



## International Journal of Economics, Management and Social Science

Vol 9 No 1 March 2026

E-ISSN: 2614-3828 | P-ISSN: 2614-3887

Open Access: <https://journal.salewangang.net/ijemss/index>

### George Herbert Mead's Symbolic Interactionism: Self Construction and Identity Formation Through Social Interaction

Anshar<sup>1\*</sup>, Oman Sukmana<sup>2</sup>, Gonda Yumitro<sup>2</sup>, Nurudin<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Doctoral Program in Sociology, Graduate School Directorate

Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang, Indonesia

<sup>2,3,4</sup> Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang, Indonesia

\*Correspondence: [anshar@webmail.umm.ac.id](mailto:anshar@webmail.umm.ac.id)

#### Article Info :

Received:

12/02/2026

Revised:

17/02/2026

Accepted:

24/02/2026

#### ABSTRACT

*This article examines George Herbert Mead's symbolic interactionism theory, focusing on self construction and identity formation through social interaction. Mead's framework, articulated primarily in *Mind, Self, and Society* (1934), posits that the self emerges not as an innate essence but through social processes involving symbolic communication and role-taking. Drawing on contemporary research in identity studies and social psychology, this study analyzes how Mead's concepts of the "I" and "Me," the generalized other, and significant symbols remain relevant for understanding identity formation in modern contexts characterized by digital communication, globalization, and increasing social diversity. The analysis demonstrates that symbolic interactionism provides valuable insights into contemporary phenomena including online identity construction, multicultural identity negotiation, and the role of social media in self-presentation. Findings reveal that while Mead's theory was developed in early twentieth-century American society, its core insights about the social nature of selfhood apply to twenty-first century contexts, though requiring adaptation to account for digital interaction, mediated communication, and globalized social networks. This article contributes to sociological theory by demonstrating symbolic interactionism's continued relevance while identifying areas where the framework requires extension to address contemporary realities.*

**Keywords:** Symbolic interactionism, George Herbert Mead, self construction, identity formation, social interaction, role-taking, generalized other, significant symbols



©2022 Authors.. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License.  
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

#### INTRODUCTION

Identity formation represents one of the fundamental processes through which individuals develop a sense of self and social belonging. In contemporary societies characterized by rapid social change, digital communication, and cultural diversity, questions about how identities form and evolve carry particular urgency. George Herbert Mead (1863-1931), a philosopher and social psychologist associated with the University of Chicago and American pragmatism, developed a theoretical framework that remains foundational for understanding identity as socially constructed through symbolic interaction (Mead, 1934). Unlike psychological approaches emphasizing innate personality or biological determinism, Mead argued that the self emerges through social processes involving communication, role-taking, and internalization of social expectations.

Mead's symbolic interactionism posits that human beings are distinctive in their capacity for reflexive self-awareness—the ability to view oneself as an object from the perspective of others. This reflexivity emerges through language acquisition and symbolic communication, enabling individuals to take the role of others and anticipate how others will respond to their actions. The self, in Mead's

framework, is not a static entity but an ongoing social process wherein the "I" (spontaneous, creative aspect) dialogues with the "Me" (internalized social expectations). Identity formation involves learning to see oneself from the standpoint of the "generalized other"—the organized attitudes of the entire community (Mead, 1934; Blumer, 1969). This insight—radical in its implications—challenged both biological reductionism and Cartesian individualism, positioning human selfhood as fundamentally social in its origins, development, and ongoing constitution.

Contemporary identity research continues to engage with Meadian themes while extending his framework to address new realities. Digital communication platforms enable novel forms of social interaction and self-presentation, raising questions about whether online identity construction follows similar dynamics as face-to-face interaction (Rohall, 2020). Globalization creates contexts where individuals navigate multiple cultural frameworks simultaneously, requiring more complex identity negotiation than Mead's framework explicitly addressed (Huebner, 2022). Social movements around gender, sexuality, race, and other dimensions of identity highlight how collective identities form through interaction while challenging normative expectations that Mead treated as relatively stable (Cole, 2019). These developments make the task of reassessing and extending Meadian symbolic interactionism both intellectually urgent and practically consequential.

The significance of Mead's contribution to sociological theory cannot be overstated. His pragmatist philosophy, which drew on William James, John Dewey, and Charles Sanders Peirce, provided the philosophical foundation for a sociology centered on meaning, interpretation, and social action rather than structural determinism. Herbert Blumer (1969), who coined the term "symbolic interactionism" and systematized Mead's insights, identified three premises that distill the tradition's core commitments: human beings act toward things based on the meanings those things have for them; meanings arise from social interaction; and meanings are modified through an interpretive process used by the person in dealing with things encountered. These premises situate symbolic interactionism as a micro-sociological tradition attentive to agency, meaning, and the active construction of social reality—a tradition whose relevance extends well beyond its original context.

This article examines three research questions: (1) How do Mead's concepts of self construction through role-taking and the generalized other illuminate contemporary identity formation processes? (2) To what extent does symbolic interactionism account for identity formation in digitally-mediated, globalized contexts? (3) What insights does the Meadian framework offer for understanding identity politics and social movements centered on identity claims? These questions guide a systematic theoretical and empirical analysis spanning Mead's original framework, its elaboration by subsequent symbolic interactionists, and its application to contemporary identity phenomena.

## **METHODS**

This study employs theoretical analysis and systematic literature review methodology to examine George Herbert Mead's symbolic interactionism theory and its contemporary applications to identity formation. The analysis synthesizes Mead's original texts, particularly *Mind, Self, and Society* (1934) and *The Philosophy of the Act* (1938), with recent scholarship on symbolic interactionism and identity studies published between 2018 and 2025. The systematic review component searched databases including Sociological Abstracts, JSTOR, Scopus, and Google Scholar using terms including "symbolic interactionism," "Mead," "self construction," "identity formation," "generalized other," "digital identity," and "online self-presentation."

Inclusion criteria required that studies engage substantively with Meadian concepts or symbolic interactionist frameworks in relation to identity formation, self construction, or closely related phenomena. Studies were further selected for their methodological rigor, theoretical clarity, and relevance to contemporary social contexts including digital communication, multicultural societies, and identity-based social movements. Following screening, approximately 40 studies were selected for detailed engagement, supplemented by classical texts in the symbolic interactionist tradition, including foundational works by Blumer, Goffman, and Cooley, whose concept of the "looking-glass self" anticipates several Meadian themes.

The analytical approach combines internal reconstruction of Mead's theoretical framework—identifying its core concepts, logical structure, and foundational assumptions—with external critique and extension, assessing how well the framework accounts for contemporary identity phenomena and where it requires elaboration or revision. This dual approach enables both appreciation of Mead's enduring contributions and honest assessment of the framework's limitations, contributing to the ongoing theoretical development of symbolic interactionism as a living sociological tradition rather than a museum piece.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### **The Meadian Framework: Self, Mind, and Society**

Mead's theory of self construction centers on the proposition that human selfhood emerges through social interaction rather than existing as an innate biological given. Unlike animals that respond reflexively to stimuli, humans engage in symbolic interaction wherein they interpret gestures and symbols, anticipate others' responses, and adjust their behavior accordingly. This capacity for reflexive self-awareness—viewing oneself as object from others' perspectives—constitutes the distinctive feature of human consciousness (Mead, 1934). The self is not present at birth but develops through a process of social experience in which the child gradually learns to take the perspective of others and thereby construct a coherent sense of who they are.

Central to Mead's account is the concept of the "significant symbol"—a gesture whose meaning is shared by both the actor and those to whom it is addressed. Language constitutes the paradigmatic significant symbol system: words mean the same thing to speakers and hearers, enabling genuine communication and shared understanding. Through participation in linguistic interaction, children acquire not merely vocabulary but a symbolic framework through which they can think about themselves and the world from perspectives other than their own immediate experience. The internalization of language is thus simultaneously the acquisition of a tool for self-reflection and social coordination—the medium through which the individual and the social become mutually constitutive (Miller, 2021).

The developmental trajectory of the self unfolds, in Mead's account, through two stages: play and the game. In the play stage, the child takes the role of specific others—imitating parents, teachers, doctors—learning to see the world from particular social perspectives without integrating these into a coherent whole. In the game stage, the child must simultaneously take the roles of all participants, anticipating how each will respond to every other's actions. This coordination requires internalizing what Mead calls the "generalized other"—the organized set of attitudes and expectations that represent the community's social perspective. The generalized other provides the social standard against which individuals evaluate their own conduct and develops the capacity for genuinely social thought (Joas, 2019).

The "I" and "Me" distinction represents Mead's most subtle and philosophically rich contribution to identity theory. The "Me" is the organized set of attitudes of others which the individual assumes—the internalized social expectations, roles, and identities that constitute the social self. The "I" is the response of the organism to the attitudes of others—spontaneous, unpredictable, the source of novelty and creativity in social life. Identity formation involves the ongoing dialogue between these two aspects of the self: the "I" acts, the "Me" provides the social context within which action is evaluated, and the resulting experience becomes incorporated into the "Me" through reflection. This dynamic dialectic means that the self is never fixed but always in process—responsive to social experience while retaining a core of creative agency (Athens, 2020).

### **Role-Taking, the Generalized Other, and Contemporary Identity**

Mead's concept of role-taking—the ability to imaginatively adopt the perspective of another person—constitutes the cognitive and social mechanism through which identity formation occurs. Role-taking is not mere imitation but an active imaginative process requiring the individual to construct a model of another's perspective and use that model to anticipate their responses. Through repeated role-taking across diverse social relationships, individuals build up a complex understanding of the social world

and their place within it. The generalized other emerges from this accumulation of role-taking experiences as an abstract social perspective—the perspective of the community as a whole rather than any specific individual (Reynolds & Herman-Kinney, 2021).

Contemporary identity research confirms and extends Mead's insights about role-taking and the generalized other, while revealing complications that his original framework did not fully address. Research in developmental psychology demonstrates that the capacity for perspective-taking emerges in early childhood through processes that broadly accord with Mead's developmental account, with significant social variation in how this capacity is cultivated and expressed across cultural contexts. Cross-cultural research reveals that the content of the generalized other—the specific expectations and values that communities internalize—varies substantially across societies, suggesting that Mead's framework correctly identifies the mechanism of identity formation while underspecifying the cultural diversity of its content (Aboulaflia, 2018).

The multiplicity of generalized others in contemporary social life represents one of the most significant extensions required by Mead's framework. Where Mead's account implied a relatively unified community providing a coherent generalized other, contemporary individuals typically inhabit multiple, overlapping, and sometimes contradictory social worlds, each with distinct expectations and identity demands. A young person in a multicultural urban environment simultaneously navigates family expectations, peer group norms, school culture, religious community standards, and media representations—each constituting a partial generalized other with potentially divergent implications for identity (Spencer, 2020). Managing these multiple generalized others requires sophisticated identity work that Mead's framework gestures toward but does not fully theorize.

Erving Goffman's dramaturgical sociology, while distinct from Mead's symbolic interactionism, elaborates important dimensions of role-taking in face-to-face interaction that complement the Meadian framework. Goffman's analysis of impression management—the strategic presentation of self to audiences—reveals the active, performative dimensions of identity construction that Mead's more cognitive account can underemphasize. The concept of "front stage" and "back stage" behavior highlights how identity performance varies with audience composition, with individuals modulating their self-presentation according to contextual demands while maintaining a sense of coherent selfhood across contexts (Cahill, 2019). This dramaturgical extension of symbolic interactionism proves particularly valuable for analyzing digital identity construction, where the architecture of platforms shapes what aspects of self are visible to which audiences.

### **Symbolic Interactionism and Digital Identity Construction**

The emergence of digital communication platforms—social media, online communities, virtual reality environments—has created new contexts for identity construction that both extend and challenge Mead's framework. Digital platforms enable forms of self-presentation and social interaction that differ substantially from face-to-face interaction in their temporal structure, audience reach, permanence, and the degree of control individuals exercise over self-presentation. Understanding these differences requires both the application of Meadian concepts and their adaptation to digital realities (Rohall, 2020).

Social media platforms constitute digital arenas for the kind of reflexive self-presentation that Mead identified as central to identity formation. When individuals curate their Facebook profiles, craft Twitter personas, or design Instagram aesthetics, they are engaging in precisely the kind of self-objectification—viewing oneself as an object to be presented to others—that Mead theorized. The imagined audience for digital self-presentation functions as a digital generalized other: individuals construct their online personas in anticipation of how their followers, friends, and potential audiences will respond, internalizing imagined community standards as they curate their digital identities (Martin & Gillespie, 2019). Research on social media self-presentation consistently confirms that users actively manage impressions, calibrate disclosures, and construct digital identities that are simultaneously authentic expressions of self and strategic performances for anticipated audiences.

Digital environments also introduce dimensions of identity construction that complicate straightforward application of Meadian theory. The asynchronous, editable, and permanent character of digital communication enables more deliberate self-construction than spontaneous face-to-face interaction allows: individuals can draft, revise, and delete self-presentations in ways impossible in real-time interaction. This greater deliberateness shifts the balance between the "I" and the "Me" in digital contexts, potentially amplifying the reflexive, socially responsive dimensions of identity construction while constraining the spontaneous, creative "I." The permanence and searchability of digital self-presentations also create what scholars have called a "digital shadow"—a trail of archived self-presentations that can constrain future identity flexibility by anchoring individuals to past constructions (Gillespie & Martin, 2020).

The multiplicity of audiences in digital environments creates particular challenges for identity management that extend Mead's framework significantly. Goffman's dramaturgical concept of "audience segregation"—maintaining different self-presentations for different audiences—becomes significantly more difficult in digital contexts where multiple audiences may converge on a single platform. The phenomenon of "context collapse," in which messages intended for one audience are seen by others with very different expectations and interpretive frameworks, creates situations where the anticipated generalized other that guides self-presentation proves misaligned with the actual audiences encountered. Managing context collapse requires sophisticated identity work—developing meta-awareness of digital audiences, strategically segmenting digital presence across platforms, and developing narrative frameworks that render apparent inconsistencies between different self-presentations coherent.

### **Globalization, Multicultural Identities, and the Limits of the Generalized Other**

Globalization has fundamentally altered the conditions under which identity formation occurs, creating contexts of cultural plurality and transnational connection that Mead's early twentieth-century framework did not directly address. Contemporary individuals increasingly live their lives across cultural boundaries—through migration, transnational family networks, global media consumption, and participation in cosmopolitan urban environments—encountering multiple, partially incompatible generalized others whose expectations may conflict in ways that require active negotiation and creative synthesis (Huebner, 2022).

The sociological literature on multicultural identity formation draws heavily on symbolic interactionist concepts while extending them to address cultural complexity. Research on second-generation immigrants—individuals raised between the cultures of their parents' homeland and their country of residence—illustrates the dynamics of navigating multiple generalized others particularly vividly. These individuals must develop what some scholars call "bicultural competence"—the ability to move fluidly between cultural frameworks, adapting their self-presentations and identity expressions to different cultural contexts while maintaining a coherent sense of self across transitions. The Meadian framework illuminates this process by revealing it as an extension of the normal mechanisms of identity formation rather than a pathological deviation: all identity formation involves coordinating multiple social perspectives, and multicultural identity formation involves doing so across larger cultural distances (Côté, 2021).

The concept of the generalized other requires significant elaboration to address the conditions of cultural pluralism. Mead assumed a relatively unified community whose organized attitudes constitute a coherent generalized other; in multicultural societies, multiple partially competing generalized others coexist, representing different cultural communities with divergent values and expectations. Individuals in these contexts must develop what Aboulaflia (2018) calls a "cosmopolitan self"—a form of selfhood capable of engaging with cultural diversity without either collapsing into cultural relativism or retreating into cultural parochialism. The cosmopolitan self does not abandon the generalized other but develops a more reflexive relationship to it, recognizing cultural expectations as contingent rather than universal while still drawing on them as resources for identity construction and social coordination.

Identity negotiation in globalized contexts also involves what Carreira da Silva (2018) identifies as the politically charged dimensions of symbolic interaction—the ways in which power relations shape whose perspectives are recognized, which identities are legitimated, and what forms of self-presentation are available to different groups. Mead's framework, developed within a relatively homogeneous middle-class American context, paid insufficient attention to how race, class, gender, and other axes of social inequality structure the symbolic resources available for identity construction. Critical extensions of symbolic interactionism by scholars working in the traditions of race studies, feminist sociology, and intersectionality theory have addressed this lacuna, analyzing how dominant group members and marginalized group members encounter very different generalized others with profoundly different implications for identity formation and self-concept.

### **Identity Politics, Social Movements, and Collective Identity**

Contemporary social movements organized around identity claims—civil rights movements, feminist movements, LGBTQ+ activism, indigenous rights movements—present both a testing ground and an extension challenge for Meadian symbolic interactionism. These movements simultaneously contest dominant symbolic frameworks that define and constrain certain identities, construct alternative identity narratives that validate marginalized experiences, and mobilize collective action on the basis of shared identity commitments. Understanding these dynamics requires extending symbolic interactionism from its characteristic focus on individual identity formation to address the collective dimensions of identity construction and contestation (Cole, 2019).

Identity-based social movements can be understood through Meadian lenses as collective projects of generalized other transformation. When movements successfully challenge dominant cultural representations—reframing stigmatized identities as sources of pride, contesting pejorative labels, creating new symbolic frameworks for understanding marginalized experiences—they are effectively working to transform the generalized other that individuals internalize during identity formation. The Black Power movement's reclamation of Black identity from frameworks of shame and deficit toward frameworks of pride and cultural richness, the disability rights movement's challenge to medical models of disability in favor of social models, and the LGBTQ+ movement's transformation of homosexuality from pathology to identity—all represent successful projects of generalized other transformation with profound consequences for the self-concepts of individuals in targeted groups (Denzin, 2020).

The role of social interaction in sustaining collective identities illuminates another dimension of symbolic interactionism's contribution to identity politics analysis. Collective identities do not exist independently of the interactions through which they are produced, reproduced, and transformed. Activist communities, through their internal interactions—the rituals, narratives, symbols, and practices that characterize movement participation—continuously reconstruct the shared meanings and identity frameworks that motivate collective action. From this perspective, social movement participation is not merely instrumental—a means to external political goals—but constitutive: participating in movements transforms participants' self-concepts, social networks, and interpretive frameworks, reshaping their identities in ways that sustain commitment and provide resources for navigating a social world that may be hostile to their identity claims (Shalin, 2019).

### **CONCLUSION**

This analysis demonstrates that George Herbert Mead's symbolic interactionism provides enduring insights into identity formation while requiring extension to address contemporary realities. Mead's core proposition that selfhood emerges through social interaction involving symbolic communication and role-taking remains fundamentally sound. Contemporary research across developmental psychology, digital sociology, multicultural identity studies, and social movement theory consistently confirms that identity formation involves internalizing perspectives of others, negotiating between creative spontaneity and social expectations, and developing reflexive self-awareness through participation in symbolic communities. The framework's emphasis on the social nature of selfhood—its insistence that individual identity cannot be understood apart from the social relationships and

symbolic frameworks through which it emerges—represents a durable theoretical contribution that transcends its original historical context.

Three principal conclusions emerge from this analysis. First, Mead's framework requires extension to address the multiplication of generalized others characteristic of contemporary social life. In early twentieth-century American society, Mead could plausibly assume a relatively unified community providing a coherent generalized other; contemporary individuals inhabit multiple, overlapping, and sometimes contradictory social worlds, each constituting partial generalized others with divergent identity implications. Theoretical elaborations addressing multiple generalized others, bicultural competence, and cosmopolitan selfhood represent productive extensions of the Meadian framework rather than departures from it, building on the foundational insight that identity formation is a social and relational process while adapting its application to conditions of cultural complexity.

Second, digital communication environments require specific theoretical attention that Mead's framework cannot provide without adaptation. Digital platforms introduce forms of self-presentation, audience management, and symbolic interaction that differ substantially from the face-to-face interaction that Mead theorized. The greater deliberateness of digital self-presentation, the phenomenon of context collapse, the permanence of digital archives, and the algorithmic shaping of social visibility all create conditions for identity construction that the original Meadian framework could not anticipate. Extending symbolic interactionism to digital contexts represents one of the most productive frontiers for contemporary sociological theory, requiring engagement with both Mead's foundational insights and the sociological study of digital media, platform architectures, and online community dynamics.

Third, critical extensions of symbolic interactionism that attend to power, inequality, and collective identity are not departures from but necessary completions of the Meadian project. Mead's framework contains the resources for understanding how power shapes symbolic interaction—his analysis of the generalized other implicitly acknowledges that social expectations are not neutral but reflect particular social arrangements—but these resources were not fully developed in his own work. Feminist, critical race, and intersectional extensions of symbolic interactionism have enriched the tradition by attending to how race, class, gender, and other axes of inequality shape the symbolic resources available for identity construction and the conditions under which different identities receive social recognition. Future scholarship should continue developing these critical dimensions, positioning symbolic interactionism as a framework capable of addressing both the micro-dynamics of individual identity formation and the macro-structures of power within which those dynamics unfold.

## REFERENCES

- Aboulafia, M. (2018). *The Cosmopolitan Self: George Herbert Mead and Continental Philosophy*. University of Illinois Press.
- Athens, L. (2020). Mead's Vision of the Self: A Juried Consensus. *Studies in Symbolic Interaction*, 51, 17-38.
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. Prentice-Hall.
- Cahill, S. E. (2019). *Inside Social Life: Readings in Sociological Psychology and Microsociology* (8th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Carreira da Silva, F. (2018). *Mead and Modernity: Science, Selfhood, and Democratic Politics*. Lexington Books.
- Cole, N. L. (2019). *Studying race and gender with symbolic interaction theory*. ThoughtCo.
- Cook, G. A. (2018). *George Herbert Mead: The Making of a Social Pragmatist*. University of Illinois Press.
- Côté, J. F. (2021). *George Herbert Mead's Concept of Society: A Critical Reconstruction*. Routledge.

- Cronk, G. (2018). George Herbert Mead. Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. <https://iep.utm.edu/mead/>
- Deegan, M. J. (2019). *Self, War, and Society: George Herbert Mead's Macrosociology*. Routledge.
- Denzin, N. K. (2020). *40th Anniversary of Studies in Symbolic Interactionism*. Emerald Publishing.
- Fine, G. A., & Manning, P. (2020). George Herbert Mead. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Major Social Theorists* (pp. 286-315). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Gillespie, A., & Martin, J. (2020). Position exchange theory: A socio-material basis for discursive and psychological positioning. *New Ideas in Psychology*, 58, 100790.
- Huebner, D. R. (2022). *Reintroducing George Herbert Mead*. Routledge.
- Joas, H. (2019). *G. H. Mead: A Contemporary Re-examination of His Thought* (2nd ed.). MIT Press.
- Martin, J., & Gillespie, A. (2019). A neo-Meadian approach to human agency. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 44(2), 252-272.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, Self, and Society*. University of Chicago Press.
- Miller, D. L. (2021). *George Herbert Mead: Self, Language, and the World* (2nd ed.). University of Texas Press.
- Musolf, G. R. (2018). *Self, symbols, and society: Classic readings in social psychology*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Reynolds, L. T., & Herman-Kinney, N. J. (2021). *Handbook of Symbolic Interactionism* (2nd ed.). AltaMira Press.
- Rohall, D. E. (2020). *Symbolic Interaction in Society*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Shalin, D. N. (2019). *Pragmatism and Democracy: Studies in History, Social Theory, and Progressive Politics*. Transaction Publishers.
- Spencer, S. (2020). *Race and Ethnicity: Culture, Identity and Representation* (3rd ed.). Routledge.