

# The Study of Explanatory Content Models in Humanities

**Mahdi Jamali<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Ahmad Hossein Sharifi**

<sup>1</sup>PhD student of Imam Khomeini Educational and Research Institute  
jamali.ir1@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>Faculty member and full professor of Imam Khomeini Educational and Research Institute  
Sharifi1738@yahoo.com

**Abstract:** Explanation, interpretation and critical approaches are the three main approaches and methods in discovering humanities and social sciences. In the meantime, explanation has a special and privileged position. Many philosophers of humanities have considered explanation as the most important component and method of these sciences. Explanation means reason of exploring human phenomena, and predicting and controlling these phenomena is possible only in the shadow of explaining and finding the reasons of those phenomena. Because of the great importance of explanation, philosophers have considered various formal models, such as inductive, deductive, retroductive, and content, as causal, structural, functional, materialistic, and rational choice. Formal models are models in relation to the form of explanation and content models are also models in relation to the material and content of explanation. In this article, first we will explain the explanation and its content models in a descriptive-analytical method, and then we will critique and review these models in an analytical-critical method and we will show that firstly, the content models that are mentioned for explanation have flaws and objections, and secondly, explanation can not alone form the whole identity of the humanities, but the humanities also need other components such as interpretation. In fact, explanation is limited to causal explanation, and other types of explanation can either be returned to it or are not essentially explanation and are merely description.

**Keywords:** Humanities, Explanation, content Models, Causal Explanation.

18 - 20 September, 2020

### 1. Introduction

Francis Bacon (1661-1661) was the first one who assigned a place to the humanities and social sciences in the classification of sciences. (Copleston, 2009, vol. 3, pp. 351-356). From the beginning of the formation of the humanities as a special class of sciences, questions have always been considered by thinkers, such as: 1. What is the humanities? 2. Is the subject and method in the social sciences the same as the subject and method in the natural sciences or not? 3. What is the subject and method or methods of humanities? Two events have had a great impact on the humanities and social sciences: 1. the development of natural sciences that began with the discoveries of Galileo (1564-1642) 2. The principle of Rene Descartes duality (1550-1696) or his distinction between soul and body (Freund, 1993, p. 8-9). The first factor led to the idea that the humanities should follow the natural sciences and its method.

Since the seventeenth century, the rapid flourishing of the natural sciences created a gap in the republic between the natural sciences and the humanities, and the increasing development of one and stopping the other caused various thinkers to raise the issue that there may be a scientific difference between the two groups of science and specialty in humanities. Some of them refused to accept the definite confrontation between these two groups of sciences and considered the natural sciences as a model of any science and believed that the lateness of the humanities could be compensated as long as these sciences accepted the norms and methods of the natural sciences. This epistemological view prevailed over other views in the eighteenth century ... Newton's research also confirmed many scholars in this field of thought, so much so that each in its turn thought that to be Newton of their age in the humanities (ibid., P. 8).

The second factor also caused some people consider the delta of the subject and method of the humanities differently from the natural sciences, and consider one about material and the other about the soul.

In contrast, another trend that was more or less faithful to Descartes' view on the distinction between soul and body transferred this ontological distinction to methodology to show that spirit and matter, nature and thought, and later nature and history cannot be interpreted to each other. Proponents of this trend denied the possibility of interpreting human phenomena to physical phenomena at least because of the importance of the end in human actions which can not be sacrificed to the mechanical process in the scientific study, and thus they founded philosophical foundations of human science independence. (Ibid: p. 9).

If we want to define the humanities according to their subject, we must consider them as sciences that discuss human actions. In other words, the humanities can be considered the science of beings that are realized by human will and awareness (Parsania, 2013, pp. 29-30). In a division, all sciences except mathematics are divided into inanimate material sciences such as physics, chemistry, etc., living material sciences such as biology, etc., and human sciences, whether it refers to the individual field of man and whether his social, such as psychology, economics, law (Mesbah Yazdi, 1989, pp. 16-17). One of the definitions offered for the humanities is that the humanities are sciences that describe, explain, (expressing reason), interpret, predict, reinforce, and modify human actions. (Sharifi, 2016, p. 115).

Methods in the humanities and social sciences in general and in chronological order of origin can be classified into two general approaches:

1. Explanation approach: This approach, which is the predominant approach of English countries and has advocates such as August Kent and Emile Durkheim (Oswitt and Batamor, 2013, p. 716), does not differentiate between the methods of natural and human sciences and

18 - 20 September, 2020

believes that it must be sought the reason of phenomena in the humanities (Rosenberg, 2007, p. 26).

2. Interpretation approach [semantics]: The interpretation approach derives from the hermeneutic tradition and phenomenology (Blaki, 2012, p. 104). This approach which is the predominant approach in German countries and it has advocates such as Dilthey, Weber, Winch, and Schutz (Otwitt and Batamor, previous, p. 716) believes that both the subject and the method in the humanities are different from the humanities. The subject of the humanities is human action and its method is interpretation or understanding. In interpretation, it should look for the meaning and reason of human action and not its reason and this is because man is an independent being with intelligence and purpose (little, 1991, pp. 68-69).

3. Frankfurt Critical Approach: This school is influenced by the philosophical thoughts of Hegel and Marx and is derived from the thoughts of the philosophers of Frankfurt School i.e, Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse and Habermas (Benton and Craib, 2005, p. 203). Critical approach on the one hand believes that the subject and method in the humanities is different from the natural sciences and therefore it is inclined to interpretive method in the humanities and on the other hand believes that interpretation should be combined with criticism (Khosropanah, 2015, p. 235 Hassani, 2006, p. 95). It is worth noting that some of the later approaches in the humanities are not purely explanatory or interpretive, but a combination of the two, such as Baskar's theory of critical realism or Giddens' theory of construction. Unlike Baskar, Giddens considers even the natural sciences to be a combination under the influence of philosophical hermeneutics (Bleiki, previous: pp. 139; 156-157).

The importance and necessity of explanation is due to the fact that the discovery of why occurring human phenomena is the central point and main goal of the humanities, and the definition and description of its introduction and prediction, control and evaluation depend entirely on it. As much as we are successful in explaining an action and discovering its causes, we can provide accurate predictions and we can be successful in reinforcing desirable actions and weakening undesirable actions. For this reason, philosophers of humanities have proposed a wide variety of discussions about explanation and have proposed different types of explanation such as causal, functional, structural, materialistic and rational choice explanation. In our opinion, explanation is merely causation, and other types either refer to it or are not essentially explanation (Sharifi, Previous, 189-193). The purpose of this article, in addition to a brief description on the types of descriptive-analytical methods, is to review and critique it with an analytical-critical approach.

## 2. What and the content types of explanation in the philosophy of humanities

In this section, we will first state what explanation is and then explain its content types.

### 1/2. What is the explanation?

Explanation in the word means to reveal and clarify (Fayumi, 1414, p. 70) and in its popular and common term in the humanities and social sciences and its philosophy means the answer to the question of "why" or "lack of proof". In fact, in explaining the reasons and factors of the occurrence of a phenomenon and their role is expressed. Why did the Islamic Revolution of Iran take place? Why do people vote? All of these questions are questions of why and seek to explain why a phenomenon occurs. The explanation approach is philosophically rooted in the philosophical views of empiricists such as Bikan, Hobbes, Lok, Berkeley, Hume, and John Stuart Mill, and it is sociologically

18 - 20 September, 2020

based on the empiricist approaches of Saint-Simon, Auguste Comte, Spencer, and Durkheim. Explanation philosophies are naturalistic, educational, and positivist. Naturalism is used in the social sciences in two senses: 1. Social phenomena are like natural phenomena, so to discover them, it must use the method of natural sciences, I.e, explanation. 2. Social phenomena, although due to the existence of elements such as belief, desire, selection, etc. are not the same as the phenomena of natural sciences, but the rules and criteria of methodology are the same in both (Norman Bleiki, previous, p. 77; Abdolhossein Khosropanah, the former, pp. 86-87). The method of explanation is also divided into two types, severe and mild: 1. Severe: the only way to recognize social phenomena is the method of explanation 2. Mild: One of the ways to identify social phenomena is explanation (Little, opcit, p 223).

As it was mentioned, the method of explanation is based on the philosophy of positivism. Positivism entered the social sciences through August Comte and Durkheim. In the first decade after World War II, forms of positivism dominated sociology and have continued to this day in disciplines such as psychology and economics. In recent times, positivism has been the subject of much debate in sociology (Bleiki, previous, p. 78). Since the method of explanation in the social sciences is born from the philosophy of positivism, it is necessary to briefly mention the basics of positivism in order to better understand explanation. The first person that introduced the humanities as an academic science was Saint-Simon, a French socialist. He accepted Condorcet's views that an ideal society should be governed by scientists in the experimental sciences. He considered all phenomena to be the product of a principle (gravity) and called this theory "cognitive unity". In his book, A Report on the Humanities, he emphasized that the humanities should be as an academic science, not a hypothetical or conjectural science, and a theory about the sciences (both physical and human) should be formulated based on the theory of general gravity that God has created the universe subordinating it and governs the world accordingly. August Comte and John Stuart Mill developed his theory (Freund, previous: p. 59).

The most important principles of positivism are:

1. Senses and experience are the only source of knowledge of human and social affairs the trend of positivism, among the sources of cognition, considers only the senses, observation, and experience, and does not value other sources of knowledge. Comte considers human life to have three stages: religious, philosophical and scientific. According to him, early man considered God as the reason of phenomena and then, as a result of intellectual development and passing through myths, he used philosophical concepts to express the reasons of phenomena. In the last stage, which is the result of the evolution of human thought, he searches for the reason of phenomena in this material world and explains them in a scientific way (Copleston, 2005, vol. 9, p. 93). The rule of nominalism in the school of positivism emphasizes that all non-empirical abstract concepts are mere words and names and have no indication of objective reality (Bleiki, former, p. 73). An interpretation of positivism known as rational positivism went so far as to consider non-empirical propositions fundamentally meaningless (ibid., P. 76). This positivist basis is also called phenomenalism (ibid., P. 73).

2. The authority and model of natural sciences for humanities

The increasing and successful growth of the natural sciences in the West, based on the empirical method caused this thought that any science must imitate the pattern and method of the natural sciences in order to progress. Based on this, the idea of the unity of natural and

18 - 20 September, 2020

human sciences was established based on the unity of the method (Amzian, 2001, p. 40). In the interpretation school of the humanities and the natural sciences, as well as their methods, they are distinguished by difference in their subjects. In this school, it is believed that the method of natural sciences is explanation and the method of humanities is interpretation, understanding and semantics. The conflict between the two schools is more than a hundred years that is started and it is still going on (Bleiki, former, p. 20).

### 3. Science means general laws

The purpose of science and the basis of science is science to obtain general laws through systems and the result is the possibility of predicting and controlling future events (Mohammadpour, 2010, p. 188).

### 4. Descriptiveness of science and negation of value issues

Based on the validity of the empirical method and the unity of the humanities and the natural sciences, all humanities issues, such as the natural sciences, will be purely descriptive and value issues will be meaningless. The result of this statement is that ethics merely means the empirical study of the customs of tribes; therefore, morality will be relative and absolute. According to positivism, science is fundamentally independent of values and values have no place in it (ibid., P. 176).

### 5. Atheism and denial of religion

The material view to the world and man is one of the most important foundations of positivism, which results in the denial of religion, the abstract soul, and every immaterial affair. Thus, in the view of positivism, religion becomes a social phenomenon, not something that has come from beyond for human welfare. Studying religion will be like studying material and experimental matters. Augustus Kent established a religion at the end of his life in which man played the role of God and great men were succeeded the saints. Kent believed that true religion is a religion that conforms to the mind of the people in the age of science, and this religion will replace the traditional religion, which involves the acceptance of sacred and unscientific beliefs (ibid., P. 70).

### 6. Denial of human will and authority

According to positivism, human free will is merely an illusion, and powerful external pressures form the human action (ibid., P. 176). According to this paradigm, observing human external behaviors and documenting it on external forces affecting it is enough to explain that behavior. Mental, emotional, and psychological processes have no effect on human behaviors (ibid., P. 192).

### 7. Invalidity of non-quantitative and experimental methods

Positivism believes that only quantitative and experimental methods are valid and other methods to achieve objective reality are invalid (Ibid: p. 176). In this school, the only induction is the method of understanding the truth (Ibid: p. 118). In inductive method, it starts from data collection and ends with inference of general rules. In this method, the mind must be emptied of presuppositions and directly observes the outside (ibid., P. 124).

These are the general principles of positivism. In fact, the explanation is the child of positivism. Of course, explanation denied some principles of positivism and distanced from them in continuing his life. For example, Popper, who believed in the explanation and unity

18 - 20 September, 2020

of the method of the natural and social sciences, refuted the basis of positivism and proposed the theory of refutation, in the sense that reality can never be discovered empirically, but a theory is valid as long as it is not cancelled (Bleiki, former., 262); Also, the school of critical realism, which has an explanation approach, was formed in the position of rejecting positivism.

## 2/2. Content types of explanation

Explanators have mentioned various formal and content models to explain. Formal models mean observer models in the form of argument, and non-formal models mean models of explanation that have nothing to do with the form of argument, but are related to the content and method of explanation. Philosophers of social sciences consider three types of formal explanations and explanatory research strategies, deductive research strategy, inductive research strategy and retrospective strategy [process inference] (Bleiki, former., P. 246). According to the explanators' view, content models of explanation are five main types and are: causal, structural, functional, materialist explanation and rational choice explanation (Little, opcit, p 6)

1. Causal explanation. Passing from the pure description of the phenomena to the discovery of its reasons is called "causal explanation" (Khosropanah, former, p. 84). This type of explanation seeks to discover and prove the causal relationship between social phenomena, such as the causal relationship between grain prices and peasants' rebellion, or the causal relationship between technological changes and changes in ideology (Little, opcit, p. 13). This model is in fact rooted in the words of Aristotle, who believed that in Lemmy's argument, one of the four causes is the middle limit and the result is inferred (Khosropanah, former, p. 83). From the point of view of those who believe in this model, reason should have three characteristics: first, it is side by side with the effect, second, it has a temporal precedence over the effect, and third, it must be a necessary relationship between cause and effect (Bleiki, former, pp. 11-12).

Now let's see what kind of cause is meant in explaining the cause. Aristotle limited causes to four types: subject cause, material cause, formal cause, and ultimate cause. Internal causes, which are material and formal causes, are basically negligently called causes because they are united with the effect and have no external changes and duality (Mesbah Yazdi, 2015, vol. 2, p. 35) unless they are called analytical cause and not external cause. The ultimate cause in modern science was released by Francis Bacon, the first English philosopher after the middle Ages. Bacon considered the goal of science not as knowing the world, but its practical application and changing the world. According to him, "Research on the ultimate causes is useless and it does not produce anything like a virgin who is dedicated to God" (Copleston, 2009, vol. 3, p. 352). The subject cause also has two terms: one is the natural subject and the other is the divine subject (Mesbah Yazdi, the former: p. 35), which here means the natural subject. Thus, the purpose of causality in causal explanation, whether in the natural sciences or in the Western social sciences, is a material subject cause.

2. Structural explanation. The term structure was first used by Ibn Khaldun (1406-1332) and then by Spencer (1903-1820) in the modern era (Otwith and Batamur, the former, p. 547). Social structures are systemic and sustainable systems that guide, limit, or inspire human behavior by setting limits and scope, such as the agro-peasant system, the land tenure system, the wage system in industrial capitalism, and so on. .. (Little, opcit, pp. 103-104). This explanation was initially a reaction against humanistic philosophies, especially existentialism, which considered man as an independent, free and creative being (Sidman,

18 - 20 September, 2020

2016, p. 215). The later and modern form of this model, which Claude Levi Strauss (1908-2009) is called his father, has been entered the social sciences from linguistics and from the thoughts of Ferdinand de Saussure of Switzerland (1913-1857). In this explanation, the unit of analysis in the social sciences is structures, not individuals; For example, if the analysis of the increase of crime in society says that the unequal distribution of wealth in society or the government's lack of attention to cultural and religious affairs caused the increase in crime, this is a structural explanation, because the increase in crime is not documented to individuals and personal motives. (Little, opcit, pp. 102-105). Proponents of structural explanation believe that in order to understand social affairs, the whole should not be broken down into parts, but on the contrary, it should seek unity in the parts and understand the whole in its entirety through its works (Skidmore, 2013, pp. 165-167).

Structuralists have actually three important claims: 1. The social sciences should have an independent subject other than psychology 2. Social structures have a separate reality in addition to individuals 3. There is a kind of order and relationship between social structures that allows the social thinker to examine and explain them (Ryan, 1970, p. 174). Structuralism is divided into two different types. The first type is called causal structuralism, in which social structures are considered to be the main cause of social phenomena. The second type is non-causal structuralism. In this type of purpose, the explanation is to show how different aspects of social phenomena are paired with sub-structures. In fact, this approach to structuralism assumes that society, like the syntactic structure of language that can be deciphered, has a latent structure that has an abstract and decipherable order. In fact, this decoding is the explanation of phenomena (Little, opcit, pp. 102-105). Some thinkers describe non-causal structural explanation as fact, not explanation (I bid, pp. 111-112). Structuralism is often linked to functionalism and creates an explanation of functional structuralism or structural functionalism. August Kent, Spencer, and Durkheim are representative of this kind of combined explanation, and its evolved form can be seen in the works of Parsons (1902-1979).

3. Functional explanation or functionalism. Functionalism, according to its proponents, is a non-causal explanation of the function of social phenomena. In this type of explanation, the answer to the question of why refers to the ends, beneficial consequences, and function of objects. In functional explanation, the phenomenon is explained by its function and service (I bid, pp. 91-92) like the explanation of religious rites to create more solidarity between peoples. In fact, functionalism was an idea in answer to the question how is social order possible? This idea was a solution proposed by sociologists, especially French sociologists in the early nineteenth century, to get out of the political unrest of the late nineteenth century, and especially the unrest during the French Revolution (Turner, 2003). Pp. 26-27). The principle of this idea is taken from biology, in which society and its structures are considered as a living organism, whose organs, in addition to being related to each other, have a function and in total meet the existing needs of the whole. (Ibid: p. 27). According to some thinkers, including August Kent, the family as social stem cells, social forces as the basic social tissues, the state and the city as social organs, and the nations of the world are similar to the organ systems in biology. (Ibid., P. 28). Spencer and Durkheim also followed Kent in this matter, likening the garment to a living organism and designing a functional explanation. Relying on the fact that clothing is like a living organism, Spencer also proposed Darwin's theory about societies (ibid., P. 29).

Durkheim, as the most effective and important figure extending functional explanation, distinguishes between this type of explanation and causal explanation, and does not equate

18 - 20 September, 2020

the two. He warns against the ultimate interpretation of the functional explanation that the consequences of an event are considered to be the cause of its occurrence and the need to maintain the system is considered to be the cause of its components, and says:

Therefore, when we explain social phenomena, we must look for the effective cause that creates that phenomenon and its function separately. We prefer and use the word "function" to the words "goal" or "intention" precisely because social phenomena generally do not exist because of the beneficial effects they produce (ibid., P. 31). In fact, the teleological explanation is the belief that society has intentions or goals that create social structures and institutions to achieve those goals. Some people consider the principle of teleological explanation to be incorrect, while others consider only the teleological explanation to be irrational. Irrational consequentialism is to consider a goal or intention as the guide of human affairs that is not in fact as this, as if we assume that because society needs reproduction, it creates the institution of the family, while structures or institutions may meet this need for other reason (Ritzer, 2016, p. 352).

Those who consider the principle of teleological explanation to be invalid believe that this type of explanation is a fallacious explanation because they consider the effect former to cause. Many of them believe that functionalists, including Durkheim, although they wanted to escape the teleological explanation, but they have fallen into its trap (Ryan, opcit, p. 183). According to Allen Ryan, in functional explanation, he wrongly attributes goals to structures and institutions (I bid, p. 191). He believes that functional explanation is not essentially explanation but it is description, because it does not express the causes of a social reality (I bid, p. 183). If functional explanation means for what goals people have designed institutions and structures, it can really call functional explanation as explanation, that is, explanation of rational choice, whereas sociologists do not mean functional explanation, and even people like Durkheim do not play a role for the intentions of individuals in sociology (I bid, 183-184). According to Allen Ryan, the weakness of the functionalists is due to the neglect of the role of human beings and their intentions in social explanations. This is where Humans says: "Humans must be return to the stage" (I bid, 194).

4. Materialist or material-subsistence explanation. Materialism intends to explain important features of collective life, such as political and cultural features, such as the explanation of peasants' particular conception from justice in a particular way of their livelihood and occupation by analyzing the various forms of livelihood, work, technology, and social arrangements governing production. The set of social and technological factors can be called material-subsistence culture or economic basis or mode of production (Little, opcit, pp. 114-115). The beginning of the materialist explanation is that societies have needs and establish institutions to meet those needs. Work and technology are essential to meet the needs and production of goods. Macro-causal orders are established between technological and social institutional growth of the production and evolution of ideological, cultural and political institutions; therefore, according to this living situation, the characteristics of society can be explained (I bid, P 122). For example, a peasant who produces as much as he lives will consider risk aversion as part of his value system, or consider a farmer and hunter valuable.

5. Explanation of rational choice. Social phenomena are the result of human actions, and human beings are beings with wisdom and intellect. According to the two characteristics of science and intention, a kind of explanation enters into social phenomena that do not exist in the natural sciences, and that explanation is based on the theory of rational choice and purposefulness and utilitarianism of individuals is in their actions. According to this type of explanation, human beings are knowledgeable, autonomous, purposeful and calculating

18 - 20 September, 2020

people who choose the action that is most beneficial for them, so in order to explain human actions, it is necessary to pay attention to insights and motivations and in fact it is the insights and motivations of individuals that are the real reason for issuing a certain verb. An example of this type of explanation is the explanation of the contract between the owner and the farmer in the feudal system, that this contract provides both the owner's profit and the farmer's profit, so that the contract was the sum of the measured powers of owners and farmers at that time (I bid, p 39).

The explanatory model of rational authority has a central principle ... that central principle is that human behavior is purposeful and measured. It is assumed that people in the multi-way, choose the path that agrees with their intentions. They calculate the profit and loss to go either way, and after examining the arguments of agree and disagree, they go for it. It is a wise and prudent action that is a suitable means to achieve a goal in the context of specific information from different fissures. Therefore, in order to explain one's behavior, one must first determine one's intentions and beliefs and then show that that action is a rational way to achieve those intentions within the framework of those beliefs (I bid, 40-41).

Elster describes the structure of rational choice theory as follows: According to Cognition, Behavior is the best means of achieving Desires. That is, according to cognitions, certain behaviors are the best means of achieving desires (Elster, 1986, p. 12). Of course, this is not enough to explain the theory of rational choice. When B behavior is rational that C and D are its reason, for example, an actor may be asked to tremble as part of a film, but the actor trembles at the time to see a snake. This action cannot be considered rational here (I bid). This view has two important results in the social sciences. First, social orders are fundamentally different from natural order. Natural orders are fixed and objective attributes of foreign objects, while social orders are the result of the consciousness and intention of human beings; And secondly, there is a form of explanation in the social sciences that has no way in the natural sciences, and that human and social phenomena are the result of human purposeful action or the sum of human purposeful actions.

### 3. Reviewing the explanation and its types

In order to study the approach of explanation in humanities and social sciences, two axes must be carefully evaluated, namely: 1. Philosophical foundations of explanation; 2. Its non-formal models. The positivist approach to confining the valid method to the empirical method and denying the validity of other methods, metaphysics and religion, has erred and has several drawbacks. That is why this approach has no advocate. Although explanation in the humanities was born from positivist principles, but since all are not believers in positivist explanation, and since it can distinguish between positivist principles and explanation and accept explanation and at the same time not accept positivism, in this article we will suffice to examine the third axis and assign the critique of the foundations of positivism to its own sources (Mesbah Yazdi, the former, vol. 1, pp. 204-206).

But there are some notable points and criticisms about non-formal models of explanation:

1. Although some explanation scholars sometimes distinguish between the five types of explanation that have passed, it is incorrect that causal explanation is structural, functional, materialistic, and rational choice, so some thinkers only consider explanation in the sense of causation. (Sharifi, the former, pp. 189-193). Little also considers structural, functional, materialist explanations, and rational choice as part of causal explanation (little, opcit, pp. 37-38, 112). Little considers structural explanation to be a kind of causal explanation. Sometimes structures are the cause of social phenomena and sometimes their individuals.

Functional explanation is also a kind of causal explanation because it has different types of causes and one of them is the ultimate cause (Sharifi, Former, p. 193). In materialist explanation and rational choice, the cause is documented in the style of livelihood and the means of production and wise decision based on profit. In general, it can be said that the correct view is that in these few categories that philosophers and thinkers of the humanities have considered for explanation, if the cause is discovered, it is called explanation or causal explanation; and if the discovery of the cause does not occur, it is not essentially an explanation, but a description or interpretation. This is why Little explains the non-causal structure (Little, opcit, p. 112). And Alan Ryan and Ian Craib describe functional explanation in fact (Craib, 1999, p. 67; Ryan, opcit, p. 183).

2. It is not as this that all parts of causes have a temporal precedence over their effect. The precedence of the cause over the effect is a hierarchical precedence, whether it is temporal like the precedence of the imperfect cause over the effect or not, like the precedence of the perfect cause over the effect itself. Hume's interpretation of causality to a permanent symmetry or sequence [orders] is also incorrect, as light and heat are in the cause of contemporaneity and consecutive day and night, but neither is another cause (Mesbah Yazdi, the former, vol. 2, p. 31; 44).

3. Citing causality, influence, and intentions on social structures as an independent matter without referring them to individuals means the originality of society and is incorrect. The existence of structures is acceptable only as a set of individuals. In fact, what is real and effective outside is only the people.

4. Causal explanation in human and social phenomena is very difficult. On the one hand, man is an autonomous being and chooses his own action, and on the other hand, human and social phenomena are usually influenced by various factors, so it must be very careful in explaining the cause. Of course, it should not be unaware of invisible and sometimes imperceptible factors in causal explanation, for example, in a narration from Imam Baqir (AS) it is stated that if someone commits adultery, he will be under the adultery with himself or with his future generations (Saduq, 1413, vol. 4). It should not always look for a tangible and empirical cause in discovering causality of human phenomenon but it should also consider the role of abstract causes and causes expressed through revelation.

5. The limitation of method in causal explanation is neither acceptable nor desirable. If the goal is to analyze human and social phenomena, then any method that is useful in this regard should be used. Since human actions are meaningful matters and under the control and influenced by the principles of worldview, cognition, etc., their study without semantics and motivational reading is an incomplete study (Sharifi, Pishin, p. 412). This is the word of the interpreters. They differentiate between cause and reason and consider reason to be the observer of the world of proof and external and specific to the natural sciences and reason to be the observer of the world of proof and the intentions and motives of the subject and specific to the humanities. Of course, the word of interpreters about limiting the humanities method in interpretation is beyond extremism.

6. Since man is an autonomous and purposeful being, the causal explanation of his actions is not possible without paying attention to his intentions. Therefore, it is often incorrect that the explanators, except for the explanation of rational choice, do not consider a role for science, human desires, intentions and goals in their actions. The complete and desirable explanation is to pay attention to both external and internal factors. External factors play the role of unlikely causes of action and internal factors play the role of near causes. In fact, the influence of external factors in action through internal factors means the impact on human

18 - 20 September, 2020

knowledge and desires. It will be clear that the separation of explanation and reason is related to the positivist view of explanation and the delta view of interpretation. Positivists consider explanation to be observed to external factors and delta of interpretation means describing the meanings of actions. But there are those who have removed the border between explanation and interpretation. Believing in the causality of internal factors, i.e. the sciences and the desires of the actor, Weber considers the method of the humanities as an explanatory interpretation (Bleiki, former, pp. 97; 105).

Although the reasons are definitely different from the physical causes, it cannot be concluded from this difference that the reasons cannot be the causes of the accidents ... Why should one bother to argue that the reasons cannot be the causes, while with such discussions, it can never change people's minds "(Sayer, 2009, p. 126).

So the conclusion is that interpretation is description if it is merely expressing the meaning of action, and it is explanation if it is expressing the internal causes of action. Interpreters consider interpretation as the first aspect and some consider it as the second aspect. (Bleiki, former., Pp. 344-345).

### **Discussion and conclusion**

Explanation means causation is one of the most important methods of humanities. The main characteristic and goal of the humanities is to find the causes of phenomena. By the causes of human and social phenomena, it can predict and control them. The positivist approach considers explanation as the only method of the humanities, but in our opinion, explanation should be considered alongside interpretation and critical approach and should not be limited to the method of explanation. Due to the importance of explanation and differences in the quality of explanation, humanities scientists have proposed different types of explanation such as: causal, structural, functional, materialistic and rational choice explanation. In our opinion, explanation means only causal explanation and other types of explanation are either part of the causal explanation or are not essentially explanation, but are description.

According to the author, due to the specific feature of man, i.e. his purposefulness and accounting, no explanation other than the explanation of rational choice can explain human actions and to be efficient theories in the humanities. Human behavior is purposeful and assessment-oriented; therefore, human beings choose a path and action that is in accordance with their intentions and goals. After calculating the profit and loss, they choose an action that is the most appropriate means to achieve the goal. In this type of explanation, social phenomena are the result of the willing or unwilling sum of deliberate decisions of individuals. Individuals make decisions in this way that choose alternatives among the possible alternatives and possible consequences that is the best possible way to achieve their goals (little, opcit, pp. 45-45). Of course, this school, unfortunately, only pays attention to the intentions of human beings in issuing action and does not pay attention to external factors, such as social structures, cultural issues, etc.; Therefore, it is suggested that the theory of rational choice to be reconsidered and the reasons for issuing the action to be divided into internal and direct causes, which are the goals and objectives of the actor, and external causes which are structures, and so on. Proponents of rational choice theory have unfortunately paid no attention to external factors. Of course, it is clear that external causes and factors affect action by influencing internal factors, i.e. the insights and tendencies of actors. The conclusion is that a combined theory of types of explanation with the centrality of the theory of rational choice can well explain human actions.

18 - 20 September, 2020

**Sources**

1. Othwitt, William and Batamor, Tom, 2013, Culture of Social Sciences of Twentieth Century, translated by Hassan Chavoshian, Tehran, and Ney.
2. Bleiki, Norman, 2012, Research Paradigms in Humanities, translated by Seyed Hamid Reza Hassani et al., Qom, Seminary and University Research Institute.
3. Benton, Ted and Craib, Jan, 2005, Philosophy of Social Sciences, translated by Shahnaz Mesmiparast and Mahmoud Motahed, Tehran, Agah.
4. Parsania, Hamid, 2013, Social Worlds, Second Edition, Qom, Farda
5. 5Turner, Jonathan, 2003, Construction of Sociological Theory, translated by Abdolali Lahsaeizadeh, second edition, Shiraz, Navid.
6. Khosropanah, Abdolhossein, 2015, Methodology of Social Sciences, Tehran, Wisdom and Philosophy of Iran.
7. Ritzer, George, 2016, Sociological Theory. Translated by Houshang Nayebi, Second Edition, Tehran, and Ney.
8. Sayer, Andrew, 2009, Method in Social Sciences, a realistic approach, translated by Emad Afrough, second edition, Tehran, Institute of Humanities and Cultural Studies.
9. Soroush, Abdolkarim, 2005, Lessons in Philosophy of Social Science, Fourth Volume, and Tehran. Ney.
10. Sidman, Steven, 2016, Conflict of Opinions in Sociology, translated by Hadi Jalili, eighth edition, Tehran, Ney.
11. Sharifi, Ahmad Hossein, 2016, Methodology of Islamic Humanities, Tehran, Aftab Tose'e.
12. Saduq, Mohammad Ibn Ali, 1413 AH, Man La Yahzara Al-Faghih, second edition, Qom, Qom Seminary Teachers Association.
13. Freund, Julien, 1993, Theories related to humanities, translated by Ali Mohammad Kardan, second edition, Tehran, University Publishing Center.
14. Copleston, Frederick Charles, 2009, History of Philosophy [Vol. 3], translated by Ebrahim Dadjoo, Tehran, scientific and cultural.
15. ,2005 , \_\_\_\_\_History of Philosophy [Vol. 9], translated by Abdolhossein Azarang and Seyed Mahmoud Yousef Sani, Tehran, scientific and cultural.
16. Craib, Jan, 1999, Modern Theories in Sociology, translated by Mahboubeh Mohajer, Tehran, Soroush.
17. 16Mohammad Amzian, Mohammad, 2001, Research Methods of Social Sciences from Positivism to Normalism, translated by Abdolqader Savari, Qom, Seminary and University Research Institute and the International Institute for Islamic Thought.
18. 17Mohammadpour, Ahmad, 2010, Method by Method, Second Edition, Tehran, Sociologists.
19. 18Mesbah Yazdi, Mohammad Taghi, 2015, Teaching Philosophy, Fourth Edition, Qom, Imam Khomeini Institute.
20. ,1989 , \_\_\_\_\_Society and History from the Perspective of the Quran, Qom, Islamic Propaganda Publications.
21. Elster, Jon. (1986). Rational Choice. New York, New York university press .
22. Little, Daniel. (1991). Varieties of Social Explanation: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Social Science. San Francisco and Oxford. Westview Press .
23. Ryan, Alan. (1970). the Philosophy of the Social Sciences. London and Basingstoke. Macmillan Education UK.