

SOUND HOREG, AKHLAK, AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY: A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW TOWARD A RESPONSIBLE ENTERTAINMENT FRAMEWORK.

| ABSTRACT

This study examines the *sound horeg* phenomenon in Indonesia, particularly East Java, through an integrated perspective of cultural identity, social solidarity, *akhlak* and *adab*, public health, social responsibility, *maṣlaḥah*, and *maqāṣid al-sharī'ah*. The study employs a systematic literature review (SLR) and qualitative thematic synthesis of 13 verified studies published mainly during 2024–2026, supplemented by foundational and international literature on systematic review methodology, Islamic ethical reasoning, and environmental noise. The synthesis identifies four interrelated dimensions. First, *sound horeg* functions as cultural expression, youth identity, collective enjoyment, solidarity, and an economic activity. Second, the same practice produces contestation because benefits experienced by participants may coexist with costs borne by residents and non-participants. Third, excessive and poorly managed noise raises legitimate health, comfort, sleep, hearing, and social-order concerns, although general environmental-noise evidence should not be converted into causal claims about every *sound horeg* event. Fourth, Islamic ethical reasoning shifts the evaluation from a binary question of permissible versus prohibited entertainment toward a contextual assessment of intention, manner, intensity, timing, location, consent, and consequences. On this basis, the study develops a Responsible Entertainment framework in which cultural expression is mediated by awareness of social and health impacts, *akhlak-adab*, *maṣlaḥah-maṣḍah* assessment, and social responsibility. The framework also offers a contextual pedagogical resource for Islamic Religious Education, enabling students to practice ethical reasoning rather than merely memorize normative rules. The study contributes a cross-disciplinary synthesis that connects contemporary cultural practice with Islamic moral education, public-health awareness, and community governance.

| KEYWORDS

Sound horeg, Islamic Education, *Akhlak*, *Maṣlaḥah*, Social Responsibility

Introduction:-

Sound horeg has become a highly visible form of popular entertainment in several parts of Indonesia, particularly East Java. It generally involves high-powered sound systems used in parades, carnivals, celebrations, community gatherings, and other public events. Its rapid visibility should not be reduced to a technological development in audio equipment. For many participants, *sound horeg* is simultaneously an expressive cultural practice, a form of youth identity, a mechanism of collective participation, a source of social prestige, and an economic activity. Auliana, Sudrajat, and Inayah (2025), for example, identify *sound horeg* as a medium of social identity among adolescents in Lumajang. Jayanti, Minza, and Nurdiyanto (2024), although studying youth solidarity more broadly, provide a useful comparative lens for understanding how shared activities can become mechanisms of belonging, cooperation, and collective action.

At the same time, *sound horeg* has generated significant social contestation. The central problem is not simply whether people have a right to enjoy music or cultural performance, but whether a particular mode of enjoyment transfers preventable costs to people who do not participate. Sufa and Pradhipta (2025) identify oppositional readings in social-media discourse, while Armayanto, Sahidin, and Khasanah (2025) explicitly frame *sound horeg* as a tension between entertainment and social disturbance. This tension is analytically important because it demonstrates that the phenomenon contains both positive and negative social meanings. Participants may interpret loud sound as celebration, vitality, prestige, and solidarity, whereas surrounding residents may experience the same event as disruption, loss of rest, stress, or an intrusion into shared space.

The health dimension strengthens the need for a multidimensional analysis. Saputra (2025) connects *sound horeg* with medical considerations and social ethics. Beyond the specific sound-horeg literature, Chen et al. (2023) report associations between environmental noise exposure and several health outcomes, while the World Health Organization identifies environmental and leisure noise as a public-health concern requiring evidence-based management. Importantly, general environmental-noise evidence does not establish that every *sound horeg* event produces a particular medical condition. It does, however, justify a precautionary ethical position in which sound intensity, duration, proximity, timing, and exposure are treated as relevant factors in responsible event management.

Islamic ethical thought offers conceptual resources for moving beyond an overly binary debate. *Akhlak* and *adab* emphasize self-restraint, respect for others, consideration of consequences, and responsible conduct. The jurisprudential maxim *lā ḍarar wa lā ḍirār* establishes a strong normative orientation against causing or reciprocating harm. Contemporary studies of *sound horeg* have increasingly employed *maṣlaḥah* and *maqāṣid al-sharī'ah* to evaluate the relationship between cultural benefit and social harm. Maram, Anam, and Senghore (2025) emphasize *lā ḍarar*, *isrāf/tabdhīr*, *lahw*, and *kibr*; Hendri et al. (2026) connect

the discussion to protection of life, intellect, property, and public order; and Syafi'i, Azhari, and Rofi'i (2026) emphasize wasatiyyah and practical limits.

Nevertheless, the existing scholarship remains fragmented. Cultural and social studies tend to foreground identity and solidarity; Islamic legal studies focus on permissibility, fatwa, harm, or contractual questions; health-oriented literature concentrates on noise exposure; and governance studies emphasize public order and rights. What remains insufficiently developed is a synthesis that brings these dimensions into a coherent moral-educational framework. Such a synthesis is particularly relevant to Islamic education because education is not restricted to formal classroom instruction. It includes the formation of habits, ethical judgment, social responsibility, and the ability to negotiate contemporary practices without abandoning religious and civic values.

Accordingly, this study addresses three research questions: (1) How is *sound horeg* constructed and interpreted as culture, entertainment, youth identity, and solidarity? (2) How can its social and health implications be understood through akhlak, adab, and social responsibility? and (3) How can *maṣlaḥah* and *maqāṣid al-sharī'ah* contribute to an educational and ethical framework for responsible *sound horeg*? The study does not claim that Islamic perspectives have never been applied to *sound horeg*. Its contribution is instead to integrate dispersed cultural, social, health, ethical, legal, and *maqāṣid*-oriented findings into a single analytical framework termed Responsible Entertainment.

Conceptual and Theoretical Framework:-

Sound horeg as Cultural Expression and Social Identity:-

A culturally sensitive analysis must begin by recognizing that *sound horeg* is meaningful to its participants. Auliana et al. (2025) show that the practice can function as a medium of youth identity and self-expression. The significance of *sound horeg* therefore lies not only in decibel intensity but also in the social meanings attached to equipment, performance, participation, collective excitement, and visibility. In this sense, *sound horeg* may be understood as a cultural arena in which young people negotiate belonging and recognition.

The cultural dimension, however, does not create an unlimited moral exemption. Culture is socially embedded and therefore involves relationships among participants, organizers, residents, public authorities, and other users of shared space. A practice may be culturally meaningful while still requiring ethical boundaries. This distinction is crucial because the study does not frame culture and ethics as mutually exclusive categories. Instead, cultural legitimacy and ethical responsibility are treated as complementary requirements.

Akhlak and Adab as Ethical Regulation:-

Akhlak concerns the quality of moral character, while *adab* concerns appropriate conduct, manners, and relational propriety. In the context of *sound horeg*, these concepts provide an evaluative bridge between formal legal permissibility and actual moral conduct. The same entertainment activity can differ ethically depending on intention, timing, location, treatment of neighbors, respect for vulnerable persons, use of resources, and willingness to respond to complaints. Maram et al. (2025) are particularly relevant because their analysis highlights *lā ḍarar* alongside *isrāf/tabdhīr*, *lahw*, and *kibr*.

This approach prevents an overly object-centered analysis. The moral question is not simply whether a sound system is permissible, but how, why, where, when, and with what consequences it is used. *Akhlak* and *adab* therefore operate as internal and relational controls. Internal control concerns self-restraint and willingness to moderate enjoyment. Relational control concerns recognition that one's pleasure should not automatically override the legitimate interests of others.

Maṣlaḥah–Mafṣadah and Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah:-

The principle of *maṣlaḥah* provides a framework for evaluating contemporary practices by considering realized or reasonably foreseeable benefit and harm. Zuhdi and Nasir (2024) demonstrate the continuing relevance of *maṣlaḥah* for contemporary Islamic legal reasoning. Applied to *sound horeg*, potential *maṣlaḥah* includes cultural expression, recreation, youth participation, solidarity, local economic activity, and community celebration. Potential *mafṣadah* includes excessive noise, sleep disturbance, health risks, social conflict, property damage, disruption of public order, and the marginalization of non-participants.

Maqāṣid al-sharī'ah strengthens this analysis by asking what fundamental interests are protected or undermined. The literature reviewed by Hendri et al. (2026), Syafi'i et al. (2026), and Vargholy and Rozi (2026) indicates that the discussion can be related to the protection of life, intellect, property, social order, and public welfare. The implication is not an automatic prohibition. Rather, *maqāṣid* reasoning encourages differentiation: practices that produce substantial benefit with limited and

98 controlled harm may be treated differently from practices characterized by excessive intensity, prolonged duration, lack of
99 consent, or demonstrable harm.

100 **Social Responsibility and Public Rights:-**

101 The notion of social responsibility is necessary because *sound horeg* takes place in shared social environments. The event
102 organizer has responsibilities toward participants and surrounding residents; the sound-system operator has responsibilities
103 concerning technical operation; participants have responsibilities concerning conduct; local government has responsibilities
104 concerning predictable and fair regulation; and religious and educational institutions have responsibilities concerning ethical
105 literacy. This distributed responsibility avoids placing the entire burden on either individuals or government.

106 A public-rights perspective also clarifies why consent matters. An event may be welcomed by participants but still affect
107 people who have not consented to the exposure. Therefore, responsible entertainment requires mechanisms for advance
108 notification, reasonable timing, location selection, duration limits, complaint handling, and mitigation. Such measures do not
109 necessarily suppress culture; they can instead protect the social conditions under which cultural expression remains legitimate
110 and sustainable.

111 **Methodology:-**

112 This study uses a systematic literature review (SLR) with qualitative thematic synthesis. The reporting logic follows PRISMA
113 2020, which emphasizes transparent reporting of identification, screening, eligibility, and inclusion processes (Page et al.,
114 2021). PRISMA improves transparency, but it should not be mistaken for a guarantee of methodological quality by itself. In
115 this study, methodological appraisal and interpretive caution are therefore explicitly incorporated. Because the included studies
116 differ substantially in design, disciplinary orientation, and outcome, statistical meta-analysis was not appropriate. Instead, the
117 study uses qualitative thematic synthesis, following the logic developed by Thomas and Harden (2008), in which findings are
118 coded descriptively and analytically before being integrated into higher-order themes.

119 The search strategy focused on Google Scholar, GARUDA, SINTA, journal platforms, and accessible international indexing
120 channels. Core search terms included “*sound horeg*,” “*sound horeg* AND Indonesia,” “*sound horeg* AND East Java,” “*sound*
121 *horeg* AND health,” “*sound horeg* AND noise,” “*sound horeg* AND Islamic,” “*sound horeg* AND maqasid,” “*sound horeg*
122 AND maslahah,” and “*sound horeg* AND social.” Supporting searches included “environmental noise AND health,” “youth
123 solidarity AND community,” and “maslahah AND contemporary Islamic law.” Contemporary empirical and analytical studies
124 were prioritized for 2020–2026, while foundational literature was retained where necessary for conceptual interpretation.

125 The verified synthesis corpus consisted of 13 studies. The number represents the final set of studies judged sufficiently relevant
126 and accessible for qualitative synthesis; it is not presented as the number of database hits. Because raw retrieval counts,
127 duplicate-removal statistics, and search-interface histories were not consistently auditable, the study deliberately avoids
128 inventing a numerical PRISMA flow that cannot be reconstructed from the available evidence. This is a methodological
129 limitation but also a transparency measure.

130 Eligibility was determined by relevance to at least one of the study’s central dimensions: cultural/social meaning, health/noise
131 implications, Islamic ethical or legal analysis, *maqāsid/maṣlaḥah* reasoning, or governance/social responsibility. Studies were
132 excluded when their content did not materially contribute to these dimensions or when sufficient text could not be verified.
133 Quality appraisal considered methodological clarity, relevance to the research questions, transparency of evidence,
134 appropriateness of research design, and argumentative strength. The appraisal was qualitative rather than converted into
135 unsupported numerical scores.

136 The synthesis proceeded in four stages: (1) extraction of bibliographic and methodological characteristics; (2) descriptive
137 coding of each study’s central findings; (3) analytical coding to identify relationships among culture, identity, health, ethics,
138 harm, and governance; and (4) synthesis into explanatory themes and a conceptual framework. Particular attention was given to
139 convergence and divergence among studies. Where a conclusion was supported only by general environmental-noise evidence
140 rather than sound-horeg-specific empirical data, the claim was explicitly qualified.

141 **Table 1. Review design and analytical procedure**

Stage	Procedure	Purpose	Output
-------	-----------	---------	--------

Stage	Procedure	Purpose	Output
Identification	Search across accessible scholarly databases/platforms using predefined combinations of <i>sound horeg</i> , noise, Islamic ethics, <i>maqāṣid</i> , <i>maṣlaḥah</i> , social, and health terms.	Locate potentially relevant literature.	Candidate records and supporting conceptual sources.
Screening	Title/abstract and relevance assessment, followed by full-text verification.	Remove sources that do not address the research questions.	Relevant full-text set.
Quality appraisal	Assess methodological clarity, relevance, transparency, design appropriateness, and argumentative strength.	Differentiate stronger from weaker evidence without artificial numerical precision.	Qualitative quality judgment.
Extraction	Record study focus, approach, context, key findings, and analytical contribution.	Create a consistent evidence matrix.	Thematic extraction matrix.
Synthesis	Descriptive coding → analytical coding → cross-study thematic synthesis.	Identify recurring patterns and tensions.	Four core themes and an integrative framework.

Source: Authors' adaptation based on Page et al. (2021) and Thomas and Harden (2008).

Table 1 demonstrates that the review is designed as a transparent qualitative synthesis rather than a pseudo-quantitative exercise. The distinction is important because the sound-horeg literature is heterogeneous: some studies are phenomenological, some socio-legal, some normative, and one major supporting source is an umbrella review of environmental-noise evidence. Treating all studies as if they generated equivalent forms of evidence would weaken the validity of the synthesis. The staged procedure therefore preserves differences in epistemic status while still allowing cross-disciplinary comparison. In particular, the final framework is an interpretive synthesis rather than an empirically validated causal model.

The decision not to report unsupported database-hit counts also strengthens the methodological integrity of the article. PRISMA encourages transparent reporting, but transparency includes acknowledging when historical retrieval data are unavailable. The present review consequently reports what can be verified: the final 13-study corpus, the thematic dimensions extracted from it, and the conceptual relationships generated through synthesis. This approach should be viewed as a limitation that future reviews can correct through prospective registration and complete search logging.

Results:-

Characteristics of the Included Literature:-

The 13 studies represent a relatively small but rapidly developing body of literature. Most were published in 2024–2026, reflecting the contemporary nature of the sound-horeg debate. The corpus covers cultural identity, social-media discourse, medical and ethical implications, Islamic jurisprudence, *maqāṣid*, *fiqh muamalah*, social order, and general environmental-noise evidence. The diversity of approaches is useful because it reveals that *sound horeg* cannot be adequately explained from one disciplinary perspective.

Table 2. Characteristics and Principal Contributions of the Reviewed Studies on *Sound horeg*

No.	Study	Approach	Principal contribution
1	Auliana et al. (2025)	Phenomenology	Youth identity, self-expression, solidarity.
2	Sufa & Pradhipta (2025)	Qualitative content/audience analysis	Oppositional public readings and contestation.
3	Saputra (2025)	Islamic/medical analysis	Noise, medical implications, social ethics.
4	Armayanto et al. (2025)	Library research	Entertainment–disturbance tension.
5	Maram et al. (2025)	Theological-legal	<i>Lā ẓarar, isrāf/tabdhīr, lahw, kibr.</i>

No.	Study	Approach	Principal contribution
6	Lubis et al. (2025)	<i>Fiqh muamalah</i>	Lease permissibility conditional on absence of harm.
7	Hendri et al. (2026)	<i>Maqāṣid</i> /fatwa analysis	Life, intellect, property, public order.
8	Syafi'i et al. (2026)	Normative/socio-legal	<i>Wasatiyyah</i> and practical limits.
9	Vargholy & Rozi (2026)	Doctrinal legal research	<i>Maqāṣid</i> balance of benefit and harm.
10	Faiz et al. (2026)	Socio-legal	Rights, noise, social order, governance.
11	Chen et al. (2023)	Umbrella review	Environmental noise and health outcomes.
12	Jayanti et al. (2024)	Qualitative case study	Communal sharing and youth solidarity.
13	Zuhdi & Nasir (2024)	Conceptual/theoretical	<i>Maṣlaḥah</i> in contemporary Islamic law.

Source: Authors' synthesis based on the reviewed literature.

Table 2 shows that the evidence base is interdisciplinary but uneven. Cultural identity and normative Islamic analysis are relatively visible, whereas sound-horeg-specific quantitative measurement of exposure, health outcomes, and community-level impacts remains limited. The literature is therefore stronger for interpreting meanings and normative tensions than for estimating the magnitude of effects. This distinction matters for a reputable scholarly article: the synthesis can support a conceptual framework and a set of testable propositions, but it should not claim empirical effect sizes that the corpus does not provide.

Another important observation is the asymmetry between studies directly examining *sound horeg* and studies used as contextual evidence. Chen et al. (2023) is not a sound-horeg study; it concerns environmental noise more broadly. Its contribution is therefore evidentiary and contextual rather than case-specific. Similarly, Jayanti et al. (2024) does not examine *sound horeg* directly but provides a conceptual comparison for youth solidarity. The review retains such studies because they illuminate mechanisms relevant to the phenomenon, while avoiding the methodological error of presenting them as direct evidence about every sound-horeg event.

Theme 1: Cultural Expression, Youth Identity, and Solidarity:-

The first theme concerns the positive social meanings of *sound horeg*. Auliana et al. (2025) indicate that *sound horeg* can become a medium of youth identity and self-expression. Its social meaning emerges through participation, collective excitement, visibility, and recognition. Jayanti et al. (2024) similarly demonstrate, in a broader youth-organization context, that communal sharing can support solidarity when participation is structured by cooperation, norms, and collective decision-making.

These findings complicate a purely regulatory approach. If *sound horeg* is understood only as a source of noise, regulatory responses may overlook why communities continue to invest emotional, social, and economic resources in it. Cultural practices persist partly because they generate meaning. A responsible framework must therefore preserve the legitimate social functions of participation while addressing the externalities that arise when enjoyment exceeds the tolerance or rights of surrounding communities.

The educational implication is significant. Rather than teaching students that contemporary cultural practices are simply “allowed” or “forbidden,” Islamic education can ask students to identify the values embedded in a practice, the stakeholders affected by it, and the ethical conditions under which the practice can contribute to communal welfare. This turns *sound horeg* into a case study for applied *akhlak* and civic responsibility.

Theme 2: Contestation, Externalities, and the Rights of Non-Participants:-

The second theme is ambivalence. Sufa and Pradhipta (2025) show that public readings of *sound horeg* are oppositional, while Armayanto et al. (2025) conceptualize the phenomenon through the tension between entertainment and disturbance. The central analytical insight is that the same event can generate asymmetric experiences. Participants receive the intended benefit—enjoyment, social connection, identity, or prestige—while residents may bear costs without having chosen to participate.

This asymmetry can be described as a social externality. The concept is useful because it shifts the debate away from moral labeling and toward responsibility. If an event produces benefits for one group and predictable costs for another, ethical

200 legitimacy requires mechanisms for reducing, compensating, or preventing those costs. In practical terms, this supports
201 advance notification, appropriate location selection, reasonable operating hours, duration limits, and complaint mechanisms.

202 The issue also concerns procedural justice. A community cannot be considered socially responsible merely because a majority
203 of participants support an event. A minority of residents, elderly persons, children, workers who need rest, or people with
204 particular sensitivities may be disproportionately affected. Ethical governance therefore requires attention not only to aggregate
205 enjoyment but also to vulnerability and unequal exposure.

206 **Theme 3: Noise, Health, and the Principle of Prevention:-**

207 The third theme concerns health and physical well-being. Saputra (2025) directly discusses the medical and ethical
208 implications of *sound horeg*. Chen et al. (2023) synthesize broader environmental-noise evidence and report associations
209 involving hearing, cardiovascular, metabolic, neurological, and reproductive outcomes, with varying certainty across outcomes.
210 WHO guidance likewise treats environmental and leisure noise as a public-health issue and emphasizes evidence-based
211 protection of populations.

212 The correct scholarly interpretation is cautious. It is inappropriate to infer that a specific sound-horeg event caused a particular
213 health condition unless event-specific exposure and outcome evidence exist. Nevertheless, the absence of event-specific
214 epidemiological studies does not justify ignoring risk. A precautionary approach is reasonable when exposure is potentially
215 intense, prolonged, close to the body, or repeated. Responsible management should therefore consider sound level, duration,
216 proximity, frequency of events, and the presence of vulnerable groups.

217 This theme also expands the meaning of *adab*. Respect for others is not merely interpersonal courtesy; it can include practical
218 efforts to prevent avoidable exposure. An organizer who voluntarily moderates sound, chooses a less disruptive location, and
219 establishes an end time demonstrates ethical responsibility in a concrete form. Conversely, deliberately disregarding
220 predictable harm can transform an otherwise permissible recreational activity into an ethically problematic practice.

221 **Theme 4: Akhlak, Adab, Maṣlaḥah, and Maqāṣid:-**

222 The fourth theme integrates the Islamic normative literature. Maram et al. (2025) identify several concepts relevant to *sound*
223 *horeg*, including *lā ḍarar, isrāf/tabdhīr, lahw*, and *kibr*. Lubis et al. (2025) similarly indicate conditional permissibility in the
224 context of leasing *sound horeg* equipment when harm is absent. These studies suggest that Islamic evaluation should focus on
225 conditions and consequences rather than on the mere existence of entertainment technology.

226 The *maṣlaḥah–mafsadah* approach makes the balance explicit. Benefits may include recreation, cultural expression, youth
227 participation, solidarity, and local economic activity. Harms may include excessive noise, sleep disruption, health risks,
228 conflict, property damage, and disturbance of public order. The ethical task is to determine whether benefits can be preserved
229 while avoidable harms are reduced. This is consistent with the broader logic of contemporary *maṣlaḥah* reasoning described by
230 Zuhdi and Nasir (2024).

231 *Maqāṣid*-oriented studies add another level of analysis. Hendri et al. (2026) relate the issue to protection of life, intellect,
232 property, and public order; Syafi'i et al. (2026) emphasize moderation; and Vargholy and Rozi (2026) foreground balancing
233 cultural and economic benefit against harm. These findings support a differentiated rather than absolutist framework. The
234 ethical status of an event should be assessed through relevant variables such as intensity, duration, location, timing, consent,
235 vulnerability, and consequences.

236 The synthesis therefore yields an important distinction between “*sound horeg* as a cultural category” and “a particular *sound*
237 *horeg* practice.” The former cannot be judged adequately without considering its cultural meaning. The latter can and should be
238 evaluated according to concrete conduct. This distinction is theoretically productive because it avoids both cultural essentialism
239 and moral reductionism.

240 **Table 3. Integrated ethical assessment matrix**

Dimension	Potential benefit	Potential risk	Ethical question	Responsible response
Cultural expression	Identity, heritage, creativity	Cultural conflict or exclusion	Does expression respect other rights?	Preserve expression while setting fair limits.
Youth solidarity	Belonging, participation, cooperation	Peer pressure, prestige competition	Does participation build or undermine social responsibility?	Encourage inclusive and cooperative participation.

Dimension	Potential benefit	Potential risk	Ethical question	Responsible response
Entertainment	Recreation, emotional enjoyment	Disturbance, fatigue, sleep disruption	Is enjoyment proportionate to social cost?	Moderate intensity, duration, and timing.
Economic activity	Income for operators and local businesses	Commercial pressure to increase intensity or duration	Are profits achieved without avoidable harm?	Adopt responsible operating standards.
Public health	Collective recreation can support well-being	Noise exposure and possible health impacts	Is exposure reasonably controlled?	Use preventive exposure management.
Public order	Community gathering and social cohesion	Conflict, complaints, property disruption	Are public spaces governed fairly?	Notification, permits/rules, complaint mechanisms.
Islamic ethics	Practice of moderation, <i>adab</i> , solidarity	<i>Isrāf</i> , <i>kibr</i> , <i>lahw</i> , harm	Does conduct embody <i>lā ḍarar</i> and <i>adab</i> ?	Apply self-restraint and harm prevention.
<i>Maqāṣid</i>	Protection of legitimate welfare	Threats to life, intellect, property, order	Which interests are advanced or harmed?	Prefer arrangements maximizing benefit and minimizing harm.

Source: Authors' synthesis based on the reviewed literature and Islamic ethical perspectives

Table 3 operationalizes the central argument of the review. It does not function as a legal *fatwa* or a numerical decision algorithm. Instead, it is an analytical matrix for identifying relevant considerations before an event is conducted. Its main contribution is to make explicit that “responsible” entertainment requires more than the absence of a formal prohibition. It requires positive attention to stakeholders, risks, proportionality, and mitigation.

The matrix also illustrates why *maqāṣid* and social responsibility can be integrated rather than treated as separate frameworks. *Maqāṣid* identifies protected interests, while social responsibility translates those interests into organizational and behavioral practices. *Akhlak* and *adab* provide the character dimension that sustains those practices even when external enforcement is weak. Together, the three levels create a more complete ethical architecture: values establish orientation, *maqāṣid* identifies protected interests, and responsibility establishes practical conduct.

Discussion:-

From a Binary Debate to a Conditional Ethical Model:-

The synthesis indicates that the most productive position lies between two extremes. The first treats *sound horeg* as an untouchable expression of culture and therefore resists meaningful regulation. The second treats it only as noise and disturbance, thereby overlooking its cultural, social, and economic meanings. Both positions are incomplete. The first risks legitimizing preventable harm, while the second risks delegitimizing a living cultural practice without understanding why it matters to participants.

The proposed third position is conditional ethical legitimacy: cultural expression is recognized as a social reality, but its legitimacy is strengthened when it is practiced with responsibility. This position is consistent with the reviewed literature because the studies do not collectively support a blanket claim that *sound horeg* is inherently beneficial or inherently harmful. Rather, they identify conditions under which benefits and harms become more or less pronounced.

The key analytical shift is therefore from “What is *sound horeg*?” to “Under what conditions does a *sound horeg* event become socially responsible?” This reframing is valuable for Islamic education because it turns a contested contemporary practice into a problem of moral reasoning. Students can learn to identify competing values, examine evidence, consider vulnerable stakeholders, and formulate proportionate solutions.

The Responsible Entertainment Framework:-

Based on the thematic synthesis, this study proposes the Responsible Entertainment framework. Responsible Entertainment is defined here as a form of cultural and recreational expression that preserves legitimate enjoyment, identity, solidarity, and economic participation while consciously limiting preventable harm and respecting the rights of others. The framework is not intended as a new legal doctrine; it is a conceptual bridge linking cultural practice, Islamic ethics, public health, and social governance.

The framework follows a sequential but recursive logic: Cultural Expression → Social Identity and Solidarity → Awareness of Social and Health Impacts → *Akhlak* and *Adab* → *Maşlahah*–*Mafsadah* Assessment → Social Responsibility → Responsible Entertainment. The sequence is not purely linear. New information about harm may require re-evaluation of an earlier decision, and community feedback may alter the location, timing, or intensity of an event. Responsible entertainment is therefore better understood as an iterative ethical process.

Table 4. Islamic Ethical Framework for Responsible Sound-Horeg Practices

Component	Core question	Expected practice	Educational value
Cultural expression	What cultural meaning is being expressed?	Recognize cultural value without romanticizing it.	Cultural literacy.
Identity & solidarity	Who participates and how does participation create belonging?	Promote inclusive participation and cooperation.	Social identity and empathy.
Impact awareness	Who may be affected and what risks are foreseeable?	Map participants, residents, vulnerable groups, and exposure.	Critical thinking.
<i>Akhlak & adab</i>	What conduct demonstrates respect and self-restraint?	Avoid arrogance, waste, deliberate disturbance, and disregard for others.	Moral character.
<i>Maşlahah</i> – <i>mafsadah</i>	What benefits and harms are generated?	Compare benefits with preventable costs.	Ethical reasoning.
Social responsibility	What concrete mitigation is required?	Set time, location, duration, volume, notification, and complaint procedures.	Civic responsibility.
Responsible entertainment	Can enjoyment continue without disproportionate harm?	Implement, monitor, receive feedback, and revise.	Applied Islamic ethics.

Source: Authors' synthesis based on the thematic findings of the review.

Table 4 translates the conceptual framework into observable questions and practices. Its significance is that it links abstract Islamic ethical concepts with decision points that communities can actually use. For example, “*adab*” becomes observable through respect for neighbors and adherence to agreed schedules; “*maşlahah*” becomes visible through the comparison of community benefits and social costs; and “social responsibility” becomes visible through notification and complaint mechanisms.

For research purposes, the framework also generates testable propositions. Future empirical studies can examine whether stronger community consultation is associated with lower conflict; whether sound-level management reduces complaints; whether contextual PAI instruction improves students' ability to identify stakeholders and harms; and whether organizers who explicitly use *maşlahah*–*mafsadah* reasoning adopt more preventive practices. Thus, the framework is not only an interpretive conclusion but also a potential research agenda.

Implications for Islamic Religious Education:-

The framework has direct implications for Islamic Religious Education (PAI). Contemporary Islamic education increasingly faces the challenge of connecting normative knowledge with rapidly changing social practices. *Sound horeg* is pedagogically useful precisely because it is neither an abstract case nor a universally accepted practice. It contains competing interpretations, making it suitable for dialogical and problem-based learning.

A teacher could present a sound-horeg scenario and ask students to map the stakeholders: organizers, performers, young participants, residents, children, elderly people, religious communities, local businesses, local government, and sound-system operators. Students could then classify potential benefits and harms, identify relevant *akhlak* principles, discuss *lā ḍarar*, and apply *maşlahah*–*mafsadah* reasoning. The final task could require students to design a fair event protocol rather than simply state whether *sound horeg* is “*halal*” or “*haram*.”

Such pedagogy develops ethical judgment. Students learn that Islamic values can function as analytical tools for contemporary problems. The teacher's role is not to impose a simplistic answer but to guide students in evidence-based reasoning, proportionality, empathy, and responsibility. This approach also supports the broader educational objective of forming citizens who can negotiate cultural diversity while protecting the rights and welfare of others.

Implications for Community Governance:-

The literature also suggests a governance model based on shared responsibility. Organizers should conduct basic risk assessment before an event, select locations with attention to residential proximity, determine operating hours, communicate schedules, and establish a clear complaint channel. Sound-system operators should understand that technical capacity is not itself a justification for maximum intensity. Local government should provide rules that are predictable, proportionate, and consistently applied rather than relying only on ad hoc enforcement.

Religious leaders can contribute by communicating balanced guidance grounded in *adab*, *lā ǧarar*, moderation, and *maṣlaḥah*. Their role is especially important when public debate becomes polarized. Rather than framing the issue exclusively as culture versus religion, religious guidance can articulate conditions for responsible enjoyment. Educational institutions can complement this role by turning real community debates into opportunities for ethical learning.

The governance implication is therefore not simply “regulate *sound horeg*” but “govern the conditions of shared enjoyment.” This distinction is important. Regulation that ignores cultural meaning may provoke resistance, while cultural advocacy that ignores externalities may deepen conflict. A participatory governance model can seek a middle ground in which rules are transparent, evidence-informed, and responsive to community feedback.

Table 5. Proposed stakeholder responsibilities

Stakeholder	Primary responsibility	Minimum responsible practice
Event organizer	Plan and coordinate the event.	Risk assessment, location/time planning, notification, duration, complaint channel.
Sound-system operator	Control technical exposure.	Responsible volume management, equipment positioning, monitoring.
Participants/youth	Participate ethically.	Respect schedules, residents, public spaces, and agreed rules.
Residents/community	Provide contextual feedback.	Use constructive complaint and dialogue mechanisms.
Local government	Ensure fair governance.	Clear, consistent, proportionate rules and monitoring.
Religious leaders	Provide ethical guidance.	<i>Adab</i> , <i>lā ǧarar</i> , moderation, <i>maṣlaḥah</i> -oriented advice.
Schools/Islamic institutions	Develop ethical literacy.	Contextual PAI learning and reflective discussion.
Health/public-health actors	Strengthen risk awareness.	Evidence-based information on noise exposure and vulnerable groups.

Source: Authors’ synthesis based on the reviewed literature and the conceptual Responsible Entertainment framework developed in this study.

Table 5 emphasizes that social responsibility cannot be assigned to a single actor. If organizers are responsible but residents have no channel for feedback, governance remains incomplete. If government regulates without cultural dialogue, legitimacy may weaken. If religious leaders issue normative judgments without practical guidance, communities may still lack operational standards. A multi-stakeholder model therefore better reflects the relational nature of the problem.

The proposed responsibilities are intentionally framed as minimum practices rather than rigid technical standards. The present literature does not provide sufficient sound-horeg-specific evidence to justify a universal numerical threshold for every setting. Future field research can supply such evidence through calibrated sound-level measurements, duration tracking, spatial exposure mapping, and community surveys. Until then, the responsible approach is to emphasize prevention, proportionality, and context-sensitive governance.

Limitations and Future Research:-

This review has several limitations. First, the contemporary sound-horeg literature remains relatively small. A substantial portion of the evidence is qualitative, normative, or socio-legal, which limits the ability to estimate causal relationships or population-level effects. Second, sound-horeg-specific health evidence is much less extensive than the broader environmental-

noise literature. Consequently, findings from general noise research must be applied cautiously and should not be treated as direct causal evidence about every sound-horeg event.

Third, heterogeneity across study designs prevented statistical meta-analysis. The qualitative synthesis is therefore interpretive and depends on the quality and scope of the included studies. Fourth, accessible search interfaces did not consistently provide auditable raw retrieval counts and duplicate-removal statistics. The study consequently reports the verified synthesis corpus of 13 studies rather than manufacturing a numerical PRISMA flow diagram from incomplete information. Fifth, the framework proposed here has not yet been empirically validated.

These limitations define a clear future research agenda. First, field studies should measure sound intensity, duration, distance, timing, and spatial distribution during actual events. Second, community surveys can examine perceptions of benefit, annoyance, fairness, and willingness to tolerate different event conditions. Third, interviews with organizers, residents, youth participants, religious leaders, public officials, and sound-system operators can reveal how ethical rules are negotiated in practice. Fourth, comparative research across East Java and other regions can identify contextual differences in cultural meaning and governance.

A further priority is educational action research. The Responsible Entertainment framework can be translated into PAI learning modules and evaluated through pre- and post-intervention measures of ethical reasoning, perspective-taking, and social responsibility. Such research would allow the conceptual contribution of this review to move beyond normative proposal toward evidence-based educational innovation.

Conclusion:-

This systematic literature review demonstrates that *sound horeg* is a multidimensional social phenomenon. It functions as entertainment, cultural expression, youth identity, solidarity, and economic activity, while simultaneously generating concerns about excessive noise, health, disturbance, conflict, and public rights. The literature therefore does not justify a simplistic interpretation of *sound horeg* as either wholly beneficial culture or inherently unacceptable noise.

The central contribution of the study is a cross-disciplinary synthesis that connects cultural and social findings with health evidence, Islamic ethics, *maṣlaḥah*, and *maqāṣid al-sharī'ah*, and then translates the synthesis into an educationally and socially relevant framework. Responsible Entertainment emphasizes that legitimate cultural expression should be accompanied by *adab*, non-harm, moderation, *maṣlaḥah*-oriented reasoning, and social responsibility.

The framework offers three contributions. Conceptually, it bridges cultural studies and Islamic ethical reasoning. Practically, it identifies responsibilities for organizers, participants, government, religious leaders, educators, and health actors. Pedagogically, it positions *sound horeg* as a contextual case through which Islamic Religious Education can cultivate ethical reasoning and civic responsibility. Future empirical research should test whether the proposed framework improves event governance, reduces conflict, and strengthens students' capacity to reason ethically about contemporary cultural practices.

Acknowledgments:-

The author would like to express sincere gratitude to Universitas Al-Qur'an Ittifaqiah Indralaya and Institut Agama Islam Hasyim Asy'ari OKI for its academic support and encouragement during the preparation of this article. Appreciation is also extended to colleagues and anonymous reviewers whose constructive comments helped sharpen the analytical framework presented in this study.

Conflicts of Interest:-

The author reports there are no competing interests to declare.

References:-

1. Armayanto, H., Sahidin, A., & Khasanah, N. U. (2025). The *sound horeg* phenomenon: Between entertainment and social disturbance. *Journal of Contemporary Islam and Muslim Societies*, 9(2), 375–397. <https://doi.org/10.30821/jcims.v9i2.26126>
2. Auliana, R., Sudrajat, A., & Inayah, N. (2025). *Sound horeg* sebagai representasi identitas sosial: Studi fenomenologis remaja di Kabupaten Lumajang. *Jurnal IKADBUDI*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.21831/ikadbudi.v14i1.85958>

- 380 3. Chen, X., Liu, M., Zuo, L., et al. (2023). Environmental noise exposure and health outcomes: An umbrella review of
381 systematic reviews and meta-analysis. *European Journal of Public Health*, 33(4), 725–731.
382 <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckad044>
- 383 4. Faiz, M. F., Warman, A. B., Huda, M. S., Aditoni, A., Chami, Y., Putra, H. M., & Miftahusurur, W. (2026). Fatwa and the
384 *sound horeg* question: Contesting rights, noise, and social order in East Java, Indonesia. *Al-‘Adalah*, 23(1).
385 <https://doi.org/10.24042/adalah.v23i1.28148>
- 386 5. Hendri, Busyro, Ismail, & Harun, M. T. (2026). *Sound horeg* in the perspective of maqāṣid al-sharī‘ah: Analysis of the
387 East Java MUI Fatwa Number 1 of 2025. *Maqasid: Jurnal Studi Hukum Islam*, 15(1), 63–75.
388 <https://doi.org/10.30651/mqsd.v15i1.29461>
- 389 6. Jayanti, M., Minza, W. M., & Nurdianto, F. A. (2024). Communal sharing as the foundation of solidarity action in youth
390 organization. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 51(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jpsi.80984>
- 391 7. Lubis, I. H., Faizin, M., & Amin, M. (2025). The lease of *sound horeg*: A fiqh muamalah perspective. *Yurisprudencia*,
392 11(2).
- 393 8. Maram, A. N., Anam, A. F., & Senghore, R. (2025). The jurisprudence of noise: An Islamic legal analysis of the “*sound*
394 *horeg*” phenomenon in Indonesia. *Dialogia*, 23(2). <https://doi.org/10.21154/dialogia.v23i02.12069>
- 395 9. Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., et al. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for
396 reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- 397 10. Saputra, I. H. (2025). Analisis *sound horeg* di Jawa Timur: Perspektif hadis dan implikasi medis terhadap kebisingan dan
398 etika sosial. *Journal of Qur‘an and Hadith Studies*, 14(1), 169–183. <https://doi.org/10.15408/quhas.v14i1.42872>
- 399 11. Sufa, F. A., & Pradhipta, A. Y. (2025). “*Sound horeg*” dan pembacaan oposisional: Analisis konten Instagram
400 @malangraya_info dalam memaknai *sound horeg*. *Jurnal Mahasiswa Komunikasi Cantrik*, 5(2), 127–142.
401 <https://doi.org/10.20885/cantrik.vol5.iss2.art3>
- 402 12. Syafi‘i, I., Azhari, F. W., & Rofi‘i, F. (2026). *Sound horeg* di Tapal Kuda Jawa Timur: Perspektif Maqasid al-Syari‘ah dan
403 Wasathiyah. *Sumbula*, 11(2), 540–553. <https://doi.org/10.32492/sumbula.v11i2.11207>
- 404 13. Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC*
405 *Medical Research Methodology*, 8, 45. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45>
- 406 14. Vargholy, M. N., & Rozi, Z. B. P. (2026). Evaluating *sound horeg* through maqāṣid-based legal reasoning: A maqāṣid
407 assessment of a contemporary cultural practice in Indonesia. *Ex Aequo Et Bono Journal of Law*, 4(1).
408 <https://doi.org/10.61511/eaebjol.v4i1.2026.3742>
- 409 15. World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe. (2018). *Environmental noise guidelines for the European region*.
410 WHO Regional Office for Europe.
- 411 16. Zuhdi, M. H., & Nasir, M. A. (2024). Al-Mashlahah and reinterpretation of Islamic law in contemporary context.
412 *Samarah*, 8(3), 1818–1839. <https://doi.org/10.22373/sjkh.v8i3.24918>