Research & Insights Report

Last Updated: 8 October 2026, 09:29

Prepared for Albemarle Excellence

Project Albemarle Excellence App

© We Are Affective Ltd 2026. All rights reserved.
Private and Confidential.

Contents

Introduction 3
What We Set Out To Understand 3
The Sessions 4
What We Found 5
Finding 1 5
Finding 2 6
Finding 3 8
Finding 4 9
Finding 5 10
Emerging Themes 12
Root Causes 14
What This Means For The Work 15

© We Are Affective Ltd 2026. All rights reserved. Private and Confidential.

Introduction

What follows is a record of what we found, not a proposal for what should change. Over the course of the discovery phase, we worked closely with the Albemarle Excellence team through a structured programme of workshops and exercises, examining the product, the brand, and the emotional experience of the people who use both. Every observation in this document has its roots in that process. Nothing here is hypothetical, and nothing has been imported from outside the room. These pages capture what surfaced when the right questions were asked.

The findings are grounded in workshop outputs, direct conversations with the Albemarle team, and a careful examination of how the current experience actually feels, for new clients, for returning ones, and for the hosts and stylists who hold the relationships together. Where we draw conclusions, they come from patterns that emerged across multiple sessions, not from a single moment or a single voice. The team brought a great deal of honesty to this process, including about the gaps, and that honesty is what makes this document useful.

The purpose of this report is to give everyone involved, design, product and leadership, the same starting point. Before any decisions are made about what the app should do or how it should feel, there needs to be a shared picture of what currently exists and what it means for the people who encounter it. That picture is not always comfortable, but it is accurate, and accuracy is where good design begins. This is that picture.

What We Set Out To Understand

At the start of this engagement, we framed a small number of central questions to guide every session and conversation. Not research objectives in the formal sense, more like the things we needed to genuinely understand before any design thinking could be trusted. They shaped which exercises we ran, which moments we examined closely, and where we pushed the Albemarle team to be honest rather than aspirational. Everything that followed was, in some way, an attempt to answer them.

- **What does a client actually feel in the first sixty seconds of the app, and how far does that diverge from what the studio has already made them feel?** The gap between walking into Mayfair and opening the app on the way home was, from early conversations, clearly significant. We needed to understand not just that the gap existed, but what it cost emotionally, and for whom it cost most.
- **What is the real relationship between being known and feeling safe, and where does the product tip from one into the other?** Albemarle's entire proposition rests on memory and personalisation. But memory, handled carelessly, stops feeling like care and starts feeling like surveillance. We needed to understand exactly where that line sits for clients, and what design decisions determine which side of it the product lands on.
- **Where does the warmth that clients experience in the studio actually stop, and what causes it to stop there?** The studio experience is, by most accounts, exceptional. The digital

© We Are Affective Ltd 2026. All rights reserved. Private and Confidential.

experience around it is not. We needed to locate the precise moments where continuity breaks, understand why those breaks have persisted, and identify which of them carry the most emotional weight.

- **What does the Albemarle brand sound like when it is genuinely itself, and how consistently does that voice appear across every touchpoint a client encounters?** There was a clear tension, surfaced early, between the language the brand uses in official copy and the language that actually builds trust with clients. Understanding that gap was essential before any work on tone or communication could begin.

Those questions now have answers. Some of them are straightforward. Others are more layered than we expected when we first asked them. This document contains all of them.

The Sessions

The discovery phase was conducted across eleven structured workshop sessions with the Albemarle Excellence team. Each session used a different exercise methodology, designed to surface a distinct layer of the brand, the product, or the emotional experience of the people who use both. Taken together, they move from the strategic and generative through to the emotional, tonal, and projective, building a picture that no single method could have produced on its own.

Session	Methodology	Primary Output
The Anti-Principles	Strategy / generative	Inverted design principles; what the product must never become
Design Principles Builder	Strategy / generative	Core product principles with measurable signals and a design checklist
The First 60 Seconds	Emotional / reflective	Entry emotional state, first impression gap, ideal opening arc
Aspiration Gap	Emotional / reflective	Emotional before and after, critical moments, structural reasons the gap persisted
Emotional Journey Mapping	Emotional / generative	Full journey emotional peaks and valleys, dead ends, and design fixes
Heartbreak Scale	Emotional / reflective	Trust, delight, anxiety, confusion and pride levels; missed opportunity mapping
The Voice Sort	Tone / reductive	Right and wrong vocabulary, formality register, voice character
The Dinner Party	Brand / projection	Brand personality, relational character, behaviour under pressure

© We Are Affective Ltd 2026. All rights reserved. Private and Confidential.

Session	Methodology	Primary Output
The Rejection Letter	Brand / reductive	Brand boundaries, market position, what Albemarle will never be
The Funeral Speech	Emotional / projection	Long-term emotional legacy, identity transformation, lasting brand truth
The Word Sort	Brand / comparative	Vocabulary taxonomy, language rules, constructs that belong and those that do not

The sequence was deliberate. The early strategy sessions established what the product stands for and, just as usefully, what it must guard against. The emotional exercises that followed moved closer to the lived experience of clients, examining not just what happens across the journey but what it costs when it goes wrong. The tonal and projective sessions at the end gave the brand a voice and a character grounded in everything the earlier work had uncovered, rather than arrived at from instinct alone. Eleven sessions, each one building on what came before.

What We Found

Finding 1

The Product and the Studio Are Describing Two Different Companies

The most consistent thing we heard across the sessions was a version of the same observation. Clients who are warmly known inside the studio encounter a product that doesn't know them at all. This isn't a small inconsistency or a branding mismatch. It's a structural break that runs through every digital touchpoint, and it sits at the centre of nearly every other finding that followed.

The clearest expression of it came from the Heartbreak Scale session, where the team described a moment at the Mayfair front desk. Helen, a client of eight years, used the app to rebook while her host Sophie stood beside her. The app asked whether she was a new client. Helen laughed and held the screen up. What she said was: "It's like you've got a twin who's never met me." She didn't say it angrily. That's what made it land. She'd accepted it. The gap was familiar enough to have become a joke.

The Aspiration Gap session examined why this gap had been allowed to persist, and the answer was uncomfortable. The app was never designed as part of the hospitality. It was added as administrative infrastructure, built outside the rooms where Albemarle's character was shaped, and then left running. Nobody who understood how the studio felt was in the room when the booking system was set up. Pride in what happened in the chair quietly became an excuse not to look at what happened around it. As the session put it, the assumption was that the warmth of the studio would compensate for anything cold that came before it. For years, more or less, it did.

© We Are Affective Ltd 2026. All rights reserved. Private and Confidential.

The Emotional Journey Mapping session gave us the structural picture. Every emotional peak in the client journey sits inside the studio. Every valley sits outside it.

Journey Stage	Emotional State	Where It Happens
The nudge	Self-conscious, slightly guilty	Outside Albemarle entirely
The recommendation	Hopeful, borrowed enthusiasm	Outside Albemarle entirely
The hesitation	Guarded, uncertain	The app
The commitment	Doubt, faint anxiety	The app
The waiting	Neutral to nervous	Silence from Albemarle
The welcome	Warmth, relief	The studio
Being looked after	Calm, cared for	The studio
The afterglow	Confidence, genuine pleasure	The studio doorstep
The drift	Slowly fading	Silence from Albemarle
The return	Hopeful, then either recognised or deflated	The app
Belonging	Ease, ownership	Bypassing the app via host

What the table shows is not a product that performs unevenly. It's a product that is essentially absent from its own client journey. The studio holds every peak. The app holds every valley. That pattern isn't accidental. It reflects the structural decision, never quite made consciously, to treat the digital layer as a booking tool rather than an extension of the care.

The First 60 Seconds session articulated the cost of that decision at the moment it matters most. Returning clients open the app expecting to be recognised and are treated as strangers. New clients arrive carrying a friend's enthusiasm about somewhere special, and the first thing they encounter is a login screen. The emotional word the Albemarle team returned to most often when describing the ideal opening experience was "expected." The feeling of walking into a room where someone was already waiting for you. The current app produces the opposite.

Finding 2

Being Known Only Feels Like Care When the Client Is in Control of It

One of the sharper distinctions to emerge across the sessions was between being remembered and being watched. The difference is not a matter of what the system holds. It's a matter of who decides

© We Are Affective Ltd 2026. All rights reserved. Private and Confidential.

how it's used. This proved to be the central design tension running through the whole engagement, and understanding it properly changes what "personalisation" means for this product.

The Anti-Principles session was where this became undeniable. The exercise asked the team to design the worst possible version of the app, a product that did everything Albemarle values in the wrong way. The result was a product that announced its memory constantly: "It's been 47 days since your last visit." That connected to Instagram to surface a client's roots in a photo and recommend a booking. That kept a partner's name on file long after the relationship had ended and still asked after him. That wrote post-visit notes in a stylist's voice using central automation, signed with their name and an emoji they'd never used in their life. None of these things were invented carelessly. They were written by people who know this business. The ease with which the team produced them was itself a finding.

When the team inverted those principles, the one that landed most strongly was: memory is shown, never surfaced for its own sake. Use what we know quietly, to save the client effort, and never remind them how much we hold. The difference between these two positions is not the information itself. It's the direction it faces. Memory pointed at the business creates discomfort. Memory pointed at the client, used only to make something easier, creates trust.

The Design Principles Builder session produced a concrete test for this. The "what we remember about you" view, a simple page where clients can see everything held about them, edit it, and remove anything they choose. The rationale recorded in that session was precise: control is what makes being known feel safe. It also settles our stylists' worry about where remembering ends and keeping a file begins. That last point matters. The anxiety about this system isn't only the client's. Hosts and stylists have their own discomfort about what gets recorded in their name and how it might be used.

The Aspiration Gap session mapped the emotional landmines most likely to detonate if this distinction is handled badly.

- Hair loss and thinning, often tied to stress, illness or grief, and usually the most private thing a client carries into the chair
- Medical treatment, where an automated "you're overdue" reminder could land during chemotherapy
- Names and pronouns, where a greeting using an old name can cause genuine pain
- Photographs, which some clients will find distressing rather than delightful
- Lapsed clients, who may have been absent for reasons a "we've missed you" message would make worse
- Textured and Afro hair, where being matched with the wrong stylist confirms a fear the client has carried from past experiences elsewhere

What these have in common is that they are all moments where the system having information creates risk rather than warmth. The information is not wrong. The handling of it is. And in each case, the harm comes from the product using what it knows without the client's direction.

© We Are Affective Ltd 2026. All rights reserved. Private and Confidential.

The Funeral Speech session expressed the long-term version of this finding. It described a changed relationship with data in which information about people is given back to them, rather than kept about them. Clients who can see and change what is held eventually trust the system enough to share more. That voluntary sharing is the clearest signal of trust the product can produce. It is not a design flourish. It is the mechanism by which being known becomes something the client has chosen, rather than something done to them.

Finding 3

Authenticity Cannot Be Scaled by Borrowing Someone's Name

Across multiple sessions, a single operational pressure surfaced repeatedly and from different angles. Albemarle's warmth currently lives in individual people, mostly in their heads, and the system provides no reliable way to hold it, travel it across studios, or sustain it on a busy Saturday night in December. That's the capacity problem the client team named explicitly from the start, and the sessions gave it a much sharper shape than the original question anticipated.

The Anti-Principles session built a specific scenario to test where this pressure leads if the wrong decision is made. Daniel has seen nine clients in one day. It's the week before Christmas. He has written three post-visit notes. Six remain. The product holds everything it needs to generate the remaining six in his voice, in his name, indistinguishable from the real ones. Nobody would know. The team acknowledged, with some honesty, that several of them might have approved those notes in a meeting.

The session then asked what passing and failing look like at that moment. Passing means the six clients receive a short, honest message from the studio that evening, signed Albemarle Mayfair rather than Daniel, because Daniel didn't write it. On Sunday morning Daniel finds six drafts built from his chair notes, reads each one, edits them, and sends them under his own name because by then they genuinely are his. Failing means the notes go out at 7.03pm, signed Daniel, written by the system. They're pleasant. Most clients smile and move on. Then one client mentions the lovely note at her next visit. Daniel looks blank for a second. She notices. Something shifts. She starts wondering which of his messages were really him.

The team identified this as the principle being tested: a message signed by a person is written by that person, and anything automated comes plainly from Albemarle. What emerged from the discussion was that the principle doesn't resist automation. It redirects it. The system drafts, the stylist approves, and the message travels under a name only once that name has genuinely been behind it. The failure mode is not using technology to help. The failure mode is using technology to impersonate.

The Voice Sort session gave this the tonal dimension. The team examined two pieces of copy side by side. The first was a text Sophie had actually sent a client: "Morning Claire. Daniel's got a gap Thursday at 10 if you still want to go a bit lighter before Lisbon. No rush at all, just thought of you. Coffee will be ready either way." The second was the app's current welcome copy: "Welcome to Albemarle Excellence. Experience the art of luxury hair care, curated by world class stylists. Select

© We Are Affective Ltd 2026. All rights reserved. Private and Confidential.

your signature service and begin your bespoke journey today." The team's description of the difference was simple. If Sophie's text feels like being thought of, the app copy feels like being marketed at. One has a person behind it. The other has a brand behind it, and clients can tell.

The Heartbreak Scale session recorded the delight score at 1 out of 5, with the observation that every moment of genuine delight the product currently produces comes from hosts working around it, not through it. Sophie sends voice notes. Daniel saves slots. Those gestures are real, and clients value them enormously. They are also invisible to the system, unrecorded, and entirely dependent on one person's memory and goodwill. When that person moves on, the history goes with them.

The Rejection Letter session named the market position this risk sits closest to: the premium chain that has solved scale by removing the personal. Consistent across locations, efficient, good apps, well-trained staff. Nobody really knows you. The session was clear that Albemarle's differentiating position is not luxury in the exclusive sense, but continuity of care. The host who knows you, and the system that holds what the host knows so it doesn't disappear. Without the second half of that sentence, the first half is fragile in exactly the way it currently is.

Finding 4

The Language the Brand Uses Publicly Is Almost the Opposite of the Language That Actually Builds Trust

The tonal sessions produced a finding that surprised nobody individually but had not been stated plainly before. The words Albemarle uses in its official communications are almost entirely drawn from the vocabulary its own team would describe as wrong for the brand. This isn't a small inconsistency. It represents a systematic divergence between how the brand speaks to itself and how it speaks to clients, and it runs through every client-facing surface currently in use.

The Voice Sort session asked the team to sort vocabulary into yes, no, and maybe piles for the brand. The yes pile contained words like unhurried, at ease, known, considered, discreet, crafted, your Albemarle story, a little something before Friday. The no pile contained luxury, exclusive, elite, curated, bespoke, signature, world class, valued client, transformative, seamlessly integrated. The current app welcome copy, examined in the same session, contained almost exclusively words from the no pile: luxury, curated, world class, signature, bespoke, journey.

The pattern the team identified in the yes pile was precise. Almost none of these words describe us. They describe how the client feels, or the relationship between us. The yes vocabulary is in the second person. The no vocabulary is in the first. When the brand addresses clients officially, it talks about itself. When Sophie texts a client, she talks about them. That distinction, more than any question of register or formality, is what separates the copy that works from the copy that doesn't.

The Word Sort session gave this a set of working rules.

© We Are Affective Ltd 2026. All rights reserved. Private and Confidential.

Language Construct	Belongs	Does Not Belong
States describing how the client feels	At ease, known, unhurried	Premium, transformative, cutting-edge
Possessives giving ownership to the client	Your usual time, your Albemarle story	Our offering, our multi-location service
Real time words	Thursday at ten, a little something before Friday	Your slot, appointment window, soon
Past participles implying care was taken	Considered, crafted	Rigorous, optimised, seamlessly integrated
Plain everyday vocabulary	No rush, of course, shall I	Curated, bespoke, synergy
Gentle offers	A little something before Friday?	Book now, don't miss out, limited availability

The Dinner Party session produced the clearest description of where the voice actually lives. Read aloud, Albemarle should sound like the person who runs the best small hotel you've ever stayed in. Not a grand hotel with a concierge desk and a uniform, but a properly good one with twelve rooms, where the owner remembers you from two years ago and has already put you in the room with the window you liked. She doesn't fuss. She doesn't tell you how lucky you are to be there. The session went on to note that this voice already exists. Sophie's text is the proof. The question is not what the voice should sound like. It's why the product keeps writing it out.

The Word Sort session also examined the maybe pile, which turned out to be the most instructive of the three. Words like trusted, tailored to you, your host remembers, and we've been thinking about you didn't fail because they were wrong about the brand. They failed depending on who was saying them, to whom, and whether they were showing something or claiming it. Trusted as a self-description is empty. Said by a client, it's powerful. Tailored to you as a header is marketing. Shown through "kept the ends soft because you wear it up for work" is evidence. The maybe pile revealed that the brand's voice isn't a fixed vocabulary. It's a judgement made in the moment about whether the language is demonstrating care or announcing it. Announcing it is always the wrong choice.

Finding 5

The Warmth the Brand Is Built On Cannot Survive Growth Without a System Designed to Hold It

The question the Albemarle team named at the start of the engagement, how do hosts keep being warm and personal at scale without any client ever feeling managed by a database, turned out to be not just an operational concern but a design problem with a specific emotional shape. Every session,

© We Are Affective Ltd 2026. All rights reserved. Private and Confidential.

from different angles, returned to the same structural vulnerability: the care currently lives in people's heads, travels nowhere, and stops the moment one person moves on.

The Aspiration Gap session named the biggest single risk plainly. Albemarle promises more personal care than its people can actually give as the business grows. Hosts get stretched, replies slow down, the temptation to fill gaps with automation dressed up as Sophie creeps in. What makes it the biggest risk is that it's caused by success. The better the experience, the more clients will message their host, the more they'll share, the more they'll expect to be remembered. Growth quietly raises the bar while also making it harder to clear.

The Emotional Journey Mapping session documented where knowledge currently stops travelling. A client who is adored in Mayfair visits Edinburgh and is met as a newcomer. When a host leaves, the client's relationship has nowhere to go. Notes from direct host messages never make it into the client's record. Whatever is learned in the chair stays in the stylist's head. Each time a client moves forward, whether to a new studio, a new host, or simply back to the app after a visit, they lose a little of being known. The experience breaks at exactly the moment it should be building.

The Design Principles Builder session proposed a measurable signal for each of the five core principles that emerged across the engagement. Together, they form a picture of what the system needs to track in order to know whether warmth is being sustained at scale.

Principle	Signal	How to Measure
We already know you	Times a returning client is asked for something already held, trending to zero	Log repeat information requests as events across app, front desk and host messages
Real people write as themselves	Zero messages sent under a stylist's name without them having written or approved it	Every outgoing message records author and signature; weekly audit flags any mismatch
Show care, don't claim it	Zero instances of banned phrases in any client-facing surface	Quarterly audit against a fixed banned phrase list, owned by one named person
Only get in touch to help	Share of clients who mute notifications falling; host message reply rate rising	Track opt-outs and muted notifications quarterly alongside reply rates
Their information, their choice	Proportion of clients who choose to add something to their own profile, growing year on year	Count client-initiated additions per active client each quarter

The Funeral Speech session described what the legacy version of this looks like when it works. It moved being remembered from luck to expectation. Before Albemarle got this right, the care you received depended on one person and their memory. Afterwards, it belonged to you. Your history, your

© We Are Affective Ltd 2026. All rights reserved. Private and Confidential.

preferences, the story of your hair over the years, all of it travelled with you, to any studio and any stylist. Clients stopped introducing themselves. They simply arrived. That description is not a vision statement. It's the design brief. The question every subsequent

Emerging Themes

The findings from each individual session point in consistent directions, but certain patterns cut across all of them in a way that shapes everything else. These are not conclusions about individual touchpoints. They are structural observations about the experience as a whole, and they account for the majority of what needs to change.

The product's emotional register and the studio's emotional register belong to different experiences

Across every session, without exception, the warmth Albemarle creates in person and the coldness it creates digitally were described as two entirely separate things. Not a gap in degree, but a gap in kind. The studio makes clients feel expected, looked after, and genuinely known. The app makes them feel like a booking being processed. Both of those responses are reasonable given what each environment currently offers. The problem is that they belong to the same brand, the same client, and often the same afternoon.

This matters emotionally because the contrast is not neutral. When something has been described to you as warm and personal, and the first thing you actually encounter is a login screen and a menu of forty services, the disappointment is sharper than if nothing had been promised at all. New clients arrive carrying a friend's enthusiasm, and the app quietly deflates it before a single appointment has been made. Returning clients carry years of genuine relationship, and the app greets them as strangers. Neither group is surprised by this anymore, and that resignation is the most expensive thing the findings uncovered. Clients have stopped expecting the digital experience to feel like Albemarle. They've accepted the twin who's never met them.

The direction this points toward is not better design in the abstract sense. It's continuity. The studio experience needs to begin before the client walks through the door and carry on after they leave, through the same people and the same voice that make the room feel the way it does. Every part of the experience that currently stops at the studio threshold needs to be examined for whether it can travel.

Memory only feels like care when the client decides how it's used

Albemarle's proposition depends on being known. But the sessions were careful and consistent about the conditions under which being known feels good. It feels good when the client is in control of it. It feels unsettling, sometimes genuinely distressing, when the system applies what it knows without the client's direction. These are not two versions of the same thing. They produce opposite emotional responses, and the difference between them is not the information held, but who decides what to do with it.

© We Are Affective Ltd 2026. All rights reserved. Private and Confidential.

The Anti-Principles session built the worst version of this with precision. An app that surfaces a root touch up after seeing an Instagram photo. That asks after a partner who's gone. That writes notes in a stylist's voice using central automation, signed with their name and an emoji they'd never use. None of those failures require bad intentions. They require only the assumption that more memory and more contact always equal more care. They don't. Memory pointed at the business creates discomfort. Memory pointed at the client, used only to make something easier or kinder, builds trust.

What the sessions returned to repeatedly was the idea of a visible, editable record. Not as a compliance feature, but as the mechanism that turns being known into something the client has chosen rather than something done to them. People share more with places they trust. Trust comes from control. Control comes from transparency. That sequence matters, and the product needs to be designed with it in mind from the very first interaction.

When the voice performing care is not the voice delivering it, clients eventually notice, and they stop believing either

The operational pressure at the centre of this engagement is real and was never understated: warmth that works beautifully with two hundred clients becomes structurally fragile with twenty thousand. The sessions examined this from multiple angles, and what emerged was not an argument against scale but a very specific argument about the failure mode to avoid. The failure is not automation. The failure is automation dressed as a person.

The December Saturday scenario, nine clients, six unwritten notes, an exhausted stylist, and a product capable of generating six warm, accurate, indistinguishable messages in his name before he's left the building, is not a hypothetical. It's a decision that gets made quietly, usually in an operations meeting, and then made again the following week, and the week after that, until the practice is unremarkable. What follows, slowly and then suddenly, is that every message from every stylist becomes slightly suspect. Clients who once replied to follow-up notes as if to a friend start wondering which ones were real. Stylists who once wrote honest notes in the chair stop bothering, because the system handles it anyway. Within a year, every note sounds slightly the same, and nobody can quite remember which ones were genuine.

The sessions were not romantic about this. They did not argue that every message must be written from scratch by a tired human at the end of a long day. They argued that the line between help and impersonation must be maintained with absolute clarity. The system can draft. The stylist must approve. And anything that goes out under a name must have genuinely passed through that person. Where that isn't possible, the honest message from the studio, signed as the studio, is always the right choice. It is also, reliably, the harder one to make on a busy Saturday, which means the product needs to make it easy enough that nobody is tempted to take the shortcut.

The language used to represent the brand publicly is almost the reverse of the language that actually builds trust with clients

© We Are Affective Ltd 2026. All rights reserved. Private and Confidential.

This finding sits across every tonal and projective session, and it is, in some ways, the most actionable of them all. The words Albemarle uses in official communications, luxury, curated, world class, signature, bespoke, journey, are almost entirely absent from the vocabulary its own team identified as right for the brand. The words that the team described as genuinely Albemarle, unhurried, at ease, known, your usual time, a little something before Friday, no rush at all, are almost entirely absent from its current client-facing copy.

The pattern the sessions identified is consistent. The official voice describes Albemarle. The real voice describes the client. One talks about the service. The other talks to a person. And the difference between those two orientations is exactly the difference between the app copy that opens by announcing luxury hair care curated by world class stylists, and the text Sophie sent to Claire: "Morning Claire. Daniel's got a gap Thursday at 10 if you still want to go a bit lighter before Lisbon. No rush at all, just thought of you. Coffee will be ready either way."

Sophie's text is not exceptional writing. It's exceptional attention, expressed in plain words. The copy currently representing the brand in official channels is polished writing expressing no particular attention to anyone. Clients feel the difference immediately, even without being able to name it. What this points toward is not a brand voice overhaul in the conventional sense. It's a much simpler discipline: before any copy reaches a client, someone should ask whether it describes Albemarle, or whether it describes how the client will feel. The second is the only answer that belongs in the product.

Root Causes

The problems identified in this report are not a reflection of the quality of Albemarle's underlying service, the skill of its people, or the ambition of its leadership. They are problems of delivery: structural failures in how an exceptional in-person experience is designed, extended, and held together across every moment a client encounters the brand.

1. The app was built as infrastructure, not as hospitality.

At some point, a decision was made to treat online booking as an administrative problem rather than a guest experience. Nobody with a clear understanding of how Albemarle feels was involved in that decision, and the product has operated from that starting point ever since. The result is a digital layer that does the transaction efficiently and the hospitality not at all. Clients walk into Mayfair as guests and open the app as strangers, and the distance between those two experiences has never been treated as a design problem worth solving.

2. The knowledge that makes warmth possible lives entirely in people's heads.

Everything Albemarle knows about its clients, colour formulas, preferences, life moments, stylist relationships, sits in individual memories and private notes that travel nowhere. It doesn't cross studios, it doesn't survive a host moving on, and it doesn't reach the product. This means that each time a client moves forward, whether returning after a gap, visiting a different city, or simply opening

© We Are Affective Ltd 2026. All rights reserved. Private and Confidential.

the app, they lose a little of being known. The care that exists in any given room is real. The system to hold it beyond that room does not yet exist.

3. There is no reliable mechanism to distinguish authentic personal contact from automation wearing a person's name.

As the business grows, the pressure to fill the gap between what hosts can genuinely give and what clients have been promised will only increase. Without a clear structural principle governing what can go out under a person's name and what cannot, the path of least resistance is automation dressed as Sophie. That decision, made quietly in an operations meeting, is the failure mode with the most serious long-term consequences. It doesn't just break one message. It makes every genuine message that came before it doubtful.

4. The brand's official voice systematically undoes the trust its people build in person.

The vocabulary used in official communications describes Albemarle to clients rather than speaking to them. It faces inward, toward the brand and its qualities, rather than outward, toward the person reading it. The language that actually builds trust, specific, personal, unhurried, oriented entirely toward the client, exists in abundance. It appears in Sophie's texts and Daniel's notes. It almost never appears on a screen.

None of these are intractable. Each one is the consequence of decisions that were not made deliberately, which means they can be replaced by decisions that are. Taken together, they form the design brief for the work ahead.

What This Means For The Work

The findings from this phase are not abstract. They produce a specific, concrete brief for the design work that follows, and every decision made in that work should be traceable back to something observed here.

- Every screen a client sees should answer the question "do they know me?" before it asks anything in return. Recognition is not a feature to be introduced later in the journey. It is the first thing the product must demonstrate, for returning clients in particular, and the absence of it at any touchpoint is a design failure, not an operational inconvenience.
- Every piece of communication that carries a person's name must have genuinely passed through that person. The system can draft, remind, and prepare. It cannot sign. Where a named message is not possible, the honest message from the studio is always the right choice, and the product must make that honest choice easy enough that nobody reaches for the shortcut on a busy Saturday.
- Every piece of information the product holds about a client must be visible to that client, written in language they would recognise as being about them, and simple to change or remove. The "what we remember about you" view is not a compliance feature. It is the mechanism that turns being known into something the client has chosen.

© We Are Affective Ltd 2026. All rights reserved. Private and Confidential.

- Every word that reaches a client should describe how they will feel, not what Albemarle is. The test is simple: if the sentence faces inward toward the brand, it belongs in an internal document. If it faces outward toward the person reading it, it belongs in the product.
- Every moment of silence from Albemarle should be intentional. The sessions were consistent that contact without purpose does harm, and that restraint is not negligence. The product needs to make it as easy to say nothing as it does to send something, and to treat quiet as a legitimate choice rather than a gap to fill.
- Every studio, every visit, and every stylist change should leave the client feeling as known as they were before. The care cannot belong to one room or one relationship. It has to travel, which means the knowledge that makes it possible must be held somewhere other than a single person's memory.

The most important single insight from this phase is one the sessions kept returning to from different directions: being known only feels like care when the client is in control of it. That distinction, between memory used on the client's behalf and memory surfaced for its own sake, determines whether the whole proposition lands as warmth or as surveillance. If the team understands that properly, it will inform every decision that follows, from what the app shows on first open, to how post-visit notes are drafted, to what happens when a host moves on. Get the control right, and the trust follows. Get it wrong, and no amount of warmth in the language will recover it.

© We Are Affective Ltd 2026. All rights reserved. Private and Confidential.