



**5th.International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

From Aspirational Taqrib to Evidence-Governed Dialogue: A Measurement-Oriented Islamic Theological Dialogue Framework for Intra-Islamic Unity

**SeyyedAbdolHojjat MoghadasNian*, SeyyedMehdi AlizadehMousavi,
SeyyedMohammadMahdi HosseinPoor, Mahdi Farmanian, Akbar Bagheri**

1. University of Religions and Denominations (URD), s14110213@gmail.com
2. University of Religions and Denominations (URD), SMA.Moosavi@urd.ac.ir
3. University of Religions and Denominations (URD), SMM.HosseinPoor@urd.ac.ir
4. University of Religions and Denominations (URD), Farmanian@urd.ac.ir
5. University of Religions and Denominations (URD), A.Bagheri@urd.ac.ir

Abstract

Intra-Islamic theological dialogue is widely affirmed as a doctrinal, ethical, and civilizational necessity, yet many initiatives remain episodic, weakly documented, and difficult to translate into institutional learning. This article develops the Islamic Theological Dialogue Framework (ITDF) as a conceptual-methodological Design Science Research artifact for governing structured theological-dialogue initiatives without reducing doctrinal truth to numerical performance. The framework is derived from an integrative review of Islamic disagreement ethics, comparative and interfaith theology, design science, performance-measurement methodology, and AI/data governance, together with the author's prior framework lineage and an aligned KPI workbook. The design output comprises five higher-order domains, fourteen operational axes, six non-compensatory safeguard gates, and 280 candidate indicators divided equally between Strategic Progress Indicators and Crisis Warning Indicators. ITDF separates a normative order comprising revelation, qualified authority, doctrinal dignity, and legitimate disagreement from a governance order concerned with evidence traceability, semantic clarification, representation, adab, escalation, institutional follow-through, privacy, and human oversight of AI/NLP tools. It also specifies an eight-stage validation pathway involving expert review, modified Delphi, CVR/CVI, transparent weighting, intercoder reliability, bounded piloting, dimensional diagnostics, and independent governance evaluation. The article contributes a non-reductionist measurement logic for theological dialogue and a testable institutional architecture for converting symbolic engagement into auditable learning. No empirical effectiveness, validated weights, causal outcomes, or cross-context generalizability are claimed.



Keywords: Islamic theology; Kalām; taqrīb; adab al-hiwār; adab al-ikhtilāf; design science research; KPI governance; semantic alignment; responsible AI; interfaith readiness.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background and Context

Intra-Islamic theological dialogue occupies a normatively sensitive space between revelation, rational argument, juristic authority, communal identity, and institutional responsibility. Modern taqrīb precedents establish foundations for mutual recognition, anti-takfīr discipline, qualified authority, principled disagreement, and interfaith engagement. The Amman Message articulated recognition boundaries among Muslim schools and conditions governing legitimate fatwā authority [1]; A Common Word demonstrated that shared theological language can support interfaith engagement without dissolving doctrinal difference [2]; and the ethics-of-disagreement tradition frames disagreement as a practice governed by evidence, fairness, restraint, and communal responsibility [3].

Normative commitments, however, do not automatically create institutional learning. Dialogue bodies may convene meetings and issue declarations while lacking consistent mechanisms for evidence traceability, semantic clarification, qualified representation, decision ownership, escalation, and follow-through. Contemporary analysis also shows that Sunni–Shī‘a relations are institutionally and contextually differentiated [4], while comparative theology requires engagement across boundaries without surrendering faithful rootedness or interpretive particularity [5,6].

Multilingual digital platforms and AI-assisted text processing can extend dialogue, but they also intensify risks of decontextualized quotation, semantic misclassification, privacy exposure, opaque inference, and authority confusion. Contemporary AI-governance frameworks therefore make human oversight, traceability, accountability, and risk control central design requirements [7,8].

Design Science Research (DSR) provides the primary theoretical lens because ITDF is an artifact intended to address a consequential institutional problem. DSR requires a defensible connection among problem relevance, theoretical rigor, artifact construction, and evaluation [9-11]. A critical-political rival lens emphasizes power asymmetry, geopolitical incentives, unequal representation, and institutional instrumentalization. ITDF therefore treats governance as necessary but insufficient: procedural quality cannot compensate for coercion, illegitimate authority, or structural exclusion.

1.2 Problem Statement and Research Gap

The research problem is the absence of a reproducible and ethically bounded operating architecture for converting theological dialogue from episodic activity into auditable institutional learning. Existing initiatives may not reliably distinguish clarified convergence from rhetorical agreement, legitimate disagreement from avoidable semantic



misunderstanding, or successful convening from durable governance capacity. The challenge is not simply how to measure dialogue, but how to govern measurement so that indicators assess observable processes such as evidence linkage, adab compliance, semantic precision, representation, escalation, and action closure without scoring doctrinal truth, piety, orthodoxy, sincerity, school legitimacy, or salvation.

The decisive gap is a missing integration mechanism. Islamic dialogue scholarship provides normative resources but seldom translates them into auditable constructs, decision rights, evidence rules, and validation procedures. DSR explains artifact development [9-11], while composite-indicator research addresses weighting, aggregation, robustness, and transparency [12]; neither stream alone resolves the epistemic risks of transferring measurement into sacred domains. The theoretical tension is therefore how to make dialogue governable without making doctrine managerial.

1.3 Purpose, Questions, and Conceptual Model

This article develops and justifies ITDF as a non-reductionist, evidence-governed, and validation-ready DSR artifact for intra-Islamic dialogue and downstream interfaith readiness.

PRQ: How can Islamic theological dialogue be transformed from an aspirational and episodic practice into an evidence-governed, ethically bounded, KPI-enabled architecture without reducing doctrinal truth to numerical performance?

Five secondary questions examine: (SRQ1) the domains and operational axes required; (SRQ2) the indicator families and safeguard gates that can govern dialogue processes; (SRQ3) the sequencing of expert, content-validity, weighting, reliability, dimensional, and pilot procedures; (SRQ4) the bounded role of human-supervised AI/NLP; and (SRQ5) the boundary conditions and misuse controls required.

The conceptual model posits that a legitimate normative order constrains a governance order through non-compensatory safeguards. When authority, representation, adab, privacy, and human oversight are satisfied, evidence traceability, semantic clarification, and institutional follow-through may support clarified convergence, transparent non-convergence, institutional memory, and interfaith readiness. The model predicts neither doctrinal uniformity nor causal social harmony.

1.4 Significance, Scope, and Contributions

The unit of analysis is the structured theological-dialogue initiative, including participants, claims, sources, terminology, records, decisions, digital tools, and follow-up actions. The framework is intended for settings with recognized authority, accountable institutions, documented evidence, and privacy safeguards; it is not designed for anonymous social-media disputes, coercive environments, armed conflict, or sectarian ranking. No validated weights, causal effects, empirical effectiveness findings, or universal generalizability are claimed.



This paper contributes by (1) defining a checkable boundary between non-measurable doctrinal truth and measurable governance conditions; (2) extending DSR through a normatively constrained theological-dialogue artifact; (3) introducing non-compensatory gates that invalidate aggregation when foundational safeguards fail; and (4) specifying an auditable pathway from candidate indicators to independent empirical validation.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Review Logic and Theoretical Positioning

This review is integrative and theory-building rather than systematic. It synthesizes five bounded streams: Islamic recognition and disagreement ethics; comparative and interfaith theology; Design Science Research (DSR); performance-measurement and validation methodology; and AI/data governance. Sources were included when they informed construct definition, artifact design, measurement boundaries, validation, or safeguarding. Polemical materials, unverifiable claims, and texts implying that doctrinal truth can be reduced to a performance score were excluded. The review does not claim exhaustive or PRISMA-compliant coverage.

DSR is the primary theoretical lens because the study constructs a governance artifact intended to address a consequential institutional problem. DSR requires alignment among problem relevance, theoretical grounding, artifact specification, and evaluation rather than presenting an untested framework as an established solution [9-11]. Accordingly, a defensible theological-dialogue artifact must specify constructs, decision rights, evidence requirements, safeguards, and evaluation procedures. Comparative theology provides a complementary interpretive lens by requiring disciplined learning across religious boundaries while preserving faithful self-description and doctrinal particularity [5,6,13]. Its interpretive strength, however, does not independently provide institutional ownership, data governance, or performance-validation mechanisms.

A critical-political rival lens cautions that dialogue outcomes are shaped not only by procedural quality but also by contextual variation, representative legitimacy, and institutional configuration [4]. ITDF therefore treats semantic and procedural governance as necessary but insufficient: technically robust procedures cannot compensate for coercion, illegitimate authority, structural exclusion, or unequal representation.

2.2 Normative Dialogue, Semantic Encounter, and Institutional Governability

The strongest conceptual consensus is that intra- and interreligious dialogue requires recognition, disciplined disagreement, faithful representation, and interpretive humility [1–3,5,6,13]. The evidence is theoretically substantial but predominantly normative and context-dependent. The central tension is whether ethical commitment and dialogical virtue alone generate continuity and institutional learning. Normative accounts clarify how participants ought to engage, but frequently leave evidence ownership, documentation, escalation, decision accountability, and implementation under-specified.



Semantic scholarship further demonstrates that theological meaning is mediated by tradition, narrative, metaphor, translation, and ritual context [5,6,13]. Semantic clarification may therefore reduce avoidable misunderstanding, mistranslation, and conceptual drift, but it cannot dissolve substantive doctrinal disagreement or neutralize institutional power asymmetries. The distinction between clarified convergence, legitimate non-convergence, and merely rhetorical agreement is consequently essential. Implication for SRQ1: normative principles must be translated into explicit domains, governance objects, decision responsibilities, and evidence protocols while preserving the legitimacy of transparent non-convergence.

2.3 Measurement, Validation, and Non-Reduction

Composite indicators can organize multidimensional phenomena, but they create risks of hidden weighting, compensation, sensitivity, aggregation bias, and false precision [12]. These risks intensify in theological contexts because an apparently strong aggregate result could conceal a breach of authority, dignity, consent, representation, or non-coercion. ITDF therefore distinguishes observable process, ethical-compliance, semantic, and institutional measures from prohibited measurements of doctrinal truth, piety, orthodoxy, sincerity, school legitimacy, or salvific status.

Validation procedures perform different functions and must be sequenced rather than accumulated decoratively. Content validity examines item relevance and clarity [14]; transparent weighting can be supported through the Analytic Hierarchy Process while remaining subject to consistency and sensitivity testing [15]; intercoder reliability assesses whether documentary and transcript-coding rules can be applied consistently [16]; and dimensional diagnostics should be attempted only after sufficient empirical observations and theoretically defensible measurement conditions exist [17]. Evidence traceability, adab coding, glossary coverage, escalation delay, and verified action closure are plausible governance measures, but each remains vulnerable to superficial compliance, coder subjectivity, multilingual non-invariance, decontextualization, and indicator gaming. Implication for SRQs 2 and 3: measurement must remain disaggregated, gate-constrained, evidence-linked, and explicitly provisional until independent validation is completed.

2.4 Digital Support, Authority, and Accountability

Artificial intelligence and natural language processing may assist bounded functions such as transcript segmentation, terminology retrieval, source-linked summarization, glossary maintenance, and semantic-drift alerts. They cannot determine orthodoxy, issue fatwā, infer sincerity, rank Islamic schools, or resolve legitimate theological disagreement. UNESCO and NIST governance frameworks support a risk-based logic centred on human dignity, transparency, accountability, evaluation, and human oversight [7,8].

Evidence for theological deployment remains limited. Machine outputs must therefore be reversible, source-linked, access-controlled, versioned, and reviewed by qualified human authorities. The principal risks are hallucinated citations, semantic decontextualization,



religious bias, privacy exposure, opaque classification, and confusion between computational output and legitimate scholarly authority. Implication for SRQ4: AI constitutes an assistive component of the governance order and must never function as an autonomous doctrinal authority.

2.5 Prior Design Lineage and Present Differentiation

ITDF consolidates a sequence of author-developed design artifacts rather than emerging as an isolated framework. The original ITDF proposed a KPI-based architecture linking intra-Islamic unity with interfaith readiness [18]. The Global Kalām Strategic Framework (GKSF) expanded theological convergence into a fourteen-pillar comparative structure spanning doctrinal, ethical, institutional, technological, and semantic concerns [19]. The Islamic Ḥiwār Framework (IHF) focused more directly on intra-faith dialogue, dialogue ethics, institutional governance, and civilizational coordination [20]. The Taqrīb Diagnostic–Decision Model (TDDM) reframed rapprochement as a diagnostic and decision problem requiring structured classification, intervention design, and performance monitoring [21]. The Unified Civilizational Theological Architecture–Performance Architecture (UCTA-PA) subsequently distinguished Crisis Warning Indicators from Strategic Progress Indicators and advanced a non-compensatory approach to governance-grade measurement [22].

These precursor works establish the conceptual lineage of ITDF but do not constitute independent evidence of indicator reliability, construct validity, or institutional effectiveness. The present article differs in four checkable respects: it consolidates the earlier concepts into one five-domain and fourteen-axis artifact; explicitly separates the normative order from the measurable governance order; specifies six non-compensatory safeguard gates; and requires a sequential, independently auditable validation protocol. This positioning both demonstrates cumulative scholarship and prevents conceptual overlap from being mistaken for empirical confirmation.

2.6 Gap-to-Model Synthesis

The literature supports three conclusions. First, theological dialogue requires legitimacy, disciplined disagreement, and interpretive fidelity, but lacks reproducible institutional mechanics. Second, performance-measurement methods offer a useful grammar for evidence and accountability, but require non-reductionist constraints in sacred domains. Third, AI-supported analysis may improve traceability and semantic management while simultaneously creating new authority, bias, provenance, and privacy risks.

ITDF addresses this integration gap through five domains, fourteen axes, six non-compensatory gates, Strategic Progress Indicator and Crisis Warning Indicator families, and a human-supervised learning loop. SRQ1 addresses the construct and domain architecture; SRQ2 addresses indicator families and safeguard gates; SRQ3 addresses validation sequencing; SRQ4 addresses bounded AI/NLP support; and SRQ5 addresses misuse risks, rival explanations, and boundary conditions. The argument is expected to hold where recognized authorities, representative participation, evidence protocols, privacy protections,



and accountable institutions exist. It is least plausible in coercive, anonymous, conflict-driven, or politically instrumentalized settings.

3. Methodology

This study employed a conceptual–methodological Design Science Research (DSR) design grounded in a bounded-pragmatic stance [9–11]. Its claim is design-oriented rather than causal, associational, or predictive. The unit of analysis is the structured theological-dialogue initiative, encompassing authority arrangements, participant representation, claims, sources, terminology, records, decisions, digital tools, risk events, and follow-up actions. The scope is limited to intra-Islamic dialogue among recognized schools and qualified participants; interfaith readiness is treated as a downstream institutional capability. Anonymous social-media disputes, coercive environments, armed conflict, and automated doctrinal adjudication fall outside the framework’s intended domain.

The evidence base comprised recognized dialogue precedents and disagreement ethics [1–4], comparative-theology and interpretive scholarship [5,6,13], DSR literature [9–11], composite-indicator and validation methodology [12,14–17,23,24], AI and data-governance sources [7,8,25–27], the prior ITDF-related framework lineage [18–22], and the aligned KPI workbook. Artifact construction comprised seven auditable activities: reframing the problem as a governance gap; defining prohibited measurement objects; mapping constructs into five domains and fourteen axes; classifying candidate Strategic Progress Indicators and Crisis Warning Indicators; specifying six non-compensatory safeguard gates; assigning evidence requirements, ownership, cadence, provisional thresholds, and escalation logic; and formulating a staged validation pathway. These activities establish structural traceability but do not constitute empirical validation. No participants were recruited, no sampling frame or primary dataset was used, and no statistical estimates or validated weights are reported.

The proposed validation protocol comprises balanced multi-school expert review, modified Delphi rounds, Content Validity Ratio and Content Validity Index assessment, transparent weighting, intercoder-reliability testing, bounded field piloting, dimensional diagnostics, sensitivity analysis, and independent governance audit [14–17,23,24]. Each secondary research question is linked to a corresponding artifact component: domain-axis architecture, indicator families and safeguard logic, validation sequencing, human-supervised AI controls, and boundary conditions. No human-participant data were collected or analysed in the present phase; subsequent expert panels, transcript studies, or field pilots will require informed consent, de-identification, controlled access, versioned audit trails, and applicable ethics and privacy review [26]. To support replication and auditability, the prospective research package comprises the construct dictionary, KPI catalogue, codebook, validation instruments, weighting files, version history, and synthetic or controlled-access examples.



4. Findings and Results: ITDF Design Output

4.1 Data Overview and Evidence Base

The study did not analyse a participant sample or empirical dataset. Its evidence base comprised the author-developed ITDF framework lineage, the aligned KPI workbook, recognized theological-dialogue precedents, and methodological literature concerning Design Science Research, composite indicators, validation, and AI/data governance. The unit of analysis was the structured theological-dialogue initiative, including its authority arrangements, participants, claims, evidence, terminology, decisions, digital tools, risk events, and follow-up actions. Because no observational cases were sampled, exclusions, missing-data treatment, imputation, and representativeness diagnostics were not applicable.

4.2 Measurement Checks and Quality Diagnostics

Statistical reliability, construct validity, model fit, common-method bias, multicollinearity, and measurement invariance were not applicable because no empirical scores were generated. The completed output is a structurally specified artifact consisting of five higher-order domains, fourteen operational axes, six non-compensatory safeguard gates, and 280 candidate indicators divided equally between 140 Strategic Progress Indicators and 140 Crisis Warning Indicators. Structural completeness does not establish content, construct, criterion, or predictive validity; those properties remain subject to the proposed independent validation sequence.

4.3 Main Findings Mapped to the Research Questions

For SRQ1, the design process produced five domains: theological foundations and shared rationality; dialogue ethics and communicative competence; institutional governance and scholarly networks; technology, data, and digital platforms; and interfaith bridges and shared religious semantics. These domains were operationalized through fourteen axes covering doctrinal boundaries, Kalām methodology, comparative reasoning, adab, mediation, historical narratives, council governance, inter-school arbitration, scholarly networks, AI-supported dialogue, KPI monitoring, theological foresight, interfaith readiness, and religious semantics.

For SRQ2, the framework produced two complementary indicator families. Strategic Progress Indicators monitor evidence traceability, semantic clarification, institutional learning, action closure, and governance maturity, whereas Crisis Warning Indicators identify authority bypass, doctrinal misclassification, coercion, privacy breach, semantic distortion, and AI misuse. Six safeguard gates authority and competence, doctrinal dignity, representation, adab and non-coercion, privacy, and human oversight must be satisfied before composite interpretation is permitted.

For SRQ3, the result is an eight-stage validation pathway: construct review, modified Delphi elicitation, CVR/CVI assessment, transparent weighting, intercoder-reliability testing, bounded field demonstration, dimensional diagnostics, and independent governance evaluation. No validation coefficient, consensus threshold, weight, factor loading, or reliability result is claimed.



For SRQ4, the framework restricts AI/NLP to assistive functions such as transcript segmentation, terminology retrieval, source-linked summarization, glossary maintenance, semantic-drift alerts, and audit-log generation. Automated orthodoxy assessment, fatwā production, sincerity inference, school ranking, or doctrinal adjudication are explicitly prohibited.

For SRQ5, the design identifies conditions under which ITDF is most and least plausible. It is intended for settings with qualified authority, representative participation, documented evidence, institutional accountability, and privacy controls. It is not designed for coercive environments, anonymous social-media disputes, armed conflict, or politically instrumentalized ranking systems.

4.4 Additional Analyses

No confirmatory statistical, robustness, heterogeneity, mediation, moderation, or subgroup analyses were conducted. Rival explanations were addressed conceptually: power asymmetry, geopolitical incentives, institutional dependence, and relational trust may influence dialogue outcomes independently of governance quality. ITDF makes these factors visible but does not claim to neutralize them.

4.5 Results-to-Objectives Traceability

The PRQ is answered through the combined architecture: five domains and fourteen axes define the governable field; SPI/CWI families and six gates define bounded measurement; the eight-stage protocol defines validation; human-supervised controls define permissible AI use; and explicit boundary conditions define where the framework should not be applied. The unanswered objective is empirical effectiveness: the current design does not establish whether ITDF improves dialogue quality, trust, convergence, or institutional outcomes.

4.6 Transparency, Ethics, and Data Availability

No human-participant data, confidential transcripts, or identifiable institutional records were analysed. The supplementary workbook is available as a conceptual research instrument, but no empirical dataset or analytical code exists for the present article. Future Delphi panels, transcript coding, or field demonstrations will require ethics review, consent, de-identification, controlled access, documented retention, and versioned audit trails.

5. Discussion

5.1 Summary of Principal Findings

The study's principal output is a non-reductionist governance architecture that separates theological truth from measurable institutional processes. Five findings define the artifact. First, intra-Islamic dialogue can be organized through five higher-order domains and fourteen operational axes without assuming doctrinal uniformity. Second, the normative order remains superior to the governance order: revelation, qualified authority, doctrinal dignity, and legitimate disagreement define what measurement may not override. Third, six non-compensatory gates prevent strong performance in one area from concealing failures involving authority, representation, adab, privacy, or human oversight. Fourth, the 140



Strategic Progress Indicators and 140 Crisis Warning Indicators constitute a candidate catalogue rather than a validated simultaneous dashboard. Fifth, AI/NLP is restricted to assistive functions under provenance, access, and qualified human review.

No empirical null results are reported because the study did not test effects, associations, or predictive relationships. This absence strengthens claim integrity: the artifact's structural completeness must not be mistaken for validity or effectiveness.

5.2 Interpretation and Mechanisms

Evidence-supported interpretation: Design Science Research requires an artifact to connect problem relevance, explicit design components, theoretical grounding, and evaluation procedures [9-11]. ITDF meets the specification component by defining constructs, roles, gates, indicators, evidence requirements, and a validation pathway. Composite-indicator scholarship also supports the concern that weighting and aggregation can create compensation, sensitivity, and false precision [12]. The gate logic therefore responds directly to a recognized measurement problem.

Interpretive proposition requiring testing: Where qualified authority and safeguard gates are present, evidence traceability, semantic clarification, adab discipline, and decision follow-through may improve institutional learning. The plausible mechanism is procedural: source-linked claims reduce evidentiary ambiguity; reviewed glossaries reduce avoidable semantic confusion; explicit ownership reduces unresolved actions; and escalation rules reduce unauthorized judgement. These mechanisms do not imply doctrinal convergence or social harmony and require independent field evaluation.

5.3 Comparison with Prior Literature

The architecture aligns with the Amman Message's emphasis on recognition, anti-takfir discipline, and qualified authority [1] and with the ethics-of-disagreement tradition's focus on fairness, restraint, and legitimate diversity [3]. It also accords with A Common Word and comparative-theology scholarship in treating common ground as compatible with religious particularity rather than doctrinal homogenization [2,5,6,13].

The present framework extends these streams by adding explicit institutional memory, decision rights, evidence trails, and validation controls. Conversely, it qualifies conventional performance-measurement logic: unlike standard scorecards and composite indices [12], ITDF does not permit foundational breaches to be offset by high scores elsewhere. The framework also develops the author's earlier ITDF and GKSF work [18,19] by consolidating their concepts into a dual-order architecture with explicit safeguard gates and an independently auditable validation sequence. These prior works establish design lineage, not independent confirmation.

5.4 Alternative Explanations and Rival Mechanisms

A political-economy explanation may attribute dialogue failure primarily to geopolitical competition, institutional incentives, resource dependence, or unequal power rather than



deficient governance. A relational explanation may instead prioritize trust, sincerity, virtue, and embodied encounter. ITDF does not displace these accounts. It can document representation, conflicts, escalation, and decision ownership, but cannot neutralize political interests or measure sincerity. A further rival mechanism is strategic compliance: institutions may improve documentation to obtain favourable dashboard results without improving dialogue quality. Independent auditing and qualitative negative-case analysis are therefore necessary.

5.5 Theoretical Implications

The first contribution is a non-reductionist theory of theological-dialogue measurement: the legitimate object of measurement is the governance surrounding theological claims, not the claims' intrinsic truth.

Second, the six gates introduce a deontic constraint into performance architecture. Authority, dignity, non-coercion, privacy, and human oversight operate as prerequisites for valid interpretation rather than weighted variables.

Third, the study extends DSR by showing that artifact utility in sacred domains depends on normative fidelity and harm prevention, not only efficiency, usability, or adoption.

Fourth, it extends comparative theology from interpretive encounter to institutional execution by incorporating evidence lineage, representation, escalation, and follow-through. Each contribution directly addresses the literature-review gap between rich normative resources and weak operational governance.

5.6 Practical and Policy Implications

A Theological Authority Board should first approve the non-reduction charter, gate definitions, authority credentials, and escalation rules. Required evidence includes mandates, representation records, source-review logs, and incident decisions. Initial KPIs should be gate-review completion and unresolved escalation duration. This work can begin before dashboard deployment; the main risks are politicized appointments and authority capture.

A Dialogue Secretariat should pilot one axis with a limited indicator set, using source registers, reviewed glossaries, decision logs, and action records. Suitable KPIs include evidence-traceability rate, glossary coverage, and verified action closure. A three- to six-month controlled pilot is more defensible than immediate implementation of all 280 indicators. The principal failure modes are administrative burden, indicator gaming, and documentation without substantive learning.

A Data and AI Governance Lead should define approved AI functions, model versions, access rights, provenance requirements, human-review procedures, and incident response before any AI-supported workflow is used. Relevant KPIs include reviewed-output rate, unsupported-source incidents, access violations, and unresolved model alerts. Privacy leakage,



hallucination, bias, and confusion of model output with religious authority remain the central risks.

5.7 Boundary Conditions, Limitations, and Threats to Validity

The framework is most plausible in institutions with recognized authorities, representative participation, documented evidence, and accountable governance. It is least applicable to anonymous digital disputes, armed conflict, coercive environments, publicity-driven dialogue, or settings where indicators become tools of sectarian ranking.

The principal limitation is the absence of empirical validation: no expert consensus, CVR/CVI results, weights, coding reliability, dimensional structure, or institutional outcomes are reported. The integrative review is purposive rather than systematic, and the author's role in developing the framework creates confirmation and circularity risks. The 280 indicators may also create excessive burden, while multilingual terminology raises translation and measurement-equivalence concerns. These limitations may overstate architectural coherence and practical feasibility. No causal claim that ITDF improves unity, trust, or dialogue quality is warranted.

5.8 Ethics, Governance, and Responsible Use

Future implementation requires consent, data minimization, role-based access, documented retention, secure version control, appeal mechanisms, and protection against doctrinal or reputational harm. AI outputs must remain source-linked, reversible, bias-tested, and subject to qualified human approval [7,8,25–27]. Public school rankings, orthodoxy indices, automated fatwā, and sincerity inference are prohibited. The author's intellectual ownership of the framework is disclosed, making independent validation and publication of adverse findings essential.

6. Conclusion

6.1 Summary of Key Findings

This article addressed how intra-Islamic theological dialogue can be transformed from an episodic and aspirational practice into an evidence-governed, ethically bounded, and KPI-supported architecture without reducing doctrinal truth to numerical performance. In response to SRQ1, the study specified five higher-order domains and fourteen operational axes covering theological foundations, dialogical ethics, institutional governance, digital and data support, and interfaith-semantic readiness. In response to SRQ2, it distinguished Strategic Progress Indicators from Crisis Warning Indicators and introduced six non-compensatory safeguard gates governing authority, doctrinal dignity, representation, adab, privacy, and human oversight. SRQ3 was addressed through a sequential validation protocol integrating expert review, Delphi elicitation, CVR/CVI assessment, transparent weighting, intercoder reliability, field piloting, dimensional diagnostics, sensitivity analysis, and independent governance evaluation. SRQ4 was answered by limiting AI/NLP to assistive, reversible, source-linked, and human-reviewed functions. SRQ5 was addressed by defining misuse prohibitions and boundary conditions.



No empirical effect, causal relationship, validated weight, reliability coefficient, or institutional outcome was established. The principal result is therefore an artifact specification and testable validation pathway, not evidence that ITDF has already improved theological convergence or institutional performance.

6.2 Scholarly Contributions

The article changes the literature in four respects. First, it establishes a non-reductionist distinction between theological truth claims and the governance conditions surrounding their discussion. Second, it extends Design Science Research into a sacred and normatively constrained domain in which utility must be evaluated alongside legitimacy, dignity, and harm prevention. Third, it introduces a non-compensatory measurement logic: failures involving authority, coercion, representation, privacy, or AI oversight cannot be concealed by favourable performance elsewhere. Fourth, it connects comparative and intra-Islamic dialogue scholarship to institutional memory, evidence traceability, decision ownership, escalation, and validation.

The paper therefore advances an operational theory of theological-dialogue governance while retaining transparent non-convergence as a legitimate outcome rather than treating doctrinal uniformity as the objective.

6.3 Recommendations for Practitioners and Policymakers

Religious councils and theological institutions should begin with governance rather than immediate deployment of the full KPI catalogue. In the short term, a qualified Theological Authority Board should approve the non-reduction charter, representation rules, and safeguard-gate triggers. Gate-review completion, authority-bypass incidents, and unresolved escalation duration should be monitored. The principal risks are politicized appointments and concentration of interpretive authority.

Dialogue secretariats should conduct a three- to six-month pilot using one operational axis and a limited indicator set. Evidence-traceability rate, semantic-glossary coverage, adab-compliance coding, and verified action-closure rate provide suitable initial measures. Administrative burden, indicator gaming, and documentation without substantive learning should be treated as explicit pilot risks.

Data and AI governance leads should approve permitted AI/NLP functions, model versions, access controls, provenance requirements, and human-review workflows before digital tools enter formal dialogue records. Unsupported-source incidents, unreviewed AI outputs, access violations, and unresolved model alerts should be tracked. Automated doctrinal classification, school ranking, sincerity inference, and fatwā generation should remain prohibited.

6.4 Limitations

The study is limited by the absence of empirical validation, expert-panel evidence, tested thresholds, reliability estimates, dimensional confirmation, and institutional outcome data. Accordingly, no causal or generalizable claim concerning ITDF effectiveness is justified. The



integrative literature review is purposive rather than systematic, which may limit coverage of regional and school-specific scholarship.

The author's role in developing ITDF and its precursor frameworks creates risks of conceptual circularity and confirmation bias. Independent multi-school review is therefore essential. The 280-indicator catalogue may also impose excessive operational burden, while multilingual and cross-school terminology creates substantial equivalence risks. Finally, institutions may optimize documentation or reputation rather than dialogue quality once indicators influence funding, legitimacy, or public standing.

6.5 Directions for Future Research

Future research should first use balanced multi-school Delphi panels to evaluate the five domains, fourteen axes, six gates, and prohibited-use rules. CVR/CVI studies should then refine the candidate items before weighting is attempted. Independent coders should test reliability using anonymized or controlled theological-dialogue records, with particular attention to negative and ambiguous cases.

Multilingual studies should apply translation, back-translation, cognitive review, and measurement-equivalence procedures across Arabic, Persian, and English instruments. Bounded field demonstrations should compare universities, seminaries, councils, and interfaith institutions, while longitudinal designs should examine action closure, escalation duration, semantic correction, participant trust, implementation burden, and unintended consequences. Human-versus-AI coding studies should test accuracy, bias, provenance, and reviewer burden under strict authority and privacy controls. Later studies may evaluate alternative weighting and non-compensatory aggregation rules, but only after adequate construct validity and data quality have been established.

6.6 Closing Synthesis

The enduring challenge is not simply to create more dialogue, but to ensure that dialogue is theologically legitimate, ethically safe, evidentially traceable, institutionally accountable, and resistant to technological overreach. ITDF offers a bounded architecture for pursuing these conditions while refusing to quantify what must remain outside managerial measurement. This paper changes the literature by defining a non-reductionist governance architecture for theological dialogue and enables institutions to design, evaluate, and improve dialogue processes without converting doctrinal truth into a performance score.

References

[1] The Amman Message. The three points of the Amman Message. Amman: Royal Aal al-Bayt Institute for Islamic Thought; 2005. Available from: <https://ammanmessage.com/the-three-points-of-the-amman-message-v-1/>

[2] A Common Word. A common word between us and you. 2007. Available from: <https://www.acommonword.com/the-acw-document/>



**5th.International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

- [3] Al-Alwani TJ. Ethics of disagreement in Islam. 3rd ed. London and Washington (DC): International Institute of Islamic Thought; 2011.
- [4] Corboz E. Sunni-Shi'a relations in Europe: framing an emerging field of research. *Journal of Muslims in Europe*; 12(1): 1-14, 2023. doi:10.1163/22117954-bja10081.
- [5] Clooney FX. *Comparative theology: deep learning across religious borders*. Malden (MA): Wiley-Blackwell; 2010.
- [6] Fredericks JL. A universal religious experience? *Comparative theology as an alternative to a theology of religions*. *Horizons*; 22(1): 67-87, 1995. doi:10.1017/S0360966900028942.
- [7] UNESCO. *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. Paris: UNESCO; 2021. Available from: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000380455>
- [8] National Institute of Standards and Technology. *Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0)*. NIST AI 100-1. Gaithersburg (MD): National Institute of Standards and Technology; 2023. doi:10.6028/NIST.AI.100-1.
- [9] Hevner AR, March ST, Park J, Ram S. Design science in information systems research. *MIS Quarterly*; 28(1): 75-105, 2004.
- [10] Peffers K, Tuunanen T, Rothenberger MA, Chatterjee S. A design science research methodology for information systems research. *Journal of Management Information Systems*; 24(3): 45-77, 2007. doi:10.2753/MIS0742-1222240302.
- [11] Gregor S, Hevner AR. Positioning and presenting design science research for maximum impact. *MIS Quarterly*; 37(2): 337-355, 2013. doi:10.25300/MISQ/2013/37.2.01.
- [12] OECD, Joint Research Centre. *Handbook on constructing composite indicators: methodology and user guide*. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2008.
- [13] Moyaert M. Towards a ritual turn in comparative theology: opportunities, challenges, and problems. *Harvard Theological Review*; 111(1): 1-23, 2018. doi:10.1017/S0017816017000360.
- [14] Polit DF, Beck CT. The content validity index: are you sure you know what is being reported? Critique and recommendations. *Research in Nursing & Health*; 29(5): 489-497, 2006. doi:10.1002/nur.20147.
- [15] Saaty TL. *The analytic hierarchy process: planning, priority setting, resource allocation*. New York: McGraw-Hill; 1980.
- [16] McHugh ML. Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochemia Medica*; 22(3): 276-282, 2012. doi:10.11613/BM.2012.031.
- [17] Jolliffe IT, Cadima J. Principal component analysis: a review and recent developments. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*; 374(2065): 20150202, 2016. doi:10.1098/rsta.2015.0202.
- [18] MoghadasNian SAH. *Islamic Theological Dialogue Framework (ITDF): a KPI-based architecture for intra-Islamic unity and interfaith readiness*. Qom: University of Religions and Denominations; 2025. doi:10.13140/RG.2.2.19952.11521.
- [19] MoghadasNian SAH. *Global Kalām Strategic Framework (GKSF): a fourteen-pillar KPI-based comparative model for Islamic unity and theological convergence*. Qom: University of Religions and Denominations; 2025. doi:10.13140/RG.2.2.16774.28489/1.
- [20] MoghadasNian SAH. *Islamic Hiwār Framework (IHF): a KPI-based architecture for intra-faith dialogue and civilizational unity*. Qom: University of Religions and Denominations; 2025. doi:10.13140/RG.2.2.34234.30403.



- [21] MoghadasNian SAH. Taqrīb Diagnostic–Decision Model (TDDM): a multi-dimensional framework for classifying, designing and evaluating Islamic intra-faith rapprochement. Qom: University of Religions and Denominations; 2025. doi:10.13140/RG.2.2.27306.68806.
- [22] MoghadasNian SAH. UCTA-PA: Unified Civilizational Theological Architecture—A performance architecture for measurable rapprochement and civilizational renewal. Qom: University of Religions and Denominations; 2025. doi:10.13140/RG.2.2.16602.40647.
- [23] Dalkey N, Helmer O. An experimental application of the Delphi method to the use of experts. *Management Science*; 9(3): 458-467, 1963. doi:10.1287/mnsc.9.3.458.
- [24] Lawshe CH. A quantitative approach to content validity. *Personnel Psychology*; 28(4): 563-575, 1975. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1975.tb01393.x.
- [25] European Parliament, Council of the European Union. Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence. *Official Journal of the European Union*; L2024/1689, 2024.
- [26] European Parliament, Council of the European Union. Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data. *Official Journal of the European Union*; L119: 1-88, 2016.
- [27] Abid A, Farooqi M, Zou J. Persistent anti-Muslim bias in large language models. *Proceedings of the 2021 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*; 298-306, 2021. doi:10.1145/3461702.3462624.

Appendix

Appendix A: Strategic KPI Architecture for the Islamic Theological Dialogue Framework (ITDF)

Appendix A presents a catalogue of 280 candidate Key Performance Indicators operationalizing the Islamic Theological Dialogue Framework (ITDF) as a bounded, evidence-governed, and ethically safeguarded architecture for intra-Islamic theological dialogue and downstream interfaith readiness. The indicators are organized across fourteen operational axes within five higher-order domains: theological foundations and shared rationality; dialogue ethics and communicative competence; institutional governance and scholarly networks; technology, data, and digital platforms; and interfaith bridges and shared religious semantics. The catalogue provides a construct-to-indicator architecture for controlled expert review, methodological refinement, supervised teaching, and future field validation. It does not constitute an empirically validated scale or evidence of institutional effectiveness.

The indicators are restricted to observable governance objects, including evidence traceability, documented rational–scriptural coherence, adab compliance, semantic precision, representative legitimacy, institutional follow-through, escalation, data protection, human oversight of AI-assisted functions, and readiness for responsible interfaith engagement. Doctrinal truth, piety, orthodoxy, sincerity, school legitimacy, salvific status, divine acceptance, and the intrinsic validity of revelation remain outside the legitimate scope of numerical measurement. This non-reductionist boundary governs the definition, application, aggregation, and interpretation of every indicator.

Each operational axis contains ten Strategic Progress Indicators and ten Crisis Warning Indicators, producing a balanced catalogue of 140 indicators in each category. Strategic Progress Indicators monitor governance maturity, institutional learning, evidence quality, clarified convergence, action closure, and implementation continuity. Crisis Warning Indicators identify authority bypass, doctrinal misclassification, coercive convergence, semantic distortion, unresolved escalation, privacy breach, data misuse, model hallucination, and other conditions that may invalidate or suspend formal interpretation.

In the accompanying supplementary workbook, each candidate indicator is linked to a governance object, operational definition, calculation rule or assessment rubric, evidence source, responsible owner, accountable authority, reporting cadence, provisional threshold, validity threat, misuse risk, and escalation response. This structure supports auditability and controlled dashboard prototyping while preserving disaggregated



5th.International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities, Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

interpretation. Composite reporting is not permitted when a safeguard gate has failed, and no aggregate output may be represented as a unity score, orthodoxy index, school ranking, or numerical judgement concerning religious truth.

Implementation requires explicit decision rights across theological authorities, dialogue secretariats, multi-school reviewers, institutional leadership, and data and AI governance functions. Human-supervised natural language processing may support transcript segmentation, terminology retrieval, glossary maintenance, source-linked summarization, semantic-drift detection, and audit-log generation. Such outputs remain provisional, reversible, access-controlled, and subject to qualified scholarly review; they may not replace doctrinal authority or enter the formal decision record without documented human approval.

The appendix translates the ITDF conceptual architecture into a candidate governance instrument while maintaining the subordination of measurement to revelation, qualified authority, doctrinal dignity, legitimate disagreement, and ethical safeguards. Its intended contribution is not to quantify theology, but to make the institutional processes surrounding theological dialogue more traceable, accountable, reviewable, and capable of disciplined learning.

Strategic Dimensions & KPI Groups

1. Doctrinal Boundary Clarification

(Strategic Dimension: Shared Creedal Premises, Legitimate Ikhtilāf, Anti-Takfīr Boundary Governance)

- Shared Creedal Premise Mapping Rate (SCPMR, %)
- Recognized Ikhtilāf Classification Rate (RICR, %)
- Doctrinal Boundary Clarification Score (DBCS, score)
- Common Uṣūl al-Dīn Reference Frequency (CURF, count)
- Mutual School Recognition Compliance (MSRC, %)
- Unresolved Theological Issue Escalation Rate (UTIER, %)
- Documented Non-Convergence Transparency Rate (DNCTR, %)
- Shared Proposition Review and Documentation Score (SPRDS, score)
- Qualified-Review Doctrinal Classification Agreement Rate (QDCA, %)
- Cross-Madhhab Creedal Understanding Index (CMCUI, index)
- Crisis Warning Indicators (CWIs)
- Unauthorized Takfīr Incident Count (UTIC, count)
- Doctrinal Misclassification Rate (DMCR, %)
- Red-Line Boundary Breach Count (RLBC, count)
- Unsupported Orthodoxy Claim Rate (UOCR, %)
- Sectarian Ranking Attempt Frequency (SRAF, count)
- Coercive Convergence Warning Index (CCWI, index)
- Doctrinal Ambiguity Escalation Lag (DAEL, days)
- Unreviewed Creedal Statement Rate (UCSR, %)
- Polemical Creedal Distortion Rate (PCDR, %)
- Authority-Bypass Doctrinal Judgment Count (ABDJ, count)

2. Kalām Methodology and the Five Arts of Reasoning

(Strategic Dimension: Rational-Scriptural Method, Burden of Proof, Argumentative Discipline)

- Dalīl Traceability Completion Rate (DTCR, %)



**5th.International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

- Documented ‘Aql–Naql Coherence Review Score (ANCRS, score)
- Uşūl Method Transparency Rate (UMTR, %)
- Burden-of-Proof Compliance Rate (BPCR, %)
- Argument Form Validity Score (AFVS, score)
- Five-Arts Reasoning Coverage Index (FARCI, index)
- Evidence-to-Claim Linkage Rate (ECLR, %)
- Counter-Argument Response Completeness (CARC, %)
- Methodological Disclosure Quality Score (MDQS, score)
- Cross-School Method Comparison Completion (CSMCC, %)
- Crisis Warning Indicators (CWIs)
- Unsupported Theological Assertion Rate (UTAR, %)
- Selective Evidence Use Warning Count (SEUWC, count)
- Methodological Category Confusion Rate (MCCR, %)
- Burden-of-Proof Evasion Frequency (BPEF, count)
- Rhetorical Substitution for Evidence Rate (RSER, %)
- Circular Reasoning Detection Count (CRDC, count)
- Unacknowledged Premise Shift Rate (UPSR, %)
- Textual Decontextualization Warning Rate (TDWR, %)
- Unresolved Contradiction Carryover Rate (UCCR, %)
- Methodological Asymmetry Warning Index (MAWI, index)

3. Comparative Kalām and Cross-School Engagement

(Strategic Dimension: Comparative Theology, Contested Issues, Cross-Madhhab Analytical Fairness)

- Comparative Kalām Topic Coverage Rate (CKTCR, %)
- Cross-School Argument Mapping Completion (CSAMC, %)
- Multi-Madhhab Source Inclusion Rate (MMSIR, %)
- Contested-Issue Taxonomy Completion (CITC, %)
- Fair Representation of Opposing Doctrine Score (FRODS, score)
- Shared Analytical Framework Adoption Rate (SAFAR, %)
- Comparative Doctrine Review Panel Frequency (CDRPF, count)
- Cross-Tradition Evidence Balance Index (CTEBI, index)
- Joint Kalām Inquiry Output Count (JKIOC, count)
- Resolved Comparative Clarification Rate (RCCR, %)
- Crisis Warning Indicators (CWIs)
- One-School Dominance in Comparative Sources (OSDCS, %)
- Misrepresentation of Opposing School Rate (MOSR, %)
- Unbalanced Comparative Agenda Warning Count (UCAWC, count)
- Contested-Issue Escalation Without Authority Rate (CIEAR, %)



**5th.International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

- Polemical Framing Frequency (PFF, count)
- Reductionist Comparison Warning Index (RCWI, index)
- Unverified Comparative Claim Rate (UVCCR, %)
- Doctrinal Strawman Detection Count (DSDC, count)
- Historical Polemic Reproduction Rate (HPRR, %)
- Cross-School Trust Degradation Signal (CSTDS, signal score)

4. Fiqh al-Ḥiwār and Ethics of Munāzara

(Strategic Dimension: Adab al-Ḥiwār, Adab al-Ikhtilāf, Ethical Speech Discipline)

- Charitable Restatement Rate (CRR, %)
- Adab al-Ḥiwār Compliance Score (AHCS, score)
- Civility and Respect Index (CRI, index)
- Turn-Taking Equity Score (TTES, score)
- Evidence-Respectful Response Rate (ERRR, %)
- Correction-with-Dignity Compliance (CWDC, %)
- Apology and Repair Completion Rate (ARCR, %)
- Ethical Disagreement Literacy Score (EDLS, score)
- Moderator Ethics Intervention Effectiveness (MEIE, %)
- Listening Marker Frequency (LMF, count)
- Crisis Warning Indicators (CWIs)
- Adab Breach Count (ABC, count)
- Ridicule or Humiliation Incident Rate (RHIR, %)
- Delegitimizing Language Frequency (DLF, count)
- Interruption Burden Index (IBI, index)
- Unrepaired Ethical Breach Rate (UEBR, %)
- Hostile Tone Escalation Index (HTEI, index)
- Sarcasm-Based Dismissal Warning Count (SBDWC, count)
- Personal Attack Rate (PAR, %)
- Moderator Non-Intervention in Breaches Rate (MNIBR, %)
- Ethical Fatigue Withdrawal Rate (EFWR, %)

5. Theological Conflict Resolution and Mediation

(Strategic Dimension: De-Escalation, Mediation Protocols, Structured Sulḥ Mechanisms)

- Theological Mediation Procedural Completion Rate (TMPCR, %)
- Conflict De-Escalation Time (CDET, hours)
- Structured Sulḥ Protocol Adoption Rate (SSPAR, %)
- Dispute Issue-Closure Rate (DICR, %)
- Mediation Case Documentation Completeness (MCDC, %)
- Escalation-to-Scholar Timeliness (EST, days)



**5th.International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

- Neutral Facilitation Compliance Score (NFCS, score)
- Post-Mediation Follow-Up Completion (PMFC, %)
- Repeat Dispute Reduction Rate (RDRR, %)
- Shared Remedy Agreement Rate (SRAR, %)
- Crisis Warning Indicators (CWIs)
- Dialogue Breakdown Frequency (DBF, count)
- Mediation Deadlock Rate (MDR, %)
- Unresolved Grievance Accumulation Index (UGAI, index)
- Escalation Without Protocol Count (EWPC, count)
- Hostile Coalition Formation Signal (HCFS, signal score)
- Mediator Bias Complaint Rate (MBCR, %)
- Refusal-to-Engage Rate (RER, %)
- Post-Session Retaliatory Discourse Count (PSRDC, count)
- Agreement Reversal Rate (ARR, %)
- Conflict Recurrence Warning Index (CRWI, index)

6. Narrative-Historical Literacy and Memory Governance

(Strategic Dimension: Historical Narratives, Source Context, Grievance Transformation)

- Historical Context Accuracy Score (HCAS, score)
- Narrative Source Traceability Rate (NSTR, %)
- Shared Historical Event Mapping Completion (SHEMC, %)
- Multi-Narrative Recognition Index (MNRI, index)
- Sensitive Event Framing Quality Score (SEFQS, score)
- Cross-School Historiographical Review Frequency (CSHRF, count)
- Grievance-to-Learning Conversion Rate (GLCR, %)
- Historical Terminology Standardization Rate (HTSR, %)
- Joint Memory Workshop Completion Rate (JMWCR, %)
- Contextualized Citation Rate in Historical Claims (CCHC, %)
- Crisis Warning Indicators (CWIs)
- Historical Grievance Escalation Index (HGEL, index)
- Selective Memory Citation Rate (SMCR, %)
- Anachronistic Interpretation Warning Count (AIWC, count)
- Event Mythologization Risk Score (EMRS, score)
- Unverified Historical Claim Rate (UHCR, %)
- Inflammatory Historical Reference Frequency (IHRF, count)
- Narrative Exclusion Rate (NER, %)
- Chronology Distortion Detection Count (CDDC, count)
- Historical Blame Amplification Index (HBAI, index)



**5th.International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

- Memory-Triggered Dialogue Withdrawal Rate (MTDWR, %)

7. Governance of Theological Councils and Dialogue Institutions

(Strategic Dimension: Institutional Accountability, Representation, Decision Rights)

- Theological Council Charter Adoption Rate (TCCAR, %)
- Representation Completeness Index (RCI, index)
- RACI Role-Clarity Completion Rate (RRCCR, %)
- Decision Traceability Score (DTS, score)
- Dialogue Governance Review Cadence Compliance (DGRCC, %)
- Minutes Publication Timeliness (MPT, days)
- Action-Item Closure Rate (AICR, %)
- Scholarly Authority Review Completion (SARC, %)
- Institutional Participation Continuity Rate (IPCR, %)
- Governance Transparency Index (GTI, index)
- Crisis Warning Indicators (CWIs)
- Institutional Capture Warning Index (ICWI, index)
- Non-Representative Decision Rate (NRDR, %)
- Unapproved Communiqué Release Count (UCRC, count)
- Governance Meeting Cancellation Rate (GMCR, %)
- Decision Owner Ambiguity Rate (DOAR, %)
- Authority Boundary Violation Count (ABVC, count)
- Documentation Gap Rate (DGR, %)
- Non-Compliance with Council Protocols (NCCP, %)
- Politicized Agenda Shift Frequency (PASF, count)
- Inactive Council Member Ratio (ICMR, %)

8. Inter-School Arbitration and Adjudication Safeguards

(Strategic Dimension: Neutral Review, Appeals, Procedural Justice, Authority-Safe Arbitration)

- Arbitration Protocol Adoption Rate (APAR, %)
- Neutral Chairing Compliance Score (NCCS, score)
- Case File Completeness Rate (CFCR, %)
- Appeal Pathway Availability Rate (APAvR, %)
- Cross-School Arbitration Panel Diversity Index (CSAPDI, index)
- Evidence Review Completion Rate (ERCR, %)
- Procedural Justice Satisfaction Score (PJSS, score)
- Arbitration Decision Publication Integrity (ADPI, %)
- Authority-Endorsed Resolution Rate (AERR, %)
- Post-Arbitration Compliance Rate (PACR, %)
- Crisis Warning Indicators (CWIs)



**5th.International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

- Arbitration Bias Complaint Rate (ABCR, %)
- Unilateral Judgment Count (UJC, count)
- Appeal Denial Without Rationale Rate (ADWRR, %)
- Procedural Irregularity Count (PIC, count)
- Evidence Omission Warning Rate (EOWR, %)
- Authority Overreach Incident Count (AOIC, count)
- Arbitration Delay Beyond SLA Rate (ADBSLAR, %)
- Confidentiality Breach in Arbitration Count (CBAC, count)
- Non-Acceptance of Legitimate Review Rate (NALRR, %)
- Arbitration Outcome Reversal Rate (AORR, %)

9. Scholarly Collaboration and Institutional Knowledge Networks

(Strategic Dimension: Academic-Religious Networks, Joint Knowledge Production, Capacity Building)

- Joint Kalām Research Output Count (JKROC, count)
- Cross-Madhab Seminar Frequency (CMSF, count)
- Shared Curriculum Development Rate (SCDR, %)
- Scholar Exchange Participation Rate (SEPR, %)
- Inter-Institutional Research MOU Count (IIRMC, count)
- Joint Peer Review Panel Frequency (JPRPF, count)
- Early-Career Scholar Inclusion Rate (ECSIR, %)
- Research Data-Sharing Agreement Rate (RDSAR, %)
- Shared Bibliography Completion Rate (SBCR, %)
- Collaborative Grant Success Rate (CGSR, %)
- Crisis Warning Indicators (CWIs)
- Network Fragmentation Warning Index (NFWI, index)
- One-Institution Dominance Ratio (OIDR, %)
- Joint Project Abandonment Rate (JPAP, %)
- Scholar Participation Dropout Rate (SPDR, %)
- Citation Imbalance Across Schools (CIAS, %)
- Knowledge-Silo Persistence Index (KSPI, index)
- Unshared Source Repository Rate (USSR, %)
- Inter-Institutional Conflict Incident Count (IICIC, count)
- Capacity Bottleneck Warning Score (CBWS, score)
- Succession Risk in Dialogue Expertise (SRDE, %)

10. Digital Platforms and Human-Supervised AI Support

(Strategic Dimension: AI/NLP Assistance, Transcript Governance, Human Oversight, Bias Control)

- Human-Reviewed AI Output Rate (HRAOR, %)
- Transcript Integrity Verification Rate (TIVR, %)



**5th.International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

- Prompt and Model Version Logging Compliance (PMVLC, %)
- AI-Assisted Topic Segmentation Accuracy (AITSA, %)
- Scholar-Validated NLP Annotation Rate (SVNAR, %)
- AI Use Disclosure Completion Rate (AIUDCR, %)
- Multilingual Model Coverage Score (MMCS, score)
- Bias Audit Completion Rate (BACR, %)
- Source-Linked AI Summary Rate (SLASR, %)
- Human Override Documentation Rate (HODR, %)
- Crisis Warning Indicators (CWIs)
- Unauthorized AI Doctrinal Judgment Count (UADJC, count)
- AI Hallucinated Citation Rate (AIHCR, %)
- Unreviewed Automated Summary Rate (UASR, %)
- Model Bias Incident Count (MBIC, count)
- Sensitive Religious Data Exposure Count (SRDEC, count)
- Consent Gap in AI Processing Rate (CGAIPR, %)
- AI Authority Substitution Warning Index (AIASWI, index)
- Unlogged Prompt Use Count (UPUC, count)
- Semantic Model Drift Alert Rate (SMDAR, %)
- Cybersecurity Incident Affecting Dialogue Data (CIADD, count)

11. KPI Dashboards and Evidence-Governed Monitoring

(Strategic Dimension: Indicator Governance, Evidence Traceability, Dashboard Stewardship)

- ITDF Dashboard Completion Rate (IDCR, %)
- Evidence-to-KPI Traceability Rate (EKTR, %)
- Indicator Definition Completeness (IDC, %)
- Data Quality Check Pass Rate (DQCPR, %)
- KPI Update Timeliness (KUT, %)
- Corrective Action Closure Rate (CACR, %)
- Dashboard User Adoption Rate (DUAR, %)
- Threshold Review Completion Rate (TRCR, %)
- Indicator Owner Assignment Rate (IOAR, %)
- Narrative Interpretation Coverage Rate (NICR, %)
- Crisis Warning Indicators (CWIs)
- Dashboard Gaming Warning Count (DGWC, count)
- Missing Evidence Rate (MER, %)
- KPI Definition Drift Rate (KDDR, %)
- Unreviewed Indicator Change Count (UICC, count)
- False Green Performance Signal Rate (FGPSR, %)



**5th.International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

- Data Lineage Break Count (DLBC, count)
- Unresolved Data Quality Exception Rate (UDQER, %)
- Metric Over-Aggregation Warning Index (MOAWI, index)
- Sectarian League Table Publication Attempt (SLTPA, count)
- Delayed Crisis Alert Rate (DCAR, %)

12. Innovation and Foresight in Islamic Theology

(Strategic Dimension: Future Kalām, Scenario Planning, Responsible Innovation, Emerging Issues)

- Future Kalām Research Agenda Completion (FKRAC, %)
- Emerging Theological Issue Response Time (ETIRT, days)
- Scenario Planning Workshop Frequency (SPWF, count)
- Responsible Innovation Review Rate (RIRR, %)
- Youth Scholar Innovation Participation (YSIP, %)
- Digital Theology Pilot Completion Rate (DTPCR, %)
- Ethics-by-Design Adoption in New Tools (EDANT, %)
- Innovation-to-Governance Translation Rate (IGTR, %)
- Foresight Report Publication Frequency (FRPF, count)
- Cross-Disciplinary Theology Lab Activity Score (CDTLAS, score)
- Crisis Warning Indicators (CWIs)
- Unassessed Emerging Issue Backlog (UEIB, count)
- Innovation Without Scholarly Review Rate (IWSRR, %)
- Speculative Theology Overclaim Warning Count (STOWC, count)
- Technology-Driven Reductionism Alert Rate (TDRAR, %)
- Ethical Impact Assessment Gap Rate (EIAGR, %)
- Future Risk Blind-Spot Index (FRBSI, index)
- Innovation Pilot Failure Without Learning Rate (IPFWLR, %)
- Uncontrolled Experimental Tool Use Count (UETUC, count)
- Public Misinterpretation of Experimental Outputs (PMEO, %)
- Foresight Governance Delay Index (FGDI, index)

13. Abrahamic and Interfaith Theological Bridges

(Strategic Dimension: Interfaith Readiness, Common Ground, Boundary-Safe Abrahamic Dialogue)

- Internal Readiness for Interfaith Dialogue Score (IRIDS, score)
- Common Ground Articulation Rate (CGAR, %)
- Non-Negotiable Doctrine Clarity Score (NNDCS, score)
- Interfaith Statement Integrity Rate (ISIR, %)
- Scriptural Common-Ground Reference Frequency (SCGRF, count)
- Interfaith Dialogue Preparation Completion (IDPC, %)
- Cross-Faith Terminology Alignment Rate (CFTAR, %)



**5th.International Congress on Management, Economy, Humanities,
Education And Business Development / 16-17 July. 2026**

Venue: East Azarbaijan Science and Technology Park

- Abrahamic Bridge Workshop Frequency (ABWF, count)
- External Representation Accuracy Score (ERAS, score)
- Interfaith Follow-Up Action Closure Rate (IFACR, %)
- Crisis Warning Indicators (CWIs)
- Premature Interfaith Engagement Warning Count (PIEWC, count)
- Internal Boundary Confusion Rate (IBCR, %)
- Common Ground Overstatement Rate (CGOR, %)
- Interfaith Misrepresentation Incident Count (IMIC, count)
- Doctrinal Dilution Concern Rate (DDCR, %)
- Unapproved Joint Statement Release Count (UJSRC, count)
- External Dialogue Backlash Signal (EDBS, signal score)
- Translation-Induced Interfaith Ambiguity Rate (TIAR, %)
- Unresolved Intra-Islamic Issue Export Rate (UIIER, %)
- Authority-Unsafe Interfaith Claim Count (AUICC, count)

14. Philosophy of Religious Language and Shared Semantics

(Strategic Dimension: Terminology Governance, Translation Fidelity, Semantic Alignment, Meaning Stability)

- Theological Glossary Coverage Rate (TGCR, %)
- Term-Sense Agreement Score (TSAS, score)
- Translation Fidelity Review Completion (TFRC, %)
- Concept Disambiguation Success Rate (CDSR, %)
- Shared Semantic Map Completion (SSMC, %)
- Contested Term Definition Usage Rate (CTDUR, %)
- Intercoder Agreement on Term Sense (ICATS, Cohen's κ or Fleiss' κ , as applicable)
- Multilingual Glossary Adoption Rate (MGAR, %)
- Semantic Clarification Request Closure Rate (SCRRCR, %)
- Philosophy-of-Language Review Frequency (PLRF, count)
- Crisis Warning Indicators (CWIs)
- Semantic Drift Detection Rate (SDDR, %)
- Translation Divergence Warning Count (TDWC, count)
- False Convergence Through Terminology Rate (FCTTR, %)
- Polysemy Misinterpretation Incident Count (PMIC, count)
- Ambiguous Key-Term Usage Rate (AKTUR, %)
- Unresolved Definition Conflict Rate (UDCR, %)
- Model-Induced Semantic Error Rate (MISER, %)
- Context-Loss in Translation Index (CLTI, index)
- Meaning-Shift Escalation Lag (MSEL, days)
- Semantic Authority Bypass Count (SABC, count)