The Phygital Scientist
An Adaptive Interventionist Method for Applied Inquiry in Technology and Business

Silvio Meira[1,2]

Abstract:

Classical scientific methods, often grounded in observation, controlled experimentation and falsification, face significant challenges when applied to domains like software engineering, innovation, marketing, and strategy. These fields are characterized by rapid change, complex system dynamics, the centrality of intervention, and the construction of new realities within an increasingly integrated physical-digital-social ("phygital") space.

Existing methodologies struggle to provide robust validation for knowledge claims derived from necessary interventions in volatile market and business contexts. This paper argues for a new approach: the Adaptive Interventionist Method (**AIM**). Grounded in the SPA (Society, Politics, Advancement) philosophical framework's emphasis on phygital reality, ethical adaptability, and long-term thinking, and incorporating principles for navigating complex interventions, AIM offers a structured yet flexible cycle for generating and validating knowledge through practice.

We propose a novel "bootstrapping" approach, analogous to compiler development, to validate **AIM** itself by applying its principles iteratively to its own refinement through practical case studies in its target domains. This work aims to bridge the gap between the philosophy of science and the epistemological needs of contemporary applied sciences operating within complex socio-technical systems.

Keywords: Philosophy of Science, Scientific Method, Applied Science, Software Engineering, Innovation, Marketing Strategy, Intervention, Validation, Phygital Space, SPA Framework, Bootstrapping Validation, Action Research, Design Science.

---

[1]**Silvio Meira** is founder and Chief Scientist at [TDS.company](), TIME Advisor at LEFIL Company, Extraordinary Professor at [cesar.school](), Porto Digital, and Distinguished Research Fellow at [Asia School of Business](), Kuala Lumpur. Meira is member of the Boards of **CI&T**, **magalu** and Chairman of the Board at **Porto Digital**. You can contact me at silvio@meira.com.

Contents

1. Introduction: The Epistemological Challenge in 21st Century Applied Science

1.1. The Rise of Intervention-Driven Disciplines

The 21st century is increasingly shaped by disciplines that move beyond the traditional scientific mandate of describing and explaining the natural world. Fields such as software engineering, strategic management, marketing science, and innovation studies are fundamentally *interventionist* and *constructivist* in nature. Their primary focus is not merely to observe existing phenomena but to actively design, build, modify, and deploy artifacts, systems, and strategies that reshape specific aspects of our reality.

Software engineers construct intricate logical systems that automate processes and mediate interactions (**Meira**).

Strategists devise and implement plans intended to alter organizational trajectories and market dynamics.

Marketers develop campaigns to influence perception and behavior (**Searle**).

Innovators conceptualize and realize novel products and services that create new possibilities and user experiences.

Unlike classical physics or biology, where the object of study often pre-exists the observer and intervention is carefully controlled to isolate variables, these applied disciplines are characterized by the creation of the very phenomena they study and by the necessity of intervention as a core mode of inquiry and operation.

The knowledge sought is often pragmatic: does the software meet user needs and scale effectively? Does the strategy lead to competitive advantage? Does the marketing campaign increase engagement? Does the innovation find market adoption?

This inherent focus on *making* and *doing*, rather than solely *observing* and *explaining*, presents profound challenges to traditional conceptions of scientific methodology and validation.

1.2. The Context: The "Phygital" Reality

These interventionist disciplines operate within a rapidly evolving context that further complicates traditional inquiry: the "phygital" space (**Meira**). As explicitly defined within the SPA framework, this term refers to the increasingly seamless integration and interdependence of the **physical**, **digital**, and **social** dimensions of our existence.

Software (digital) runs on physical devices and infrastructure, mediating social interactions, economic transactions, and political discourse.

Marketing strategies (social/digital) leverage digital platforms to influence behavior related to physical products and services.

Innovation frequently involves blending physical hardware with sophisticated digital intelligence and relies on social adoption dynamics (**Tapscott**).

This deep entanglement means that interventions rarely have purely isolated effects; an algorithmic change (digital) can impact social equity (**O'Neil**) and physical access, while a new physical product requires digital integration and social marketing for success. Understanding phenomena or validating interventions requires a holistic perspective that acknowledges these intertwined dimensions.

The phygital context is characterized by non-linearity, emergent behaviors (**Surowiecki**), rapid feedback loops, and a blurring of boundaries that challenges neat categorization and reductionist analysis (**Latour**) *that the phygital concept also transcends*).

This complex, dynamic, and deeply interconnected environment forms the backdrop against which the limitations of classical scientific methods become particularly apparent for applied, interventionist fields.

It demands approaches that recognize the constructed, interactive, and evolving nature of knowledge in a world increasingly shaped by technology (**Hayles**; **Braidotti**; **Turkle**; *Focusing on the specific ways technology alters social interaction within this space*; **Lynch**).

1.3. The Problem: The Misfit of Classical Scientific Methods

The dominant paradigms of 20th-century philosophy of science, while profoundly influential, struggle to provide adequate methodological guidance or robust validation frameworks for knowledge claims within these phygital, intervention-driven domains. Consider Karl Popper's principle of falsification: *science progresses by proposing bold conjectures and subjecting them to rigorous attempts at refutation through empirical testing* (**Popper**).

While powerful in domains where controlled experiments can isolate variables and test predictive hypotheses about natural laws, its application is problematic in software engineering or strategic management.

Is a software design "falsified" if it contains bugs or fails to meet initial user expectations, or is it simply iterated upon? Can a business strategy be truly "falsified" by market outcomes when countless uncontrollable variables (competitor actions, economic shifts, social trends) intervene, and the intervention itself alters the competitive landscape? The very act of testing often involves modification and adaptation, blurring the line between refutation and refinement.

Similarly, Thomas Kuhn's conception of scientific progress through paradigms—*periods of "normal science" operating within an accepted framework, punctuated by revolutionary shifts when anomalies accumulate* (**Kuhn**)—offers limited traction.

Fields like innovation and marketing often lack universally accepted, stable paradigms in the Kuhnian sense. Instead, they are characterized by competing frameworks, rapid evolution driven by technological change and market feedback, and a focus on pragmatic effectiveness rather than puzzle-solving within a fixed theoretical structure.

An "anomaly" in marketing might simply be a poorly performing campaign, leading to tactical adjustments rather than a fundamental paradigm crisis. Furthermore, the goal is often not convergence on a single paradigm but the successful navigation of a complex, shifting landscape using a diverse toolkit of models and practices.

The constructive nature of these fields means they often *create* the "puzzles" they solve, rather than discovering pre-existing ones in nature. Beliefs about what constitutes valid knowledge and successful practice are tightly coupled with the specific goals and contexts of intervention (**Schmitt**).

The core issue is that *classical methods were largely developed for observational sciences aiming to uncover universal truths about an external, pre-existing reality*. They often presuppose a level of system stability, variable control, and observer detachment that is unattainable—and perhaps even undesirable—in fields predicated on active intervention, construction, and adaptation within complex, dynamic, socio-technical (phygital) systems.

1.4. The Need: A Call for a Renewed Philosophy and Methodology

The mismatch between the epistemological assumptions of classical scientific methods and the operational realities of 21st-century intervention-driven disciplines creates a significant gap.

Practitioners in fields like software engineering, innovation, and marketing often rely on heuristics, best practices, tacit knowledge, and ad-hoc experimentation, but lack a coherent, rigorous, and philosophically grounded methodology for validating their knowledge claims and guiding their interventions.

This can lead to cycles of fad and fashion, difficulty in accumulating reliable knowledge, and challenges in systematically learning from success and failure. There is a pressing need for a renewed philosophy of science and an accompanying methodology that explicitly addresses the unique characteristics of these domains: their interventionist nature, their operation within the complex phygital space, their constructivist goals, and their reliance on pragmatic validation criteria.

Such a framework should provide a basis for more rigorous inquiry and more reliable knowledge generation, while still embracing the complexity, dynamism, and practical orientation of these critical fields.

1.5. Proposal Overview: Introducing the Adaptive Interventionist Method (AIM)

This paper proposes the Adaptive Interventionist Method (**AIM**) as a step towards addressing this need. **AIM** is conceived as a scientific methodology specifically designed for inquiry and knowledge validation within intervention-driven disciplines operating in the 21st-century phygital context.

It draws its philosophical grounding from the SPA (Society, Politics, Advancement) framework (**Meira**), embracing its holistic view of the physical-digital-social continuum, its emphasis on ethical adaptability, and its focus on navigating complexity and change. Procedurally, AIM incorporates principles designed for structured intervention and learning within dynamic systems, emphasizing iterative cycles of modeling, intervention, embedded observation, pragmatic assessment, and adaptation. AIM seeks to provide a framework that is both epistemologically sound and practically relevant for generating and validating actionable knowledge in fields like software engineering, innovation, marketing, and strategy.

1.6. Paper Roadmap

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section 2 will delve deeper into the limitations of the state-of-the-art scientific methodologies when applied to interventionist inquiry. Section 3 will formally present the proposed Adaptive Interventionist Method (AIM), detailing its philosophical underpinnings, core principles, and operational cycle. Section 4 will introduce a novel bootstrapping strategy for validating AIM itself through its application. Finally, Section 5 will discuss the broader implications of AIM for the philosophy of science and for practice in the target disciplines, acknowledging limitations and suggesting future research directions.

2. The State of the Art and its Limitations for Interventionist Inquiry

To fully appreciate the need for a methodology like the Adaptive Interventionist Method (**AIM**), it is crucial to examine the established frameworks for scientific inquiry and articulate precisely why they fall short when applied to the dynamic, constructive, and intervention-centric disciplines operating within the 21st century's phygital context.

While these frameworks represent monumental achievements in the history of thought and remain powerful tools for many scientific endeavors, their underlying assumptions and operational logics *encounter significant friction when confronted with the realities of fields such as software engineering, innovation management, marketing science, and strategic planning*.

2.1. Brief Review of Dominant Scientific Methodologies

The landscape of 20th-century philosophy of science offers several influential models for understanding scientific progress and validating knowledge claims. Central among these is the **hypothetico-deductive (H-D) method**, a foundational approach where hypotheses are formulated, their logical consequences (predictions) are deduced, and these predictions are then tested against empirical observations. Confirmation occurs when observations match predictions, though consensus acknowledges the logical asymmetry: confirming instances don't prove a hypothesis true (problem of induction), whereas a conflicting observation can, in principle, disprove it.

Building upon this, **Karl Popper's falsificationism** provided a powerful demarcation criterion between science and non-science (**Popper**). For Popper, the hallmark of a scientific theory is not its verifiability but its falsifiability—its capacity to make risky predictions that, if proven wrong by observation or experiment, would lead to the theory's rejection or revision. Science progresses, in this view, *through a process of conjecture and refutation, eliminating erroneous theories and provisionally retaining those that withstand rigorous testing*. The emphasis is on critical rationalism and the avoidance of ad-hoc modifications designed merely to save a failing theory.

Thomas Kuhn, conversely, emphasized the sociological and historical dimensions of science (**Kuhn**). He argued that science typically operates within accepted "paradigms"—constellations of theories, methods, values, and metaphysical assumptions shared by a scientific community. During periods of "normal science," researchers engage in "puzzle-solving" within the paradigm's framework, extending its scope and precision. Progress is cumulative within the paradigm. However, the accumulation of anomalies—puzzles the paradigm cannot resolve—can precipitate a crisis, leading eventually to a scientific revolution and a paradigm shift, where a new, incommensurable framework replaces the old. Kuhn highlighted the role of community consensus and psychological shifts in scientific change, challenging purely logical accounts.

Imre Lakatos attempted to reconcile elements of Popper and Kuhn by proposing the concept of "research programmes" (**Lakatos**). A research programme consists of a "hard core" of fundamental assumptions, protected from direct refutation by a "protective belt" of auxiliary hypotheses. Programmes are evaluated not instantaneously but over time, judged as "progressive" if they lead to novel predictions and empirical discoveries, and "degenerating" if they merely accommodate known facts or rely heavily on ad-hoc adjustments to the protective belt. This offers a more nuanced view of theory persistence and rational change than simple falsification or revolutionary overthrow.

These frameworks (H-D, falsificationism, paradigms, research programmes), despite their differences, largely share an *orientation towards understanding an objective, external reality through observation, controlled experimentation, and logical inference*, aiming for theories with broad explanatory and predictive power, often *implicitly assuming a degree of stability in the phenomena under study*.

2.2. Analyzing the Inadequacy for Interventionist Inquiry

When we turn to disciplines like software engineering, innovation, marketing, and strategy within the phygital context, the limitations of these classical methodologies become starkly evident across several dimensions:

- **Constructivist Nature:** These fields are fundamentally *constructivist*. Software engineers do not *discover* pre-existing software systems; they *build* them based on logic, requirements, and design principles (**Searle**).

  Marketing strategies are *designed* artifacts intended to shape perceptions and behaviors. Innovations *create* novel products or processes. While empirical data informs these activities (user feedback, market analysis), the core activity is **creation** and **realization**, not discovery of immutable laws. Classical methods focused on describing "**what is**" struggle to assess knowledge embodied in "**what is made**" or "**what could be**." The criteria for success are often less about correspondence to an external reality and more about fitness for purpose, utility, scalability, user adoption, or market impact—criteria deeply intertwined with the constructed artifact itself.

- **Intervention Feedback Loops:** Intervention is not a peripheral activity for testing theories but the *central mode of operation and inquiry*. Developing a new software feature, launching a marketing campaign, or implementing a new business strategy *is* the research, or at least inseparable from it.

  This immediately **violates** the classical ideal of the detached observer minimizing their impact on the system under study.

  The intervention inevitably changes the system (e.g., user behavior adapts to new software, competitors react to a new strategy, market sentiment shifts due to a campaign).

  This creates complex feedback loops where cause and effect are entangled.

  Isolating the impact of a specific variable (a feature, a message) becomes exceedingly difficult, *if not impossible*, as the context co-evolves with the intervention. The system is not static but reactive and adaptive, rendering the premises of controlled experimentation highly problematic (**Latour**).

- **Context Dependency:** Findings and successes in these domains are often intensely context-dependent. A software architecture optimal for one application may fail in another. A marketing strategy effective in one demographic or culture may backfire elsewhere (**Turkle**). A business model successful in one market may not be transferable.

  This context includes the specific technological platform, the social dynamics of users or consumers, the prevailing economic conditions, the regulatory environment, and the competitive landscape—all elements of the complex phygital milieu. Classical science often strives for universal laws or generalizable theories, abstracting away from context. However, in these applied fields, **context is not** noise to be filtered out **but** a critical determinant of outcomes.

  Theories often take the form of context-sensitive heuristics, patterns, or frameworks rather than universal laws, challenging validation methods predicated on broad generalizability.

- **Pace of Change:** The phygital environment is characterized by extremely rapid technological evolution and shifting social and market dynamics. Software platforms are updated constantly, new communication channels emerge, consumer preferences change quickly, and competitive landscapes are disrupted.

  The lifecycle of relevance for a specific technology, marketing tactic, or even business strategy can be very short.

  Classical scientific validation, involving rigorous peer review and replication, often operates on timescales that are simply too slow to keep pace.

  By the time a finding is robustly "validated" in a traditional sense, the underlying context may have shifted so significantly that the finding is obsolete or irrelevant.

  These fields require methods that facilitate rapid learning, adaptation, and timely decision-making under uncertainty (**Lynch**).

- **Validation Gap:** Perhaps the most significant inadequacy lies in validation. How do we rigorously validate knowledge claims when the primary evidence comes from successful intervention rather than controlled observation, when outcomes are context-dependent and rapidly evolving, and when the goal is often pragmatic success rather than correspondence to truth?

Falsification is difficult, as "failures" often lead to iteration and adaptation rather than outright rejection.

Confirmation through repeated success is challenging due to context dependency and feedback loops.

While practitioners develop sophisticated domain-specific metrics (conversion rates, user engagement, market share, system performance), translating these pragmatic measures into robust, generalizable knowledge claims validated according to classical scientific standards remains an open challenge. There is a gap between the practical validation used within these fields and the epistemological criteria demanded by traditional philosophy of science.

2.3. Existing Attempts and Their Shortcomings: Action Research, Design Science, and Lean

The manifest limitations of classical scientific methods when applied to interventionist domains have not gone unnoticed by researchers and practitioners within these fields. Over decades, several alternative methodologies and frameworks have emerged, attempting to provide more suitable approaches for inquiry that involves active change, construction, and operation within complex socio-technical contexts.

While these represent important advancements and offer valuable practical guidance, a closer examination reveals they still fall short of providing the **comprehensive**, philosophically **grounded**, and ethically **integrated** framework envisioned for the Adaptive Interventionist Method (AIM), particularly when considering the full scope of the phygital reality.

Three prominent examples warrant detailed consideration: Action Research (AR), Design Science Research (DSR), and Lean Methodologies.

Action Research (AR): Originating in the work of social psychologist Kurt Lewin, Action Research is fundamentally characterized by its cyclical process and its dual commitment to generating practical knowledge and fostering change within a specific social context (**Lewin**).

The classic AR cycle involves diagnosing a problem, planning an intervention, taking action, evaluating the outcomes, and specifying learning, which then informs the next cycle (**Reason**). Key features often include collaboration between researchers and practitioners (or community members), a focus on solving real-world problems relevant to the participants, and an iterative process of learning through doing.

Variations like Participatory Action Research (PAR) further emphasize the empowerment of participants in co-generating knowledge and directing change (**Kemmis**).

- **Strengths:** AR excels at bridging the gap between theory and practice, generating rich, context-specific understanding grounded in lived experience. It provides a structured way to study interventions *as they happen* and facilitates organizational or social learning and adaptation. Its collaborative nature can lead to more relevant and sustainable solutions.
- **Shortcomings from AIM's Perspective:** Despite its strengths, *AR often faces challenges regarding the generalizability and theoretical contribution of its findings*.

  The deep contextual embedding, while a strength for local problem-solving, makes it difficult to distill universal principles or robustly validated theories in the classical sense. Validation criteria are often pragmatic and situated, focusing on whether the intervention "worked" for the participants in that context, which may lack broader epistemological rigor (**Somekh**).

  While ethically motivated, AR frameworks may not possess the explicitly integrated and adaptable ethical reasoning component envisioned for AIM, derived from SPA's focus on long-term systemic consequences within the phygital space.

  Furthermore, AR typically focuses on specific organizational or community settings, and may lack the conceptual tools to systematically address the complex interplay of physical, digital, *and* social dimensions inherent in the broader phygital context that SPA highlights, *particularly concerning large-scale technological systems or market dynamics*.

Design Science Research (DSR): Particularly prominent in the Information Systems (IS) field, Design Science Research *addresses the constructivist nature of technology disciplines head-on*. Its core objective is to generate knowledge *through* the process of building and evaluating novel IT artifacts (constructs, models, methods, instantiations) that address specific classes of problems (**Hevner**; **March**).

DSR aims for contributions beyond the artifact itself, seeking to develop generalizable design knowledge, principles, or theories. *Evaluation is central, assessing the artifact's utility, quality, and effectiveness in solving the targeted problem*. Rigor is sought through systematic construction processes and appropriate evaluation methods (e.g., case studies, simulations, field experiments).

- **Strengths:** DSR provides a clear framework for research focused on technological invention and construction, legitimizing the creation of artifacts as a valid research outcome. It emphasizes utility and problem-solving relevance, directly aligning with the goals of many interventionist disciplines. It explicitly aims to contribute generalizable design knowledge, moving beyond purely local solutions.
- **Shortcomings from AIM's Perspective:** The epistemological status of DSR knowledge remains a subject of debate – is it producing scientific theory, engineering principles, or something else? (**Gregor**).

  While evaluation of utility is central, it may not always equate to deep understanding of the underlying phenomena or the broader systemic impacts of the artifact within the phygital context.

  The focus can be heavily instrumental, potentially underemphasizing unintended consequences or long-term social and ethical implications unless explicitly built into the evaluation—AIM, grounded in SPA, seeks to make ethical adaptability a *core*, non-negotiable part of the method itself (**Meira**).

  Furthermore, DSR lifecycles, while often iterative during design, *may not fully capture the continuous adaptation and evolution needed for systems operating perpetually within dynamic phygital environments*; **AIM** proposes a potentially more fluid and ongoing cycle of intervention-observation-adaptation.

  The validation often relies heavily on demonstrating artifact utility, which, while crucial, *might not satisfy broader criteria for scientific validation or deep explanatory power concerning the interplay of physical-digital-social factors*.

Lean Methodologies: Originating from the Toyota Production System's focus on efficiency and waste reduction (**Womack**), Lean thinking has been widely adapted, notably in software development (**Poppendieck**) and entrepreneurship via the Lean Startup movement (**Ries**).

Core tenets include minimizing waste (effort not adding value), rapid iteration, delivering value quickly, validated learning through empirical customer feedback, and pivoting or persevering based on evidence. The "**Build-Measure-Learn**" feedback loop is central, emphasizing the rapid testing of hypotheses (often about customer needs or business models) using Minimum Viable Products (**MVPs**).

- **Strengths:** Lean provides highly effective practical frameworks for managing uncertainty and accelerating learning in fast-paced environments like software startups and product development. Its emphasis on empirical validation through real-world feedback aligns well with the need to connect intervention with outcomes. It fosters adaptability and responsiveness to changing conditions.

- **Shortcomings from AIM's Perspective:** Lean is primarily a *management philosophy* and *process optimization framework*, not explicitly a *scientific methodology* aimed at generating robust, generalizable knowledge claims with deep epistemological grounding.

  "**Validated learning**" in the Lean Startup context, for example, is typically focused on specific business hypotheses and product-market fit, often using metrics optimized for immediate business goals rather than deep scientific understanding or long-term systemic impact analysis (**Blank**).

  There's a potential risk of optimizing locally (e.g., short-term growth metrics) without adequately considering broader ethical implications or systemic effects within the complex physical-digital-social landscape (the phygital view from SPA).

  The emphasis on speed ("fail fast") might sometimes conflict with the need for careful reflection, rigorous analysis, or the consideration of long-term consequences that a more philosophically grounded scientific method like AIM would mandate. *While highly valuable for navigating uncertainty in business execution, Lean lacks the explicit philosophical structure, the integrated ethical dimension, and the broader systemic scope required for a foundational scientific methodology for interventionist inquiry in the 21st century.*

Synthesis of Shortcomings: In conclusion, while Action Research, Design Science Research, and Lean methodologies offer significant practical advancements over classical methods for specific purposes within interventionist domains, **they do not fully address the fundamental need identified in this paper**.

AR may lack generalizability and a robust framework for phygital complexity.

DSR's epistemological grounding and integration of ethics and continuous adaptation can be questioned from a foundational perspective.

Lean, while pragmatically powerful, operates primarily as a management process lacking deep scientific or ethical methodological structure.

None of these frameworks inherently possess the combination of features proposed for AIM: a **grounding** in a coherent philosophy (SPA) that explicitly embraces the integrated physical-digital-social reality; a **core**, non-negotiable integration of ethical adaptability and long-term thinking; and a **potential** for rigorous self-validation through mechanisms like bootstrapping.

They provide essential tools and perspectives, but the need remains for a more comprehensive, philosophically robust scientific method to guide and validate knowledge generation in the complex, constructive, and intervention-driven fields shaping the 21st century.

3. The Adaptive Interventionist Method (AIM): A Proposal

The critique presented in Section 2 underscores a significant epistemological and methodological vacuum at the intersection of contemporary applied sciences and the philosophy of science.

Disciplines charged with actively shaping our increasingly complex physical-digital-social reality require modes of inquiry that acknowledge their inherently interventionist, constructivist, and context-dependent nature—characteristics ill-suited to classical scientific frameworks predicated on detached observation and the pursuit of universal laws.

To bridge this gap, we propose the Adaptive Interventionist Method (**AIM**), a framework for scientific inquiry designed explicitly for generating and validating knowledge within these 21st-century domains, such as software engineering, innovation management, marketing science, and strategic planning.

AIM is not merely a collection of techniques but a coherent methodology grounded in a specific philosophical outlook, structured around core principles, and operationalized through an iterative, adaptive cycle.

3.1. Philosophical Foundations: The SPA Framework

AIM derives its foundational philosophy directly from the SPA (Society, Politics, Advancement) framework (**Meira**). SPA provides the necessary conceptual architecture and normative orientation for a methodology intended to navigate the complexities outlined previously.

Several core tenets of SPA are particularly crucial in shaping **AIM**:

- **Embracing the Phygital Reality:** AIM adopts SPA's central concept of the "**phygital space**"—the inextricable integration of physical, digital, and social dimensions—as its fundamental ontological premise. This means **AIM** rejects reductionist approaches that isolate these dimensions. Instead, it mandates that inquiry, intervention design, observation, and evaluation must holistically consider the interactions and feedback loops across all three realms.

Understanding the impact of a new software system (digital), for instance, requires assessing its physical infrastructure requirements, its usability by human bodies (physical), its mediation of social interactions, its embeddedness in organizational structures (social), and its potential to reshape norms or power dynamics (social/political).

This integrated perspective is essential for comprehending the complex systems within which interventions occur.

- **Ethical Adaptability as a Core Tenet:** Moving *beyond ethics as an external constraint or afterthought*, AIM internalizes SPA's emphasis on "ethical adaptability." This implies that ethical considerations are not merely regulatory hurdles but are integral to the framing of inquiry, the design of interventions, the evaluation of outcomes, and the adaptation of knowledge (**Meira**).

  AIM requires researchers and practitioners to proactively consider the potential social, political, and personal consequences of their interventions within the phygital space, both intended and unintended (**O'Neil**). Furthermore, ethical understanding itself is seen as adaptable—subject to refinement based on the observed consequences of interventions and evolving societal values.

  This contrasts sharply with methodologies where ethics, if considered at all, are often treated as fixed, external rules. Examples like the principle of "ethical responsibility" noted for software engineering (**Meira**) align with this imperative, suggesting domain-specific ethical principles can be cultivated within AIM.

- **Long-Term Thinking and Systemic View:** Informed by SPA's call for "long-term thinking," AIM encourages a perspective that extends beyond immediate project goals or short-term metrics. It pushes researchers to consider the potential cascading effects and sustainability of interventions over time within the broader socio-technical system.

  This involves adopting a systems thinking approach, recognizing that interventions in one part of the phygital system can have far-reaching and often delayed consequences elsewhere (**Meadows**). This orientation counteracts the tendency towards local optimization or short-termism sometimes seen in practice (e.g., in certain interpretations of Lean) and aligns inquiry with broader goals of societal advancement and resilience.

- **Navigating Complexity and Uncertainty:** AIM acknowledges the inherent complexity, dynamism, and uncertainty of the phygital systems within which interventionist disciplines operate (**Morin**). It recognizes that complete prediction and control are often impossible.

Therefore, *AIM is designed not to eliminate uncertainty but to navigate it effectively*. It prioritizes **learning**, **adaptation**, and **resilience**. The focus shifts from seeking definitive, universal laws to developing robust, context-aware models and heuristics that guide effective action under uncertainty.

This resonates with Herbert Simon's work on bounded rationality and satisficing in complex decision environments (**Simon**). The iterative nature of AIM is a direct response to this need for continuous learning and adjustment in the face of evolving complexity.

In essence, AIM represents a philosophical commitment to responsible interventionism.

It views scientific inquiry in applied domains **not** as a passive mirroring of reality, **but** as *an active, ethically-aware participation in the co-creation and shaping of that reality, guided by pragmatic goals but informed by systemic understanding and long-term considerations*.

3.2. Core Principles and Process of AIM

Building upon its philosophical foundations, AIM is operationalized through a set of core principles and an iterative methodological cycle.

The AIM Inquiry Cycle:

This cycle represents a structured yet flexible approach to inquiry through intervention:

1. **Contextualize & Frame:**
    - ***Activities****:* Deeply **analyze** the specific problem or opportunity within its phygital context. Identify key stakeholders, their perspectives, and potential conflicts. **Map** the relevant physical, digital, and social elements and their interactions. **Collaboratively define** clear, achievable, yet ambitious goals for the intervention. Crucially, **establish** initial **ethical** boundaries and **guiding** principles based on SPA's ethical adaptability concept, considering potential impacts on individuals, groups, and the broader system. **Articulate** the initial framing of the problem/opportunity, acknowledging assumptions and biases.
    - ***Output****:* A rich contextual understanding, clearly defined goals, stakeholder map, initial ethical guidelines, and problem/opportunity framing.

2. **Model & Hypothesize:**
    - ***Activities:*** **Develop** initial models—which may be conceptual, qualitative, mathematical, computational simulations, or combinations thereof—representing the dynamics of the system relevant to the intervention goals. These models should **explicitly** incorporate physical, digital, and social factors where appropriate. **Leverage** existing theory and empirical data, but acknowledge model **limitations** and **uncertainties**.

      Based on these models, **formulate specific**, **testable hypotheses** about the expected effects of potential interventions (e.g., "Implementing feature X [digital] is hypothesized to increase user engagement [social] by Y% without degrading system performance [physical/digital], based on model Z"). Use **abstraction** creatively to capture complexity (**Meira**).
    - ***Output:*** Initial system models, intervention hypotheses linked to models, explicit assumptions.
3. **Design & Plan Intervention:**
    - ***Activities:*** **Design** the specific **intervention** artifact or process (e.g., a software prototype, a marketing campaign plan, a new organizational workflow, a policy draft). **Detail** the implementation steps. Crucially, **design** the *observation strategy* concurrently: **determine** what **data** (quantitative/qualitative) needs to be collected across the phygital dimensions to **test** hypotheses, evaluate goals, and monitor unintended consequences.

      Select appropriate instruments and methods (e.g., logs, surveys, interviews, sensor data, ethnographic observation). **Refine** the ethical guidelines specifically for the planned intervention, considering issues like consent, data privacy, potential harms, and fairness. **Plan** for **reflexivity** – **how** the researchers'/practitioners' **presence** and **actions** will be **monitored**.
    - ***Output:*** Detailed intervention design, observation plan (metrics, methods, instruments), refined ethical protocol, reflexivity plan.
4. **Intervene & Observe:**
    - ***Activities:*** **Implement** the intervention according to the plan. Simultaneously, **execute** the observation strategy, systematically collecting data on the intervention process, its immediate effects, and the

evolving context. **Practice** *embedded observation*, acknowledging that the act of observation can influence the system and that researchers are participants within the process. **Document** deviations from the plan, unexpected events, and contextual shifts. **Maintain** reflexivity journals or logs. **Ensure** adherence to the ethical protocol throughout.

   - ***Output***: Intervention implemented, rich dataset (quantitative and qualitative) covering process and outcomes across phygital dimensions, documentation of context changes and observer reflections.

5. **Analyze & Evaluate (Pragmatic & Systemic):**
   - ***Activities***: **Analyze** the collected data to assess the intervention's effects against the initial hypotheses and goals. **Evaluate** outcomes using pre-defined *pragmatic validation criteria* (see below). Critically, **extend** the analysis **beyond** immediate goals to assess broader systemic impacts, both positive and negative, intended and unintended, across the physical, digital, and social dimensions. **Conduct** an explicit **ethical evaluation**: **Did** the intervention adhere to ethical principles? **Did** it produce ethically desirable or undesirable outcomes? **Were** there unforeseen ethical dilemmas? **Synthesize** findings from diverse data sources.
   - ***Output***: Analysis of intervention effects vs. hypotheses/goals, evaluation against pragmatic criteria, assessment of systemic impacts, ethical evaluation report, synthesized findings.

6. **Adapt & Theorize:**
   - ***Activities***: Based on the analysis and evaluation, **adapt** the understanding of the system by **refining** the initial models. Identify flaws in assumptions or logic. **Abstract** insights from the specific case into potentially transferable knowledge—this might take the form of refined design principles, updated heuristics, context-sensitive patterns, or contributions to domain-specific theory (**Gregor**). **Update** the ethical guidelines based on the experiences and ethical evaluation in the previous step. **Consider** how the software or system itself **evolves** (**Meira**).
   - ***Output***: Refined models, transferable insights (patterns, principles, theoretical adjustments), adapted ethical guidelines.

7. **Iterate or Conclude:**
   - ***Activities***: Based on the adapted understanding and refined goals, make a deliberate **decision**: **Is** further intervention needed? **Should** the cycle repeat with a modified intervention or refined goals (pivoting)? **Should** the

intervention be scaled up or down? Or **should** this specific inquiry cycle conclude? **If** concluding, ensure comprehensive documentation and dissemination of findings, models, and lessons learned (including ethical reflections) to relevant stakeholders and the broader knowledge community.

    - ***Output****:* Decision on next steps (iterate/conclude), final documentation and dissemination plan/report.

Elaboration of Key AIM Principles:

- **Pragmatic Validation:** AIM **shifts** the focus of validation away from a sole reliance on truth-correspondence or universal falsification towards a more central role for *pragmatic validation*.

  This involves **assessing** knowledge claims and intervention effectiveness based on their demonstrated utility, workability, and ability to achieve intended goals within a specific context, **while** adhering to ethical principles.

  Criteria might include measures of system performance, user adoption, achievement of strategic objectives, market success, problem resolution, or contribution to stakeholder value.

  However, AIM insists that these pragmatic criteria be **defined *explicitly***, **measured *rigorously***, **interpreted *critically*** within their context, and **balanced** with systemic and ethical evaluation. It draws inspiration from philosophical pragmatism, which links belief and knowledge to practical consequences and successful action (**Dewey, John**; *A key figure in pragmatism linking inquiry, action, and experience*).
  This contrasts with ad-hoc justifications of success often found in practice, demanding a **structured** and **reflective** approach to pragmatic assessment.

- **Embedded Observation & Reflexivity:** Recognizing that the researcher / practitioner is part of the system being studied and changed, AIM **mandates** *embedded observation* and *reflexivity*.

  This means **acknowledging** and **accounting** for the influence of the interventionist team on the process and outcomes.

  It **requires** using multiple methods (qualitative and quantitative) to capture diverse perspectives and data types across the phygital space. It also involves **systematic reflection** by the inquiry team on their own assumptions, biases, actions, and their effects on the situation under study (**Schön, Donald A.**;

Influential work on reflective practice, relevant to the learning process within AIM).

- **Model-Centric Epistemology:** AIM adopts a **model-centric** view of knowledge. The goal is **not necessarily** to uncover universal, immutable laws, **but** to build, test, and refine **useful *models* of reality** that aid understanding, prediction (within limits), and effective intervention in complex systems.

  These models are seen as tools—abstractions that capture relevant aspects of the phygital reality for specific purposes (**Giere**). Principles like '**entity duality**' (software as abstract concept and functional entity) or '**creative abstraction**' (**Meira**) exemplify the kind of model-based thinking central to AIM, particularly in domains like software engineering.

  Knowledge accumulates through the iterative refinement and validation (pragmatic, systemic, ethical) of these models.

- **Explicit Ethical Integration:** As highlighted in the foundations, ethics are woven into the **fabric** of the AIM cycle. From initial framing and goal setting, through intervention design and observation, to final evaluation and adaptation, ethical considerations based on SPA's principle of adaptability are paramount.

  This involves **anticipating** potential harms, **ensuring** fairness and equity, protecting stakeholders, and **reflecting** on the broader societal implications of the intervention and the knowledge generated. This **proactive** and **integrated** approach distinguishes AIM from methods where ethics are peripheral or treated merely as compliance issues.

- **Phygital Contextualization:** Throughout the cycle, AIM **demands** continuous attention to the interconnected physical, digital, and social dimensions. Analysis **must** avoid isolating factors within a single dimension if they have cross-dimensional causes or effects. Evaluation **must** consider impacts across the entire phygital context relevant to the intervention. This holistic requirement, derived directly from SPA, is **crucial** for **understanding** and **acting** effectively *within contemporary socio-technical systems*.

3.3. Contrasting AIM with Classical Methods

To further clarify AIM's distinctive nature, it is useful to contrast it explicitly with the classical methodologies discussed earlier (summarized broadly as H-D / Popperian / Kuhnian approaches), as we do in the table below.

Feature	Classical Methods (H-D, Popper, Kuhn)	Adaptive Interventionist Method (AIM)
Primary Goal	Discover universal laws, explain existing reality, achieve truth-correspondence.	Guide effective & responsible intervention, solve practical problems, generate useful & context-aware knowledge/models.
Mode of Inquiry	Primarily observation, controlled experimentation, logical deduction/inference.	Primarily intervention, construction, embedded observation within iterative cycles of action and reflection.
Process Structure	Often linear (hypothesis -> test -> confirm/refute) or revolutionary (paradigm shifts).	Inherently cyclical and iterative (contextualize -> model -> intervene -> evaluate -> adapt -> loop).
Validation Focus	Falsification, empirical confirmation, coherence within a paradigm, predictive accuracy (often seeking universality).	Pragmatic success (utility, goal achievement), systemic viability, ethical desirability, model robustness within context.
Role of Observer	Ideally detached, objective; minimize interference with the system under study.	Necessarily embedded, participant-observer; acknowledges and manages intervention effects and reflexivity.
Nature of Knowledge	Aims for universal, context-independent laws or theories organized in stable paradigms.	Aims for context-sensitive models, patterns, principles, and heuristics; knowledge seen as evolving and adaptable.
Handling Complexity	Often seeks to simplify, isolate variables, reduce complexity for controlled study.	Embraces complexity; uses systems thinking and holistic (phygital) view; focuses on adaptation and navigation.
Role of Ethics	Typically external to the method itself (research ethics as constraints).	Integral to the method; ethical adaptability guides framing, intervention design, evaluation, and knowledge adaptation.
Context Sensitivity	Often strives to abstract away from context to find general laws.	Context is central; findings and models are inherently situated within the phygital environment.

This comparison highlights that *AIM is not simply an adjustment of classical methods but represents a fundamentally different approach to scientific inquiry*, tailored to the unique epistemological and practical demands of disciplines focused on actively shaping our complex, technology-infused, phygital world. It offers a pathway for achieving rigor and generating reliable knowledge in domains where traditional approaches have proven inadequate.

4. Bootstrapping AIM: A Meta-Methodological Validation Strategy

Having proposed the Adaptive Interventionist Method (AIM) in Section 3 as a necessary response to the epistemological challenges of 21st-century applied sciences, we now confront a crucial meta-methodological question:...

> **How can AIM itself be validated?**
>
> **How can we establish confidence in its utility, rigor, and appropriateness for the complex tasks it is designed to address?**

Proposing a new scientific method necessitates proposing a strategy for its own justification. This section outlines such a strategy, drawing inspiration from the concept of "**bootstrapping**" in computer science, to iteratively demonstrate and refine AIM's practical value through its systematic application to itself.

This approach directly confronts the the eventual user's critical questions:

> *Is AIM useful in practice?*
>
> *How do I use it?*

—by embedding the answers within the validation process itself.

4.1. The Challenge of Validating a Method

Validating a scientific *methodology* presents unique and profound challenges distinct from validating specific scientific *claims* generated by a method.

Classical approaches to validation often rely on demonstrating predictive accuracy, explanatory power, or empirical confirmation against external reality. However, when the object of validation is the *instrument* of inquiry itself, these approaches become problematic.

Firstly, there is the inherent risk of circularity: using the method's own principles to justify the method (**Laudan**). If AIM defines success partly through pragmatic utility, how can we avoid simply declaring AIM successful because it achieves what *it defines* as success? **Secondly**, comparative validation (demonstrating AIM yields "better" results than existing methods like falsification or DSR) is difficult.

AIM is *proposed precisely because classical methods are deemed inadequate or inappropriate for the specific contexts and goals* (intervention, construction, phygital complexity) *it addresses*. They often aim for different kinds of knowledge and operate under different assumptions.

A direct comparison of outcomes might be comparing **umbus** (*Spondia Tuberosa*) and **juás** (*Ziziphus Joazeiro*), failing to capture whether AIM is *fit for its specific purpose*.

Thirdly, *absolute proof or definitive justification for any scientific method is arguably unattainable*; methodologies are ultimately human constructs evaluated based on their *perceived ability to reliably generate valuable knowledge and guide effective action within a specific domain of inquiry over time*.

Therefore, the validation strategy for AIM cannot realistically aim for absolute proof of correctness or universal superiority.

Instead, it must focus on demonstrating its *pragmatic value*, its *internal coherence*, its *learnability and usability* by researchers and practitioners, its *capacity to guide fruitful inquiry* leading to useful outcomes and adaptable models, and its *ability to facilitate critical reflection and ethical consideration* as intended.

The validation must itself be an adaptive, learning process.

4.2. The Bootstrapping Analogy: Learning from Computer Science

To structure this adaptive validation process, we borrow the concept of "**bootstrapping**" from computer science, particularly from the development of compilers and operating systems.

- **Compiler Bootstrapping:** Compilers are programs that translate source code written in a high-level programming language (like C++ or Java) into machine code that a computer can execute. To create the very first compiler for a new language, developers often start by writing a minimal version of the compiler in a simpler, existing language (like assembly language or even machine code).

  This minimal "seed" compiler is just powerful enough to compile a slightly more complex version of the compiler, written in the new language itself. This second-stage compiler can then compile an even more complex version, and so on, until the full, optimized compiler—written in its own language—is produced. Each stage uses the output of the previous stage to build a more capable version (**Aho**).

- **Operating System Bootstrapping:** Similarly, when a computer starts up, it executes a small piece of firmware (the BIOS or UEFI) which loads a slightly larger program, the bootloader. The bootloader, in turn, has just enough functionality to load the main operating system kernel into memory and start it running.

  The kernel then initializes the rest of the system services and applications. The system effectively "pulls itself up by its own bootstraps," starting from a minimal trusted base (**Tanenbaum**).

The core idea in both analogies is **iterative self-construction and reliance**: using a minimal, functional version of a system to build progressively more complex and capable versions of itself. It starts with a foundational "seed" and leverages its own capabilities to grow.

This provides a powerful metaphor for validating AIM: we can start with an initial definition of AIM (the "**seed**") and use its own principles to guide its application, evaluation, and subsequent refinement.

4.3. Proposed Bootstrapping Protocol for AIM

Applying the bootstrapping analogy, we propose the following multi-phase protocol for the iterative validation and refinement of the Adaptive Interventionist Method:

- **Phase 0: Define Seed AIM (AIM v0.1) and Meta-Validation Criteria:**
    - ***Action***: Formalize the initial version of the AIM cycle based on the principles and steps outlined in Section 3. This "Seed AIM" or "AIM v0.1" represents the initial hypothesis about an effective methodology.
    - ***Crucial Step***: Concurrently, define explicit *pragmatic validation criteria for the methodology itself*. These criteria address the question "What would count as evidence that AIM is useful and effective *as a method*?". Examples include:
        - ***Clarity and Understandability***: Can researchers/practitioners understand the steps and principles of AIM?
        - ***Guidance Utility***: Does AIM provide effective structure and guidance for framing problems, designing interventions, collecting data, and analyzing outcomes in interventionist projects? Is it perceived as more helpful than ad-hoc approaches?
        - ***Usability/Feasibility***: Can the steps of the AIM cycle be reasonably implemented within the time and resource constraints of typical projects in the target domains (software, innovation, etc.)?
        - ***Model Generation Capability***: Does using AIM facilitate the development of insightful and adaptable models (conceptual, formal, etc.) of the systems under study?

        - ***Ethical Guidance***: Does AIM effectively prompt and support explicit ethical reflection and consideration throughout the inquiry process?
        - ***Facilitation of Learning/Adaptation***: Does the method demonstrably help teams learn from interventions and adapt their strategies or designs effectively?
    - ***Output***: A documented specification of AIM v0.1 and a corresponding set of explicit, measurable (where possible) pragmatic validation criteria for the method itself.
- **Phase 1: Application of Seed AIM:**
    - ***Action***: Apply AIM v0.1 to conduct a set of initial, well-defined research or development projects within its target domains (e.g., developing a specific software module with user feedback loops, testing a new digital marketing tactic, running a pilot innovation project).
    - ***Focus***: While achieving the specific project goals is important, the primary focus during this phase *for the purpose of meta-validation* is on the *experience and process of using AIM v0.1*. Researchers/practitioners should meticulously document how AIM guided their work, where its steps were helpful, where they were ambiguous or difficult to apply, and any perceived gaps or shortcomings in the methodology. This involves collecting data not just on the project's outcome, but on the *method's performance in guiding the project*.
    - ***Output***: Completed initial projects, rich documentation of the process of applying AIM v0.1 (e.g., project logs, reflective journals, team debriefs, data on adherence to the method), and project outcomes.
- **Phase 2: Meta-Reflection and Evaluation of Seed AIM:**
    - ***Action***: Systematically evaluate the performance of AIM v0.1 *using its own principles*. This involves applying AIM's emphasis on embedded observation, analysis (pragmatic, systemic), and ethical evaluation *to the method itself*, based on the data collected in Phase 1.
    - ***Process***: Analyze the documentation from Phase 1 projects against the meta-validation criteria defined in Phase 0. Did AIM v0.1 meet its own standards for clarity, utility, usability, etc.? Where did it excel? Where did it fail? Conduct root cause analysis for identified shortcomings (e.g., was a step poorly defined? Was a necessary principle missing? Were suggested techniques inadequate?). Explicitly consider if the *process* of using AIM v0.1 raised any unforeseen ethical issues related to the

methodology itself. This phase embodies the reflexive core of the bootstrapping approach. Apply principles like embedded observation to the research team's own methodological practice (**Alvesson**).

    - ***Output**:* A critical evaluation report detailing the strengths and weaknesses of AIM v0.1 based on empirical evidence from its application, assessed against its own pragmatic validation criteria. Identification of specific areas needing refinement.

- **Phase 3: Refinement and Adaptation of AIM:**
    - ***Action**:* Based on the findings from Phase 2, revise and refine the AIM methodology. This might involve:
        - Clarifying definitions or descriptions of steps in the cycle.
        - Adding, merging, or splitting steps.
        - Modifying core principles or adding new ones.
        - Providing better guidance on specific techniques (e.g., for modeling, observation, or ethical analysis).
        - Adjusting the meta-validation criteria themselves based on experience.
    - ***Goal**:* To produce an improved version, "AIM v1.1" (or subsequent designation), that directly addresses the identified weaknesses and enhances its strengths, making it more robust, usable, and effective.
    - *Output:* A documented specification of the revised AIM methodology (e.g., AIM v1.1).
- **Phase 4: Iteration and Continued Validation:**
    - ***Action**:* Repeat the cycle: Apply the refined AIM (v1.1) to a new set of projects (Phase 1), potentially tackling more complex or diverse problems. Conduct meta-reflection and evaluation on AIM v1.1's performance (Phase 2). Refine it further into AIM v1.2 (Phase 3), and so on.
    - ***Dynamics**:* This ongoing iterative process allows AIM to evolve and adapt based on accumulating evidence of its practical utility and limitations across a widening range of contexts. It mirrors the evolutionary nature of knowledge emphasized within SPA and AIM itself (**Meira**). The methodology becomes a living framework, continuously improved through its own application.

- ***Output:*** A sequence of increasingly refined and empirically grounded versions of AIM, accompanied by a growing body of evidence demonstrating its utility and limitations in diverse practical settings.

4.4. Expected Outcome: Demonstrably Useful and Validated Methodology

The proposed bootstrapping protocol does not aim for a final, static "proof" of AIM's validity in the classical sense. Instead, its expected outcome is far more dynamic and pragmatic:

- **Demonstrated Utility:** Through repeated application to real-world problems, the process **generates** direct evidence of AIM's usefulness (or lack thereof) in guiding inquiry, facilitating learning, achieving project goals, and fostering ethical reflection. It directly answers "Is AIM useful in practice?" by showing *how* it is useful, and refining it where it isn't.
- **Iterative Validation:** Confidence in AIM **grows** not from a single decisive test, but from its demonstrated resilience and adaptability across multiple cycles of application, evaluation, and refinement. Its validation is grounded in its evolving fitness for purpose, assessed through its own reflective principles.
- **Refined Methodology:** The process yields **progressively** more robust, detailed, and usable versions of the AIM framework, incorporating lessons learned from practice.
- **Guidance on Use:** The protocol **itself** serves as an answer to "How do I use AIM?", specifically demonstrating how to use it *reflectively* and *adaptively*, contributing to its own improvement.
- **Community Building:** Engaging research groups and practitioner communities in applying and refining AIM through this protocol can foster a shared understanding and collective ownership of the methodology.

Ultimately, the bootstrapping strategy aims to produce an Adaptive Interventionist Method that is **not only** philosophically coherent (as argued in Section 3) **but also** demonstrably valuable and trustworthy *in practice*, validated through the very processes of intervention, reflection, and adaptation that it advocates for scientific inquiry itself. It seeks to establish AIM's credentials through performance and evolution, rather than solely through abstract argument.

5. Discussion: Implications and Future Directions

The proposal of the Adaptive Interventionist Method (AIM) represents an attempt to bridge a critical gap between the philosophy of science and the operational realities of highly consequential 21st-century applied disciplines.

Grounded in the SPA framework's recognition of our integrated phygital existence and predicated on iterative intervention, pragmatic validation, and ethical adaptability, AIM offers a potential pathway towards more rigorous, reflective, and responsible knowledge generation in fields like software engineering, innovation management, marketing science, and strategic planning.

This concluding discussion explores the potential implications of adopting such a methodology, acknowledges its inherent limitations and challenges, and outlines promising avenues for future research.

5.1. Addressing the Epistemological Gap

As detailed in Sections 1 and 2, classical scientific methodologies face significant strain when applied to domains characterized by construction, intervention, complexity, and rapid change within the physical-digital-social continuum. AIM offers a **potentially** more suitable epistemological framework **precisely** because it is designed *with* these characteristics in mind:

- **Alignment with Interventionism:** By placing **structured intervention** at the core of its inquiry cycle, AIM directly reflects the operational logic of fields like software engineering or strategic management, where 'doing' and 'making' are inseparable from 'learning' and 'knowing'. It provides a framework for **turning necessary** practical interventions into **opportunities** for systematic knowledge generation.
- **Embracing Constructivism:** AIM acknowledges that these fields often *construct* the realities they study (software systems, market strategies). Its focus on **building** and **refining** useful models, **validated** pragmatically, aligns better with this constructivist nature than a sole pursuit of correspondence to a pre-existing, independent reality (**Searle**).
- **Phygital Holism:** Mandating consideration of physical, digital, and social dimensions throughout the cycle (from contextualization to evaluation) equips AIM to handle the **interconnected complexity** of contemporary socio-technical systems, avoiding the pitfalls of reductionist approaches that ignore crucial cross-dimensional feedback loops (**Meira**).
- **Adaptive Knowledge:** Recognizing the dynamism of the phygital context, AIM promotes an epistemology where knowledge is viewed as evolving, context-sensitive, and embodied in adaptable models and principles, rather than static universal laws. This aligns with the practical need for **continuous learning** and **adaptation** in these fields (**Meira**).

By providing a methodology that resonates more closely with the ontological and operational realities of these disciplines, AIM holds the potential to close the gap between their practical activities and the demands of rigorous, justifiable scientific inquiry, fostering a more coherent 'science of the artificial' (**Simon, Herbert A.**; *Relevant as AIM applies primarily to human-designed systems and interventions*).

5.2. Contributions to Philosophy of Science

Beyond its immediate applicability, AIM offers potential contributions to broader philosophical discussions:

- **Epistemology of Practice and Intervention:** AIM contributes to the growing body of work exploring the epistemology of practice, design, and interventionist research (**Schön**). It offers a specific, structured methodological proposal for how knowledge can be rigorously **generated** and **validated** *through* intervention, **moving beyond** generic calls for 'reflective practice'.
- **Rigor in Pragmatic Validation:** While pragmatism has a long philosophical history (**Dewey**), applying pragmatic criteria rigorously within scientific validation remains **challenging**. AIM's emphasis on *explicitly defined*, *measurable*, *critically evaluated* pragmatic criteria, balanced with systemic and ethical assessment within a structured cycle, offers a **potential** pathway towards more robust forms of pragmatic validation, **enriching** epistemological debates currently dominated by truth-conditional theories.
- **Integrating Ethics and Epistemology:** AIM attempts a **deep integration** of ethical considerations within the scientific method itself, driven by SPA's concept of ethical adaptability. This challenges traditional views where ethics are often seen as external constraints on scientific activity. AIM suggests that in interventionist sciences shaping the phygital world, **ethical reflection is** an *epistemically necessary* component for generating responsible and truly useful knowledge (**O'Neil**).
- **Philosophy of Technology and STS:** AIM **aligns** with perspectives from the philosophy of technology and Science and Technology Studies (STS) that emphasize the **co-construction** of technology and society, the **agency** of non-human actors (artifacts, systems), and the **complex entanglements** within socio-technical networks (**Latour**). AIM provides a **methodological framework** that operationalizes some of these insights, offering a way to systematically study and guide the co-evolution of interventions and their phygital contexts.

By engaging directly with the challenges of contemporary applied science, AIM may stimulate valuable dialogue and development within the philosophy of science itself, particularly concerning the **nature** of knowledge, validation, and responsibility in an increasingly engineered world.

5.3. Practical Implications for Practitioners

Beyond its philosophical significance, AIM aims to provide tangible benefits for practitioners working in technology, innovation, marketing, and strategy:

- **Structured Learning from Practice:** AIM offers a systematic alternative to ad-hoc trial-and-error or purely intuition-driven approaches. Its **iterative cycle** provides a framework for planning interventions more thoughtfully, observing outcomes more systematically, and extracting reliable lessons learned to inform future actions.
- **Enhanced Rigor in Decision-Making:** By demanding **explicit modeling, hypothesis formulation**, **data collection**, and **structured evaluation** (including pragmatic, systemic, and ethical dimensions), AIM can bring greater rigor to decision-making processes regarding product development, strategic initiatives, or marketing campaigns. This can help justify choices and investments based on **evidence** generated through the process.
- **Improved Adaptation and Resilience:** The emphasis on continuous monitoring, model refinement, and iterative adaptation can **enhance** the ability of teams and organizations to navigate **uncertainty** and respond effectively to the rapid **changes** characteristic of their operating environments.
- **Facilitating Cross-Disciplinary Collaboration:** AIM's requirement to consider physical, digital, and social dimensions **encourages** communication and collaboration across different functional silos (e.g., engineering, marketing, user experience, social impact assessment) by providing a **shared framework** for understanding complex interdependencies.
- **Proactive Ethical Consideration:** Integrating ethical reflection throughout the cycle can help teams **anticipate** and **mitigate** potential negative consequences of their work, fostering more responsible innovation and potentially avoiding costly reputational damage or societal harm. It **operationalizes** principles like ‘ethical responsibility’ (**Meira**).
- **Building Cumulative Knowledge:** While acknowledging context dependency, AIM's focus on **abstracting patterns and principles** allows for the gradual accumulation of robust, albeit context-sensitive, organizational or domain-specific knowledge, moving beyond purely anecdotal evidence.

Implementing AIM would undoubtedly require investment in training and potentially shifts in organizational culture towards greater reflection and systematic inquiry, but the potential benefits lie in more effective, adaptive, and responsible practice.

5.4. Limitations and Challenges

Despite its potential, AIM faces significant limitations and challenges that must be acknowledged:

- **Defining Robust Pragmatic Criteria:** Operationalizing "pragmatic validation" rigorously remains a **key challenge**. How can criteria like "utility," "effectiveness," or "value" be defined in ways that are measurable, non-arbitrary, context-appropriate, yet resistant to manipulation or superficial interpretation (e.g., focusing only on easily quantifiable short-term metrics)? Developing robust **heuristics** and **standards** for defining and applying these criteria will be crucial.
- **Ensuring Ethical Conduct and Avoiding Relativism:** While AIM integrates ethics, the principle of "ethical adaptability" itself requires **careful handling** to avoid slipping into unchecked relativism or the justification of ethically dubious actions based on shifting contexts or goals. Establishing strong governance mechanisms, ensuring diverse stakeholder involvement in defining ethical boundaries, and potentially developing core, non-negotiable ethical constraints alongside adaptable ones will be necessary (**O'Neil**). The **power dynamics** inherent in intervention also require constant critical attention.
- **Potential for Bias:** The deeply embedded nature of the researcher/practitioner within the AIM cycle **increases** the risk of **confirmation bias**, **motivated reasoning**, **or overlooking data** that contradicts desired outcomes. While reflexivity is built into the method, ensuring sufficient critical distance and incorporating genuinely diverse perspectives (**Surowiecki**) to **challenge** assumptions will be an ongoing struggle.
- **Complexity and Resource Intensity:** Implementing the full AIM cycle, with its emphasis on holistic modeling, multi-modal observation, and thorough evaluation, **may be** perceived as complex and resource-intensive, **potentially limiting** its applicability for smaller projects or organizations with limited resources or time pressures. Tailoring the **rigor** of application to the scale and criticality of the problem will be necessary.
- **Scope of Applicability:** While proposed for specific interventionist fields, the precise boundaries of AIM's applicability are **yet to be** determined. Is it suitable for all types of software development, all forms of innovation, or all strategic decision-making? Further research **is needed** to understand where AIM provides the most value compared to simpler heuristics or existing specialized methods.
- **Cultural and Organizational Barriers:** Adopting AIM may require significant shifts in organizational culture, moving away from purely execution-focused approaches towards embracing reflection, systematic learning, transparency about failures, and proactive ethical engagement. Overcoming **inertia** and **resistance** to such changes can be a major practical hurdle.

5.5. Future Research Directions

Addressing these limitations and realizing AIM's potential requires a concerted research agenda:

- **Further Theoretical Development:** Continue refining AIM's theoretical foundations. This includes deeper engagement with specific philosophical traditions (e.g., different strands of pragmatism, systems theory, ethics of technology), developing more precise language for its principles, and exploring its relationship with established theories within target domains (e.g., formally integrating software engineering principles into AIM applications).
- **Broad Empirical Testing via Bootstrapping:** The most critical need is for widespread empirical application and testing of AIM using the bootstrapping protocol outlined in Section 4. This should involve diverse teams, problems, organizational contexts, and cultural settings to understand its robustness, adaptability, and practical utility across different scenarios. Documenting both successes and failures transparently is crucial.
- **Developing Heuristics for Pragmatic Criteria:** Research is needed to develop practical guidelines, typologies, and case-based examples for defining and measuring robust pragmatic validation criteria suitable for different types of interventions and contexts.
- **Investigating Ethical Governance:** Explore effective governance mechanisms and practical tools to support the implementation of "ethical adaptability" within AIM, ensuring accountability and preventing misuse. This could involve developing ethical assessment frameworks tailored to AIM or integrating with existing responsible innovation guidelines.
- **Comparative Studies (Carefully Framed):** As AIM matures and a body of evidence accumulates, carefully designed comparative studies exploring its effectiveness relative to other methods (e.g., DSR, specific Agile practices) for particular types of problems might become feasible and informative, while acknowledging the inherent differences in goals and assumptions.
- **Exploring Computational Support:** Investigate the potential for computational tools to support the AIM cycle. This could include platforms for collaborative phygital system modeling, tools for integrated data collection and analysis across diverse sources, dashboards for tracking interventions and pragmatic criteria, AI-assisted tools for identifying potential systemic effects or ethical risks, or systems for managing the iterative knowledge base generated through AIM cycles.

The journey of developing and validating AIM is envisioned as an iterative process mirroring the method itself. Its ultimate success will depend on the willingness of researchers and practitioners to engage with its principles, apply it critically in practice, share their experiences openly, and contribute to its ongoing evolution as a potential cornerstone for responsible and effective inquiry in the 21st century.

6. Conclusion

6.1. Summary of the Problem and Proposed Solution

This paper has addressed a **critical** and **growing** disjuncture between the established canons of scientific methodology, largely inherited from the natural sciences, and the epistemological needs of contemporary applied disciplines central to shaping our 21st-century world.

Fields such as software engineering, innovation management, marketing science, and strategic planning—characterized by their interventionist nature, constructivist goals, and operation within a complex, integrated physical-digital-social ("phygital") reality—find traditional methods based on detached observation, controlled experimentation, and falsification inadequate for guiding inquiry and validating knowledge claims.

This inadequacy risks undermining the rigor, reliability, and ethical grounding of these highly consequential fields. In response, this paper has proposed the Adaptive Interventionist Method (AIM), a novel framework for scientific inquiry specifically designed to navigate these challenges.

AIM offers a structured, iterative, and ethically-informed approach intended to bridge the gap between the demands of practice and the requirements of robust scientific methodology.

6.2. Reiteration of AIM's Core Principles

The Adaptive Interventionist Method is defined by a core set of interconnected principles, deeply informed by the underlying philosophy of the SPA (Society, Politics, Advancement) framework (**Meira**).

Key among these are:

1. An **interventionist cycle** that treats action within the world not as a contaminant of research but as its central engine and object of study;
2. A commitment to **pragmatic validation**, rigorously assessing the utility and effectiveness of interventions and models within their context, balanced with systemic analysis;
3. A focus on building **adaptive models** that capture the dynamics of complex phygital systems and evolve based on empirical feedback, rather than seeking solely static, universal laws;

4. An explicit and integrated emphasis on **ethical adaptability**, ensuring continuous reflection on the societal and human consequences of interventions throughout the inquiry process; and
5. A grounding in the **phygital context**, mandating a holistic view across physical, digital, and social dimensions. These principles collectively shape AIM into a methodology suited for learning and knowing through responsible doing.

6.3. Emphasis on Bootstrapping Validation

Recognizing the inherent challenge of validating any new methodology, this paper has also proposed a novel meta-methodological contribution: a **bootstrapping validation strategy** for AIM itself. Drawing analogy from computer science, this strategy involves using AIM's own principles—particularly its iterative cycle and emphasis on embedded observation, pragmatic evaluation, and adaptation—to systematically test, evaluate, and refine the methodology through its application to real-world problems and, crucially, to itself.

This approach moves beyond abstract justification, aiming instead to build confidence in AIM through demonstrated utility and iterative improvement based on empirical feedback regarding its performance *as a method*. This reflexive, self-correcting process represents a potential new pathway for establishing the credentials of methodologies designed for complex, interventionist domains.

6.4. Final Statement: Towards a Rigorous and Relevant Applied Science

The challenges posed by the 21st century's complex phygital landscape demand scientific approaches that are both rigorous and relevant, capable of guiding effective action while remaining critically reflective and ethically attuned.

Classical methodologies, while retaining immense value in their appropriate domains, often fall short when faced with the unique demands of applied sciences focused on construction and intervention.

The Adaptive Interventionist Method (AIM), grounded in the SPA philosophy and validated through a pragmatic bootstrapping process, represents a dedicated effort to conceptualize and operationalize such an approach.

While acknowledging the limitations and challenges inherent in this endeavor, AIM holds the potential to significantly enhance the capacity of fields like software engineering, innovation, marketing, and strategy to generate reliable knowledge, foster responsible practice, and contribute more effectively to navigating and shaping our shared future. It is offered not as a final answer, but as a robust starting point for developing the rigorous, relevant, and responsible applied science our complex times require.

Appendix A: Specification of AIM v0.1

A.1. Purpose and Status

This Appendix details the initial specification of the Adaptive Interventionist Method, designated AIM version 0.1 (AIM v0.1). This version serves as the "Seed AIM" described in Section 4.3 (Phase 0) of the paper. It represents the first operationalization of the AIM framework, intended for initial application and subsequent evaluation and refinement through the proposed bootstrapping validation protocol.

AIM v0.1 is grounded in the SPA (Society, Politics, Advancement) framework (**Meira**) and designed for inquiry within intervention-driven disciplines operating in complex phygital contexts.

Users of AIM v0.1 are expected to apply it critically and contribute feedback towards its evolution.

A.2. Core Principles Underpinning AIM v0.1

The application of the AIM v0.1 cycle should be guided by the following core principles derived from the SPA framework and the methodological requirements outlined in Section 3:

1. **Phygital Contextualization:** All phases must explicitly consider the interconnected physical, digital, and social dimensions relevant to the inquiry.
2. **Ethical Adaptability:** Ethical considerations must be proactively integrated into framing, planning, intervention, evaluation, and adaptation, subject to reflection and refinement based on experience.
3. **Long-Term & Systemic Thinking:** Analysis and evaluation should strive to consider potential long-term consequences and broader systemic impacts beyond immediate goals.
4. **Complexity & Uncertainty Navigation:** The method embraces complexity and focuses on learning, adaptation, and building useful models rather than solely on prediction or control.
5. **Pragmatic Validation:** Evaluation centrally includes rigorous assessment against explicitly defined pragmatic criteria (e.g., utility, goal achievement), balanced with systemic and ethical evaluation.
6. **Embedded Observation & Reflexivity:** Data collection must capture intervention dynamics from within the process, and the inquiry team must continuously reflect on their own role, biases, and influence.

7. **Model-Centric Epistemology:** The primary knowledge outputs are adaptable models (conceptual, formal, etc.) representing system dynamics and intervention effects, refined through iterative testing and evaluation.

A.3. The AIM v0.1 Inquiry Cycle

AIM v0.1 operates through an iterative cycle comprising seven distinct phases:

Phase 1: Contextualize & Frame

- ***Activities:***
  - Identify the core problem or opportunity requiring intervention.
  - Conduct a preliminary analysis of the relevant phygital context: map key physical elements (e.g., infrastructure, devices), digital systems (e.g., software, platforms, data flows), and social structures (e.g., user groups, organizational roles, market segments, norms, regulations).
  - Identify primary and secondary stakeholders; analyze their interests, perspectives, potential conflicts, and influence.
  - Collaboratively define specific, measurable (where possible), achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART-er) goals for the intervention project.
  - Establish initial ethical boundaries: identify potential risks and benefits for stakeholders; draft preliminary ethical guidelines based on SPA principles and relevant professional codes; consider issues of fairness, privacy, autonomy, transparency, and potential harm.
  - Document the initial problem/opportunity framing, key assumptions, known constraints, and potential biases of the inquiry team.
- ***Expected Outputs:*** Context Analysis Document (Phygital Map, Stakeholder Analysis), Defined Project Goals, Initial Ethical Protocol Draft, Problem/Opportunity Framing Statement.

Phase 2: Model & Hypothesize

- ***Activities:***
  - Based on the contextual analysis, develop initial models representing the current understanding of the system dynamics relevant to the project goals. Models can be qualitative (e.g., influence diagrams, causal loop diagrams) or quantitative (e.g., statistical models, simulation parameters) or conceptual (e.g., architectural diagrams, process flows). Ensure models attempt to integrate relevant physical, digital, and social variables and relationships. Leverage existing theories where applicable.

    - Explicitly state the assumptions embedded in the models and identify key uncertainties.
    - Formulate specific intervention hypotheses derived from the models. These hypotheses should predict the expected effects of a potential intervention on key variables or outcomes (e.g., "Introducing gamification elements [digital intervention] into the user onboarding process [social context] is hypothesized to increase user retention rate [pragmatic outcome] by 15% within 3 months, based on model [X] of user motivation, without significantly increasing server load [physical/digital constraint]").
- ***Expected Outputs***: Initial System Models (documented, including assumptions), Specific Intervention Hypotheses (linked to models and goals).

Phase 3: Design & Plan Intervention

- ***Activities***:
    - Design the concrete intervention (e.g., specify software features/architecture, detail marketing campaign elements, outline strategic initiative steps, draft policy wording).
    - Develop a detailed implementation plan, including timeline, resources, and responsibilities.
    - Design the corresponding observation and data collection plan:
        - Identify key performance indicators (KPIs) and metrics aligned with goals and hypotheses (including pragmatic, systemic, and potentially ethical indicators).
        - Select appropriate data collection methods spanning phygital dimensions (e.g., system logs, performance monitoring, user surveys, A/B test results, interviews, focus groups, ethnographic observation, social network analysis data, sensor data).
        - Specify data collection frequency, tools, and analysis techniques.
    - Refine the ethical protocol for the specific intervention: detail procedures for informed consent, data anonymization/security, risk mitigation, handling of vulnerable populations, and addressing potential conflicts of interest. Obtain necessary ethical approvals if applicable.
    - Plan for reflexivity: schedule regular team debriefs; decide on methods for documenting observer effects and contextual changes during intervention (e.g., team journals, contextual event logs).

- ***Expected Outputs***: Detailed Intervention Design Specification, Implementation Plan, Data Collection Plan (metrics, methods, tools), Finalized Ethical Protocol for Intervention, Reflexivity Plan.

Phase 4: Intervene & Observe

- ***Activities***:
  - Implement the designed intervention according to the plan.
  - Simultaneously, execute the data collection plan meticulously. Gather data on intervention fidelity (was it implemented as planned?), process dynamics, immediate outcomes, user/stakeholder reactions, and contextual factors.
  - Practice active embedded observation: team members note down qualitative observations about the intervention unfolding, unexpected events, system behaviors, and stakeholder responses.
  - Maintain reflexivity documentation (journals, logs) capturing team discussions, decision points, biases encountered, and perceived influence on the system.
  - Monitor adherence to the ethical protocol; address any emerging ethical issues promptly and document actions taken.
  - Document any necessary deviations from the implementation plan and the reasons for them.
- ***Expected Outputs***: Intervention Implemented, Comprehensive Raw Dataset (quantitative & qualitative), Reflexivity Records (journals/logs), Ethical Compliance Documentation, Deviation Log.

Phase 5: Analyze & Evaluate (Pragmatic & Systemic)

- ***Activities***:
  - Process and analyze the collected data using the techniques specified in the plan.
  - Evaluate intervention effects against the initial hypotheses: Were predictions confirmed, refuted, or were results ambiguous?
  - Assess outcomes against the project goals using the pre-defined pragmatic validation criteria: Did the intervention achieve the desired utility, effectiveness, or impact? Quantify where possible.
  - Conduct a broader systemic impact analysis: Look for unintended consequences (positive or negative) across physical, digital, and social

dimensions. Consider effects on different stakeholder groups. Analyze feedback loops observed.

  - Perform an explicit ethical evaluation: Review adherence to the protocol; assess the actual ethical impacts and outcomes of the intervention; compare against initial ethical guidelines; identify lessons learned regarding ethical considerations.
  - Synthesize findings from all data sources and analyses into a coherent narrative. Acknowledge limitations of the data and analysis.
- ***Expected Outputs***: Data Analysis Results, Hypothesis Assessment Report, Pragmatic Evaluation Report (vs. goals/criteria), Systemic Impact Analysis Report, Ethical Evaluation Report, Synthesized Findings Summary.

Phase 6: Adapt & Theorize

- ***Activities***:
  - Based on synthesized findings (especially discrepancies between hypotheses/models and observations), adapt and refine the initial system models. Update understanding of system dynamics, causal relationships, and intervention effects. Document model changes and rationale.
  - Abstract key learnings from the specific intervention context. Identify potentially transferable insights, patterns, design principles, or heuristics. Frame these as tentative contributions to domain knowledge or theory, noting their context-dependency.
  - Refine ethical guidelines and best practices based on the ethical evaluation and experiences during the cycle.
  - Document the adapted models and abstracted learnings clearly. Consider how the intervention artifact itself (e.g., software) has evolved or should evolve.
- ***Expected Outputs***: Refined System Models (documented), Abstracted Learnings (patterns, principles, heuristics), Adapted Ethical Guidelines, Documentation of Artifact Evolution.

Phase 7: Iterate or Conclude

- ***Activities***:
  - Based on the evaluation (Phase 5) and adapted understanding (Phase 6), make a strategic decision regarding the next steps:

        - *Iterate:* Initiate a new cycle (return to Phase 1 or an earlier phase) with refined goals, models, or intervention designs. This could involve scaling the intervention, pivoting the approach, or addressing newly identified problems/opportunities.
        - *Conclude:* If goals are met, learning is sufficient, or further iteration is not feasible/desirable, formally conclude the current inquiry cycle.
    - If concluding, prepare comprehensive documentation summarizing the entire cycle, including context, goals, intervention, findings, model evolution, abstracted learnings, ethical reflections, and limitations.
    - Disseminate findings and learnings appropriately to relevant stakeholders (e.g., project team, management, users, research community).
- ***Expected Outputs***: Decision Record (Iterate/Conclude), Final Project Report (if concluding), Dissemination Activities.

A.4. Initial Pragmatic Meta-Validation Criteria for AIM v0.1

As specified in Section 4.3 (Phase 0), the performance of AIM v0.1 itself will be evaluated during the bootstrapping process using criteria such as the following. Data to assess these criteria should be gathered during the application of AIM v0.1 (Phase 1 of bootstrapping) and analyzed during meta-reflection (Phase 2 of bootstrapping):

1. **Clarity & Understandability:** How easily and accurately can researchers/practitioners understand the purpose, principles, steps, and expected outputs of AIM v0.1? (Assessed via team feedback, training effectiveness, consistency of interpretation).
2. **Guidance Utility:** To what extent does AIM v0.1 provide helpful and actionable guidance for structuring interventionist projects compared to previous or ad-hoc methods? Does it effectively guide problem framing, intervention design, data collection, analysis, and reflection? (Assessed via team surveys/interviews, analysis of project documentation quality).
3. **Usability & Feasibility:** How practical is it to implement the AIM v0.1 cycle within typical project constraints (time, resources, team skills)? Are any phases disproportionately difficult or time-consuming? (Assessed via effort tracking, team feedback, analysis of deviations from the method).
4. **Model Generation Capability:** Does the application of AIM v0.1 lead to the development of system models that are perceived by the team as insightful, useful for understanding complexity, and adaptable based on evidence? (Assessed via quality review of models generated, team feedback).

5. **Ethical Guidance:** How effectively does AIM v0.1 prompt and support explicit, meaningful consideration and documentation of ethical issues throughout the project lifecycle? Does it help teams anticipate or address ethical dilemmas? (Assessed via review of ethical protocols/evaluations produced, team interviews on ethical awareness).

6. **Facilitation of Learning & Adaptation:** Does using AIM v0.1 demonstrably improve the team's ability to learn from interventions (both successes and failures) and adapt their models, strategies, or designs effectively? (Assessed via analysis of model evolution, documented pivots/adaptations, team self-assessment of learning).

These criteria will form the basis for evaluating AIM v0.1 and guiding its refinement into subsequent versions through the bootstrapping protocol.

References

Aho, Alfred V., et al. *Compilers: Principles, Techniques, and Tools*. 2nd ed., Addison-Wesley, 2007. ["The Dragon Book"]

> This classic computer science text on compiler design is referenced in Section 4.2 as a source for understanding compiler bootstrapping. The analogy between compiler bootstrapping (using a simple compiler to build a more complex one) and the proposed validation strategy for AIM is central to explaining how AIM can be iteratively developed and validated through self-application, starting from an initial "seed" version.

Alvesson, Mats, and Kaj Sköldberg. *Reflexive Methodology: New Vistas for Qualitative Research*. 2nd ed., Sage Publications, 2009.

> This work is cited in Section 4.3 (Phase 2) to support the critical need for reflexivity within the AIM bootstrapping protocol. Alvesson and Sköldberg's insights into critically examining research practices underpin the requirement for the AIM validation process to turn the method's own principles (like embedded observation and analysis) inward, evaluating the methodology's performance and the researchers' own biases.

Blank, Steve. *The Four Steps to the Epiphany: Successful Strategies for Products that Win*. 2nd ed., K&S Ranch, 2013.

> Referenced in Section 2.3, this book provides foundational concepts for the customer development process that heavily influenced Lean Startup. Its inclusion helps contrast the specific business-model-discovery focus of the "learning" emphasized in Lean Startup with the broader epistemological and

methodological goals of the proposed AIM framework, highlighting differences in scope and intent.

Braidotti, Rosi. *The Posthuman*. Polity Press, 2013.

Cited in Sections 1.2 and 2, Braidotti's work on posthumanism provides essential philosophical context for the paper. It helps articulate the condition of the human subject within technologically saturated, networked environments (the phygital space), informing the understanding of the complex interplay between humans and technology that AIM must navigate, particularly concerning ethical considerations and the nature of intervention.

Dewey, John. *Logic: The Theory of Inquiry*. Henry Holt and Company, 1938.

This foundational text of American pragmatism is cited in Section 3.2 (Pragmatic Validation) and Section 5.2. Dewey's linking of inquiry directly to experience, practical problem-solving, and active intervention provides significant philosophical grounding for AIM's core tenets, particularly its emphasis on learning through doing and its adoption of pragmatic validation criteria alongside traditional epistemic concerns.

Giere, Ronald N. *Explaining Science: A Cognitive Approach*. University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Cited in Section 3.2 (Model-Centric Epistemology), Giere's work supports AIM's epistemological stance. His influential advocacy for a model-based view of science—where scientific knowledge resides in context-dependent models rather than universal laws—resonates strongly with AIM's focus on developing, testing, and refining useful, adaptable models as primary knowledge outputs for navigating complex phygital systems.

Gregor, Shirley, and Alan R. Hevner. "Positioning and Presenting Design Science Research for Maximum Impact." *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 37, no. 2, 2013, pp. 337-355.

This article is referenced in Section 2.3 and Section 3.2 (Adapt & Theorize). It helps articulate the different *types* of knowledge contributions (such as constructs, models, methods, instantiations, and design principles) that can arise from design-oriented research like DSR. This is used by analogy to suggest the kinds of adaptable, potentially generalizable knowledge AIM also seeks to generate through its iterative cycle.

Hayles, N. Katherine. *How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature, and Informatics*. University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Referenced in Sections 1.2 and 2, Hayles's work offers crucial historical and conceptual background on the merging of information technologies with human embodiment and materiality. This analysis is vital for grounding the paper's use of the "phygital space" concept, highlighting the deep integration of digital and physical realities that AIM is designed to address.

Hevner, Alan R., et al. "Design Science in Information Systems Research." *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 28, no. 1, 2004, pp. 75-105.

Cited prominently in Section 2.3 and used for context in Section 3, this paper is seminal for defining Design Science Research (DSR) within the Information Systems field. It serves as a key reference point for describing and evaluating a major existing methodology for interventionist and constructivist research, allowing for a clear comparison and contrast with the proposed AIM framework.

Kemmis, Stephen, and Robin McTaggart, editors. *The Action Research Planner*. 3rd ed., Deakin University Press, 1988.

Cited in Section 2.3, this work provides practical details on participatory forms of Action Research. It is used to illustrate variations within the broader AR tradition, helping to differentiate AR's specific focus (often collaborative and empowering within local contexts) from the broader systemic scope and specific methodological cycle proposed for AIM.

Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 4th ed., University of Chicago Press, 2012.

Referenced extensively in Sections 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, and 3.3, Kuhn's landmark work provides the influential concepts of scientific paradigms, normal science, and scientific revolutions. It represents a cornerstone of 20th-century philosophy of science, serving throughout the paper as a primary point of contrast to highlight the limitations of classical views when applied to AIM's target domains and to emphasize AIM's different approach to progress and knowledge validation.

Lakatos, Imre. *The Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes: Philosophical Papers Volume 1*. Edited by John Worrall and Gregory Currie, Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Cited in Sections 2.1, 2.2, and 3.3, Lakatos's concept of scientific research programmes (with their "hard core" and "protective belt") is introduced as a sophisticated refinement of Popperian falsificationism. It represents another significant classical model of scientific rationality, used as a foil to emphasize the distinct features of AIM's iterative, adaptive, and pragmatically oriented approach to knowledge development in applied sciences.

Latour, Bruno. *We Have Never Been Modern*. Translated by Catherine Porter, Harvard University Press, 1993.

Referenced in Sections 1.2, 2.2, and 5.2, Latour's work is invoked for its influential critique of the "modern constitution" that rigidly separates nature and culture, humans and non-humans, science and politics. This critique supports the paper's argument that the phygital space requires integrated analysis transcending such boundaries, and aligns with Actor-Network Theory concepts relevant to understanding the complex entanglements AIM must address.

Laudan, Larry. *Progress and Its Problems: Towards a Theory of Scientific Growth*. University of California Press, 1977.

Cited in Section 4.1, Laudan's work addresses the complex philosophical problem of how to justify scientific methodologies and evaluate scientific progress over time. It is referenced to frame the inherent difficulty of validating any scientific method, thereby motivating the need for the pragmatic, iterative bootstrapping strategy proposed for justifying AIM based on demonstrated utility rather than absolute proof.

Lewin, Kurt. "Action Research and Minority Problems." *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 2, no. 4, 1946, pp. 34-46.

Cited in Section 2.3, this article by the originator of Action Research (AR) serves as a foundational reference. It establishes the historical context for interventionist research methodologies by outlining AR's core principles (linking research to social action and problem-solving), allowing AR to be discussed as an important precursor and alternative approach compared to AIM.

Lynch, Michael P. *The Internet of Us: Knowing More and Understanding Less in the Age of Big Data*. Liveright Publishing Corporation, 2016.

Referenced in Sections 1.2 and 2.2, Lynch's work addresses the specific epistemological consequences of living within the contemporary data-saturated, digitally mediated environment. It highlights challenges such as the pace of information change and the potential disconnect between data access and deep understanding, underscoring the complex knowledge landscape that AIM must effectively navigate.

March, Salvatore T., and Gerald F. Smith. "Design and Natural Science Research on Information Technology." *Decision Support Systems*, vol. 15, no. 4, 1995, pp. 251-266.

Cited in Section 2.3, this paper presents an early and influential framework distinguishing the goals and activities of design science (build, evaluate) from those of natural science (theorize, justify) within the context of Information Technology research. It helps set the stage for discussing DSR and provides context for positioning AIM as a method focused on intervention and construction.

Meadows, Donella H. *Thinking in Systems: A Primer*. Chelsea Green Publishing, 2008.

Cited in Section 3.1, this widely accessible text on systems thinking provides foundational concepts such as feedback loops, leverage points, and unintended consequences. It is referenced to support AIM's requirement for a systemic perspective, emphasizing the need to understand interventions within the broader context of interconnected phygital systems and to consider potential long-term, indirect effects.

Meira, Silvio. *SPA: Society, Politics, Advancement*. TDS.company, 2025.

This work is the central conceptual anchor for the entire paper, cited extensively throughout (Sections 1-6 and Appendix A). It provides the foundational SPA philosophical framework, introducing the core concepts of the "phygital space," "ethical adaptability," and "long-term thinking" that directly inform AIM's design.

Morin, Edgar. *On Complexity*. Translated by Robin Postel, Hampton Press, 2008.

Cited in Section 3.1, Morin's influential philosophical work on complexity is referenced to support AIM's fundamental premise that the domains it addresses are inherently complex, uncertain, and interconnected. This underpins AIM's focus on adaptation, learning, and navigating uncertainty rather than seeking complete prediction or control.

O'Neil, Cathy. *Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy*. Crown, 2016.

Cited in Sections 1.2, 3.1, 5.2, and 5.4, O'Neil's work provides powerful real-world examples of the significant negative social and ethical consequences that can arise from poorly designed or unethically deployed digital interventions (algorithms) within the phygital space. These examples underscore the critical necessity for AIM's integrated approach to ethical adaptability and the ongoing challenges regarding ethical governance.

Popper, Karl R. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. Routledge Classics, 2002.

Referenced extensively in Sections 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, and 3.3, this is the canonical text presenting Popper's principle of falsification. It serves as a primary representation of classical scientific methodology throughout the paper, used consistently as a point of contrast to highlight AIM's fundamentally different approach to inquiry, validation (pragmatic vs. falsificationist), and progress in applied, interventionist domains.

Poppendieck, Mary, and Tom Poppendieck. *Lean Software Development: An Agile Toolkit*. Addison-Wesley Professional, 2003.

Cited in Section 2.3, this key text details the application of Lean principles specifically to the domain of software development. It is used to define Lean Software Development, allowing for its analysis as a valuable process framework but distinguishing it from AIM's objective of providing a more foundational scientific methodology with deeper epistemological and ethical grounding.

Reason, Peter, and Hilary Bradbury, editors. *Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and Practice*. Sage Publications, 2001.

Cited in Section 2.3, this comprehensive handbook provides an authoritative overview of Action Research (AR) theories, practices, and variations. It is used to establish AR as a significant interventionist methodology, enabling a comparison with AIM regarding scope, validation approaches, and philosophical underpinnings.

Ries, Eric. *The Lean Startup: How Today's Entrepreneurs Use Continuous Innovation to Create Radically Successful Businesses*. Crown Business, 2011.

Cited in Section 2.3, this influential book defines the core concepts of the Lean Startup movement, such as the Minimum Viable Product (MVP) and "validated learning." It is referenced to analyze Lean Startup's strengths in managing uncertainty but also its limitations as primarily a business strategy and product development process, contrasting its focus with AIM's scientific methodology goals.

Schmitt, Frederick F, editor. *Knowledge and Belief*. Routledge, 1999.

Cited in Section 1.3, this edited volume provides general philosophical background on epistemology, particularly the nature of knowledge and justified belief. It is referenced to contextualize the discussion about different forms of justification and validation criteria, especially when contrasting AIM's pragmatic approach with traditional science's focus on truth-conditional justification.

Schön, Donald A. *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. Basic Books, 1983.

Cited in Section 3.2 (Embedded Observation) and Section 5.2, Schön's seminal work on reflective practice provides crucial theoretical support for key aspects of AIM. His analysis of how professionals generate knowledge through reflection *in* and *on* action underpins AIM's emphasis on embedded observation, iterative learning within the inquiry cycle, and its contribution to the epistemology of practice.

Searle, John R. *The Construction of Social Reality*. Free Press, 1995.

Cited in Sections 1.1 and 2.2, Searle's influential philosophical work explains how human institutions and social facts (like money or corporations) are constructed through collective intentionality and constitutive rules. This supports the paper's argument that fields like marketing and strategy are inherently constructivist, actively shaping the social realities they operate within, thus requiring a methodology like AIM that acknowledges this.

Simon, Herbert A. *The Sciences of the Artificial*. 3rd ed., MIT Press, 1996.

Referenced in Sections 3.1 and 5.1, Simon's foundational work explores the distinctive nature of disciplines concerned with human-designed artifacts and systems (the "artificial") as opposed to natural systems. It is highly relevant for situating AIM as a methodology suited for these "sciences of design," acknowledging principles like bounded rationality and satisficing in complex problem-solving and intervention.

Somekh, Bridget. "Taking Issue: The Quality of Action Research." *Educational Action Research*, vol. 4, no. 3, 1996, pp. 411-423.

Cited in Section 2.3, this article discusses methodological challenges within Action Research, particularly concerning issues of rigor, generalizability, and validation. It is used to highlight potential limitations of AR that AIM, with its structured cycle and explicit validation strategies (pragmatic and bootstrapping), aims to address more systematically.

Surowiecki, James. *The Wisdom of Crowds: Why the Many Are Smarter Than the Few and How Collective Wisdom Shapes Business, Economies, Societies and Nations*. Doubleday, 2004.

Referenced in Section 1.2 and Section 5.4, Surowiecki's work explores the power of collective intelligence and the conditions under which diverse, independent judgments can lead to surprisingly accurate results. It is cited both to point towards the emergent, often unpredictable dynamics of complex systems (like markets) that AIM must handle, and critically, to underscore the importance of incorporating diverse perspectives as a potential mitigation strategy against bias within the AIM cycle.

Tanenbaum, Andrew S., and Herbert Bos. *Modern Operating Systems*. 4th ed., Pearson, 2015.

Cited in Section 4.2, this standard textbook on operating systems provides background information on OS concepts, including the boot loading process. This supports the explanation of the operating system bootstrapping analogy, used alongside the compiler analogy, to make the proposed meta-validation strategy for AIM more concrete and understandable.

Tapscott, Don, and Anthony D. Williams. *Wikinomics: How mass collaboration changes everything*. Penguin, 2010.

Referenced in Sections 1.2 and 5.4, this book illustrates the power and dynamics of large-scale collaboration enabled by digital technologies. It is used to highlight key features of the contemporary phygital environment relevant to innovation and market behavior, and also implicitly points to the potential benefits and challenges (managing diverse inputs, potential for groupthink) related to collaboration within AIM projects.

Turkle, Sherry. *Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other*. Basic Books, 2011.

Cited in Sections 1.2 and 2.2, Turkle's work provides critical sociological insights into how digital technologies shape human relationships, identity, and social interaction. It is referenced to emphasize the importance of considering the specific social dimension and context when analyzing interventions within the phygital space, a core requirement of the AIM framework.

Womack, James P., et al. *The Machine That Changed the World: The Story of Lean Production*. Harper Perennial, 1991.

Cited in Section 2.3, this foundational text introduced the principles of Lean production, derived from the Toyota Production System, to a global audience. It provides essential historical context for understanding the origins of the Lean methodologies later adapted for software development and startups, which are discussed as important process frameworks but distinguished from the scientific methodology goals of AIM.