

The Adaptability of Homans's Social Exchange Theory with Iranian Society

Garineh Keshishyan Siraki¹

Assistant professor, Department of Political Sciences, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University,
Tehran, Iran

Said Khosravi²

Ph.D. Student, Department of Political Sciences, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University,
Tehran, Iran

Received 25 December 2020 ||| Accepted 1 March 2021

Abstract: In this article, we dealt with wise and comprehensive criticizing the theory of social exchange that developed by Homans, while raising and extending the mentioned theory. In this respect, it could be noted to a significant theoretical evolution in 1950s of 20th century that is emerging of exchange theory, in which George Homans plays role as main character. Behavioral of Skinner accounts as main source of Homan's exchange theory in sociology. In present article, at first after expression and describing exchange theory, we dealt with fundamental subject of Homans through descriptive method. Then, we pointed out to critiques raised by Parsons, Mulem, and Abrahamson and Ake suggesting presences of some defects in exchange theory in view of extreme reduction proposed by Homans, and established methodology of this paper on qualitative, analytical and expressive method. Foundations of critique rose against exchange theory of Homans established on triple criteria for criticizing (Ontology, Epistemology in addition, methodology). The exchange theory could be regarded as a behaviorism theory and models of behaviorism to analyze of behavior of actors is merely based on experiences, that is the point, in which scholars in transcendental traditions criticizing, therefore, relevant hypothesis in this paper is based on the question that: whether exchange theory suggests constant and persistent criteria for scientific recognition of behavior, its emersion and prediction? In addition, concluded by authors. Present article, considering the history of raised reasons through criticizing of Homan's theory, make distinction between current paper and other criticizing studies.

Keywords: Model of social facts, Model of social definition, Model of social behavior.

|||

Introduction

Behaviorism is one of the most prominent causal approach in human and social science that vastly apply in both domains of psychology and political science. Behavior – orientation uses in psychology as Behaviorism and in political sciences as Behavioralism. Watson has utilized this term for the first time (in 1913). Behaviorism is in fact, an effort criterion to transform political – social exploration to theoretical knowledge (scientific). Turing to this approach, however, grounded in Kent Spencer's doctrines and originality of Scientism in 19th century, but following to the efforts spent in Vienna Circle in field of philosophy to merge logic, mathematic and language analysis, the first steps to turn politic to scientific knowledge in 20th century.

Behaviorists reject Aristotle's behavior model, in which every practice is subjected to a telos and substitute the model with causal theory of natural science that possesses higher prediction power. The behaviorism founded on general rules and causal mechanism, that is, it could be regarded every phenomenon as an effect to another external cause. In general, word, behaviorists deal with observable phenomenon, that is, the individual or group behavior. They are seeking to find reasons for behaviors. Therefore, they do not admit subjective mechanisms, but rather believe that, there is obviously an important way to examine these behaviors. The behavior is in fact, something objective and measureable. In psychology of behaviorist, the only appropriate subject to feed to a scientific psychological research is observable and measureable behavior. Through behaviorism, it could be possible to recognize all humans and their behaviors (in different situations) through a particular mechanism. They emphasize on what people do, not to what they express to do. Their main aim is to

¹ Email: g.keshishyan71@gmail.com (Corresponding Author)

² Email: saeidkhosravi65@gmail.com

achieve general rules for human behaviors. In this way, they are seeking to provide possibility to make predictions in human and social sciences (Rosenberg, 1988, p. 52). It should be noted that in this approach, it has been emphasized vigorously on application of term of behavior (3). It could not use term of Action since there is distinction between action and behavior. The behavior supposed to a natural phenomenon that is not a thing more than reaction in relation to an external stimulant. Therefore, source of behavior could be known as an external factor and does not initiate from human itself, hence, the behavior of human is not subjected to his intention and purpose. The behaviorist regards intentions as last shelter for scientific expression that initiated with Aristotle. However, upon their interpretation, 5centuries scientific advances practiced, suggested that such these explanations could not be well expression to that (Manouchehri, 2008:12)

Definitions

- ✓ Model of social facts: model of social facts comprises many theoretical visions. Functional – structural theorist is intended to consider social facts very close together and believe that regularity would be preserved with collective consensus. The conflict theorists are intended to emphasize on irregularity among social facts and believe that, regularity would be retained publicly merely imposing force.
However, structural functionalism and theory of conflict account as dominant theories in this model (Ritzier, 2014, p. 635)
- ✓ Model of social definition: mentioned model emphasized on how to define social situation from actors and influence of said definitions on actions and future interaction and point out role of actors in generation of social fact and comprises of symbolic interaction theories, phenomenology, public methodology and existentialism. (Ritzier, 2014, p. 653)
- ✓ Model of social behavior: this mode deals with investigation on reaction and unconscious behavior of people that they display against exterior stimulants and emphasize on awards to desired behavior and punishments resulting from undesired behavior.
The exchange theory spent its effort to compromise principles of behaviorism and after combination of these principles with other thoughts, apply those to problems sociologists are interested. The exchange theory however has been posed for a long time (Knox, 1963, p. 61), but with 1950 to 1960s, it experienced a period of booming through Homans' works. Beniger and Chivalry 1981, p. 240). The exchange theory of George Homans could be accounted as reaction against model of social facts and relevant sociology theories, in particular structural functionalism.

Fundamental theorems of Homans

However, some of relevant theorems to Homans discuss about two people who are in mutual action, but he was not neglected to memorize that his theorems establish on psychological principles. In view of Homans, his theorems are among psychological cases based on two reasons:

1. These theorems normally experience and express by whom they called themselves as psychologist. (Homans, 1967, pp. 39- 40)
2. Most important that, his theorems are among psychological cases, since involve with individual through the society: he stated that these theorems deal with behavior of people, then are belonging to psychological domain (Homans, 1967, p. 40)

Because of such this standing, Homans admitted to call him by such fearful title as psychological reductionist. (Ibid, 1974, p. 12) Reductionism, in view of Homans is included of a process showing that how theorems in a certain science (in this case, sociology) could logically follow more general theorems in another science. (For instance; psychology). However, he admitted the psychological principles, but did not considered individuals as something separated from each other. He understood that humans are social creations and spend a significant part of their time in action against others. Homans merely sought to express social behavior through psychological principles, hence, the stand he takes, is that: psychological general theorems that explain influence of human behaviors' consequences, are persisting

if such these consequences rather deriving from physical environment, has been taken from behavior of other humans (Homans, 1967, p. 59).

Homans did not negate stand of Durkheim suggested that a new object will be emerged through mutual action. He only argues that these emerged qualities could be expressed through psychological principles; hence, to express social facts, there is no need to introduce some new theorems. He used concept of Norm that is in high importance in sociology, to express his view (as follows :) the evident instance for social facts is social norms, so there is no doubt that relevant norms of a group, leads most of individuals belong to that groups to consistency with those norms in their behaviors. The matter involved is not on influence of norms on behaviors of people, but rather, is distinction between expressions of mention theorem. Norms often do not confine people: the reason upon which people obliged themselves to be in consistence with norms is that they suppose finally this will be on their benefit and this is psychology that deals with influence of supposed interest on behavior of people. (Homans, 1967, p. 70) Homans in his different works described his plans to turn people to sociology. But he was still seeking to develop theory that emphasize on psychology, people and fundamental form of social life. That is the theory of exchange hypothesis. In view of Homans, this theory considers social behavior as an exchange between tangible and intangible and more or less rewarding or punishing between actions at least between two individuals. (Homans, 1961, p. 13)

Homan within above-mentioned raised instance has tried to justify development of machineries based on steam power in textiles industries and industrial revolution through this psychological axiom that suggested people to increase their rewards, probably do this way. He, in more general manner and in form of his particular theory of exchange, attempted to express fundamental social behavior based on rewards and damages. In this way, he has insofar impressed by social realism, in particular functionalism – structural theories of his famous colleague and friend, but with regret, he could not express anything (Homans, 1961, p. 10)

In view of Homans, structural functionalists have not done anything unless to generate behavioral subjects and plans. He admitted that sociology requires to this subjects, but in addition believed that sociology needs to series of general subjects related to these issues. Since, in lack of such these theorems, expression is not possible, that is no theorem, no expression (Homans, 1974, p. 10). Hence, Homans, obliged himself to establish theorems that emphasize on psychology, these theories provide ground for exchange. Homans, admitted in this book as welfare in social behavior and its elementary forms (1961, 1974) that his theory of exchange derived from behavioral psychology and elementary economy. Homans express his regret that why his theory called as exchange theory, since he called his theory as practical behavioral psychology in particular situations. He initiates discussion upon an instance about behaviorism model, in particular investigation on behavior of pigeon that rose by B.F. Skinners: suppose a pigeon in a cage located in a laboratory that is unfamiliar with birdcage; one of his behavioral natural equipment that he could apply to assess his new environment is his beak. In this situation, he capers and pecks to wall of cage with his beak, till by chance his tip strikes to a red round spot and in same time, a psychologist standing over there or an automatic machine, as soon as striking the beak to red point feed him with some seed into cage. After that, the probability that pigeon shows such these behaviors, that is rather to pecking randomly, just touch the red point, will be increased. In view of Skinners, pecking of pigeon to that point is an active behavior that reinforces and poured seed into cage accounts merely as a reinforcement, in fact, pigeon has been impressed by conditioning factor. If we want to express this in general word, it should be said that learned pecking to red points through rewarding (Homans, 1961, p. 18).

In this respect, Skinners was interested in investigation on behavior of pigeons, but the interested matter of Homans was people. In view of Homans, inquest pigeon of Skinners has not been places in a real exchange relation with his psychologist. This pigeon, in this examination has been involved in a bilateral exchange relation; where as relevant exchange of people is always mutual. Inquest pigeon has been reinforcing with seeds, but examiner psychologist has not been reinforcing mutually with pecking of pigeon. This pigeon establishes same relation with psychologist that has been held with his natural

environment. Since there was not any mutual action in this relation, Homans regards it as an individual behavior. It seems that, Homans left investigation of such these behaviors to psychologists, whereas requests sociologist seriously to assess social behaviors; those in which, activities of at least one of two parts, reinforce or discourage other's activities each one as mutual influence over the others. (Homans, 1961: 30) In this case, it is important that, in view of Homans, to express social behavior, as behavior that is in conflict with individual behavior, there is no need to introduce any new theorem. Governing regulations in individual behavior, that Skinners achieved through study on pigeon behavior can also express social behavior; of course if we consider mutual reinforcement complication. Homans admitted that eventually should go beyond principles of Skinners, but with a little hesitation. Homans in his theoretical work, confined himself to assess daily social interactions, but in any case, it is evident that, in his view, sociology that founded over his principle, eventually must be able to express any kind of social behavior. Here we discuss about one of the prominent issues in desired exchange relations of Homans as follows:

“Suppose two people who work in an office and engage with documentary jobs. According to regulations governing over the said organization, every employee must do his work individually and in case he needs to be guided, he shall counsel with his supervisors. One of these two, who we called him first one, are not skilful in his job and if occasionally receive counsel, so he is able to do his job better and more quickly. Nevertheless, the current regulations permitted, he hesitates to go with his supervisor, to prevent injuring his opportunity for appraisal, he avoids confessing to his weakness, rather he tries requesting assistance from other person, and we called him second one.

The later one is more experienced in this job than the earlier one and could do his tasks better and quicker and as a results, have more free time and can assist to first individual, since knows that, there is no reason for supervisor getting out of his office and observe someone goes against law. In this way, someone help the others and in return receive appreciation and gratitude sentences from him, as a result it could be said that they exchange assistance and gratitude with each other. (Homans, 1961, pp. 31-32) Homans however discuss about behavior that is more complicated eventually, but at first, he is aiming to express his theory of exchange in this level. He, emphasizing such these types of behavior and based on Skinners' findings about pigeons, developed different theorems, those form bases for his theory of exchange about social behavior.

Theorem of Success

“With respect to all actions people take, if his action has been rewarded, this is mostly so that, the probability that mentioned action irritated by himself will be increased.” (Homans, 1974: p. 16) According to instance that Homans has drawn about mutual actions of first and second one in an office, this means that, if someone has already been rewarded by others through useful counsel he received from others, there is more probably to ask for more assistance. In the other word, the more individual received counsels that are more useful previously; more probably there is to ask counsel from others. In this way, if second one previously has been appreciated and rewarded, in future, he is in higher preparation to deliver counsel.

According to theorem of success, behavior has three stages:

1. An individual's action
2. Result attributed to reward
3. Irritation of first action that being same to first action at least in some aspects.

Homans noted to some points in theorem of success. First, however it is generally right that more reward has been dedicated, more actions will bring with, but this process could not have endured unlimitedly. In some cases, people could not do the same as they mostly did in past. Secondly, more shortened duration between behavior and reward has been, more probability is there for someone irritates the behavior. In contrast, long duration between emersion of behavior and reward, decrease the probability of irritation of that behavior. At the end, in view of Homans, frequent reward could encourage repeated

behavior more than continual rewards. Continual rewards bring boredom and dismal situation, whereas frequent rewards (as could be observed in gambling), increase probability of irritation of behavior.

Stimulant theorem:

If there were a particular stimulant or a series of stimulant at past that caused someone has been rewarded due to his action, more present and future stimulants are similar to past ones, more probability there is that someone in facing these stimulants emerge same action or similar actions. (Homans, 1974: p. 23) Taking note from same instance of Homans about office employees, if at past, first and second one detected exchange of counsel and reward, in same future also, probability they do same actions. In this case, Homans, draw more tangible instance: an angler, who catch fish from muddy water, there is more probability to hook up in same pond. (Homans, 1995: p. 23)

Homans was interested in process of extension; it means he was inclined to extend behavior to similar situation. Considering instance of fishing, one of aspect of extension is to move from fishing in entirely muddy waters towards in every pond with all levels of muddiness. Thus, success in fishing, probability moves from one type of fishing to another king (for example, fishing in white waters to fishing in salty waters) or even move from fishing to hunting. Hence, process of making distinction is also influential; it means, an actor may turn to fishing in situations, in which success has been proved at past. Other point is that, if success condition has been vigorously achieved, there is weak probability to motivate that behavior in similar conditions. If determinant stimulants emerge sooner than relevant behavior, it could not motivate that behavior in practice. An actor may display too much sensitivity against stimulants, in particular if the stimulant is valuable for actor. In fact, an actor may take action against irrelevant stimulants, unless his consecutive failure has not corrected his situation. All of these situations depend on consciousness or attention of an individual to stimulants.

Theorem of Value

More valuable the action has been for individual, more probability there is, that same action would be taken. (Homans, 1974: p. 25) Considering the instance of office employees, if rewards they dedicate to each other, thought to be valuable, there is more probability for these two actors to emerge desired behavior, comparing the case when the rewards regarded as worthless. Here, Homans poses two concepts of reward and punishment. In his view, punishment is an action that has born positive value; an increase in reward, enhance probability to motivate desired behavior. Nevertheless, punishment regards to an action that has born negative value, an increase in punishment motivate actors to display undesired behavior lesser. Homans knows punishment as ineffective tool to oblige people to exchange behavior, so it is better not to reward to undesired behavior that cause the behavior to be subsided. On the other hand, there is less probability that punishment works correctly as a tool to oblige people to do something. In such these cases, reward prefers on punishment, of course, if it has not been taken so generously. Homans revealed that his theory is not merely a joyfulness theory; rewards could also have been both physical (such as money) and philanthropic. (Such as charity)

Theorem of deprivation – satisfaction

More a certain reward has been previously dedicated to someone, less valuable the same reward would be him. (Homans, 1974: p. 29)

Within the instance about office employees, it may first and second one, as to exchange counsels, reward each other so that, those reward no longer worth them. Here, the factor plays determinant role, if certain rewards dedicate in long time, there is less probability that people sate with it; here, Homans raises two another basic concept that is included of:

- Loss
- Profit

The loss would be identified in each behavior by rewards that actor will lost in certain period. Profit in social exchange identifies with more number of rewards the people receive comparing with among of loss. These two concepts encouraged Homans to re-cast theorem of deprivations – satisfaction so that:

more benefit someone receives because of an action; more probability is there to do the same. (Homans, 1974: p. 31)

Theorems of aggression – confirmation

Theorem a: While someone could not receive expected rewards from his action or receives unexpected punishment, it makes him angry and in such these situations there is more probability to display aggressive behavior, while results of such these behavior worth to him (Homans, 1974: p. 37) Again, while returning to instance of office employees, it could be observed that, if first one could not receive counsel he expected from other (second one) or in other case the other could not receive predicted appreciation, both of them will make angry. While we face concepts of frustration and anger in works of Homan it makes us surprising, since these concepts point out to subjective moods. In fact, Homans himself admitted the matters: when someone could not receive what he has expected, it must be said that he frustrated, but an absolute behaviorist never points out to concept of expectations, since this addresses to a subjective mode (Homans, 1974: p. 31). He continues that frustration resulting from such these expectations, do not merely refer to a subjective mode. This concept could address to an entirely external events, such events that not only by individual itself, but also is observable by other people. Theorem A, with respect to confirmation – aggression, merely addresses to negative emotions, while Theorem B involves with emotions that are more positive. Theorem B: when someone receive his expected reward, in particular, if mentioned reward has been more than he expected, or does not receive expected punishment, feels happiness; in this case, there is more probability to display confirmative behavior and results of his behavior will be more valuable to him (Homans, 1974: p. 39).

For instance, in said office, if individual (first one) could receive expected counsel and the other receives his expected appreciation, both will be happy and there is more probability they exercise procedure of exchange again. In this case, counseling and appreciation will be made worthier for both of them. Therefore, it could be summarizing theory of Homans as an idea, in which he regards actor as an intelligent jobber. Hence, we could not remove thoroughly all subjective modes or extensive structures from his thinking system. For instance, he had to admit the point that institutional history makes distinction in personal behavior. He admitted that there is need to more advanced psychology with respect to consciousness. (Homans, 1974: p. 45) Despite these admission, Homans remained as a behaviorism; who actively worked in level of individual and believed that if perceive elementary social behavior correctly, consequently, understand better extensive structures. He came into the conclusion that exchange process in level of personal and social are the same; however, he admitted that in social level, method of combination of this elementary process is more complicates. (Homans, 1974: p. 358)

Critics on Homans' theory

Exchange of Homans' theory caused to raise serious critics. Two main weaknesses of Homans' theory and what sociologist criticized in his theory is included of two elementary issues of Homans as follows:

1. Failure of Homans to deal with social and cultural level appropriately;
2. Insufficiency of Homans' theory to investigate internal subjective process (Eke, 1974: p. 52)

For instance, Eke, criticized Homans due to his emphasizing on merely two people or twin exchange and neglecting more extensive model. Meanwhile, Eke criticized him to disregard norms and values forms exchange relations in symbolic manner. Hence, critics of Talcott Parsons, in one relevant view to model of social facts, illustrates better than other critics defects of Homans' theory in level of society.

Critic of Parsons about Homans' Theory

Parsons points out to two elementary distinctions between Homans and himself. First, he argues that Homans extemporize distinctions between behaviors of human and behavior of low-level creatures, but Homans himself identify clear distinction between these two. In view of Parsons, applicable principles to express human behavior differed from what apply in expression of animals' behavior in qualitative view. His opposites to the experience of Homans in which he derives exchange principles of human from investigation of Pigeons (by Skinners).

The second critics raised by Parsons is even fundamentally than his first critic; “The most basic configurations applicable to humans as individuals that I do not regard those as psychological principles but rather called as action principles, are not suffice on complicated micro systems of action. (Parsons, 1964: p. 216) In the other word, psychological principles do not justify social facts and in facts cannot do such these work. Homans could not show how psychological principles would be applicable in level of sociology. As Parsons says, Homans has to show how his principles could express structural features of extensive social system. (Parsons, 1964: p. 216) He makes conclusion that even if Homans tried to do so, made failure since social facts are variables that without addressing to psychological principles of Homans are both determinant and expressible (Parsons, 1964: p. 219). Critic of Abrahamson to Homans’ theory: the other main critic raised about Homans’ theory, pointed out to failure of present theory to provide a sufficient analysis about consciousness. For instance, Banquet Abrahamson says that Homans inclined to emphasizing on clear behaviors and disregarding of internal experiences of actors; “Awarding about experiences of people and their perceptions about rewards against some actions is on high importance to understand and prediction of their behaviors (Abrahamson, 1978: p. 283). Jack N Michael criticize reductionism of Homans and his failure in investigation of dynamic of awareness: “Each theory that tried to express or understand nature of social behavior of individual, could not implicitly or explicitly assumes that mutual action merely is as a result of calculated needs or process of biology, psychology or economy. What we feel its lacking is perception about uncertainty, doubtful and inquest issue. (Abrahamson, 1978: p. 81)” Michael to dominate over limitations of exchange theory in analysis of awareness proposed merging of visions, whose sociologist such as Guff man, Garfinkle define about exchange theory.

Critics of Mulem about Homans’s theory

Mulem says: most of distinctions in exchange theories with other sociological theories founded on misunderstanding rather than reality (Mulem, 1981: p. 154). Mulem considering governing misunderstandings about sociological behaviorism discusses about three elementary critics about this theory. The first critic is that social behaviorism is insofar reductionist, since mostly emphasize on personal behavior. In view of Mulem, this is not applicable for macro behaviorism (such as Belau) and then feels that this even does not applicable for micro social behaviorist. He admitted, however that behaviorism psychologist believes in reductionist, but states that behavioral sociologist are not so. Behavioral psychologists investigate how behavior of individual is impressed by independent and personal probability; some relations, in which, what causes to reinforce people, merely are based on his personal behavior (Mulem, 1981: 154). But, in contrast, behavioral sociologist is seeking to assess that how behaviors of two or more people impress by social mutual probability; relations in which, what causes to reinforce people, insofar, happen based on behavior of other people (Mulem, 1981, p. 154).

While Homans and other pure behaviorists emphasize that how behavior of people impress by behaviors of others. Most of behavioral sociologist raise the question that how relations between behaviors of others, impress by relation between their behavior and reward (Mulem, 1981: p. 155). Social behaviorists are not among reductionist, since note to structural relations between people and for that, clearly locate in domain of sociology. Structural relations are not attributes of people or exaggerations about individual features, but rather are real variables of relations (Mulem, 1981: p. 155). Mulem even goes beyond and says social behaviorism is in fact less reductionist than other social theories. Investigations that performed on twosome or group behavior by behavioral sociologist is thoroughly in conflict with those implemented by most of contemporary social psychologist and structural sociology in which individual accounts as a unit for analysis and exaggerated non related variables will be investigated. On the other hand, this is so evident that behavioral sociologists that study social probability, in fact assess structural variables, (microstructures). (Mulem, 1981: p. 156)” There is no doubt that Mulem is right in this respect that most of other sociology while involve with practical researches exercise reductionist (Acers, 1981: Mc File: 1981), but this is not proper defense against reductionism posed in behaviorism theory.

Robert Perin Banagam raises the same argument, when says: stand of Mulem could not response to critic raised about this theory, because conviction of reductionism posed against this theory since these main

expressive variables, do not considered new characters of mutual actions, exchanges, groups and even situations (Mulem, 1981: p. 168). Even, Cook has written in his book with respect to exchange theory, through a conscious objective that expands this theory to more extensive level, as Turner say: the context of chapters in this book is clearly intellectual. The second critic raised to behavioral sociology is that it leaves most of things, in particular norms and values, unexpressed. Mulem, in one hand says that behaviorism (Stolet) in this area did not take action worse than other sociologist did. But on the other hand says that behavioral sociologists provided something about formation of norms and values (of course in our view, more challenging theory) and in this way extended, personal principles of behaviorism to more extensive units; As it is required to investigate the education background of people to understand their personal behavior, it will be required to assess education background of inquest group or culture to perceive formation procedures of norms (Mulem, 1981: p. 156).

The third critics that posed against social behaviorism are that behaviorism theory operates based on a mechanical or unemotional perceived from actors. Mulem, argues against the critic that active behaviors, does not excited by previous incentives simultaneously, these just happen, Organism cause to emerge these behaviors but they do not excite by stimulants (Mulem, 1981: p. 156). But this does not provide active and creative image about actors and as Perin Banagam; “such these claims, rather to be regard as to response critic about mechanical perception of behaviorism they take from actors, in fact, confirm it. These arguments are in thorough consistence with behaviorism image of human as a passive, machinelike, impulsive and originality that merely can display such these behaviors. (Mulem, 1981: p. 166), in the other word, image of Mulem about actors, does not display anything about formation of social actions (Mulem, 1981: p. 166).

In more positive word, evolutions mentioned in exchange theory, depends on other theoretical transformations that has been discussed in other chapter of his book. First, because exchange theory, significantly impressed by Richard Emerson and emphasized on existing continuities in micro and macro level, from exchange point of view. The next reason to that is existing linkages between exchange theory and theory of network. As Cook says, importance of such this evolutions (perception of Emerson from exchange networks) underlies in this matter that all works that recently has been done in social networks, related to exchange theory.

An ontological critic about behaviorism (form of political matter)

To understand behaviorism, it could be considered interpretations of August Kent as basis. Of Course, behaviorists divided into two main schools gradually. The first one, is the school emphasizes on stimulants as a factor or cause of human behavior. This approach has more than 100 back ground in empirical psychology. Classics measure all behavior according to formula of stimulant – reaction. The second school emphasizes on theory of B. F. Skinner. They have machinelike approach to nature of human and in their assessment, environmental factor plays significant role. The said school that identifies with relies on B.F. Skinner’s opinion, respects environment life of human to originality and determination. Based on opinions of Skinners, empirical behaviorist does not subject aim of science as to understand the mind, but regards that to observable behavior system, that is systemization and provide general statement, enable to relate environmental conditions with behaviors it triggers. Such this systemization could not be based on intentional theory. Social psychological and behavioral sociologists like George Homans applied mentioned theory. Of course psychological behaviorism does not negate but due to following reasons does not pay attention to that:

1. It is possible to explain human behavior without addressing to mind
2. It can’t express human behavior referring to mind.
3. Relevant questions to mind it are not possible to answer.

An ontological critic about behaviorism (confrontation with political matter)

The research aim of Skinner behaviorism, is to understand individual people, but rather is to regulated observable behavior. In his point of view, relevant Greek visions to behavior have been already failed. (Skinner, 1991: p. 29). Among these, environment plays drastically determinant role. In view of Skinner

and also a scientific analysis is to express it and related to conditions in which individual lives. These events must be linked together and in fact, there is no need to any other intervener factors; it means that environment is not only a stimulant, but rather it is selectors as well. We know behaviors through its consequences and in this respect pay attention to interaction of environment with organism. (Skinner, 1991: p. 29). We meant with term of regulating, is to provide general statements, enable us to link observable environmental conditions with behavior resulted from that. Therefore, behavior is main phenomenon (or main issue) in individual and collective life of humans. The basic rules to express law of effect, is behaviorism. This law expresses the principles, upon which, behavior of human, is in fact an external stimulant that is reason for behavior. Of Course, intellectual selection that is a naturalism approach, in which calculator wisdom of human plays determinant role and accounts as an approach to behaviorism. (Manouchehri, 1999: pp. 43 – 45).

A methodological critic about behaviorism

Comparing with positivistic, suggested that; those statements which are neither definable (useful tautologies) nor empirical, are meaningless, behaviorism has philosophical roots in Positivism. As results, any weakness that is existed in Positivism consequently must be found in behaviorism. Perhaps, among vast of critic that imposed on Positivism, the most important ones suggested that large categories of statements Positivism regards them as meaningless, are in fact including vast of idea that could serve us significant assistance to perceive social behavior and human conditions. In tight framework of positivists, there is no role considered for exchange theory (behavioral), since behavioral discussion are not limited to descriptive and empirical statements. Moreover, for this purpose, there could be no role assumed for aesthetic or moral contestations, consequently there is no role proposed for Hermeneutic analysis that is seeking to understand social behavior through internal deep surveillance about nature of human imagination, intellectual process and motivations. According to this contest, if behaviorists wish to neglect such these reflects, it seems that they go wrong. Modern behaviorism prefers to expose their theoretic arguments to empirical examination and do not admit disability of scholars in unempirical tradition to provide compelling answer to this main question that; “how do you know that your scientific work is wrong” (Marsh, 2013: p. 115).

Conclusion

In brief, the word of Homans and his approach to Durkheim established on the context, upon which, social facts result in individual reaction and these reactions itself, cause to emerge new social facts. Hence, the main factor is neither behavior nor social fact. However, Levi Strauss, turned to answer to Homans; he found human as who is able to display creative and dynamic action, whereas, all animals could behave in static manner. It seems that one of critic imposed is matter of being static in human posed by and dynamism raised by Levi- Strauss that is drastically challenging. If we deliberate more in Homans’ emphasize on human behavior reactions, we found that that display unconsciousness and this causes to raise serious discussion about Ontology issues in active behavior that introduces taints to the matters. Homans rejects emphasizing of Strauss on one type of moral system and instead contested that basis for human exchange is self-interest that is founded on combination of economic and psychological needs. In view of epistemology, matter of economic interest and materialism of human interest of Homans is vulnerable and attributes originality to delighting of commitment in active actions and we found moral and spiritual statements void, those have been noted by human of today particularly, since new subjects in 21st century, including Human rights and liberties are in conflict with states Homans proposed. At last, it is possible to criticize analysis level of Homans in sense of methodology. The level of Homans theory is based on subjective – micro stage and the matter points out to reductionism of Homans here would be raised. We find from the statement that Homans induction fails to express action of actors in view of generality and thoughts (values and norms) and a theory must be able to adapt itself with different situation as appropriate with alterations of its time and resolve new events in current century, therefore, such this detail and objectivity draws off exchange theory from subjective and general matters and such this defect, makes distance between exchange theory from generalizations in its domain of applications or minimize scope of mentioned theory as far as possible.

References

1. Beniger, JR., (1981), Who Are the Most Important Theorists of Communication? *Communication Research*. 1990; 17(5):698-715.
2. Homans, G.C. (1961) *Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms*. Harcourt, Brace, and World, New York.
3. Homans, G.C., (1941), *English Villagers of the Thirteenth Century*, <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb.01205>
4. Homans, G.C., (1950), *the Human Group*, New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
5. Homans, G.C., (1958), "Social Behavior as Exchange." *American Journal of Sociology* 63:597–606. Retrieved December 12, 2020, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2772990>
6. Homans, G.C., (1962), *Sentiments & Activities: Essays in Social Science*, United States: Free Press.
7. Homans, G.C., (1967), "The Nature of Social Science", United Kingdom: Harcourt, Brace & World.
8. Homans, G.C., (1984), *Coming to My Senses: The Autobiography of a Sociologist*, New Brunswick, N.J., and London: Transaction Books
9. Homans, G.C., (1987), *Certainties and Doubts*, New Brunswick, N.J., and London: Transaction Books
10. Knox, E. G., (1963), *Malformations in Time and Space*, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8749.1963.tb05038.x>
11. Manouchehri, Abbas, (2008), *approach and method in Political science*, Tehran, Samt Publisher.
12. Marsh David, Jerry Stockers, (2013), *Political method and theory*, translated by Haji Yousefi Amir Mohammad, 7th edition, Tehran, Strategic Research Institute
13. Ritzier, George (2014), *Contemporary Sociology theory*, Translated by Salasi, Mohsen, 19th edition, Tehran, Scientific Publishers
14. Skinner, B.F. (1991), *beyond freedom and dignity*, translated by Seif Ali Akbar, Tehran, Roshan Published