider what it claims. Frontline staff should not carry accountability for decisions they cannot change.

The return must also reach people. A revised Method, repaired service, clearer expectation or available resource becomes relevant when it changes what happens in a subsequent Moment. Internal agreement that a problem has been addressed remains a business event until the field supplies evidence of its consequence.

The research examines these relationships together. It can distinguish an interpretation error, a failure to respond and a response that was implemented but did not help. This is what gives the proposed feedback loop a practical object of study.

6 Making a promise practical

Each brand promise needs its own configuration. A promise of easier preparation, dependable maintenance or greater learning capability identifies different activities and standards of evidence. The common method is to make the relationship among the promise, the person's purpose, useful support and accountable return explicit before building additional interaction.

Design question	Required definition
What is being promised	The actual claim, intended audience, conditions and relevant exclusions
What matters to the person	An attributable intention and the practical difference the person values
When can the brand help	A relevant Moment, actual context and appropriate invitation
What support is useful	A product, service, Method or Utility with a defined contribution
What evidence is sufficient	Selected Before, During and After observations, their sources and limits
What each party contributes	Support, effort, permissions, commitments and expected benefit
Who can respond	A responsible business role with authority, resources and a response route
How the return is tested	A later application and criteria for judging whether the response helped

These definitions should be developed with the people who will use and deliver the support. A brand's initial interpretation can be treated as a proposition. Fieldwork may show that the relevant moment occurs earlier, that a different Utility is needed or that the most useful intervention is an operational change outside the interface.

The promise needs enough precision to make disappointment and success interpretable. “Easier weekday cooking” might become a study of whether a particular Method can support an intended meal within declared preparation constraints. That study cannot validate every meaning of ease or every meal. It can identify conditions under which a narrower commitment is supported.

The person's purpose remains wider than the brand's claim. They may decide that an unhurried shared meal matters more than speed, or that using available ingredients matters more than a recommended product. The configuration should expose this divergence and allow a different direction. It should also allow the finding that no additional brand Utility is useful.

The resulting specification is a working relationship ready to be demonstrated and tested. It connects the promise to actual responsibilities and makes clear what evidence could justify continuing, changing or ending the proposed engagement.

7 The System of Brand Things

A System of Things (SOT) is a declared set of relationships among people, roles, physical contexts, objects and available capabilities. A System of Brand Things applies that structure to a brand's promise and its use. It connects the three tiers while preserving the source, purpose and permitted audience of each account.

Earth → Place → Space → Thing → Utility describes how a capability is situated. Earth provides the wider spatial reference. A Place identifies a physical location. A Space gives organization within it. A Thing is a relevant object or surface. A Utility is a capability available through that context. Presence and applicable permissions govern eligible access. Planning an activity elsewhere does not establish present admission there.

Goal → Method → Task relates purpose to practice. A Goal expresses an attributable intention. A Method offers a way of pursuing it. A Task makes bounded effort and an intended result explicit. Each Task binds an Action and an Agent, whether Human Intelligence (HI) or Artificial Intelligence (AI). Journaling locates selected evidence Before, During or After that application, preserving its source, responsible actor and permitted consequence.

Technology	Role in the proposed relationship
Spatial	Establish actual context, presence and eligible access to the relevant Utility
AI	Process authorized material and return an attributed, reviewable Perspective or permitted action proposal
Block	Preserve proof of Data Well ownership and owner-authorized lifecycle transitions

A Data Well is the governed body of records belonging to an owner within the declared relationship. A Block records authorized proof about ownership or lifecycle; it does not establish the truth of every account. AI interpretation remains distinguishable from the lived source on which it draws.

The single pane of glass premise gives participants a coherent way to encounter these relationships. Each person or role receives the view its purpose and authority permit. A participant may inspect their intended activity and reviewed experience. A service team may receive the finding needed to respond. A brand team may review an appropriately prepared pattern without obtaining the underlying private accounts.

The three technologies and the three tiers describe different aspects of the framework. The tiers locate responsibility. The technologies support the means by which context, evidence and permitted continuity can be maintained. Their contribution must be demonstrated through actual use and evaluated against the purpose they are intended to serve.

8 Four Moment Types

Private, Personal, Professional and Public are the four Moment Types through which people can enter the inquiry. A Moment is a bounded context in which purpose, participants, evidence, processing and review become specific. Its type establishes permitted relationships; neither a commercial tier nor an academic discipline selects it automatically.

Moment Type	Possible brand relationship	Boundary to preserve
Private	Someone uses relevant product knowledge to understand a personally meaningful difficulty	Access to knowledge does not give the brand access to the person's account
Personal	People coordinate a shared activity with a useful product or service	One participant cannot authorize another person's experience for sharing
Professional	Staff or practitioners apply a Method in a declared role	Task authority, customer information and employee records remain distinct
Public	A participant prepares an adaptation or finding for possible wider contribution	A separate authorized release is required before publication

A public setting can contain Private, Personal and Professional Moments. Likewise, a Public Moment concerns a chosen purpose for potential wider contribution, not unrestricted capture of everyone nearby. The physical location and the permission to share answer different questions.

A person might privately explore a difficulty with a product and later choose to send a concise support request. That later disclosure has its own purpose and audience. It need not expose the whole inquiry. A staff member might contribute a Professional account of a recurring service problem while keeping unrelated personal circumstances outside the record.

The brand's invitation must fit the Moment. A useful explanation can be welcome during an activity, while an unrelated sales message at the same surface can breach the expected relationship. Contextual integrity provides a foundation for examining whether information flows fit the purposes and norms of the situation. Applying that foundation here requires explicit choices about who receives which information and why. [8]

The field study should test whether people understand the choices and can exercise them without excessive work. Researchers should examine transitions between Moments, corrections, refusal and withdrawal as part of ordinary use. The system should preserve the possibility that an experience remains unrecorded or that a participant receives useful support without contributing it to brand research.

9 Utilities that fit the moment

The proposed engagement begins where support becomes relevant. A product, package, service point, work surface or other Thing can provide access to a Utility in its actual context. The design question is what that Utility helps the person do now and what interaction is proportionate to that help.

The framework distinguishes an entry surface, L1, from a specific Utility surface, L2. L1 makes relevant capabilities discoverable in context. L2 supports their use under applicable participant, role and spatial authority. Journaling carries Before, During and After through the selected activity. The handoff must preserve the Method application and context needed to continue that account. An L1 encounter does not itself select a Public Moment or authorize research participation.

For a brand promising useful cooking support, an entry surface might make the appropriate Method available near the product. A subsequent Utility could help a person adapt that Method to relevant circumstances they choose to provide. The useful outcome is an achievable preparation. Requiring repeated navigation, a social profile or an unrelated interaction would need justification against that purpose.

The interface can include a screen when a screen helps. Physical-first describes where purpose and consequence remain anchored. The field test must demonstrate entry, Utility use and BDA Journaling as a coherent sequence that allows attention to return to the activity. More visits, longer sessions or repeated prompts are not default measures of success.

Timing requires evidence. A prompt may arrive before the person knows their available resources, during an action that occupies their hands or after the opportunity has passed. The study should identify which moments are useful, which should remain quiet and which requests can wait for later review. Presence alone cannot establish readiness or interest.

Useful support may also be an instruction, a human response, a resource made available or a better-designed product. A new digital Utility should earn its place through the contribution it makes. Investigators should record unsuccessful attempts to obtain help, abandoned interactions, dependence on facilitators and the effort required to correct the system.

A direct brand system therefore needs restraint as an operating property. The participant should encounter a relevant capability within a chosen relationship and understand how to leave it. The programme tests whether that arrangement can replace demands for attention with timely, useful participation, and whether it remains practical when research staff are no longer guiding the encounter.

10 Before During and After in Journaling

Before, During and After (BDA) give Journaling its temporal structure. A journal sequence belongs to a particular application of a Method in pursuit of a Goal. It connects what the person intended, the effort and support encountered, and the consequence available for review. These relationships make the brand promise inspectable in lived activity.

Phase	What Journaling makes available	Question for the promise
Before	Intent, starting conditions, available resources, selected Method and intended result	What would useful support make possible for this person now?
During	Selected actions, actual support, difficulties, adaptations and changes of intent	How does the promise perform within the effort and circumstances?
After	Observed result, participant judgment, remaining difficulty and proposed next action	What became possible, what burden arose and what response is warranted?

L1 and L2 provide access and Utility surfaces. BDA describes the activity supported through them; the phases are not assigned one-to-one to those surfaces. The proposed flow carries the relevant context from an L1 encounter into the chosen L2 Utility and its Journaling activity. Returning to that activity must preserve the application and the participant's authority over the account.

Each capture needs a phase, a source and an association with the relevant Goal, Method and Task. It may be an image, short video or brief account suited to the activity. The proposed Utility advances Before → During → After within that application, allowing additional captures in a phase before moving on. During can include repeated attempts, adaptations or help from a person or AI, with the responsible Action and Agent identifiable. Capture must remain proportionate to the activity.

Phase and capture time remain distinct. A Before account added after the event is retrospective and must be identified as such. Missing evidence remains unknown; it cannot be filled by an AI reconstruction presented as observation. A participant's correction should preserve what was corrected. The study must examine whether the useful evidence justifies the effort of producing it.

After supports a reviewed Perspective and, where permitted, a finding that a responsible business role can address. A revised Method, service or product enters a later Before as available support. The next During shows its actual use; the next After examines its consequence against the person's intent. Each application retains its own conditions and versions. This return connects a complete BDA sequence to recursive learning; completing the journal alone cannot establish that the promise was kept.

11 Reciprocal data and attributable effort

The brand and the person each bring knowledge that can make an engagement useful. A business may know how its product should be used, which conditions matter and what support it can provide. A person knows their intention and encounters the actual result. The system should make these contributions available under a defined purpose while keeping their sources, ownership and limits legible.

Contributor	Possible contribution	Permitted use to specify
Person or participating group	Chosen intent, selected BDA journal evidence, an account of experience and corrections	Support for the active inquiry, separately authorized retention and any agreed disclosure
Brand and business	Product knowledge, Methods, staff expertise, service capacity and an attributable response	Application in the declared context, with source, version and commercial interest visible
Kitsune and investigators	System operation, bounded processing, research interpretation and evaluation	Tasks and access authorized by the protocol, with implementation and research roles distinguished

We use Vivo for lived data with presence and attributable context, and Vitro for digital data produced by Utilities or processing. A Perspective is an attributed interpretation offered for review. It can connect these sources while preserving whether a claim rests on observation, a participant's account, supplied knowledge or inference. A reviewed interpretation does not become a directly observed event.

For example, an image may support a statement about an item visible at a particular time. It does not establish how the item was used later. A participant can explain that a Method was difficult; an investigator still needs a suitable design to attribute that difficulty to a specific product feature. The brand's knowledge also requires scope: a recommended Method is evidence of what was advised, not proof that it will fit every circumstance.

Participation, processing, retention and sharing are distinct decisions. Supplying a product, service or research setting does not confer ownership of a person's evidence. Permission to receive a service does not silently extend to advertising, model training or unrelated inference. If another use is proposed, it must be assessed and authorized under its own terms.

The research should examine whether this reciprocal flow improves practical understanding. Does the person receive something useful for the effort and access contributed? Does the business receive sufficient permitted evidence to act responsibly? Where either contribution is inadequate or excessive, the configuration should change. A functioning relationship needs evidence of both the value of exchange and the ability to control it.

12 Returning experience through accountable action

The proposed feedback loop connects lived experience to a responsible decision and then follows the decision back into use. Recursion occurs when the consequence of one application informs a later application whose consequence can also be examined. The point of return is the human activity the promise was meant to support.

Part of the loop	Required account
Experience	Before intent and conditions, During effort and support, and After consequence
Reviewed finding	What the evidence supports, whose interpretation it is and what remains uncertain
Business decision	The responsible role, intended response, resources and reason for acting or declining
Delivery	What changed, its version, intended recipients and how it became available
Subsequent experience	A later BDA sequence showing whether the response reached use and what followed

A brand might improve an instruction, change a product detail, adjust service delivery or revise its promise. The response should name an owner and an appropriate time for review. A decision to defer or decline also needs an attributable reason. Unresolved work remains visible instead of being recorded as successful closure.

Argyris's account of double-loop learning supports examining underlying objectives and assumptions as well as correcting execution. For this programme, that distinction makes the promise itself available for revision when repeated experience challenges it. [9]

Staff must be able to report what prevents delivery. Edmondson's field study of 51 work teams found an association between psychological safety and learning behavior. It supports attention to the conditions under which people surface problems; it does not establish that a new reporting interface creates those conditions. [10]

The study should therefore examine the response process alongside the interface. Who could raise a concern? Who had authority to change the relevant condition? Did the response increase unpaid work or place pressure on staff to describe the outcome favorably? A recurring difficulty may reveal a resource or incentive problem that software cannot resolve alone.

At the next relevant use, a new BDA sequence makes the return reviewable. Before identifies the revised support and current intent; During records its use; After examines what it made possible. Earlier and later applications remain distinguishable, including their different conditions. The loop has produced evidence when the return and its consequence can be traced; whether it has produced an improvement remains a separate question.

13 Continuity and the timing of review

An engagement becomes a continuing inquiry when people can relate an earlier intention, the support received and a later consequence without losing their distinct contexts. A recurring question can connect separate Moments. Each account still needs its own source, time, participants and permitted use.

The timing of support should follow the activity. Someone may need help during a task, while a business needs enough experience to judge whether a Method warrants revision. A review interval is therefore part of the research design. It should be evaluated against usefulness, burden and the opportunity to act on what is learned.

One configuration combines support and BDA Journaling in the immediate activity, a weekly Perspective and a monthly Master Engagement Record, or MER. The MER connects authorized findings across applications: what was intended, what endured from review, which response occurred and what later experience revealed. Weekly and monthly review draw on BDA sequences; they do not replace the review of each application.

Harkin and colleagues' meta-analysis of 138 randomized studies found that interventions encouraging progress monitoring improved goal attainment on average. It offers a reason to investigate review linked to action. It does not establish a calendar month as the right interval for this framework or determine what monitoring is proportionate in a particular life. [\[11\]](#)

The person, operational team and brand leadership may receive different authorized Perspectives from a cycle. Each transition from raw evidence to retained understanding needs an explicit purpose and authority. A shared review cadence does not imply shared access to every source.

In the proposed implementation, raw captures enter a review workspace for no more than 72 hours from original capture. Copying, transcription, processing or unfinished review does not restart that clock. Retained findings require separate authorization and permitted lineage. The study must define what concise findings and measurements may endure and what later verification source expiry will prevent.

Time has several distinct meanings. Occurrence time locates the activity; capture time locates the record. Intended time concerns a possible future activity. Expiry limits evidence availability. BDA locates evidence within a Method application. It is separate from morning, midday and evening, the 72-hour retention limit, and weekly or monthly review. A 28-day period and a calendar month must also remain distinguishable.

The research should test whether this continuity helps people and organizations understand what changed and make a useful next choice. If the proposed cadence or evidence lifecycle cannot support the question adequately, the design or the scope of the claim needs revision.

14 Responsibility and balanced benefit

The proposed relationship carries consequences for both parties. The business is responsible for the promise it makes, the support it supplies and its use of the access granted. The participant is responsible for commitments they knowingly accept within the engagement. Those responsibilities need to be understandable, proportionate and related to what each party can control.

A participant may agree to return borrowed equipment, describe an attempt honestly or apply specified conditions in a product test. Such commitments do not imply loyalty, future purchases, a positive account or unlimited data sharing. Changed circumstances, disagreement and an unsuccessful result must remain distinguishable from deliberate misuse.

Similarly, a brand may commit to providing a defined resource, addressing an eligible service problem or reviewing a finding by an agreed time. It cannot treat the person's willingness to receive help as general permission to occupy later moments. The business must make material limitations visible and respond when its own design prevents the promised benefit.

Reciprocity does not mean equal power. A business can control access, incentives and the terms of a service in ways an individual cannot. The study must examine whether people can refuse additional capture or participation without losing an unrelated entitlement, and whether staff can question a process without bearing an inappropriate consequence. Agreed participation terms require examination in use.

Misuse should be addressed through a bounded review of the relevant commitment and evidence. A disputed account needs an opportunity for correction and a responsible human decision. The proposed system does not justify a general score of customer trustworthiness or employee worth. Evidence of one engagement should not silently become authority over another.

Profit is a legitimate business outcome within this position. The research asks whether commercial value can be sustained through support that remains useful and acceptable to the people who make that value possible. A transaction, a useful permitted finding or a continuing relationship may contribute business value. Their presence does not cancel a participant's burden or establish that the promise was kept.

Balance must therefore remain visible as separate outcomes. Human benefit, business value, attention, effort, cost and disclosure should be examined together without collapsing them into a universal score. A useful result may identify a workable arrangement, a necessary change in the promise or a boundary beyond which the brand should not participate.

15 Making the framework operational

A research framework needs a way to relate its concepts to behavior that can be observed. The proposed Data-Logic-Action specification, or DLA, describes the evidence a Utility may use, the reasoning and review it may perform, and the response it may support. It makes assumptions about the relationship available for inspection before they are embedded in an application.

Component	What must be specified for the inquiry
Data	Purpose, spatial context, Method application, BDA phase, source and time of evidence, supplied knowledge and permissions
Logic	How phase and sequence are preserved, intent and consequence are compared, uncertainty is represented and interpretation is reviewed
Action	What support and capture are permitted, who may act and how a response returns into a later BDA application for review

The specification begins with a particular promise and a participant-valued purpose. It identifies which knowledge and capabilities could help, which circumstances matter and what evidence would make the attempt intelligible. Those choices must be appropriate to the selected activity. A useful record of a preparation will differ from a useful record of maintenance or learning.

A Goal-Based Task makes purposeful effort explicit within Goal → Method → Task. Before establishes its intended result and conditions; During relates selected evidence to the responsible Action and Agent; After supports review of the result. The specification must preserve that association through L1, L2 and Journaling, including the Method and system versions, permissions and evidence expiry.

Task completion, goal attainment, promise fulfilment and contribution eligibility are different judgments. A failed attempt may reveal a useful defect. A completed task may leave the larger purpose unmet. Recording an observation twice cannot create two independent contributions or two independent study participants.

The same specification should make the response inspectable. Which finding can reach which business role? What permits a change? How does the participant encounter it, and which later observation could show whether it helped? These relationships turn the proposed loop into a sequence that investigators can follow.

A DLA describes operational expectations. A research protocol supplies the study question, comparison, measures and basis for interpretation. Early fieldwork may use declared human facilitation where automation is incomplete, with its effort recorded. Authored rules, demonstrated behavior and evidence of benefit remain separate forms of evidence.

16 Following a promise into an ordinary evening

Consider a food brand that promises easier weekday cooking. This illustrative sequence shows how L1, L2 and BDA Journaling could make the relationship available for research. Its events are constructed to explain the framework.

A person arrives home intending to prepare a meal before a shared evening commitment. An L1 surface on the product gives access to cooking support. They choose the relevant L2 Utility, where the Method and Journaling activity carry the context of this application. Using an available Method need not require sharing a broad household record.

Before. For the participating inquiry, the person selects the appropriate Moment Type and permits a small account of intent and starting conditions: the intended meal, available time, ingredients and a relevant equipment constraint. The brand supplies an attributable Method and product knowledge. An image or brief account establishes the starting point and distinguishes what the person knows from what the brand advises.

During. Preparation reveals a step that assumes equipment or work absent from the stated Method. The person adapts and chooses to journal the difficulty. A selected capture records the affected Task and circumstances. Further captures can show another attempt or useful support without continuously recording the kitchen. An AI proposal may suggest an adaptation; its source and the person's review remain attributable.

After. The person records the result and assesses it against the intended meal and the promise of ease. Was the meal achievable? What additional time, help or effort did it require? The review relates that outcome to the Before conditions and During evidence. An unresolved difficulty remains visible even if the meal was completed.

With permission, the relevant finding reaches the business role responsible for the Method. The business supplies a revision that states the missing preparation and offers an alternative. Responsibility for a product or service defect must reach someone able to change it beyond the support interface.

The next application. A later Before records the person's current intent, conditions and revised Method. During shows whether the alternative is used and helpful. After examines the result and remaining burden. Different ingredients, time or assistance remain visible when comparing the applications. A favorable reaction to revised instructions alone cannot establish an easier meal.

The person may gain an achievable meal or less wasted effort; the business may gain more reliable support or fewer avoidable service problems. Each outcome needs evidence. Weekly Perspective and monthly review can connect the authorized findings, response and later result. The value of the loop lies in what returned to the person's life and what that experience taught both parties.

17 A field environment spanning all three tiers

The research environment includes the promise as expressed, the operations responsible for it and the places where people encounter its consequences. Studying only the interface would leave the business response unresolved. Studying only internal decisions would leave the human return unresolved.

Field component	What investigators follow
Brand expression	The actual promise, its versions, intended audience and expected conditions of use
Business practice	Product and service provision, staff work, decisions, resource constraints and delivery of responses
Lived activity	L1 and L2 use and BDA Journaling in relevant Places, Spaces and Things, including later applications
Governed continuity	The permitted connection among evidence, reviewed findings, action and subsequent use

A bounded first study would examine a specific promise and the operating roles responsible for its delivery. The setting should allow repeated applications and a realistic opportunity to change the support. Investigators need to be able to follow a finding through an attributable decision and into later use.

Recruitment should include variation relevant to the promise: experience, working patterns, resources, ability, care responsibilities or other contextual differences. The purpose is to identify conditions that alter usefulness and burden. It is not to infer sensitive characteristics or assemble a comprehensive profile. Investigators should document which people and circumstances remain outside the study.

Staff participate as knowledgeable contributors with their own boundaries. The programme should examine the work required to provide support, reconcile evidence and implement changes. A customer benefit achieved through excessive staff effort is an important finding about the arrangement's sustainability.

The same method can extend beyond food. An equipment brand promising dependable use may study setup, maintenance and return to operation. A learning brand may examine whether material and a timely Utility help someone understand or perform a chosen activity. Each extension requires its own Methods, measures and responsible expertise. Evidence from one configuration cannot validate another automatically.

The environment should permit modest entry. A participant need not provide a full personal history, seed every part of a home or adopt an entire catalogue of Utilities before one useful inquiry begins. The protocol should identify the minimum context and demonstrated capabilities necessary for the selected question.

Research access, service delivery and commercial use remain distinct. The business contributes knowledge and participates in response within the declared inquiry. The person retains authority over the permitted account of their experience. Investigators remain responsible for the methods and claims used to evaluate the relationship.

18 Beginning with practice and building a testable configuration

The programme begins by understanding how the promise already enters ordinary activity. Participant accounts, contextual observation and discussions with staff can reveal the practical differences that matter before a preferred technical intervention is selected. Investigators should follow activities people consider relevant and agree to make available.

Stage	Work	Evidence required to proceed
Understand existing practice	Examine the promise, participant purposes, constraints and current support	A bounded research question and plausible moments where support could help
Configure the relationship	Define Utilities, Methods, roles, evidence, commitments and response routes	A versioned specification and a protocol with meaningful outcomes
Demonstrate feasibility	Exercise L1 entry, L2 use, BDA Journaling, review, correction and return	A linked application and later return, with facilitation, failures and burden documented
Evaluate later use	Compare outcomes and follow the consequence of implemented responses	Evidence adequate to the selected claim, including uncertainty and contrary results

The unit of inquiry is a participant's purpose followed through one or more BDA applications, including a return after a business response. Each application connects the L1 and L2 context with Journaling evidence; separate captures remain observations within it. Compare cases across circumstances and retain contrary findings. Participant review can correct an account while preserving disagreement with the investigator.

Sample decisions for exploratory work should follow the depth and variety of inquiry required. Recruitment and stopping decisions need a documented rationale. Numerical efficacy claims require a separate design with sample size justified by the selected outcome, meaningful effect, variation, dependence and expected attrition.

The feasibility stage should follow at least one actual return into subsequent use. That can demonstrate a sequence in a case. It cannot establish population benefit, commercial sustainability or transfer across settings. A simulated response may test a mechanism under controlled conditions, but it must remain distinguishable from a business change delivered in ordinary operations.

Before human-participant work begins, the programme should obtain appropriate independent ethics review and establish consent, access, correction and response procedures. The review must address the actual setting, including any employment, care or service dependence that could make refusal difficult. Additional populations or clinical questions require the relevant expertise and scope.

A successful development stage produces something concrete to test: an operating relationship with known limitations, accountable actors and a defensible way to observe its consequence. Development can stop when the field shows that the proposed support adds no sufficient value.

19 Distinguishing the contribution of the system and AI

The evaluation should test a proposition arising from fieldwork. For a defined promise and setting, does the proposed relationship make useful support more achievable and improve subsequent experience? Which part of the arrangement produced the difference? The following comparison distinguishes the contribution of the structured relationship from the additional contribution of AI interpretation.

Condition	What participants receive	Comparison purpose
A Usual practice	The specified existing product, service and support	Establish a reference for the added programme
B Structured inquiry and response	L1 and L2 access, BDA Journaling, human review and a defined route for business response	Compared with A, examine the added structure, review and organizational response together
C Added AI Perspective	The B process with an attributed AI proposal that can be reviewed, corrected or rejected	Compared with B, examine the incremental contribution of AI

This is a design family, not a requirement to run three conditions in every pilot. A focused study may compare B and C. That comparison can examine AI's additional contribution but cannot, by itself, establish the benefit of B relative to usual practice. Likewise, B versus A does not separate the effects of better documentation from a newly responsive business unless the study introduces another suitable comparison.

B and C should use comparable BDA prompts, capture opportunities and human review. Human support, knowledge access and material assistance should be comparable when they are not the intervention. Record facilitator time, staff effort, incentives, equipment and subsidies so effects can be attributed to the arrangement actually received.

Assignment should occur at the level where the intervention operates. A business-wide product or Method revision may affect customers across conditions. Staff may transfer learning between cases. The design must address those spillovers through an appropriate unit of allocation, separated versions or a different comparison. With one brand-wide change and no credible control, findings may support feasibility and observed association rather than a causal effect.

Repeated applications by one person are related observations. Multiple tasks, captures or reviews do not create independent participants. Learning also persists, which can make a simple crossover unsuitable. The analysis plan should address clustering, missing evidence, withdrawal, changes of intent and variation between settings.

Specify primary outcomes and analysis before examining the comparative results. Report uncertainty and the assistance needed to sustain any effect. A later application with changed circumstances can examine transfer, while a longer follow-up can examine durability. Neither should be claimed from a single successful return.

20 What would count as evidence

The study needs a primary human outcome tied to the selected promise and the participant's purpose. A primary business outcome can be specified alongside it. Their relationship is part of the inquiry; combining them into one favorable score would hide circumstances in which one party benefits at the other's expense.

Domain	Candidate evidence	A contrary or limiting finding
Promise fulfillment	A defined commitment becomes useful under documented conditions	The promised result occurs only after substantial unreported assistance
Human benefit	An intended action, understanding or experience improves in a meaningful way	Confidence or satisfaction rises while capability or practical fit does not
Business value	Supported changes in service work, product support, permitted learning or commercial outcome	Value depends on hidden subsidy, excessive staff effort or greater unwanted access
Agency and burden	People can review, correct, refuse and control sharing at an acceptable cost	Participation displaces activity or declining it becomes practically difficult
Accountable return	A permitted finding leads to an attributable response and observed subsequent use	A decision or software release is counted as benefit before its consequence is examined

Measures must fit the claim. Time to complete an activity can be observed under specified conditions. The meaning of a shared experience requires accounts from the people involved. Capability requires an appropriate assessment, with assistance stated. Physiological effects require suitable measurements and expertise. Validated measures should be used where they fit, and new measures should be identified as such.

Burden belongs on both sides. Examine whether Before establishes an interpretable starting point, During captures useful effort without displacing it, and After supports review. Record capture and correction time, interruptions, participant cost, staff work and response resources. Set meaningful thresholds before intervention and examine differences between participants. An average benefit can conceal an arrangement that fails for some people.

Report denominators: eligible opportunities, accepted engagements, BDA applications, captures, available findings, implemented responses and observed later uses. Several captures within a phase do not create independent cases. Identify missing phases and retrospective accounts. Reasons may be sought within authorized participation; unrecorded activity remains unknown, rather than a failed task or refusal of the promise.

Independent assessment should examine important claims where feasible, with assessors unaware of condition when the task allows. Participant accounts, staff reports, agent proposals and investigator judgments should remain attributable. Report negative findings, corrections, withdrawal and unresolved disagreement alongside useful effects.

The practical test is whether support changed something that mattered under the circumstances studied, whether both parties could sustain the arrangement and what evidence would warrant a further application.

21 Failure conditions and research limits

The proposed relationship can fail even when an interface works as intended. The promise may be too broad, the Utility may arrive at the wrong time or the person may already know what to do. Evidence may omit the decisive circumstance. An AI interpretation may be plausible but wrong. The business may understand the finding and lack the authority or resources to respond.

A response can also fail in use. Revised instructions may shift work to the customer. Faster service may overload staff. A helpful pilot may depend on facilitation that the business cannot sustain. These outcomes belong in the study because they identify what the relationship actually requires.

The protocol should name conditions for pausing a particular function or the study. These include unauthorized access, failure to honor a correction or expiry, an unmanageable increase in burden, and support that creates a material problem within the selected domain. It should identify who receives the concern, who can act and how participants are informed. Thresholds need to be specific to the activity rather than decorative statements of care.

A business's interest in a favorable interpretation can influence the inquiry. Recruitment may favor enthusiastic customers, staff may hesitate to report difficulties and participants may believe a positive account is expected. The study should examine those pressures, preserve a route for concerns and disclose each organization's role in design, access, interpretation and reporting.

The research also has limits of scope. A selected set of participants cannot represent every customer. A useful configuration for one promise cannot validate the entire System of Brand Things. A feasibility sequence cannot prove efficacy. A short study cannot establish enduring trust or profitable operation. Source expiry may limit later verification, and missing participation may limit what can be said about ordinary use.

The scholarship in this paper is a selected foundation. It contains conceptual work, qualitative cases, observational studies, a laboratory experiment and a meta-analysis. Those sources support different questions. Their presence does not establish that combining the proposed technologies and practices will improve agency or experience.

The programme should retain the ability to conclude that a simpler service, better product or different promise is the appropriate response. The research succeeds in producing a defensible account of what helps, what fails and what conditions matter, even when the proposed Utility is not continued.

22 Conclusion

A brand's promise becomes consequential through the people, products, services and practices that carry it into life. Its practical meaning emerges in relation to a person's purpose, the support available and the experience that follows. Making that relationship accountable requires a way to understand what happened, identify who can respond and examine what the response changes.

Physical-first intelligence places human intent and lived consequence at the centre of that inquiry. The System of Brand Things extends the thesis through three connected tiers: the brand's story and promise, the business responsible for enabling it and the human encountering its value in practice. Spatial context, bounded AI processing and authorized continuity provide technical means of supporting that relationship.

The applied work identifies the Moments and Utilities that make each promise useful. L1 and L2 connect access to support; BDA Journaling connects intent, effort and consequence within its application. People must be able to review and direct that account. Permitted findings reach business actors able to respond, and the response enters a later BDA cycle where its practical value can be examined.

Human benefit and business value remain distinct. Commercial value can be a legitimate consequence of useful participation. Its sustainability must be examined alongside attention, effort, disclosure, staff work and the responsibilities accepted by each party. A gain that depends on an unacknowledged transfer of burden requires a different account of success.

This framework proposes a research approach for investigating those relationships. It begins with existing practices, develops configurations for particular promises and tests them through situated use and appropriate comparisons. The scholarship supplies concepts and methods for asking better questions. The proposed system must establish its own effects in the circumstances studied.

The intended contribution is a practical way to determine when a brand's participation is welcome and useful, how experience can change the business practice behind its promise and whether that change returns value to the human at hand. The claim remains open to contrary findings. A responsible system must be able to learn that its timing, Utility or promise needs to change.

References

- [1] Grönroos, C. (2009). Marketing as promise management: Regaining customer management for marketing. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 24(5-6), 351-359. Conceptual analysis. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08858620910966237>
- [2] McCracken, G. (1986). Culture and consumption: A theoretical account of the structure and movement of the cultural meaning of consumer goods. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13(1), 71-84. Theoretical account. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209048>
- [3] Fournier, S. (1998). Consumers and their brands: Developing relationship theory in consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24(4), 343-373. Theory developed through three in-depth case studies. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209515>
- [4] Suchman, L. (2006). Situated actions. In *Human-Machine Reconfigurations: Plans and Situated Actions* (2nd ed., pp. 69-84). Cambridge University Press. Conceptual and situated account of purposeful action; print year follows the publisher's chapter record. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511808418.008>
- [5] Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78. Theoretical and empirical synthesis. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>
- [6] Plassmann, H., O'Doherty, J., Shiv, B., & Rangel, A. (2008). Marketing actions can modulate neural representations of experienced pleasantness. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105(3), 1050-1054. Laboratory experiment involving price information and wine tasting. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0706929105>

References continued

- [7] Swami, V., Hochstöger, S., Kargl, E., & Stieger, S. (2022). Hangry in the field: An experience sampling study on the impact of hunger on anger, irritability, and affect. *PLOS ONE*, 17(7), e0269629. Repeated self-report observational study. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0269629>
- [8] Nissenbaum, H. (2004). Privacy as contextual integrity. *Washington Law Review*, 79, 119-158. Conceptual account of appropriate information flows. <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wlr/vol79/iss1/10/>
- [9] Argyris, C. (1977). Double loop learning in organizations. *Harvard Business Review*, 55(5), 115-125. Organizational learning framework. <https://store.hbr.org/product/double-loop-learning-in-organizations/77502>
- [10] Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350-383. Field study of 51 work teams. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999>
- [11] Harkin, B., Webb, T. L., Chang, B. P. I., Prestwich, A., Conner, M., Kellar, I., Benn, Y., & Sheeran, P. (2016). Does monitoring goal progress promote goal attainment? A meta-analysis of the experimental evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 142(2), 198-229. Meta-analysis of 138 randomized studies. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000025>