



**SOCIOLOGICAL  
THEORY**

**FOR  
AFRICAN STUDENTS**

First Edition

Edited by  
Olutayo, A. O.  
Akanle, Olayinka

Ibadan University Press  
Publishing House  
University of Ibadan  
Ibadan, Nigeria

© A.O. Olutayo and Akanle Olayinka 2013

*First Edition 2013*

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, transmitted, transcribed, stored in a retrieval system, or translated into any language or computer language, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, magnetic, chemical, photocopy, recording, manual or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

**ISBN: 978 – 978 – 8456 – 02 – 5**

<b>9</b>	<b>Structuration Theory: Giddens Explored</b> <i>Busari, D.A.</i>	<b>161</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Rationality in Sociological Perspective</b> <i>Kudus Adebayo</i>	<b>177</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Actor-Network Theory</b> <i>Adeniran, Adebuseyi Isaac,</i> <i>Ugbem, Comfort Erima,</i> <i>Adegoke, Peter Damilola,</i> <i>Ayokunle, Olumuyiwa Omobowale</i>	<b>197</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>Feminism: An Africanist Perspective</b> <i>Yusuff, Olabisi Sherifat</i>	<b>209</b>
	<i>Index</i>	<b>231</b>

UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN LIBRARY

---

## Structuration Theory: Giddens Explored

*Busari D.A.*

### **Introduction**

Sociology has only been around since the mid nineteenth century but has provoked some of the most heated debates concerning humanity. The role we play in our shared reality with the world has come under the studies of some of the most prestigious sociologists, with the likes of Karl Marx, Emile Durkheim, and Max Weber. These figures have formulated some of the most influential theories of their time and have laid the basis of discussion for contemporary theorists. However, in the structuralist tradition the emphasis is on structure (as constraint), whereas in the phenomenological traditions the human agent is the primary focus. Structuration theory attempts to recast structure and agency as a mutually dependent duality. The theory posits that the human element in the social world has taken various positions in each theory. There are several stances that sociologist beliefs are either one way or the other with no middle ground that balances elements from both sides (i.e. macro and micro theories). Anthony Giddens, the figure that is the focus of this paper, is unique in this sense because of his thoughts on the delicate relationship between structure (external forces) and agency (internal motivations) in society; or macro v. micro perspectives respectively. Giddens' thoughts have been used by some of the most well known policy makers in the world including the United Kingdom's Prime Minister, Tony Blair. The use of sociological theories in real world policies is an important aspect to study in order to understand the intricate complexities that develop in our society.

Giddens' early work on the basis of Sociology argues that the current state of the field was overly revolutionary. The role of the human agent was either solely based on volunteerism, where human action was unconstrained by social forces, or that it was too deterministic, that humans are solely restricted by their social

structure. Giddens rejected both points of view because he thought that neither theory gives proper attention to the actors themselves in producing their social reality. Giddens could be said to be a theorist of the humanistic frame of thought. He believed that it was humans that act as knowledgeable objects in conjunction with the social order to change their social reality. He redefines the role of structure by realizing it can be both a constraining and an enabling element for human action. As society becomes more digitalized Giddens theory can be of great assistance to policy makers and sociologists alike to understand the needs of the current and future generations.

For example, the United Nations habitat organisation reports that the number of people living in metropolitan areas has been rapidly increasing and is projected to be the home for more than 6 billion people worldwide or two-thirds of the human population by 2050. The role of the city in human development is universal. Cities are well known for their abilities to promote economic trade including employment, providing a stage for civil protest and offering a healthy lifestyle for its citizens. Yet, as our cities grow and change it is important that we do not lose sight of the unintended consequences of such a rapid immigration to urban areas. Cities in different parts of the world are not always equal in their offering of goods and services to their citizens. The main focus presented here will be on exploring the complexities of Giddens' Structuration theory and understanding how it is currently being implemented in societies.

Structuration theory offers an account of how societies exist, persist and change across time and space. The social system, for Giddens (Giddens 1979; Giddens 1984; Giddens 1991), is recursively (re) created as a result of its human actor's knowledgeable actions and interactions over time and space; drawing on social structures and so recursively (re)creating both those structures and society itself across time and space of its own making. Anthony Giddens identifies social structures as being Signification, Legitimation, and Domination. Through their respective real world "modalities", these social structures enable people to firstly "Communicate" with each other, secondly be

socially “Sanctioned” in their actions and interactions and, thirdly, have Power over other human agency and non-human resources, authorizing respectively a person’s agency and allocating resources. Humans draw upon each structure’s modalities in their acting and interacting with others. These modalities are respectively: for communicating Interpretive Schemes based on the persons stocks of knowledge and a facility with language; Norms that provide the individual with social rights, while also imposing on them social obligations to act in certain ways under particular conditions; and finally a facility for authorising other peoples behaviours and the allocation of non-human material resources in achieving some form of agency through an exercise of power

### **Theory of Structuration**

Anthony Giddens uses a selected vocabulary to understand his theory of Structuration. The relationship between actors and social forces may not be clear immediately but in this paper we will explain how he uses these terms in conjunction with his theory of Structuration, the different forms of structure (social forces) and how the relationship between the two can be used to understand our shared reality.

### **Structuralism**

The basis of the theory of Structuration involves the identification of the relationship between the individuals and the social forces that act upon us. In Giddens’ theory of Structuration he tries to balance the role that actors play with their limited choice of position in history and in the social fabric they find themselves. In his theory, Giddens proposes that people do not have entire preference of their actions and their knowledge is restricted, nonetheless, are the element that recreates the social structure and produces social change (Craib 1992, pg.33).

Structuration theory may be seen as an attempt to resolve a fundamental division within the social sciences between those who consider social phenomena as determined by the influence of ‘objective’, exogenous social structures and others who see them as products of the action of human ‘agents’ in the light of their

subjective interpretation of the world. Giddens attempts to 'square this circle' by proposing that structure and agency be viewed, not as independent and conflicting elements, but as a mutually interacting duality. Social structure is therefore seen as being drawn on by human agents in their actions, while the actions of humans in social contexts serve to produce, and reproduce, the social structure. Structure is thus not simply an exogenous restraining force, but is also a resource to be deployed by humans in their actions: it is enabling as well as disabling.

Giddens emphasises that social structures do not exist independently of human action, nor are they material entities. He describes them as "memory traces" (CS: 17) and argues that they exist only through the action of humans. This leads to a view of human beings as being in a constant state of reflexive monitoring of their situation and to the omnipresent potential for change. That we may not be aware of this monitoring or of the continuous opportunities for change is ascribed by Giddens to the existence of two types of consciousness: practical and discursive. The former relates to our ability to act in a knowledgeable way and the latter to our incomplete explanations for those actions. We therefore, as Polanyi (1967) argues, know more than we can say.

Structuration, as with any theoretical issue, is suggested to have two significant philosophical components; Ontology and Epistemology. Ontology is the theory that suggests the existence of some phenomenon and the second, Epistemology, emphasizes the philosophical theory of knowledge; exploring a definition for a phenomenon, recognizing both its sources and establishing its limits (Cloke 1991, pg. 95). Giddens is more interested in proving the existence of this duality between structure and agency than defining what exactly causes or reinforces its existence.

He specifies that structure and agency cannot be separated; that they are connected to one another in what Giddens has termed the 'duality of structure'. Human actors are the elements that enable creation of our society's structure by means of invented values, norms or are reinforced through social acceptance. Yet, at the same time people are constrained by our social structure. A person is unable to choose who one's parents are or what period of time one

exists. Giddens describes structure in terms of what he refers to as modalities as a set of rules and resources that engages human action. He explains that rules restrict actions but the resources facilitate them.

Along the same lines he also distinguishes the differences between systems of interaction and structures. A system of interaction, he explains, exhibits structural qualities although it is not entirely a structure itself (Cloke 1991, pg. 101). One of the most widely used examples of a system of interaction is speech. The monologue of the speaker is understood by the audience if they understand the language i.e. structure. Languages use strict guidelines or rules to insure that what is being expressed is understood by the interpreter, this is what Giddens compares to element of structure. It is through the use of the actor's voice and knowledge of the language (structure) that speech (system of interaction) is understood.

Therefore, structuration is the process of structures reproducing systems; the system of interaction exists as a result of the structure of the language spoken. This relationship is what Giddens refers to as the rules and resources established by structures that facilitate and reproduce social interaction. Giddens recommend that structures (traditions, institutions, moral codes, and other sets of expectations) are universally steady, nevertheless, could be changed mainly during the unintentional consequences of action. For example, when people begin to pay no attention to the social norms, substitute them, or reproduce them in a different way.

### **Types of Structure**

Giddens defined structure in the following manner, "Rules and resources, recursively implicated in the reproduction of social systems. Structure exists only as memory traces, the organic basis of human knowledgeability, and instantiated in action" (Giddens 1984, p. 377). He identifies three kinds of structures in a social system, those of signification, legitimation and domination. In the stratification model of structure Giddens attempts to illustrate the links between the structure and the system of interaction (Jacobs 1993). The first type of structure is signification which produces meaning through organized webs of language (semantic codes,

interpretive schemes and discursive practices). Drawing on the speech example referenced above, the interaction of agents through speech "can be structured because particular interpretations of reality can be signified in our language beyond the simple meaning of mere words and thoughts" (Cloke 1991, pg. 103). In this respect Giddens is expanding the role of the actor to be able to interpret and manipulate a structured language by interpretive meanings.

The second dimension of his stratification model, legitimation, produces a moral order via naturalization of societal norms, values and standards. When the individual agents interact they exhibit consciously, subconsciously, or unconsciously meanings (Giddens refers to these as sanctions) on their behavior. Interacting in this manner shapes the current social norms and are weighed against the moral rules of the structure. Therefore, whether or not an action is considered legitimate in the social order is structured by this dimension of legitimation. The final element, Domination, focuses on the production of (and exercise of) power, originating from the control of resources.

Giddens identifies that forces of domination and submission exist in the delicate power relationship that Karl Marx is well known for remarking upon. Giddens, like Marx, believes that resources are the vehicles for power. However, Marx is more interested in relationship between the 'means of production' in the capitalist societies whereas Giddens' goal is to understand the power relationship as a form of interaction between the actor and the structure that one finds themselves. In this interaction, resources can be used as a form of authority illustrated by a boss and employee relationship. Resources can also be used in the form of property such as the allocation of wealth or property.

The modalities function as both the enabling and constraining elements of the structure and give the duality of structure clarity. The 'rules' of the structure could be illustrated by the accordance of the law by a society. There are limits that the structure places on the agency to act in a certain way. In this respect the structure is imposing restrictions upon the agency in order to accomplish societal norms. Norms, however, have changed in the past and are under constant manipulation by the society through the use of structural 'resources'. Civil laws can and have been overturned or

rewritten in the past. Laws that have limited human liberties, such as the Jim Crow Laws for the black population in the US, have been overturned by landmark court cases, *Brown v. Board of Education*, that have deemed them unconstitutional. The resources used in this example could be seen as the use of the lawyers to present a case for social reform. It could also be said that the process of using the judicial body to alter the written law is the utilisation of the American political system for its facilitating capabilities.

### **Agency**

Human agency, in Giddens' formulation, is the 'capacity to make a difference' (Giddens 1984 pp. 14). Agency is intimately connected with power - in fact this is one of its defining characteristics, since the loss of the capacity to make a difference is also powerlessness. In practice, human agents almost always retain some transformational capacity - though it could be small. Power involves the exploitation of resources. 'Resources are structured properties of social systems, drawn on and reproduced by knowledgeable agents in the course of interaction' (Giddens 1984, pp. 15). Resources are 'of two kinds: authoritative resources, which derive from the coordination of the activity of human agents, and allocative resources, which stem from control of material products or aspects of the natural world' (Giddens 1984). Power is not itself a resource. Actions have intended and unintended consequences.

The basic human acts and resulting activities can be seen as the two defining capabilities of what Giddens terms the 'Agency'. Giddens distinguishes between acts as a separate progression of action and action as a continuous flow of involvements by different and autonomous human agents (Cloke 1991, pg. 99). Giddens identifies that action could be stimulated by the individual who wants to investigate what he/she is doing; the self examination process is referred to as reflexive monitoring (Giddens 1984, pg. 5). Giddens' model of action, as depicted in figure 2, has three elements of action, reflexive monitoring, rationalization and motivation of action. Each element has a specific role in the overall process of action. The atmosphere we interact with, that Giddens is

pointing out, is that of an individual's action which is influenced by both unintended consequences and unacknowledged conditions of their acts. The unacknowledged circumstances involve the unconscious sources of motivation, as a persistent stream of interference in the world by special agents (Cloke 1991, pg 101).

Action or the ability to act by the agency is always interacting with power. Structuration theory suggests that the agency is the fundamental element to create any sort of change. Change can be thought of as simple as movement through space to interact with a new environment, thereof changing interaction or as complex as voting to pass a piece of legislation that will create new laws, changing the routine of society. Through the decision to act, either consciously or not, creates changes within the agency and to the structure that one has influence on (Mestrovic 1998, pg.182).

### **Micro versus Macro**

Structuration is essential for both micro and macro level topics. Taking the example used previously of restricted selection of one's parents. At a micro level we cannot choose our parents but have the choice to have children. The relationships we create are in constant interaction and are controlled by the individuals themselves. On the other hand, we are not capable of organizing as a society without some form of state and social organizations. At this macro level we are held together by a common pattern of survival which is structured by a set of determined standards such as state laws. The two perspectives could not be separated otherwise it will be difficult to understand them apart. This shared bond between individuals and exterior forces brings Giddens theory of Structuration together.

### **Introductory Connections**

The main point of convergence in structuration theory is the emphasis that Giddens gives to the knowledgeable human agency and their freedom in time and space. Humans are constantly in action in one sense or another; be it through monitoring of one's own or other's action, developing an understanding for such action or choosing their own course of action. Yet, as Giddens points out,

an's action which is influenced by unacknowledged conditions of circumstances involve the uncon- persistent stream of interference (Giddens 1991, pg 101).

the agency is always interacting suggests that the agency is the sort of change. Change can be through space to interact with a interaction or as complex as that will create new laws, Through the decision to act, either within the agency and to the (Mestrovic 1998, pg.182).

both micro and macro level topics. usly of restricted selection of one's cannot choose our parents but have The relationships we create are in controlled by the individuals we are not capable of organizing as of state and social organizations. At together by a common pattern of a set of determined standards such perspectives could not be separated understand them apart. This shared and exterior forces brings Giddens r.

nce in structuration theory is the to the knowledgeable human agency d space. Humans are constantly in r; be it through monitoring of one's ing an understanding for such action of action. Yet, as Giddens points out,

day-to-day activities are not directly motivated but through reflective monitoring the individual can rationalize their actions (Giddens 1984, p. 6). Therefore, according to Giddens, humans' routines are based on rational thought not on the often hidden motivations that drive our actions. The relevance of the separation between routines and motivations can be witnessed through the capabilities possessed by humans and the unconscious results of their action. The idea of consequences of action is well outlined in Giddens own words:

The consequences of what actors do, intentionally or unintentionally, are events which would not have happened if that actor had behaved differently, but which are not within the scope of the agent's power to have brought about (regardless of what the agent's intentions are).(Giddens 1984, pg.11)

Perhaps an everyday example may help to illustrate the central concept of structuration theory, albeit at the cost of presenting it in a rather more mechanistic way than might be desirable. We may expect, for example, that people working in an office will typically wear, more or less formal, business attire, such as a suit or smart casual clothing. When encountering somebody in a work setting we draw on structures of signification that inform our understanding of that person's role. So, if we meet a person in a white coat in a hospital we are likely to assume that he is a doctor (at least in many settings), or, in a laboratory, that he is a scientist. Clothes do not simply indicate who a person is, but also convey important messages about the powers that they hold. Thus police officers' uniforms enable them to influence people's behaviour in ways that would be unlikely to be successful if they were in plain clothes, while in a military setting, sometimes subtle differences in people's uniforms are important indicators of rank that are significant in that context, whether or not they are recognised by civilians. There are also structures of legitimation that define the appropriate dress code in particular settings, the transgression of which may invoke sanctions. Organisations may differ, for example, in the degree of formality expected in employees' dress, and even "dress-down Fridays" may be subject to clear limits on

how "casual" attire may be: traditional attires OK, perhaps, western dress unacceptable. As may be evident from this example the structures underlying dress codes are not implacable or immutable. They are sustained by their ongoing reproduction by social actors, but can be changed. So long as employees continue to follow the dress code then its influence on the behaviour of new recruits is likely to be maintained. If certain individuals or groups challenge the code, then, over time, new structures, no less influential, may develop. Individuals are thus seen as possessing the capability to transform structures.

Giddens is telling us that our current state of affairs in this world is in control by the factors that influence them not solely restricted by our structure. This idea can be applied in several ways and at different levels of society or through institutions such as the student-teacher relationship. The way in which people have altered human development patterns can be illustrated through the application of an apartheid or racial/ethnic segregation in city planning or the displacement of people from regions because of conflict. One of the most widely known apartheid ever to have dominated the social mainstream was in place under the South African government from 1950's until the mid 1990's. South Africa, a country founded in British colonialism, created separate areas for 'white' and 'non-white' people to ensure European dominance in the area. Both white and non-white people were restricted by the area that they could move, do business, go to school as well as limiting that one could interact with and even marry. Racial apartheid has been used in several points throughout human history including the Native American reservations or the separate but equal standards during the black suffrage years in the United States. Today, there is no known nationally enforced apartheid; mainly because the policy is considered to be a crime against humanity by the United Nations. However, it is a great example to illustrate exactly what Giddens means by the consequences of action and the result of concentrating so much power in the hands of a few.

In the Structuration theory, the agency does not have complete power but is constrained by the second modality of the structure which is the societal 'rules' that limit human freedom. As said

previously, structure is not only its rules but also facilitates act circumstances, such as South unevenly distributed. Most often stratification as the main dividing 'have-nots'. While Giddens would main determining factor in resource the relationship between rules dynamic than solely reliant on it to note what Giddens is trying to do to the agency and explaining the resources he is expressing his structural theorists, such as Karl M structure the constraining character facilitating abilities as well. So, imperative to seek how Structuration in the social world we are interacting illustrate this in three ways: the separation of agents in space and policy.

#### **Globalization, Social Intergration Distanciation and Routinization**

Globalization has been a dominant appearance on the world stage. It has met with both great appreciation and fiercely opposed because of its lack angles to look at the issue of global political ties to its changes in the frameworks. Globalization has influenced the world most of us interact with, the way people interact, gain and share the last 20 years. The realm of an agent has vastly increased. This can be seen large foreign direct investment into very little more than video conferencing mouse. This example also illustrates

traditional attires OK, perhaps, may be evident from this example as codes are not implacable or by their ongoing reproduction by ed. So long as employees continue influence on the behaviour of new ed. If certain individuals or groups per time, new structures, no less iduals are thus seen as possessing ctures.

our current state of affairs in this ctors that influence them not solely s idea can be applied in several ways ty or through institutions such as the he way in which people have altered s can be illustrated through the or racial/ethnic segregation in city of people from regions because of idely known apartheid ever to have ream was in place under the South 1950's until the mid 1990's. South British colonialism, created separate white' people to ensure European h white and non-white people were hey could move, do business, go to hat one could interact with and even een used in several points throughout e Native American reservations or the during the black suffrage years in the re is no known nationally enforced he policy is considered to be a crime nited Nations. However, it is a great ctly what Giddens means by the l the result of concentrating so much

ry, the agency does not have complete y the second modality of the structure s' that limit human freedom. As said

previously, structure is not completely constraining as a result of its rules but also facilitates action through resources. In many circumstances, such as South African example, resources are unevenly distributed. Most often people have identified class stratification as the main dividing point between the 'haves' and 'have-nots'. While Giddens would agree that class differences are a main determining factor in resource allocation he also thinks that the relationship between rules and resources is much more dynamic than solely reliant on class position. It is most important to note what Giddens is trying to prove here. By giving preference to the agency and explaining that structure has both rules and resources he is expressing his biggest disagreement with past structural theorists, such as Karl Marx, who have blindly given the structure the constraining characteristics without acknowledging its facilitating abilities as well. So, with this understanding it is imperative to seek how Structuration theory is facilitated and exists in the social world we are interacting with today. We would like to illustrate this in three ways: the effect of globalization, in separation of agents in space and in terms of multicultural city policy.

#### **Globalization, Social Intergration and Time/Space Distanciation and Routinization**

Globalization has been a dominant issue ever since its first appearance on the world stage. It has been a concept that has been met with both great appreciation for its connective abilities and fiercely opposed because of its lack of intimacy. There are several angles to look at the issue of globalization from economic and political ties to its changes in the traditional social and cultural frameworks. Globalization has influenced the social framework of the world most of us interact with, many times unknowingly. The way people interact, gain and share knowledge has all changed in the last 20 years. The realm of an actor's impact on world affairs has vastly increased. This can be experienced by the increase in large foreign direct investment into businesses and countries with very little more than video conferencing and the click of the mouse. This example also illustrates that the space that someone

really needs to physically cover has shrunk tremendously in day to day activities. This trend is mainly fueled by innovations in technologies and streamlined production processes.

Giddens distinguishes between the cohesive effects of social interactions which take place when actors are physically present and wider systemic effects of interactions across distance. 'The reflexive monitoring of action in situations of co-presence is the main anchoring feature of social integration' (Giddens 1984 pp 191) 'Whereas social integration refers to face-to-face reciprocities between agents who meet in circumstances of co-presence, and therefore preserve a concern for *social* system. Integration refers to reciprocities between absent agents, i.e. agents who are physically and/or temporally situated in different settings, which admits the possibility of intersituational articulations of systemic patterns' (Cohen 1990). Technology helps replicate social practice on a wider scale than the face-to-face interactions permit. Time space distanciation involves the 'stretching of social systems across time-space, on the basis of mechanisms of social and system integration' (Giddens 1984 pp 377). As the recursive and reflexive structuration of social interaction extends between people over geographical distance and over time, so the embeddedness or 'bite' of those practices increases. 'The structural properties of social systems exist only in so far as forms of social conduct are reproduced chronically across time and space' (Giddens 1984 pp 377).

Giddens' Structuration theory has been influential by giving us a notion for understanding how actors' routine behavior has influenced the structure of society and introducing ideas of time-space. Giddens stresses that "the concept of routinisation is vital to the theory of Structuration (Giddens 1984, pg 60)". Globalisation has been one of the most well known phenomena to be taking place around the world today; with only a couple of exceptions. The number of ways it has affected our daily routines has been enormous even if you do not agree with its externalities. The marketplace used to be the hub of personal interaction and trade, while, in modern societies the process has moved into computers and mobile phones. People are unconsciously covering virtual

space and time by always be communication at many times of cover by shopping, talking, or to now dually connected to our day physical space and time we exist illustrates this separation in time geographic studies very well.

Separation of people through sociological frame of thought. In of human development is the situations involving labor relation understanding demographic pattern the following way: "Space is not a social groupings become structural terms of its involvement in the interactions (Giddens 1984, pg. 39 understood as elements of connection with each other is understood by Giddens linked to the network relationships to view systems of interaction as a space.

The example of segregation in space that took place in South Africa extreme cases but illustrates how change with real events. In more contemporary race and ethnicity takes place but modern societies low income communities tend to group people to value. In this case, the agent is subject market to determine the location allocation of resources. The settlement limited and it would be believed that settlement occurs, the position of settlement usually well established but seems modification. For instance, a new layer of society if demand is great economic development has several negative consequences located away from areas that have access

has shrunk tremendously in day to day life, mainly fueled by innovations in communication processes.

the cohesive effects of social interactions between actors are physically present across distance. 'The integration of situations of co-presence is the integration' (Giddens 1984 pp 10-11). Integration refers to face-to-face reciprocities in circumstances of co-presence, and social system. Integration refers to agents, i.e. agents who are physically present in different settings, which admits the articulations of systemic patterns' which replicate social practice on a scale where interactions permit. Time space integration of social systems across time through mechanisms of social and system integration (Giddens 1984, pp 10-11). As the recursive and reflexive interaction extends between people over time, so the embeddedness or 'bite' of the structural properties of social interaction as forms of social conduct are integrated in time and space' (Giddens 1984 pp 10-11).

has been influential by giving us a way to understand how actors' routine behavior has been shaped by society and introducing ideas of time-space integration. The concept of routinisation is vital to understanding social interaction (Giddens 1984, pg 60)". Globalisation has made all known phenomena to be taking place in time-space; with only a couple of exceptions. The impact of globalisation on our daily routines has been affected by its externalities. The nature of personal interaction and trade, and the process has moved into computers and networks, which are unconsciously covering virtual

space and time by always being connected to a source of communication at many times of the day. The virtual space that we cover by shopping, talking, or trading (via global technology) is now dually connected to our daily activities with respect to the physical space and time we exist in. Giddens' duality of structure illustrates this separation in time and space that is very crucial to geographic studies very well.

Separation of people through space is fundamental to the sociological frame of thought. In each, the socio-spatial patterning of human development is the key to understanding complex situations involving labor relations, housing selection, as well as, understanding demographic patterning. Giddens defines space in the following way: "Space is not an empty dimension along which social groupings become structured, but has to be considered in terms of its involvement in the constitution of the systems of interactions (Giddens 1984, pg. 396)". Social groupings should be understood as elements of connectivity. The way people connect with each other is understood by Giddens as a matter that is closely linked to the network relationships between agents. It is interesting to view systems of interaction as a major determinant in creating space.

The example of segregation and exclusion of people from space that took place in South Africa is another of the more extreme cases but illustrates how Giddens framework matches up with real events. In more contemporary times segregation by class, race and ethnicity takes place but is much more transparent. In modern societies low income housing projects or gated communities tend to group people together by their relative market value. In this case, the agent is subject to the institutional capital market to determine the location of settlement based on the allocation of resources. The settlement of humans across space is limited and it would be believed that Giddens would agree. When settlement occurs, the position of state and local civil facilities is usually well established but seems to be a process of continuous modification. For instance, a new landfill location is useful for all of society if demand is great enough but the fact that the development has several negative connotations is more likely to be located away from areas that have access to bargaining resources.

As a result, low income groups may feel that they are being discriminated against because of a lack of resources. The point being that when agents settle they tend to connect with people that have similar shared experiences. Take public transportation for example, in many instances gets labelled as a low income mode of transportation (at least in Lagos State where there is an organized public transportation system). The people that share the same bus line day-in and day-out are said to share a common bond and could be considered a system of interaction. The social grouping of people on the bus line reinforces the daily routine that exists in time and space. The relationship that actors share across any dimension, not just class, adds to the collective bargaining power of the group. The example presented here is one possible way to apply Giddens' Structuration theory to public service provisions. Elements such as land and housing costs may limit access of actors' settlement patterns but, as a result of settlement, collective bargaining can be established and used as a resource for agents with similar views, norms and values. Therefore, the collection of people in a region can indirectly manipulate the lived environment and alter the structure of their neighborhood.

Social practice which endures over time is, effectively, routine - people repeating recognizably similar encounters. Social practice spreading over distance, involving both space and larger numbers of people, incorporates Giddens concept of system integration. Social practice which spreads through time and space becomes stable, institutionalized. Technology, information systems, may become part of that practice. Social practices represent the fabric of our daily life on a spectrum from the societal, through the various forms of social collectives that we associate with, to the personal, in our family relationships. They are not really separable - in other words the set of rules and capabilities which enable and constrain a social interaction at work cannot really be distinguished from how we treat our family members, how we vote, or our sexual behaviour; all experiences can be assimilated and may affect all other interactions.

## Conclusion

Giddens has presented a case for choice within a structuralist framework completely blind to the influence of agency. The duality of structure and agency complexities that exist in the social elements. The position that he has taken by confining the agency to a set of rules is the element of humanism by expressing that an agency can deduce from experience the structure. Giddens spends a significant amount of time why agency should be used to explain structure. The freedom that an agency has in the context that the agency is observed and native language is not of our own. The agency has a vital part to play in the world. It comes to such things as policy changes. Giddens believes that the structure and agency have the power to influence their lived environment.

Structuration theory has argued for a restricted view of the knowledgeable agent and as a result has been criticized for its realism frame of thought, Giddens' relationship that agency shares with structure is a limited causal explanation for study. They would argue, has no understanding of how changes are reflected in the structure. They have raised concerns the necessities of structure to be seen in both. When and how structure is considered significant enough to change. A British economist, raised this question. Giddens has been criticized about the completeness on Giddens' part in his propositions in Giddens' theory. Part of the problem to explain social life through "complete social theories for the world" involves reflection and monitoring.

...ps may feel that they are being  
 of a lack of resources. The point  
 y tend to connect with people that  
 Take public transportation for  
 labelled as a low income mode of  
 State where there is an organized  
 the people that share the same bus  
 to share a common bond and could  
 interaction. The social grouping of  
 es the daily routine that exists in  
 ship that actors share across any  
 to the collective bargaining power  
 ented here is one possible way to  
 eory to public service provisions.  
 ousing costs may limit access of  
 as a result of settlement, collective  
 and used as a resource for agents  
 values. Therefore, the collection of  
 y manipulate the lived environment  
 eighborhood.

...es over time is, effectively, routine  
 y similar encounters. Social practice  
 wing both space and larger numbers  
 ens concept of system integration.  
 s through time and space becomes  
 mology, information systems, may  
 Social practices represent the fabric  
 rum from the societal, through the  
 ctives that we associate with, to the  
 nships. They are not really separable  
 es and capabilities which enable and  
 t work cannot really be distinguished  
 ily members, how we vote, or our  
 ences can be assimilated and may

### Conclusion

Giddens has presented a case for individual knowledgeable and choice within a structuralist theory that was partially if not completely blind to the influence that the agency has on the structure. The duality of structure is essential to understand the complexities that exist in the relationship between the two elements. The position that he has taken has avoided volunteerism by confining the agency to a set of societal 'rules' and introduced the element of humanism by explaining that the knowledgeable agency can deduce from experiences of their location in the structure. Giddens spends a significant amount of time to explain why agency should be used to explain the status of the structure. The freedom that an agency has in their environment is reliant on the context that the agency is observed in. Our placement in history and native language is not of our choosing but in the same sense the agency has a vital part to play in changing the structure when it comes to such things as policy changes. It is illustrated here why Giddens believes that the structure is a reflection of agency's power to influence their lived environment.

Structuration theory has argued against past structuralists' restricted view of the knowledgeable agent's influence on structure and as a result has been criticized for its claim. In the critical realism frame of thought, Giddens is suggesting that there is a relationship that agency shares with the structure; yet, it has a limited causal explanation for studying the dichotomy. The theory, they would argue, has no understanding of how or when agency changes are reflected in the structure. The main argument that they have raised concerns the necessities that need to occur for changes to be seen in both. When and how are changes by agency considered significant enough to change the structure? Geoff Hodgson, a British economist, raised this question as a chief argument that Giddens has been criticized about. This reservation of the relative completeness on Giddens part illustrates one of the main propositions in Giddens' theory. Past sociologists have attempted to explain social life through "empire building endeavors" or complete social theories for the world. Understanding Giddens involves reflection and monitoring of actions. That being said,

Structuration theory does not try to "complicate things" by involving elements apart from the context which Giddens is trying to observe them in.

The examples that have been drawn upon here have illustrated the main contributions that Structuration theory has made towards understanding the relationships that exist in the structures that we find ourselves: political, geographical, religious, et. cetera. The knowledge gained from this understanding can be seen as a building block that humans can use to bring about change through social reform. In contrast with Marx, Giddens understands that structural change can be and has been achieved peacefully.

### References

- Cloke, P., Philo, Ch. & Sadler, D. 1991. *Structuration Theory: Anthony Giddens and the Bringing Together of Structure and Agency*.
- Craib, Ian. 1992. *Anthony Giddens*. Routledge a division of Routledge, Chapman and Hall Inc.
- Giddens, A. 1984. *Constitution of Society*, Cambridge polity press Oxford.
- Held, D., Thompson, J. 1989. *Social Theory Of Modern Societies Anthony Giddens and His Critics*. Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Mestrovic, Stjepan G. 1998. *Anthony Giddens the last modernist*, Routledge London, 1998.
- Van Hooijdonk, G. (February, 1999) *Interventies in de sociale infrastructuur een terreinverkenning*.  
<http://members.home.nl/guivanho/sociale%20infrastructuur.htm>, Utrecht

## Rationality in Soci

Kudus A

### Introduction

In our day to day interaction acquaintances and people with a tendency for us to concoct explanations cases where such explanations do we often find ourselves probing i directly ask them to justify why th do. Sometimes we accept their ex reasonable or rational – but at oth senseless, unjustified, unreasonab situations however, we tend to understand and interpret individual behaviour to that of larger groups, belief systems. Here, one may be i Boko Haram is tormenting the Nig the aim of discerning the 'real' reas particular period in time.<sup>1</sup> Simil preferring decentralisation to centra socialism, monotheism to polytheis also be of concern to us. This proc explanation for action, thought or b reasonable explanation) is intimately human beings possess rationality underscored by this assumption, th and it is a position that is shared by philosophers and social scientists. In

<sup>1</sup> The same question may be asked of the probable response to this inquiry will be refers to them as 'freedom fighters,' 'oil this of these tags decides what response becomes