

Tutti Table Worked Example

Paul Moon • AI-Augmented Witness Inquiry

This worked example gathers selected entries from all six working documents. It follows the fictional inquiry through its first trial and review. The excerpts illustrate reasoning and connections; they do not constitute a completed real project or supply missing permissions, sampling details, or later outcomes. Read it alongside Chapters 1 and 4–11.

A gathering and an assumption

The people and events in this case are fictional. The excerpted records bring together its reasoning across the book; they do not supply interviews, permissions or institutional decisions that the chapters never specified. The AI exchanges alongside it are actual editorial demonstrations using fictional packets. Their date and provenance belong to manuscript preparation. They are not events observed in the pastor's inquiry.

Study Cafe supplies the background to this fictional inquiry. Searches for a place to study with others drew the pastor's attention to an underserved need. After the congregation opened the space, people using it wanted somewhere to gather before their Friday nightlife. Tutti Table began as a response to that further need. The pastor's hypothesis is that participants experience the gathering as a place where they belong. That expectation gives the inquiry a purpose; participants' accounts must establish what can be said about it.

The pastor now has something worth understanding: how people experience the welcome offered at Tutti Table. She also wants contributions to be freely given. Her hopes can guide her attention, but they leave questions that attendees must be able to answer differently.

The sequence matters. An initial brief and learning plan precede listening. Two successive Friday meals and separately arranged conversations provide the initial listening period. Interpretation leads to follow-up, then to a preparation week and one trial Friday. Review follows that event. No second trial has occurred in the teaching case. The separate rehearsals of interpretation in Chapter 2 and planning in Chapter 3 are not additional case evidence. Chapter 5's weekday visiting collection is also separate; its sources L01–L09 are not additional Tutti Table accounts.

The five stages make the work of that sequence easier to distinguish. Wide Listening and Interpretive Reading develop the question; Field Testing undertakes the bounded attempt. Evaluation and Communal Discernment examine its differing accounts, and Theological Reflection develops the responsibility they bring into view. The field journal's review and next decision remain open until the necessary grounds are available. Individual reflection accompanies the whole inquiry.

M01–M06 identify people in the case; C1 identifies the first action cycle. Within the Ministry Experiment Journal, C1-B01 is the baseline, C1-D01 the decision history, C1-E01 the event note, C1-R02–C1-R06 the responses and C1-G01 the shared review. The Evidence and Interpretation Map cites these entries when evaluating claims. Editorial AI exchanges have separate F, G and J identifiers. These identifiers retain their original meaning; the six working documents use the names shown below.

Chapter 4's design-packet labels and Chapter 5's visiting-source labels are explained where they are used. They are separate from the Tutti Table case identifiers. Appendix B indexes the AI exchanges across the book.

Inquiry Brief to Inquiry Register From concern to question

Fictional Inquiry Register excerpt. The starting question is, “How is Tutti Table helping people belong?” It carries an expectation in its wording. During design, the question becomes, “How do adult participants describe what they value, find difficult, or would change about Tutti Table?” The revised question makes space for accounts that would not confirm the pastor’s expectation.

The initial theological commitment is that hospitality involves receiving neighbors generously and making room for contributions they choose freely. A distinct empirical assumption is retained for examination: “Clearly stating that a contribution may be limited or declined will be enough to protect that freedom.” The pastor holds this assumption; it is not attributed to the participants.

Following interpretation and further conversation, the question narrows again: “How do participants experience an opportunity to influence this meal decision, including their freedom to limit involvement, and what, if anything, does that experience mean for their place in the gathering?” The wording travels into the action plan and evaluation. It does not promise to demonstrate lasting belonging.

Keep the first brief and all three question versions in the Inquiry Register. A Decision Note gives the reason for narrowing the question, with the relevant interpretive entry linked. The Reflection and Learning Journal explains any change in the pastor’s way of judging. A possible later inquiry about wider belonging can remain in the Inquiry Backlog without becoming a promised outcome of this trial.

The inquiry concerns adult participants’ accounts and a bounded decision about serving time. The sample excerpts do not provide a denominator for all attendees or a complete recruitment record. The pastor’s authority and involvement remain relevant to what people may be willing to say. A real brief would give the local design, sampling rationale, institutional decisions and fuller scholarly engagement. These cannot be inferred from the existence of the teaching example.

Sources and AI Register What may be used and how

Fictional Sources and AI Register excerpt. M01–M06 are participant codes. The case distinguishes willingness to contribute research material from willingness to undertake ministry work. It also distinguishes permission for one conversation or shared review from permission for quotation, examination, publication or external AI processing.

M04 permits the limited concern about the additional task to enter the shared review and retains a private route for further response. That limited agreement does not establish permission to disclose the fuller response to examiners, the public or an external AI service. The case does not supply a complete permission register for all participants. Chapter 4’s prospective discussion of processing M03’s material is not evidence that the permission was later obtained.

The actual editorial exchanges demonstrate how augmentation can operate alongside this case and the separate exercises. Appendix B indexes all twelve exchanges by chapter and task and points to AWI Complete AI Demonstrations in the reader companion. It preserves the fixed inputs, responses and examinations. The generated proposals help develop the inquiry’s reasoning; they do not replace the case evidence.

G1 shows how one exchange can serve connected tasks. Its comparison of Tutti Table sources informs the map in Section 5.6; the same response’s alternative readings continue in Section 6.2. G2 reconsiders those readings alongside the established participant clarifications. G2’s prompt supplied the distinction between running the gathering and other possible roles in decisions.

All twelve responses were generated on September 21, 2026 by the Codex assistant in the existing manuscript conversation and examined by that same assistant. Later case context was available; the responses are not independent confirmations or blind discoveries. Exact model identifiers and generation settings were not captured.

In an actual project, the Sources and AI Register would preserve the source inventory, preparation history, exchanges and the candidate's examination. The Evidence and Interpretation Map would develop retained empirical and theological reasoning. The Ministry Experiment Journal would link any practical consequence, the Reflection and Learning Journal would explain reconsideration, and the Research Argument Map would trace the contribution into the report. The model need not originate every idea to make an intellectual contribution; that contribution must still be distinguished from participant evidence.

Evidence and Interpretation Map Listening and interpretation

Fictional Evidence and Interpretation Map excerpt. The initial comparison uses three selected sources. M01 note paragraph 1 is the pastor's paraphrase that M01 valued the company. M02 note paragraph 1 is the pastor's paraphrase that dinner offered relief after work. Neither is a verbatim quotation. M03 transcript answer 1 contains the recorded answer:

"I like knowing there will be someone to sit with. But we find out what is happening after it's decided. I'd like us to have a say."

The whole answer matters. Appreciation and a request for influence belong together. The record does not yet establish whether having a say means consultation, an organizing role, or something else. The three selected sources also do not establish how common any experience is among attendees.

G1's editorial comparison keeps company, practical relief and the request for influence distinct. Section 5.6 uses that comparison to explain the provisional map; Section 6.2 develops alternative readings of M03's request. One Sources and AI Register entry therefore supports two connected teaching functions. In an actual inquiry, the researcher would preserve the permitted packet and exchange there and develop the resulting interpretation in the Evidence and Interpretation Map.

In the follow-up, M03 says, "If you move the time, ask us while it can still change. I don't want to run it." M02 says, "After work, I just want to sit down with dinner. Please don't give me another job." M01 gives no response; the reason is unknown. These qualifications make the developing interpretation more specific. Having influence and assuming responsibility for running the gathering cannot be treated as the same wish.

The handoff to design is a question about an actual opportunity to influence a still-open decision, alongside freedom to limit involvement. It gives the trial a purpose while leaving the wider significance for belonging open. The original brief and subsequent question versions remain in the Inquiry Register, linked to the interpretive grounds and any reconsideration explained in the Reflection and Learning Journal.

Reflection and Learning Journal An assumption kept available

Fictional Reflection and Learning Journal excerpt before the trial. Preserve the pastor's assumption about clearly stating the freedom to decline. Link it to the theological commitment in the Inquiry Register. Listening may uncover whether the question or proposed action needs revision; it has not yet tested whether a stated contribution limit will hold during an event.

The pastor's early expectation about belonging also changes the way the opening question is framed. That question revision is a design development. It should not be presented as an outcome showing that the intervention changed the pastor or the attendees.

The entry after the trial appears below, after the evidence that makes the revision intelligible. This order prevents the final insight from being written backward into the initial record.

Ministry Experiment Journal Planning the first trial

Fictional Experiment Plan within the Ministry Experiment Journal. The design group consists of the pastor, coordinator, M03 and M04. M02 has a separate route to respond. Four people is a workable choice in this illustration, not an AWI sample-size requirement.

C1-B01 records the earlier decision practice: the coordinator prepared the serving schedule around volunteers and the building; the pastor approved it before public notice. Informal suggestions were possible, but there was no regular consultation before the decision. The existing schedule was checked. C1-B01 remains the baseline identifier within the journal.

The usual serving window is 6:00–7:00. During the preparation week, consultation is offered through writing, brief conversations and a private route. A possible shift of the window by half an hour remains open. M04 needs the 6:00 start, and M02 favors a later finish. The group chooses to retain 6:00 and extend serving to 7:15 for one Friday. C1-D01 is the Decision Note preserving the options, responses, decision and reasons within the Ministry Experiment Journal.

M04 agrees to about twenty minutes reviewing and distributing the notice during the preparation week. That agreement includes no kitchen or serving duty. The coordinator remains responsible for staffing. M03 seeks influence over the decision and does not want to run the gathering. This does not settle every possible continuing role in decisions. The plan records the feasible arrangements, accepted limits and follow-up. A designated record keeper will observe without also serving; this person is not described as an independent observer.

Five consenting participants, M02–M06, belong to the follow-up group. Four attend the trial; M06 does not. M01 is outside this follow-up group. These distinctions prevent the missing follow-up and the event absence from being collapsed into one form of nonparticipation.

Ministry Experiment Journal: What happened

Fictional event entry in the Ministry Experiment Journal. C1-E01 records a 6:10 start, a 7:15 finish and M04 carrying plates at 7:05. The coordinator later explains that preparation ran behind. The observation and the later explanation remain separate. M02 obtains dinner during the extended window. The opening time was missed; the closing time was kept.

The five follow-up entries supply different kinds of grounds:

C1-R02. “The later finish helped. I could come after work and still get dinner. I wasn’t looking for a bigger role.” This supports practical benefit for M02 without attributing a desire for additional responsibility.

C1-R03. “This time you asked while we could still change it. I could raise a problem and it mattered.” The account continues: “I still come for the company. I felt more able to speak about this decision. I don’t know yet whether anything else has changed.” Influence over the decision is described; its wider relational significance is unsettled.

C1-R04. “I said I could help with the notice. When I was asked to take the plates through, I felt I couldn’t really say no.” Read with C1-E01, this makes pressure around the extra work available for interpretation. The observer did not know that experience merely by seeing the plates.

C1-R05. “I saw the new time. I didn’t see anything asking what I thought before it was decided.” The final notice reached M05; effective access to the earlier consultation did not. The reason remains unresolved.

C1-R06. “I got the invitation, but I wasn’t there on Friday. I can’t tell you how the meal went.” This is an account of receiving an invitation, not an assessment of the event.

Ministry Experiment Journal The developing Experiment Review

Fictional Experiment Review excerpt. C1-G01 preserves the shared review and the permitted private responses. M04's limited concern enters the discussion under the terms already described. The coordinator confirms making the request and knowing the original preparation-only limit, while explaining that the small request had not seemed like a change of role. M03 asks who will carry unfinished work, shifting attention beyond clearer wording alone. M05 confirms the distinction between seeing the final notice and encountering consultation. M02 continues to value the later finish without seeking an additional role.

The coordinator apologizes. This has occurred in the fiction. It does not require M04 to forgive publicly, resume helping, or supply a favorable account of the review. Changed staffing coverage, revised invitations and another extension remain proposals. Neither clearer agreements nor revised coverage has yet been tested as a remedy.

The immediate field review can identify what happened and what needs attention. The fuller participant and shared accounts now allow Stage Four to examine claims about those events. The Experiment Review links that developing analysis and keeps a later decision open where its grounds are still incomplete. Record each account at its actual place in the chronology.

Evidence and Interpretation Map Evaluation and Communal Discernment

Fictional empirical claim view. M03's experience of consequential influence is **supported within limits** by C1-R03 and the open decision and revised proposal in C1-D01. It concerns one person's experience of this decision. Familiarity with the pastor or attention from the inquiry may also matter; the design does not isolate their effects.

The claim that contribution boundaries were honored throughout is **not supported**. C1-R04, C1-E01 and the review account give relevant grounds for withdrawing it. This judgment does not erase M02's practical benefit or establish that every participant felt pressure.

Whether the opportunity changed M03's wider sense of being part of the gathering is **inconclusive** beyond the reported opening to speak. C1-R03 leaves further change uncertain. That uncertainty is not a finding that no change occurred.

The proposed composite claim, "Consultation enabled influence while protecting freedom from additional work," is **supported with revision** only when both the original and replacement remain visible. The revised wording is: "M03 reported meaningful influence over this decision; the attempt did not consistently secure either access to consultation or freedom from additional work." The revision withdraws the unsupported conjunction; it does not rename the breached agreement as success.

A statement that the trial caused lasting growth in belonging would exceed the design. It remains an example of an overclaim, outside the findings. It is not a failed causal hypothesis the study set out to test.

The initial hypothesis that participants experience Tutti Table as a place of belonging therefore remains open at the wider level. The accounts warrant particular claims about company, practical benefit and influence. Those claims give the pastor more to understand without establishing a common experience of belonging.

Reflection and Learning Journal What the pastor can say about learning

Fictional Reflection and Learning Journal excerpt after review. The original assumption was that clearly stating a contribution could be limited or declined would be enough. M04's experience and the coordinator's account give grounds to revise it. The pastor now recognizes a responsibility for organizers to account for unfinished work and for requests made under pressure, alongside the wording of an agreement.

The contrast between the earlier entry and the later reasoning supports an account of the pastor reconsidering this assumption. The apology is an action already taken by the coordinator. Revised coverage is a proposal. Evidence

that the revised judgment persists in later practice is still absent. A later cycle could examine that question, but the journal must not supply its answer in advance.

Evidence and Interpretation Map Theological Reflection

Fictional theological reasoning entry. The candidate begins from a Christian commitment to receive neighbors generously. Romans 12:1–13 locates practical generosity and hospitality within a response to God’s mercies and an account of differing gifts. Hebrews 13:1–3 places hospitality to strangers alongside continuing love and attention to vulnerable others. Leviticus 19:33–34 joins treatment of the resident stranger with love and Israel’s remembered experience in Egypt. These are distinct scriptural settings, read in NASB 2020; the meal is not simply identified with every group addressed in them.

From these texts, the candidate argues that welcome should allow a neighbor to receive what is offered and contribute freely. M02’s dinner after work can matter on its own terms. M04’s account asks whether the organizers’ conduct matched their commitment. The candidate also considers the warnings about status and unequal table fellowship in Luke 14:7–14 and 1 Corinthians 11:17–34. These readings place responsibility on the organizers as well as on the person invited to help.

The field accounts illuminate how this practice was experienced. They do not establish that God endorsed the trial, that numerical growth would prove faithfulness, or that every participant shares the candidate’s theological understanding. The candidate must explain the interpretation and engage relevant scholarship and the candidate’s actual tradition. The case supplies no named denomination to fill that place.

Sections 9.2–9.4 and 11.2 place the case in conversation with hospitality scholarship. These are the book’s teaching applications; they do not establish when the fictional pastor read those sources. The full theological argument belongs in the Evidence and Interpretation Map. Its practical consequence returns to the Ministry Experiment Journal: address contribution boundaries and access to consultation before assuming another extension is warranted. Pivoting may lead to changed arrangements, further listening or a pause. These possibilities remain proposed, with no second trial or remedy outcome to report.

Research Argument Map Carrying the case into a report

Fictional Research Argument Map excerpt. The context and question point to the Inquiry Register and the baseline in the Ministry Experiment Journal. The methods account links the design, source inventory and actual interpretive work. The trial account follows C1-D01, C1-E01 and C1-R02–C1-R06. Findings and theological reasoning remain in the Evidence and Interpretation Map; the learning account points to the Reflection and Learning Journal. Alongside this fictional route, the book identifies where actual editorial AI proposals entered its teaching argument. A real project would trace its own augmentation from the Sources and AI Register to the relevant claims and report passages.

The central contribution can be stated proportionately: this inquiry distinguishes a consequential opportunity for influence from reliable access to consultation and freedom from extra work. Those experiences did not move together in the first trial. The distinction helps the candidate question an assumption about hospitality and specify what a next action would need to address. It does not establish the effectiveness of the proposed remedy.

The Research Argument Map also records what a particular reader may inspect. The fictional case provides no actual dissertation pages, institution or examiner-access agreement. Those are fields for a real project to complete. A candidate could not cure missing permission by placing a private account in an appendix. If a central claim could not be appropriately assessed, its use or the arrangements would need reconsideration.

This is where the teaching case ends: a useful meal, a consequential opportunity to speak, an agreement not consistently honored, and a more exact account of responsibility. The record permits the next decision to begin from those differences.