THE ISLAMIC PERSPECTIVE ON SYMBOLIC INTERACTION THEORY

¹Mahmud Yunus Daulay
mahmudyunus@umsu.ac.id
²Rubino
rubino@uinsu.ac.id
³Mailin
mailin@uinsu.ac.id

Abstract

The discussion of symbolic interaction emphasizes more on the motives underlying human actions. Symbolic interaction states that all human actions are based on two motives, namely the motive for (in order to motive) and the motive because (because to motive). Both motives are in the mind of a person who does the act and no one else knows. In Islam, this motive can be called the intention that underlies the act. This intention is important because it is the cause of the acceptance or rejection of an action. Therefore, it is necessary to critique this theory from the perspective of Islamic communication. The results of the criticism of this theory from an Islamic perspective are, first, behavior must be carried out with good motives and intended because of God as the owner of power. Although sometimes in life, there are also many motivations for human behavior that are for other than God. Second, human behavior is not entirely born of his will, but there is also God's will in it. Third, Islam recommends that confirmation be carried out to see the motives of actions.

Keywords: Perspective, Islam and Theory

¹ State Islamic University of North Sumatra, Indonesia
² State Islamic University of North Sumatra, Indonesia
³ State Islamic University of North Sumatra, Indonesia

INTRODUCTION

Etymologically, symbolic interaction comes from two words, namely interaction and symbolic. Interaction is a reciprocal influence, influencing one another.[4] And symbolic is a representation, a style of language that describes an object by using other objects as symbols or representations.[5] The word symbolic actually comes from the word symbol, which means something used to represent something else based on mutual agreement.[6]

In terms of terminology, symbolic interaction is a concept that states that the essence of social interaction between individuals and groups or between groups in a society is communication, a unity of thought in which internalization or introspection previously took place within each individual involved.[7]

According to Herbert Blumer, symbolic interaction is an activity that is characteristic of humans, namely communication or the exchange of symbols that are given meaning.[8] According to Joel M. Charon, symbolic interaction is a joint social action in which individuals communicate with one another about what they are doing by orienting their activities toward each other.[9]

---

[4] M. Dahlan Al Barry, *Popular Scientific Dictionary* (Arkola, 1994), 265.

[5] Al Barry, *Popular Scientific Dictionary*, 708.

[6] Deddy Mulyana, *Introduction to Communication Studies* (Rosda Karya, 2002), 84.

[7] Onong Uchjana Effendy, *Dictionary of Communication* (Mandar Maju, 1989), 352.

[8] Herbert Blumer, *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method* (University of California Press, 1986).

[9] Dadi Ahmadi, "Symbolic Interaction: An Introduction," *MEDIATOR* 9, no. 2 (208 AD).

Based on the above definitions, both in terms of language and terminology, I can provide a brief definition that symbolic interaction is interaction carried out by humans using symbols or signs that have been mutually agreed upon to achieve a specific goal.

Symbolic interaction theory focuses on the origin of interaction, namely dynamic social activities in the lives of individuals. The dynamic nature indicates that everything about humans is considered a process that is constantly changing, therefore the limits of interpretation and action often change as well. In social interaction, a person will involve themselves with other people, symbolic perspectives, life experiences, thoughts, and abilities in determining their role.

In general, each perspective in social science has its own characteristics in viewing social reality, as does symbolic interactionism theory, which was developed based on psychological thinking, particularly social psychology. Several American experts developed symbolic interactionism theory, such as William James, James M. Baldwin, John Dewey, George H. Mead, which was later continued by Charles Horton Cooley, William I. Thomas, and Kuhn and Herbert Blumer. These figures agreed to use the term symbolic interactionism to explain a joint action, which would eventually form social structures or other community groups through unique interactions.

This theory inherits the intellectual tradition and position that developed in Europe in the 19th century and then crossed over

to America, especially in Chicago. However, some experts argue that symbolic interaction theory, particularly that of G.H. Mead (1920s-1930s), was first known in the field of interpretive sociology, which falls under the umbrella of social *action theory*, as proposed by the great philosopher and sociologist Max Weber (1864-1920).

Although symbolic interactionism does not fully adopt Weber's theory, Weber's influence is quite significant. One of Weber's views that is considered relevant to Mead's thinking is that social actions have deep meaning based on the subjective meaning given to them by individuals. These actions take into account the behavior of others and are therefore oriented towards appearance (Mulyana, 2002). In its subsequent development, symbolic interactionism was influenced by several schools of thought, including the Chicago school, the Iowa school, the dramaturgical approach, and ethnomethodology, inspired by philosophical views, particularly pragmatism and behaviorism.

The pragmatism school formulated by John Dewey, William James, Charles Peirce, and Josiah Royce has several views: first, true reality never exists in the real world, but is actively created when we act upon the world. Second, humans remember and base their knowledge of the world on what has proven useful to them. Third, humans define the physical and social objects they encounter based on their usefulness to them, including their purposes. Fourth, if we want to understand people who perform actions (*actors*), we must base that understanding on what they

actually do in the world. Meanwhile, the behaviorist school of thought pioneered by Watson argues that humans must be understood based on what they do.[10]

While other scientists such as James Mark Baldwin, William James, Charles Horton Cooley, John Dewey, and William I. Thomas are known as pioneers of symbolic interactionism, G. H. Mead is known as the most popular scientist who laid the foundations for this theory of symbolic interactionism.

The theory of symbolic interactionism was first introduced in 1969 by Herbert Blumer, but the initial idea for this theory came from George Herbert Mead, only to be later modified by Blumer to achieve certain objectives. This theory actually has a good idea, but it is not as deep and specific as proposed by G. Herbert Mead.

G. Herbert Mead was born in Massachusetts in 1863. When he was eleven years old, he attended Oberlin College. After graduating, he taught briefly at an elementary school, but that job only lasted four months because he was fired for frequently expelling noisy children from the classroom.

In 1887, Mead entered Harvard University, majoring in philosophy and psychology. Mead had a keen interest in Hegel's philosophy, which is why he tried to learn directly from famous figures such as William James, Hellen Castel, and others.

Hegel's influence on Mead can be seen in the three philosophical perspectives he proposed, one of which is German dialectical idealism. This perspective complements Watson's idea

---

[10] Didik Hariyanto, *Textbook on Introduction to Communication Science* (UMSIDA Press, 2021).

that an individual's adaptation to the outside world is connected through the process of communication.[11]

Symbolic interaction seemed to be hidden behind Takott Persons' functionalism theory in its early development. However, in the 1950s and 1960s, symbolic interaction resurfaced and developed rapidly due to the decline of functionalism theory.[12]

In its early development, this theory emphasized human behavior in interpersonal relationships rather than in society or groups. Therefore, many experts assessed through their statements that symbolic interaction theory was only appropriate for explaining microsociological phenomena or from a social psychology perspective. However, in its subsequent development, this theory also developed its sociological perspective, so that the statements made by these experts were no longer accurate.

Symbolic interactionism, which emerged in the 1960s, is a view of social reality, but experts believe that this view cannot be considered new. Stephen Littlejohn says that the founders of symbolic interactionism are George Herbert Mead, Herbert Blumer, Manford Kuhn, Kenneth Burke, and Hugh Duncan[13].

In fact, in developing this symbolic interaction theory, Blumer was greatly influenced by Mead's thinking. On the other hand,

---

[11] "George Herbert Mead | Research Starters | EBSCO Research," EBSCO, accessed December 1, 2025, https://www.ebsco.com.

[12] Bernard RAHO, *Modern Sociology Theory (Revised Edition)* (Ledalero Publishers, 2021), http://repository.iftkledalero.ac.id/309/.

[13] Dadi Ahmadi, "Symbolic Interaction: An Introduction," *Mediator: Journal of Communication* 9, no. 2 (2008): 301–16, https://doi.org/10.29313/mediator.v9i2.1115.

Mead was greatly influenced by the thinking of his close friends, such as John Dewey and Colley.

During the 1960s, interactionist figures such as Howard S. Becker and Erving Goffman produced fascinating interpretive studies on socialization and the relationship between individuals and society.

Meltzer states that symbolic interactionism is considered relatively homogeneous, but in fact this perspective consists of several schools of thought based on their different historical and intellectual roots. These schools of symbolic interactionism are the Chicago and Iowa schools. The dramaturgical and ethnomethodological approaches. The Dramaturgical and Ethnomethodological schools provide a more complete understanding of the reality being studied. Both approaches analyze not only the presence of humans among their peers, but also the motives, attitudes, and values they hold in their private lives.[14]

The roots of symbolic interaction theory are pragmatism, behaviorism, and Darwinian evolution. Pragmatism was formulated as ism by John Dewey et al. This school of philosophy has several views, namely: *First:* True reality never exists in the real world but is actively created when we act on the world. *Second:* This school of thought believes that humans remember and base their knowledge of the world on what has proven useful

---

[14] Yunan Irham Maraya, "The Meaning of Love Services at the Technical Services Unit of the Surabaya Institute of Technology Library" (thesis, UNIVERSITAS AIRLANGGA, 2015), http://lib.unair.ac.id.

to them. They will do something they consider useful and abandon it when it is no longer useful to them. *Third:* Humans define the physical and social objects they encounter based on their usefulness to them, including their purpose for them. *Fourth:* If we want to understand people who perform actions (actors), we must base that understanding on what they actually do in the world.[15]

In fact, the symbolic interactionist view and the behaviorist view are very different, but Mead's view was influenced by the latter. Mead agreed with the behaviorist view that humans must be understood based on what they do.

According to Mead, social behaviorism refers to the description of behavior at a level that is unique to humans. So, in social behaviorism, the basic concept is social action, which also considers the hidden aspects of human behavior. Meanwhile, Watson's radical behaviorism tends to assume that human behavior is the same as the behavior of other animals , namely as passive and non-thinking creatures, no different from puppets, whose behavior is determined by external stimuli.[16]

Mead was also influenced by Darwin's theory of evolution, which holds that organisms continually adapt to their environment, leading to ongoing change. Thus, he saw the human mind as something that emerged through natural evolution.[17]

---

[15] Ahmadi, "Symbolic Interaction."

[16] A.M.Irfan Asfar et al., *BEHAVIORISM THEORY (Theory of Behaviorism)* (2019), https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.34507.44324.

[17] Mahattama Banteng Sukarno, *Understanding Symbols (An Introduction to the Symbolic Interactionism Paradigm-George Herbert Mead)* (Deepublish, 2025).

The influence of Darwin's theory of evolution mainly concerns his method, which is considered to contain atheistic elements. In the 19th century, Darwin's theory emphasized the view that all organism behavior, including human behavior, is not random but is carried out to adapt to the environment. Another aspect of Darwin's view that is considered influential is that just as nature must be studied in its natural state, humans must also be studied in their natural state. Just as Darwin believed that nature is constantly changing over time, Mead also believed that everything about humans, their assumptions about themselves, their environment, their views of the past and future, the symbols they use, the rules they follow, and the ways they treat their environment also change over time.[18]

Symbolic interaction theory actually falls under sociological theories and can be considered a new theory, so it is natural that symbolic interaction theory is referred to as a contemporary sociological theory. Some experts argue that symbolic interaction theory actually falls under Max Weber's theory of social action, although upon closer examination, G. Herbert Mead did not develop Weber's theory; rather, there is a similarity in perception between the two figures in assessing human behavior.

As mentioned earlier, in its early stages of development, symbolic interactionism emphasized the study of human behavior in interpersonal relationships rather than in groups or society as a

---

[18] Abdur Rouf Hasbullah et al., "The Application of Symbolic Interaction Theory and Social Change in the Digital Age," *At-Tahdzib: Journal of Islamic Studies and Muamalah* 10, no. 1 (2022): 36–49.

whole. The most fundamental proposition of symbolic interactionism is that human behavior and interaction can be distinguished because they are expressed through symbols and their meanings.

The theory of symbolic interaction is underpinned by Max Weber's theory of social action, in which Weber defines social action as all human behavior when and to the extent that individuals give subjective meaning to that behavior, meaning that actions have social meaning based on the subjective meaning given by individuals. According to G.H. Mead , symbolic interaction is an activity that is characteristic of humans, namely communication or the exchange of symbols whose meaning is based on mutual agreement.

In general, there are six proportions used in the concept of symbolic interaction, namely: 1). Human behavior has underlying meaning. 2). The meaning of humanity needs to be sought in human social interaction. 3). Human society is a holistic, inseparable, non-linear, and unpredictable process. 4). Human behavior is based on phenomenological interpretation, which occurs based on intention, meaning, and purpose, not based on mechanical and automatic processes. 5). Human mental concepts develop dialectically. 6). Human behavior is natural and constructively reactive.

According to Jarome and Bernand Meltzer, there are 7 basic propositions in symbolic interaction[19] , namely: 1). Humans understand things through meanings derived from experience, and human perceptions always arise with symbols. 2). Meaning can be learned through human interaction, and meaning arises from the exchange of symbols within social groups. 3). All social structures and institutions are created based on human interaction. 4). Human behavior is not only influenced by events but also by their own will. 5). The human mind contains internal conversations, reflecting that it has interacted with others. 6). Behavior is created in interaction with social groups. 7). A person cannot be understood solely from their overt behavior, but must be understood as a whole.

Through these propositions, we can see that communication between humans occurs through the exchange of symbols and the interpretation of those symbols.

According to Blumer, there are three main points of symbolic interaction, namely: 1). That humans act *(act)* towards something *(thing)* based on meaning *(meaning).* 2). Meaning originates from a person's interaction with others. 3). Meaning is treated or changed through a process of interpretation that people use when encountering something.

---

[19] Rahmawati Rahmawati, "A Study of Symbolic Interactionism in the Tradition of Reciting and Completing the Qur'an Among the Mandar People in Letawa Village, Sarjo District, Pasangkayu Regency" (diploma, IAIN Palu, 2021), http://repository.iainpalu.ac.id/id/eprint/1093/.

According to Thomas, a person does not immediately react when they receive external stimuli[20] . A person must first make an assessment and consideration, so that external stimuli are selected through a process called situation interpretation. There are two types of situation interpretation or situation definition, namely situation interpretation made spontaneously by individuals and situation interpretation made by society.

The interpretation of situations made by society is a set of rules that govern human interaction. There are three types of rules that govern human behavior when they interact with others, namely rules regarding space, rules regarding time, and rules regarding movement and body posture.

Karp and Yoel say that the factors that influence interaction are characteristics that are innate, such as gender, age, and race; appearance and body shape, which are influenced by clothing; and what the actor says.

Symbolic interaction uses language as one of the most important symbols and gestures, but symbols are not factors that have already occurred; rather, they are an ongoing process. This means that they are a process of conveying meaning and symbols, which is *the subject matter* in symbolic interaction.

Humans act towards something based on the meanings that objects have for them, where the meanings of these symbols are the result of social interaction in society. This means that interactions between humans are bridged by the use of symbols, by

---

[20] Dr Sumanto M.A, *General Psychology* (Media Pressindo, 2014).

interpretation, and by the certainty of the meanings of other people's actions. Thus, their actions are not merely reactions to each other's actions according to a stimulus-response pattern, as believed by behaviorists, without any understanding of those actions. Between the stimulus and the response, there is an "insertion" of the interpretation process. It is this interpretation that determines the response to the stimulus, namely the response to act based on symbols interpreted in social interaction. Therefore, social interaction in society itself is symbolic interaction.

In principle, symbolic interaction occurs between various thoughts and meanings that characterize society. In symbolic interaction, both individuals and society are actors. Individuals and society are a single unit that cannot be separated; they determine each other. In other words, a person's actions are the result of internal and external stimulation or of the social form of the self and society. This is the basic assumption of symbolic interaction.

The characteristics of symbolic interaction theory are marked by the relationships that occur between individuals in society. Thus, individuals interact with one another through communication. Individuals are symbols that develop through the symbolic interactions they create between individuals. Meanwhile, society is a continuous recapitulation of individuals.

Symbolic interaction is formed through certain characteristics, namely through a framework. This framework is characterized by the existence of a specific elaboration theory introduced by sociological theory. However, Blumer's symbolic

interaction was introduced as sociological knowledge from the micro level to the macro level.

G.H. Mead said that symbolic interaction theory is summarized by three concepts, namely mind, self, and society.[21] All creatures have brains, but not all of them have minds, which arise from the manipulation of symbols through the process of learning and self-development. The process of human mind interaction takes the form of interaction with oneself, others, and the environment, all of which are expressed symbolically. Human symbolism expresses words or feelings based on interpretation and understanding. If the mind functions to realize the self, it is called mental activity, then the mind is used to perform symbolic interaction with the self, which is done by humans themselves in using symbols and directing them towards the self. Symbols have meanings or signals that are meaningful to their users or exist in the form of words, behaviors, objects, and language that are rich in symbols.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses the *library research* method*,* which focuses on collecting, reviewing, and analyzing written sources relevant to the topic. These sources include books, scientific articles, journals, previous research results, as well as classical and contemporary literature discussing symbolic interaction theory and Islamic perspectives, particularly those related to the concepts of meaning,

---

[21] Judistira K. Garna., *Social Sciences, Fundamentals-Concepts-Positions.* (Primaco Akademika, 1999), 74.

social interaction, and the construction of reality. The research process was carried out by tracing primary literature as a theoretical basis and secondary literature to strengthen the analysis. Each piece of data found was then critiqued, compared, and synthesized to gain an in-depth understanding of the similarities, differences, and contributions of Islamic thought to symbolic interaction theory. The analysis was conducted qualitatively with an emphasis on the interpretation of texts and contexts, thereby producing comprehensive and accurate scientific arguments regarding the relationship between Islamic perspectives and symbolic interaction theory.

RESEARCH RESULTS

Before presenting criticism from the 7-point perspective, the author presents a general critique of symbolic interaction theory. At a minimum, there are several main criticisms directed at this perspective, namely:

1. The mainstream of symbolic interactionism has been accused of too readily discarding conventional scientific techniques. Eugene Weinstein and Judith Tanur aptly state: "Just because the degree of consciousness is qualitative does not mean that its expression cannot be coded, classified, or even counted" (1976:105). Science and subjectivism are not mutually exclusive.

2. M. Kuhn (1964), W. Kolb (1944), B. Meitzer, J. Petras and L. Reynolds (1975), and many others criticized the ambiguity of Meadian essential concepts such as: mind, self, *I,* and *Me.* More generally, Kuhn (1964) discusses the ambiguity and

contradictions in Mead's theory. Beyond Mead's theory, they criticize various basic concepts of symbolic interactionism theorists as being erroneous, inaccurate, and therefore incapable of providing a strong basis for building theory and research. Because these concepts are inaccurate, they are difficult to operationalize, resulting in the inability to produce testable propositions (Stryker, 1980).

3. Symbolic interactionism has been criticized for underestimating or ignoring the role of broader structures. This criticism is expressed in various ways. For example, Weinstein and Tanur say that symbolic interactionism ignores *the connectedness* of outcomes (1976:106). Sheldon Stryker states that symbolic interactionism's focus on micro-level interactions serves to "minimize or deny the facts of social structure and influence society's perception of control over behavior."

4. Symbolic interactionism is not sufficiently microscopic, ignoring the important role of factors such as the unconscious and emotions. Similarly, symbolic interactionism has been criticized for ignoring psychological factors such as needs, motives, goals, and aspirations. In their attempt to deny the existence of eternal forces that compel actors to act, symbolic interactionist theorists instead focus their attention on meaning, symbols, actions, and interactions. They ignore psychological factors that may limit or suppress actors. In both cases, symbolic interactionist theorists are accused of making an "absolute worship" of everyday life. This focus on everyday life further marks an overemphasis on

immediate situations and an "obsessive attention to temporary, episodic, and brief situations."

In critiquing this symbolic interaction theory, out of the seven points presented, the author highlights only four points : scope, usefulness, testability, and time testing.

1. Scope

Regarding criticism of the scope of this theory, there are several important points to note, namely:

a. Symbolic interaction theory is considered too American in flavor because it emphasizes individual freedom and limits the role of society.

b. Symbolic interaction theory is considered too narrow in its research.

c. Symbolic interaction theory has an overly broad approach.

d. Symbolic interaction theory is too general in its conclusions and therefore does not meet the criteria for a good theory.

e. Symbolic interaction theory does not examine human emotions in the sense that symbolic interaction theory is not truly psychological.

f. Symbolic interaction theory is only interested in a limited scope of social structure in the sense that symbolic interaction theory is not truly sociological.

g. Symbolic interaction theory describes meaning as something that emerges naturally during interaction under certain conditions.

h. Symbolic interaction theory is considered too subjective due to its proximity to the research subject.

2. Usefulness

This theory is useful in predicting the behavior of communication partners. Through this theory, we can detect the motives of communication partners when communicating. As we know, all human behavior is based on two motives, namely *because to motiv* and *in order to motiv*. A simple example is that when a Muslim performs the obligatory prayer, his actions are based on at least these two motives. He prays because he is carrying out a command and in order not to sin.

In addition, symbolic interaction theory also has many uses. As we understand, symbolic interaction theory explains how the human mind can interpret and give meaning to objects and events that are experienced, explain their origins, and predict them. The mind also makes an individual's life itself an object of recognition, or what is called *the self*, with certain characteristics and status. For example, name, gender, religion, nationality, and others. Basically, these originate from society or the process of interaction. The way humans interpret the world (mind) and themselves (*self*) is closely related to their society. The unity between thinking and acting, the mind and the self, is part of human behavior, namely their interaction with other people. This interaction allows humans to know the world and themselves.

3. Testability

cal interaction theory has high testability. Many studies have tested and validated the cal concepts proposed in cal interaction theory. For example, one recent study that uses cal interaction theory is a study entitled "The Tradition of Manten Mubeng Sumur in Traditional Javanese Marriage in Dukuh Porodesan, Klaten Regency" conducted by Rohmad Fauzan. Among the results of his research, he states that "The meaning of the manten mubeng sumur tradition can be understood through symbolic interactionism, namely that human life uses symbols from their group and has its own meaning. In practice, the Porodesan community only carries out the manten mubeng sumur tradition but does not apply the meaning contained within it."

4. The theory has stood the test of time.

This theory is classified as a theory that still exists today. This is because its basic assumptions can still be used to explain the phenomenon of human behavior in everyday life.

For example, we can see how Herbert Blumer wrote about the three main principles of symbolic interactionism theory. First, a person acts and behaves based on the meaning interpreted from the behavior or actions of that person. Second, social meaning is the result of social construction. Third, the creation of meaning and social understanding is an ongoing interactive process.

This theory views reality as a social construction that is formed through a continuous process of interaction. In addition,

this theory is often classified as a micro-sociological theory because its scope of analysis extends to individual aspects.

Over time and with changing times, this theory has developed into various schools and movements. This includes the theory developed by Herbert Blumer, which has been criticized by the new generation for shifting towards micro analysis. Interactionism has entered a new era, known as post-Blumerian.

There have been continuous efforts to synthesize symbolic interactionism with other ideas, such as exchange, structural functionalism, phenomenology, and ethnomethodology, as well as attempts to connect it with post-structuralism, post-modernism, cultural studies, and radical feminism. Thanks to these efforts, symbolic interaction theory can still be used today.

DISCUSSION

The theory of symbolic interaction, inspired by G.H. Mead and later popularized and developed by Blumer, has several propositions. *First,* human behavior has underlying meaning. Blumer believes that behind behavior there is something that serves as a foundation. If we relate this to Islamic teachings, then behavior must be carried out with good motives/intentions and for the sake of God as the owner of power. Although sometimes in life, there are also motivations for human behavior that are not for God. Perhaps we still remember the hadith that deeds are judged by their intentions, as in the hadith of the Prophet Muhammad SAW narrated by Bukhari, Muslim, and the four imams of the Hadith, which means:

"From Umar, may Allah be pleased with him, that the Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, said, 'Actions are judged by intentions, and a person will only receive according to their intention. Whoever migrates for the sake of Allah and His Messenger, then his migration is for the sake of Allah and His Messenger. And whoever migrates for the sake of this world or for a woman to marry, then his migration is for the sake of what he migrated for." (Narrated by Bukhari, Muslim, and the four imams of Hadith scholars)."

Second, human behavior is not only influenced by events but also by their own will. Through this second proposition, Blumer wants to emphasize that humans have absolute power or will over their own actions. However, if we look at the Quran, it is Allah SWT who has the power to regulate human actions, as stated in Surah *Ash Shafat* verse 96, which means: "*And Allah is the one who created you and what you do (your actions)*."

Third, a person cannot be understood solely from their overt behavior, but must be understood as a whole. Blumer explains that in understanding people, we must not only look at their overt behavior, but must understand them as a whole. This opinion is in line with Islamic teachings, that we must seek accurate information (n: *tabnayyun).* As Allah says in Surah Al-Hujurat verse 6, which means:

"O you who believe, if a wicked person comes to you with important news, then verify its truth so that you do not harm a people out of ignorance, which will cause you to regret your actions."

In addition, Allah also directs us not to immediately punish and accuse someone who is reported of adultery, but to present

witnesses. The point of presenting witnesses is a command not to judge someone solely based on their apparent behavior.

Consider the words of Allah SWT in the Quran, Surah *An-Nur,* Verse 4, which means:

> *"And those who accuse chaste women (of adultery) and do not bring four witnesses, then flog them eighty times, and never accept their testimony afterward. They are the ones who are wicked."*

CONCLUSION

Symbolic interaction teaches us that human behavior does not arise on its own. However, all human behavior has two bases: *because to* and *in order to.* Thus, it is hoped that we will not be prejudiced when we see the behavior of others not in line with our expectations.

REFERENCES

Ahmadi, Dadi. "Symbolic Interaction: An Introduction." *MEDIATOR* 9, no. 2 (208 AD).

Ahmadi, Dadi. "Symbolic Interaction: An Introduction." *Mediator: Journal of Communication* 9, no. 2 (2008): 301–16. https://doi.org/10.29313/mediator.v9i2.1115.

Al Barry, M. Dahlan. *Popular Scientific Dictionary*. Arkola, 1994.

Asfar, A.M.Irfan, Andi Muhamad Asfar, and Mercy Halamury. *BEHAVIORISM THEORY (Theory of Behaviorism)*. 2019. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.34507.44324.

Blumer, Herbert. *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. University of California Press, 1986.

Citraningsih, Diningrum, and Hanifah Noviandari. "Symbolic Interactionism: The Role of Leadership in Decision Making."

Social Science Studies 2, no. 1 (2022): 072–086. https://doi.org/10.47153/sss21.3152022.

EBSCO. "George Herbert Mead | Research Starters | EBSCO Research." Accessed December 1, 2025. https://www.ebsco.com.

Effendy, Onong Uchjana. *Dictionary of Communication*. Mandar Maju, 1989.

Hariyanto, Didik. *Introduction to Communication Science Textbook*. UMSIDA Press, 2021.

Hasbullah, Abdur Rouf, Nur Ahid, and Sutrisno. "The Application of Symbolic Interaction Theory and Social Change in the Digital Age." *At-Tahdzib: Journal of Islamic Studies and Muamalah* 10, no. 1 (2022): 36–49.

K. Garna., Judistira. *Social Sciences, Fundamentals-Concepts-Positions.* Primaco Akademika, 1999.

M.A, Dr Sumanto. *General Psychology*. Media Pressindo, 2014.

Maraya, Yunan Irham. "The Meaning of Love Services at the Technical Service Unit of the Surabaya Institute of Technology Library." Thesis, UNIVERSITAS AIRLANGGA, 2015. http://lib.unair.ac.id.

Mulyana, Deddy. *Communication Science: An Introduction*. Rosda Karya, 2002.

Rahmawati, Rahmawati. "A Study of Symbolic Interaction in the Tradition of Reciting and Completing the Qur'an Among the Mandar People in Letawa Village, Sarjo District, Pasangkayu Regency." Diploma, IAIN Palu, 2021. http://repository.iainpalu.ac.id/id/eprint/1093/.

RAHO, Bernard. *Modern Sociology Theory (Revised Edition)*. Ledalero Publisher, 2021. http://repository.iftkledalero.ac.id/309/.

Sukarno, Mahattama Banteng. *Understanding Symbols (An Introduction to the Symbolic Interactionism Paradigm—George Herbert Mead)*. Deepublish, 2025.