

Printable Working Documents

Paul Moon • AI-Augmented Witness Inquiry

Begin with a document you can maintain

Start with an Inquiry Brief that can grow into the Inquiry Register. Keep its first dated version, and add the other documents when their work arises. The Sources and AI Register holds source provenance and actual augmentation. The Evidence and Interpretation Map develops claims; the Reflection and Learning Journal examines the researcher's judgments. The Ministry Experiment Journal follows practical trials, while the Research Argument Map connects the whole inquiry to its report. One person can begin this work before a team has formed.

Use stable source identifiers and links. If the Ministry Experiment Journal holds an event note, the Evidence and Interpretation Map can cite its identifier and paragraph when developing a finding. The Research Argument Map then points to that claim and the report section that presents it. The source inventory belongs in the Sources and AI Register. Keep one authoritative location for each source; copying the same note into several files makes later corrections harder to follow. The documents can be maintained as linked files or another arrangement the candidate and authorized readers can use.

Carry the question version into each claim that answers it. For example, a claim in the Evidence and Interpretation Map can point to the Inquiry Register's current question, particular event and response entries in the Ministry Experiment Journal, and a report location through the Research Argument Map. When the question changes, identify which claims still answer it and which need reconsideration. An identifier connects entries; the linked wording and reasoning explain the connection.

Keep an original entry when a question or judgment changes. Add the new wording, date, reason and linked evidence. If an entry is reconstructed after the event, say so and identify its basis. Do not give it the standing of a contemporaneous note. This practice adapts the concern for traceable grounds and decisions in Lincoln and Guba's account of an audit trail; maintaining such a trail is distinct from having an independent audit performed (1985, 322–327).

The bracketed spaces below are fields for the candidate to complete. Expand them in Word as needed. A printed form may use continuation pages carrying the record identifier and version. Use “not applicable” with a reason where appropriate, and distinguish information not collected from information collected but unavailable for a particular use.

An unresolved entry needs a consequence. State what is missing, who can resolve it, and which activity or claim depends on it. Do not begin that activity until its necessary arrangements are settled. Other permitted work may continue. “Not collected,” “collected but unavailable for this use,” and “not yet decided” describe different problems; a completed-looking form should not conceal them.

A short start that can grow

Begin with the brief below. The entries show how further responsibilities develop as you need them; six completed forms are not a condition of starting. Preserve your reasoning before substantive AI work, then keep the exchange and your examination. Individual reflection continues throughout. When a field attempt is warranted, develop it with I.G.N.i.T.E., prepare observation before acting, and connect feedback and review to the next decision.

Inquiry Brief — Describe the concern, people and setting, an open question, the practical purpose and the understanding sought. State the boundaries, theological commitments and one consequential assumption with its

present reasons. Identify the first substantive AI task, the permitted material it will examine, and your next inquiry. Date this initial version.

[Initial brief; author and date; starting reasons; first AI task and response location; next question.]

The Sources and AI Register — Establish the conditions for gathering and using material. What must be settled before listening, recording, sharing or processing begins? Preserve the first AI task, its input and response, your examination and the resulting decision. Add fuller source and access entries as the work develops.

[Enter the arrangements, first AI task and examination plan, and unresolved decisions.]

The Evidence and Interpretation Map — Identify the first material and the question it can illuminate. Link its inventory entry, develop a provisional reading, and state what remains uncertain. Anticipated material is still a plan.

[Enter source identifiers and limits. Mark anticipated material as planned.]

The Reflection and Learning Journal — Preserve the assumption or judgment you want to examine, whose it is, why it is plausible and what experience could challenge or sustain it. Link the AI proposal where it affected this reasoning.

[Preserve the original wording and its date.]

The Ministry Experiment Journal — State what you need to understand before choosing an action and when you will review that understanding. When a trial is warranted, develop its Experiment Plan and the later Experiment Review within this journal.

[Enter the listening plan and review point. Leave an intervention open if it is not yet warranted.]

The Research Argument Map — Identify who will read the inquiry and the requirements to obtain. As claims develop, connect them to the question, their grounds and the contribution they may support. Add report locations as writing proceeds.

[Name the intended readers and requirements to obtain. Develop this map as writing approaches.]

Inquiry Register

Use this form with Appendix A. Replace the bracketed prompts with your own entries and expand the space as needed. Preserve earlier dated versions when a question or judgment changes. References to numbered sections refer to the book.

Begin with the Inquiry Brief

Describe the concern, people and setting, an open question, the practical purpose and the understanding sought. State the boundaries, theological commitments and one consequential assumption with its present reasons. Identify the first substantive AI task, the permitted material it will examine, and your next inquiry. Date this initial version.

[Initial brief; author and date; starting reasons; first AI task and response location; next question.]

Develop the Inquiry Register

The initial Inquiry Brief becomes the opening version of this register. Keep that brief, then develop the fields below as the inquiry requires them. Make the current direction easy to find while preserving earlier questions and the decisions that explain their development.

Identity and version. Give the project title, record identifier, candidate, setting, version, date, and location of the previous version. Name the person responsible for updating this record.

[Enter identity and version information.]

The concern and its significance. Describe the ministry practice closely enough for its difficulty to be understood. Separate your concern from what other people have said, and link the grounds for contextual claims. State the practical purpose alongside the research purpose: what would be useful in this setting, and what does the inquiry seek to understand? Revise both as the question develops (Sections 4.1 and 7.1).

[Concern and grounds; practical purpose; research purpose.]

Question and scope. State the current question, who or what it concerns, the period and setting, and what the inquiry will leave outside its reach. Preserve earlier question versions here with dates and reasons for revision. Link the Reflection and Learning Journal where a change involves reconsideration of an assumption or judgment. A question should permit an answer you did not hope to receive.

[Enter the question and boundaries.]

Research position and analytic approach. Explain the kind of knowledge sought, how accounts and observations will be interpreted, and why the chosen approach fits. Identify the candidate's role and relationships that could shape what is said or heard. Name any departure from a source method and explain its consequences. State how each proposed AI task fits this position, including whether it selects material or suggests meanings; link the decision in the Sources and AI Register. The planned augmentation should develop the inquiry's reasoning in each stage undertaken. Naming AWI does not name every analytic procedure the study requires (Section 6.1).

[Research position; analytic approach; departures and reasons; substantive AI tasks and their fit; Sources and AI Register links.]

Commitments and developing design

Commitments and assumptions. Distinguish a theological or ethical commitment from an empirical expectation. Preserve each consequential assumption's wording, holder and date; link its examination in the Reflection and Learning Journal. State how the commitments inform the inquiry without prescribing its findings.

[Enter commitments, assumptions and links to the Reflection and Learning Journal.]

The scholarly conversation. For each essential source, record the edition, passage read, argument relevant to the question, and the difference between that argument and your application. Name the uncertainty to which the inquiry might contribute. Keep reading still to be done visible.

Augmentation plan. Identify the intellectual contribution sought in Wide Listening; Interpretive Reading; Field Testing; Evaluation and Communal Discernment; and Theological Reflection. Name suitable tasks, permitted input types and how the proposals will be examined. Link completed exchanges through the Sources and AI Register as the plan develops. A task may change while the research purpose remains; record the reason.

[Literature conversation and provisional contribution; intended AI contribution in each stage, permitted material and examination plan.]

Design and participation. Describe recruitment, inclusion and exclusion, the proposed sample and its rationale, collection methods, accessibility, influence over decisions, and alternatives to taking part. Explain how the design can illuminate the question. Link data arrangements in the Sources and AI Register and the initial plan in the Ministry Experiment Journal.

[Enter the design and its rationale.]

Decision to proceed or revise. Record the person or body responsible for each necessary decision, its status, and the next review point. Institutional review, permission to conduct ministry activity, and an individual's research participation are distinct matters.

[Enter decisions, conditions and unresolved work.]

Inquiry Backlog and Decision Notes

The Inquiry Backlog is an ordered list of possible next work within this register. Include a question to investigate, a missing perspective, a source to examine, an AI inquiry, or a possible field investigation. The research question governs the list; not every item must be undertaken. Preserve the reason for deferring or setting aside a consequential item.

For each item, record its descriptive title, relation to the research question, reason for priority, evidence or access still needed, intended AI contribution where relevant, responsible person, status, and next review point. Use plain statuses such as proposed, ready, underway, awaiting information, completed, or set aside. Completion refers to the task, not proof of its underlying claim.

[Item and question link; reason for priority; material or access needed; intended AI work; owner; status and date; next review; result or reason set aside.]

A Decision Note preserves a consequential choice in the document where that choice belongs. In this register, use it for the question, design, priorities, or overall direction. Record the context, alternatives, decision, grounds, person responsible, date, status, consequences, and links. Keep an earlier decision when another supersedes it. An interpretation decision belongs with its claim; a trial decision belongs in the Ministry Experiment Journal. Link these notes rather than repeating them.

[Context; alternatives; decision and reasons; owner and date; proposed or agreed status; consequences; source and AI links; earlier or superseding decision.]

The Inquiry Backlog adapts Agile Alliance's account of an evolving backlog to the selection of research work (n.d.). Decision Notes adapt Nygard's context, decision, status and consequences structure (2011). These are AWI adaptations. A prioritized item remains a question or task to examine; its completion is not proof that a claim is true.

Sources and AI Register

Use this form with Appendix A. Replace the bracketed prompts with your own entries and expand the space as needed. Preserve earlier dated versions when a question or judgment changes. References to numbered sections refer to the book.

Identity and responsibility. Give the project identifier, version, date, data custodian and protected location. Keep any identity key separately under the agreed arrangements.

[Enter identity and responsibility.]

Source inventory entry. Repeat for each item. Give the stable source ID, source type, creator or participant code, date and circumstances, protected location, version, and usable locator. Distinguish a recording, checked transcript, contemporaneous note, later recollection and supplied document. Link the relevant permission entry in this register.

[Source ID; kind; circumstances; version; locator; permission entry link.]

Preparation entry. Explain transcription, correction, redaction or selection that affects interpretation. Preserve the source version. State who checked uncertain wording and what remains uncertain. A paraphrase stays a

paraphrase when moved into a working table. When a source changes, follow the correction chain described in Section 10.5.

[Preparation; correction grounds and checker; source version; affected claims and record links; rechecks; unresolved issues.]

Permission and access entry. Repeat this entry for each source or group of sources with the same actual terms. Identify the source IDs, what collection was agreed, how agreement was recorded, withdrawal or correction arrangements, and the uses allowed. Distinguish research use, shared discussion, quotation, examiner access, public reporting and external processing. Record a restriction as precisely as the permission.

[Source IDs; agreement evidence and date; permitted uses; restrictions; unresolved uses.]

Storage and lifecycle entry. Name the protected original, working copies, permitted users, transfer arrangements, retention and deletion decisions, and the applicable institutional guidance. Record how changes or incidents will be handled. Do not infer permission from the fact that a file is accessible.

[Locations; responsible people; access; retention; review and disposal arrangements.]

AI tasks and their examination

AI task entry. Repeat for each consequential use. Give the task ID and date, intellectual purpose, tool and model/version as available, relevant settings, and environment used. Link the rationale in the Inquiry Register and identify the material supplied, input version, actual prompt and output locations. State whether the task develops a question, organizes material, proposes interpretations, examines an action plan, develops theological reasoning or constructs an argument. Explain how it fits the approach and why this use of the material is permitted. Preserve context already available to the model and any selection among responses. Record unavailable details as unavailable.

[Task ID and date; intellectual purpose; Inquiry Register rationale; task fit; tool details; permitted input; existing context; exact prompt and output; response selection if any.]

Examination and disposition. Identify who compared the response with which sources and input version. Record what it developed, omitted or distorted; what you retained, qualified or rejected; and the reasons. Trace its effect on a question, interpretation, action, theological argument or report. For a small collection, compare all relevant supplied accounts. Where a source cannot be processed, record how the task was redesigned around permitted material. Link the candidate's own reasoning in the Reflection and Learning Journal when a learning claim is pursued (Sections 5.5 and 10.4).

[Examiner and date; sources and input version; intellectual contribution; examination and limits; disposition and reasons; downstream locations; Reflection and Learning Journal link where relevant.]

Reporting entry. Draft a disclosure sufficient for a reader to understand the actual assistance and responsibility. Link fuller details where appropriate and permitted. Do not reproduce protected prompts publicly merely to demonstrate transparency. Jones's disclosure heuristic informs the questions to ask, but this compact register is an AWI adaptation, not a claim to reproduce or validate that entire heuristic (Jones 2025).

[Disclosure; intended audience; supporting details available; limits on access.]

Evidence and Interpretation Map

Use this form with Appendix A. Replace the bracketed prompts with your own entries and expand the space as needed. Preserve earlier dated versions when a question or judgment changes. References to numbered sections refer to the book.

Identity and corpus boundary. State the record version, date, current question, what material is included, what is excluded, and why. Name any parts not yet read or unavailable. Three selected examples are not automatically the whole dataset.

[Enter the question, corpus boundary and reading status.]

Selected-source view. Identify the sources included in this particular analysis by linking their inventory and preparation entries in the Sources and AI Register. Explain the selection and what remains outside this reading. Keep one authoritative source location and propagate corrections to the claims that use it.

[Included source links; selection grounds; exclusions; correction links.]

Provisional pattern entry. Record a working label, the passages that prompted it, material that complicates it, and what remains undecided. Link the AI comparison and your examination in the Sources and AI Register, including source coverage and any proposed grouping you rejected. Note how you searched beyond the first attractive examples. A repeated word and an interpretive theme are different kinds of analytic result.

[Pattern label; source locators; contrary material; missing perspectives; next reading.]

Claims and theological reasoning

Interpretive memo. Explain the proposed relationship among accounts, context, alternatives, and the researcher's part in reaching the reading. Where a surprise prompts a new explanation, preserve the earlier expectation, the detail it missed, competing readings, and what further material could distinguish them. Identify participant responses and their circumstances; agreement does not certify the whole analysis (Sections 6.3–6.5). Link the generated proposal, its examination and the resulting interpretation to the Sources and AI Register. Identify what the input already supplied and what the response developed.

[Interpretation and grounds; competing explanations; participant response; further evidence; decision and limits.]

Claim view. This is a view within the Evidence and Interpretation Map. Give the claim ID, exact wording and version, and the question version in the Inquiry Register that it answers. State its scope; supporting and challenging source locators; the analytic reasoning; what is missing; and the current judgment. When using the four judgments from Chapter 8, distinguish supported within limits, supported with revision, not supported, and inconclusive. Preserve both original and revised wording. Separate an empirical finding from a theological judgment or a proposed action.

[Claim ID and version; Inquiry Register question version; scope; evidence; reasoning; judgment; original and revised wording where needed.]

Theological reasoning entry. Link the empirical claims to which this argument responds, preserving the difference between those claims and the theological judgment. Explain the candidate's theological position, sources and contexts, and the reasoning relating them to the experience. Where useful, compare professed commitments, enacted practice, authoritative texts and scholarly arguments as in Section 9.1; these voices can overlap. Address alternatives and unresolved tensions, distinguishing what the material illuminates from the theological judgment defended. Preserve the AI-generated relation or alternative you examined, the sources used to assess it and the practical consequence, with the full exchange in the Sources and AI Register.

[Empirical claim links; theological argument; source passages and locators; alternatives; responsibilities and limits.]

Handoff. Explain whether the interpretation warrants a bounded action, further listening, a changed question or deferral. Link the decision in the Ministry Experiment Journal and any changed assumption in the Reflection and Learning Journal. State what the next step could illuminate and what it cannot establish.

[Decision; reasons; record links; remaining limits.]

Reflection and Learning Journal

Use this form with Appendix A. Replace the bracketed prompts with your own entries and expand the space as needed. Preserve earlier dated versions when a question or judgment changes. References to numbered sections refer to the book.

Entry identity. Give the project and entry IDs, author, date, relevant question version and linked entry in the Inquiry Register. State whether the entry was made at the time or reconstructed later, and on what basis.

[Enter identity, timing and links.]

The assumption or judgment before review. Preserve its exact wording and identify whose judgment it was. Explain the grounds then available and the decision it shaped. Write this reasoning before the relevant AI task when possible. Identify a later reconstruction as such; do not present it as a contemporary baseline.

[Original wording; holder; earlier grounds; consequence.]

The encounter that calls for attention. Link the particular account, observation, disagreement or outcome and explain why it matters. Identify the AI proposal you examined through its Sources and AI Register entry, its grounds and your disposition of it. Preserve the separate contribution of a participant's response, a source and your own reasoning. A changed judgment needs an explanation; surprise alone does not supply one.

[Source locator; encounter; significance for the assumption.]

Alternatives examined. Could the original judgment still be reasonable? What other explanation fits? What source or perspective would distinguish these possibilities? Do not manufacture dissonance to fill the form.

[Alternative readings and their grounds.]

Judgment and later learning

Judgment after review. State whether the judgment is retained, qualified, replaced or still unresolved. Preserve the former wording. Identify what changed in your way of framing or judging the situation, as distinct from a change in activity alone.

[Current judgment; reason; link to evidence and relevant theological reasoning.]

Consequence and later check. What has changed in the way you seek understanding, and what conduct is actually recorded? Distinguish the revised question or plan from its enactment. Explain a proposed later occasion that could examine persistence or use in a different situation, including the differences that would matter. Add its result only when available.

[Action already taken; proposal; later check; result when available.]

Limits and continuity. State whose learning is claimed and what supports it. Distinguish improved work, explained reasoning, later conduct, and changes in group practice. For communal learning, identify how members' contributions affected a shared judgment, retaining differences; a proposal alone does not establish changed practice. Explain what remains unknown and link the Ministry Experiment Journal and the Research Argument Map. These questions guide evidence gathering; they are not a validated assessment scale (Section 10.3).

[Bounded learning claim; unresolved matters; links.]

Ministry Experiment Journal

Use this form with Appendix A. Replace the bracketed prompts with your own entries and expand the space as needed. Preserve earlier dated versions when a question or judgment changes. References to numbered sections refer to the book.

This journal follows a bounded trial from its plan through the event, feedback, review, and next decision. The Experiment Plan and Experiment Review are sections of the journal. A provisional entry may identify learning needed before an intervention has been chosen; it does not imply that a trial has begun.

The Experiment Review examines this attempt and its immediate practical implications. Stage Four, Evaluation and Communal Discernment, develops the fuller empirical account with participant perspectives and shared examination. Stage Five develops the theological argument. Link those judgments back here as they become available. A review or next decision may remain open pending that work; preserve its status rather than inventing an earlier conclusion.

Planning with the Experiment Plan

Cycle identity and initial learning plan. Give the cycle ID, version, dates or planned interval, current question and responsible people. Begin before an intervention has been chosen if listening is the next warranted step. State what the inquiry needs to understand, how it will be approached, and the review point. Keep any evaluation of practitioner or team learning proportionate to the stated research purpose and participation arrangements. Link the Inquiry Register, the Sources and AI Register, and relevant entries in the Reflection and Learning Journal.

[Identity; question; initial learning purpose; arrangements; review point.]

Reason for the next step. Link the reading in the Evidence and Interpretation Map. Explain why action, further listening, revision or deferral is warranted. If proposing an action, name the decision still open and the alternatives considered, including no change. Link the AI comparison of alternatives and your reasons for selecting or revising a proposed course.

[Grounds; open decision; alternatives; chosen route.]

Participation and feasibility. Record whose experience matters, who can influence which decisions, roles people have actually accepted, contribution limits, resources, and responsibility for work left undone. A group of three to five and a short cycle are possible starting points; explain the scale appropriate here.

[People and decision rights; accepted roles and limits; coverage and resources.]

Action and observation plan. Specify the proposed change, place and period; what remains constant; what material could answer the question; who will record it; and how differing or absent experiences will be approached without pressure. Link I.G.N.i.T.E. planning where useful. Set the review time, pause conditions, response to distress or breached agreements, and who may stop the activity. Link the AI examination of what the plan can distinguish and the observation questions retained from it.

[Plan; evidence sought; recorder; follow-up; review; pause and response arrangements.]

What happened and what was observed

What occurred. Keep the planned account above and add events with dates, source kinds and locators. Distinguish observation from another person's explanation. Record deviations and immediate responses, including care or corrective action. Link the consent and access terms for new material in the Sources and AI Register.

[Event entries; deviations; explanations and their sources; immediate action.]

Review the attempt with the Experiment Review

Begin with what the available record supports about this attempt. Compare the plan and what occurred, specify material still needed, and link relevant AI comparisons and their examination through the Sources and AI Register. Date each review and identify its participants and available material. A later explanation must not become something known during the event.

[Review date and scope; plan and event links; completed and missed commitments; accounts available; AI examination link; unresolved matters; decisions pending.]

Participant and communal review. Record who was offered which route to respond, who responded, what each response concerned, and the limits on its use. Preserve disagreement, silence and absence without inventing their meaning. Where a contribution changed a shared decision, identify the contribution and the reason. Keep that decision distinct from later enactment, and a limited shared account distinct from a private fuller account.

[Review routes; response IDs; disagreement; permission limits; decisions.]

Findings and theological responsibilities. Link the reviewed empirical claims and theological reasoning in the Evidence and Interpretation Map. Identify their consequences for this trial or a proposed later attempt. Keep the full argument in its source location and state whether the resulting practical response is proposed, undertaken, or evaluated.

[Reviewed claim and theological argument links; consequence for the trial; proposed, undertaken or evaluated status.]

Explain the next decision

Next decision. Explain the reasons for continuing, changing, pausing or ending. Name the person responsible and the next review point. Mark whether the action is proposed, undertaken, or evaluated, and link the actual event and review entries where they exist. Distinguish an action already taken from a proposed next trial; do not fill a later result before it is available. Link learning in the Reflection and Learning Journal and any design revision in the Inquiry Register. Unfavorable findings can warrant stopping.

[Decision; grounds; owner; action status; event or review links if available; next review.]

Research Argument Map

Use this form with Appendix A. Replace the bracketed prompts with your own entries and expand the space as needed. Preserve earlier dated versions when a question or judgment changes. References to numbered sections refer to the book.

Requirements and audience. Give the project, record version and date. Identify the actual handbook or guidance, its version and relevant sections; the intended examiner and public audiences; and the person who can resolve uncertainties. Appendix D supplies a fuller writing worksheet.

[Requirements sources; audiences; unresolved questions and responsible person.]

Argument map entry. Repeat for each major claim or report function. State the question and its version in the Inquiry Register, the exact claim and version in the Evidence and Interpretation Map, the report section or page, and links to supporting material in the other research documents. For methodological claims, link the approach in the Inquiry Register and consequential AI tasks in the Sources and AI Register so that a reader can examine their fit. When reporting action or learning, carry the Ministry Experiment Journal's distinction between a proposal, an action undertaken, and an evaluated result. Check that the abstract, synopsis, findings and conclusion use the same scope and degree of certainty.

[Question and claim versions; report location; source links; method fit; action status where relevant; consistency check.]

Review entry. Name what was examined, by whom, when, against which criteria, and with what access. Record the response and any resulting change. Distinguish the candidate's review, supervision, participant engagement and an independent audit. A methodologically informed reviewer can still have a relationship that needs disclosure.

[Review purpose; reviewer relationship; material available; findings; response.]

Access and reporting decision. For each sensitive item, identify the use permitted in the Sources and AI Register, what this audience may see, the authorized location, what is withheld or summarized, and the consequence for assessment. If essential grounds cannot be assessed through an acceptable arrangement, narrow or omit the claim, or resolve the arrangement before submission.

[Item; audience; permission; access route; restriction; effect on claim.]

Contribution and examination

Contribution and limits. Connect the findings to the literature and theological argument. State the contribution warranted here, alternative explanations, limits of transfer, and work still needed. A proposal is not an observed outcome.

[Contribution; scholarly relationship; limits; further work.]

Examination preparation. Record a difficult question, a concise answer, its source locators, and what would make you qualify the answer. Practise explaining how an unwelcome finding changed the report as carefully as a favorable one.

[Question; answer; grounds; concession or unresolved point.]

Final continuity check. Check identifiers, dates, question versions, claim wording, quotations, references, AI disclosures, permissions, and report destinations. Record what remains unresolved and its consequence. State who completed the check and when.

[Checks completed; unresolved items; disposition; reviewer and date.]