

***Migration in the New World Order:
Structuration Theory and its contribution
to Explanations of Migration***

**Richard L. Wolfel
Department of Geography
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville
Edwardsville, IL 62026-1459
(618) 650-2943
Fax: (618) 650-3591
rwolfel@siue.edu**

The reconstitution of economic, political and social factors is an important characteristic of the contemporary world. The changing structure of societies represents a dramatic change in the motives for migration. As a result of these major societal changes, the explanations of migration need evaluation in order to address the complex social, political and economic factors that have become important in this era. Not only does this transitional era require an examination of the methodological approaches to migration, but it also requires a rethinking of migration. A theory that can address both individual and societal factors is necessary to understand migration.

The insights presented in this research are informed by the work of Anthony Giddens. In his theory of structuration, Giddens emphasizes that both individual and societal forces are influential on the constitution of society and incorporates this into one explanation. Some migration studies have utilized Giddens' work in their projects, but none have focused on all of the elements of structuration theory. This study seeks to use Giddens' theory of structuration as a method of bringing both macro and micro influences of migration into a more complete explanation of the migration decision making process.

Structuration Theory and Migration

Structuration theory is "an approach to social theory concerned with the intersection between knowledgeable and capable social agents and the wider social systems and structures in which they are implicated" (Gregory, 1994: 600). Several studies have emphasized the advantage of adopting a Giddensian approach to migration. Tammaru and Sjoberg (1999: 242) argue that migration studies should employ a "structurationist approach." To that end, they suggest the use of qualitative approaches to

understand the motives that migrants can formulate discursively, while quantitative approaches can capture motives that are influenced by tacit knowledge. Tacit knowledge refers to actions that migrants cannot explain, like irrational migration behavior.

According to Tammaru and Sjoberg (1999), a multi-method approach to migration studies is appropriate to understanding the motives of migrants since it not only addresses the stated concerns of the migrants, but also looks at wider societal issues that influence migration in a tacit manner.

Goss and Lindquist (1995) emphasize the institutionalization of networks in their study of migration in the Philippines. In their study, they conceptualize individual migrants as knowledgeable agents undertaking action within pre-established institutions with recognized rules. These networks provide a set of information that helps potential migrants decide if migration would improve their utility function, or perceived opportunities that would be associated with the move.

Halfacree (1995) is a strong proponent of the use of structuration theory in studies of migration. In his study of household migration and the structuration of patriarchy, he emphasizes the importance of the duality of structure in the migration decision making process. He emphasizes that migration is more than just a simple cost-benefit analysis, but is influenced by wider social issues. To this end, Halfacree (1995: 170) stresses “the need for analysis of the institutional structures which sustain the apparent sex-role structure” in a gender perspective on migration. It is important to view both the societal characteristics and the individual’s responses to those characteristics in order to understand the processes behind migration fully.

Boyle et al. (1998: 80) continue to develop a Giddensian perspective on migration by emphasizing the importance of “unintended consequences” of an agents decision. By acquiescing to migration in which their place-utility is not improved, through a movement to improve the place utility of the male of the household, women are unintentionally perpetuating the institution of patriarchy in a society. Boyle (1998) and Halfacree’s (1995) conceptualization of migration and the Duality of Structure is a great contribution to a Giddensian perspective on migration.

While all of these studies promote one aspect of Giddens’ theory, none of them address all six of the elements of Structuration Theory (Agency, Structure, the Duality of Structure, Institutions, the Dialectic of Control, and Time/Space relations). Most importantly, none of these projects address the Dialectic of Control, one of the foundations of Structuration theory. As a study of place utility, migration is seen as a process of improving one’s condition. This tends to be universal across theories of migration. Applying Giddens’ work on power will allow for a greater understanding of place utility through the identification of an individual’s source of power to influence the structuration of society.

Macro and Micro Level Influences on Migration Decisions

This research addresses one of the key debates in migration studies over the past several decades. The importance of macro and micro level influences on migration have been debated in the migration literature. Gardner (1981) cites macro-level models as models “which try to relate aggregate conditions to mobility rates” (Gardner, 1981: 62). According to the human capital theory of migration (Sjaastad, 1962), people are likely to move to regions with many employment opportunities. In this theory, macro-level

influences guide migration decisions. In other words, the individual moves as a result of factors beyond the migrant's control.

Macro-level decision making is also visible in other important works of migration. An important aspect of the life-cycle approach to migration is labor market competition. This concept is addressed by Plane and Rogerson (1991). They conclude that individuals in a large cohort will face stiffer competition for employment (Plane and Rogerson, 1991: 417). As a result, members of a large cohort, especially people born late in a cohort will be forced to migrate in an effort to find employment due to macro-level societal influences.

One final example of macro-level migration modeling includes studies that emphasize aggregate regional conditions as important determinants of migration. In his review of migration theory, Shaw (1975) describes the Lowry model of migration. This model addresses the relationship between origin and destination factors, but it emphasizes the importance of "employment opportunities at the place of destination" (Shaw, 1975: 64). Studies of origin and destination factors of migration tend to study the characteristics of the society at the macro-level often at the expense of individual migration decision-maker.

Macro-level theories of migration are challenged by researchers who emphasize the need for local-scale context in studies of migration. This focus on individual motives of migration is defined by Gardner (1981) as micro-scale migration theories. Halfacree and Boyle (1998: 71) identify this as the "humanistic critique of determinism." These approaches focus on personal, or individual, characteristics of migrants rather than the aggregate societal conditions. These studies tend to utilize smaller level statistical

analyses or qualitative methods in an effort to demonstrate how individuals arrive at decisions to migrate, rather than focus on large scale, statistical models that aggregate factors for an entire society.

One example of a micro-level approach to migration is Lawson's (1995) study of gender relations in the Ecuadorian garment industry. While she does link this study to macro-level process in Ecuador, including neo-liberalism and austerity programs, the focus of her study is on the individual. Her methodology emphasizes this point through the use of in-depth interviews in an effort to gain insight into the individual motives that drove individual people to migrate. The emphasis on individual motives is a strong defining element of micro-level theories of migration.

Lee (1969) addresses this lack of connection between micro and macro theories of migration in his revision of Ravenstein's (1885) Laws of Migration. In this study, Lee (1969: 285) identifies four major factors: origin factors, destination factors, intervening opportunities and personal factors. Lee sees the personal factors as exceptions to the migration rule. To that end, Lee (1969: 288) states, "We must expect, therefore, to find many exceptions to our general rule since transient emotions, mental disorder and accidental occurrences account for a considerable proportion of the total migration." The issue with Lee's work is not his acknowledgement of the existence of personal factors, but his relative disregard of these issues. Micro-level migration decisions are more than just transient, accidental "disorders" that cause deviation from the generalizations. The role of micro-level factors is an integral part of the migration decision-making process.

This study seeks to use Giddens' theory of structuration as a method of bringing both macro and micro influences of migration into a more complete explanation of the

migration decision making process. Giddens' conceptualization of societal change, especially his view of power, institutions and the duality of structure allow for the creation of an explanatory device that will take into account both macro level influences on migration, while his discussion of agency allows for a thorough discussion of the micro level process that influence migration. In order to explain the methods used in explaining migration in a transitional society, it is necessary to review the work of Giddens and others who have written about structuration theory and then apply these insights into a theory of migration.

Giddens' Theory of Structuration and Applications to Migration

Social theories have been employed in the social sciences in an effort to explain the nature of the formation and organization of societies. Most of these theories can be classified into one of two theoretical camps. The first groups of voluntaristic theories emphasize the individual within a society as the primary influence on social change. This voluntaristic group of theories emphasizes individual actions as significant to the reconstitution of society. This group of theories can be contrasted with the structural theories. Structuralists emphasize the role of societal structures, for example capitalism, nationalism or masculinity, as the primary influences on the reconstitution, or redevelopment, of society. The voluntaristic theories tend to underestimate the influence of societal structures, while emphasizing the role of the individual in social change. Consequently, both of these theories provide reductionist or limited explanations of the entire nature of societal change. In reality, both the people and the structures of society are important influences in the reconstitution of society. Giddens attempts to correct this shortcoming in his theory of structuration. Structuration theory is "an approach to social

theory concerned with the intersection between knowledgeable and capable social agents and the wider social systems and structures in which they are implicated" (Gregory, 1994: 600). It is important to emphasize that this is not an attempt to "marry" structuralism and humanistic social theories, but an attempt to overcome their deficiencies through an understanding that both the agent and structure interact to bring about social change. What Giddens has proposed is not a compromise, but a whole new social theory. His theory attempts to place equal importance on both the societal structures and human agents.

In order to understand a Giddensian theory of migration, six key concepts must be addressed and defined. Agency, Structure, the Duality of Structure, Institutions, the Dialectic of Control, and Time/Space relations are the important points on the nexus of structuration theory. In order to understand structuration theory, each of these six points must be defined and related to Giddens' theory. Once these points have been elaborated, they will provide the foundation for a Giddensian theory of migration.

Agency

In Giddens' structuration project, the individual plays an important role. In Giddensian thought, the agent is a "knowledgeable and capable subject" (Cloke, 1991: 97). In structuration theory, the agent knows what she is doing and why she is doing it. According to Giddens, all actions are "intentional or purposeful" (Giddens, 1979: 56). The emphasis that agents are knowledgeable and their actions are intentional is one of the cornerstones of Giddensian thought.

As for the process of decision making, according to Giddens, "[a]n actor may 'calculate the risks' involved in the enactment of a given form of social conduct, in

respect of the likelihood of the sanctions involved or actually applied, and may be prepared to submit to them as a price to be paid for achieving a particular end" (Giddens, 1979: 87). In Giddensian theory, people use a cost-benefit analysis in order to make a decision. If the benefits for undertaking an action are greater than the costs, the action is undertaken. The costs also include the possibility of suffering negative sanctions. Therefore, the decision includes not only immediate costs of the actions, but also the negative consequences. If the benefits for an action outweigh both the costs and the sanctions of the action, it is undertaken. It is important to remember that a knowledgeable actor undertakes this cost-benefit analysis utilizing a host of criteria, not just economic concerns.

Since no actor has "perfect knowledge," it is necessary to define the limits of human knowledgeability. According to Giddens (1984), "[t]he knowledgeability of human actors is always bounded on the one hand by the unconscious and on the other by unacknowledged/unintended consequences of action" (Giddens, 1984: 282).

Unconscious actions may not appear to be rational, but they are governed by some unconscious behavior that a person cannot. According to Giddens, these actions are often ignored if they conform to society or if they are momentary "slips in bodily management or slips of the tongue" (Giddens, 1984: 6).

The unintended consequences of action are more significant to Giddensian theory. These consequences are the result of activities that produce an outcome that is different from the expected (Giddens, 1984: 10). In order to understand unintended consequences, it is necessary to view the results of the actions rather than the motives for the actions (Giddens, 1984: 11). Giddens utilizes the example of an actor turning on a light in a room

(See Giddens, 1984: 10) The motive behind turning on the lamp is to illuminate the room. Yet, another consequence of the action is chasing a prowler away. The chasing of the prowler is an unintended consequence. Since the actor knew nothing of the prowler, it seems senseless to study the action in terms of the actor's motives if one is interested in understanding why the prowler ran away. In this example the conclusion that the actor's action is irrelevant is valid. However, in more complex situations, unintended consequences can be quite influential. For example, if a person migrates in an effort to unite with family, but in the process discovers an improvement in employment, the reason for the move is not to find better employment, this would be the unintended consequence of the migration. Such an action might trigger more migration as people migrate to find better employment. Since the action is the result of the individual it is an important component of an individual's influence on society. In order to understand reactions to this process, Giddens uses the duality of structure, which will be discussed later in this paper.

Although Giddens stresses the individual as a human agent, he places the individual as part of the process of making history, rather than the "maker of history" (Cohen, 1989: 47). This is what separates Giddens' theory from humanistic social theories, like humanism or postmodernism. The humanistic theories would see actors as the makers of history. Giddens sees them as part of a process of historical change. As a result, in order to understand Giddensian theory, it is essential to understand the relationship between the society and the individual. Giddens calls this relationship the "duality of structure." Before this relationship can be fleshed out, however, it is necessary to understand Giddens' definition of structure.

Giddens discussion of the agent provides important insights into the individual migrant. The agent in Giddens' theory performs both intentional and unintentional actions. The intentional actions could be classified as proximate determinants of migration following the work of Thapa and Conway (1983). Thapa and Conway (1983) and Todaro (1976) have defined proximate determinants as factors that have been identified in previous migration research as important explanatory factors of internal migration. Examples of proximate determinants of migration include: the life-cycle theory of migration (Rogers, 1978; Plane, 1984), economic opportunities (Sjaastad, 1962; Vanderkamp, 1977), and previous migration history (Rogerson, 1984).

The unintended consequences of actions are also important in explaining migration during transitional eras. This is emphasized by Boyle, et al. (1998). They conclude that women do not intentionally perpetuate the institution of patriarchy, but by migrating based on the needs of their husbands, they are unintentionally promoting it. Also, based on humanistic theories of migration, especially Wolpert (1966), people often make hurried, or irrational, decisions during times of stress and strain. According to Wolpert (1966: 95) "[s]train may induce additional bias into the migration decision by (perhaps) triggering off a hasty decision to move, encouraging a disorganized search for other places to go, or fixation on a single destination place when closer examination of several alternatives is more beneficial." Often, these decisions are undertaken using incomplete or outdated information and result in unintended consequences, especially when such decisions are studied using traditional, human capital theories of migration.

Structure

The second element, after agency, in Giddens' structuration theory is the role of structure in social change. Giddens defines structure as, "[r]ules and resources, recursively implicated in the reproduction of social systems. Structure only exists in memory traces, the organic basis of human knowledgeability, and as instantiated in action" (Giddens, 1984: 377). In other words, structure includes the rules that govern society. The use of the term "recursive" is important to understanding the role of structure in Giddensian thought. Gregory refers to recursiveness as the theory "that structure is both the medium and the outcome of the social practices constituting social systems" (Gregory, 1994: 112). This is echoed by Giddens who notes that, "[s]tructure thus is not to be conceptualised as a barrier to action, but as essentially involved in its production" (Giddens, 1979: 70). In a Giddensian framework, this implies that structure is both influenced by and influences social change, in other words, it is recursive. Societies have certain laws and resources that influence social change. Also, these rules and resources can be modified through the process of restructuring society. This is the basis for the duality of structure that will be discussed later.

The second half of Giddens' definition of structure views the structure of society as an intangible feature (Structure only exists in memory traces, the organic basis of human knowledgeability, and as instantiated in action [Giddens, 1984: 377]). One cannot view the rules or resources of a society on one's own, only their influences can be studied. It is also important to note that structures exist only instantaneously. Since structure is involved in social change, its existence as a tangible (measurable) entity can only be temporary. In other words, structure never is static, it is always being modified.

Another key element of Giddensian thought is the differentiation between structure, system and structuration. Structure is defined as the "rules and resources, organised as properties of social systems" (Giddens, 1979: 66). Structure is the set of rules that exist in society and the ability for individuals to change the laws of society. He contrasts this with system, which Giddens defines as "[r]eproduced relations between actors or collectivities, organized as regular social practices" (*ibid.*). System refers to the relations between individual and groups of actors. Each of these groups utilizes the structure of society differently. The process of social change in a society is referred to as structuration. Structuration is defined by Giddens as "[c]onditions governing the continuity or transformation of structures, and therefore the reproduction of systems" (*ibid.*). In other words, structuration refers to the methods by which society is changed. These three factors together describe the methods and patterns of social change that are influenced by or influence the structure of society.

The society also is an important influence on migration decisions. Giddens' insights into society, or structure, potentially add to an explanation of migration. It is important to note that structure is recursive in structuration theory. Within a study of migration, structural determinants of migration represent the influence of structure on migration decisions. Structural variables, according to Thapa and Conway (1983), "represent societal constraints and governmental development policies" (Thapa and Conway, 1983: 28). Halfacree's (1995) work on the structuration of patriarchy is an example of a societal constraint on migration. Governmental economic development policies are also important influences on the structuration of society and migration. For example, Wolfel (2004) concludes that during the transitional era in the Russian

Federation, people were migrating to regions that were economically flourishing (compared to the rest of the Russian Federation). People left the Russian North because of the decline in government expenditures there. Finally, nationalism is an important structural determinant of migration, as Zolberg et al. (1986) and Brubaker (1995) emphasize. Zolberg et al. (1986) identifies conflicts over national identity as an important push factors in the migration decision-making process (Zolberg et al. 1986: 163). Brubaker (1995) strives to analyze the relationship between “political reconfiguration and migrations of ethnic unmixing in post-Soviet Eurasia” (Brubaker, 1995: 191). All of these societal events are structural determinants of migration, since none of these are specifically targeted to influence the population dynamics of the countries.

Duality of Structure

The Duality of Structure is one of Giddens’ most important contributions to social theory. Giddens has identified this duality as the foundation of his Structuration Theory. According to Giddens (1979), “[t]he theory of structuration involves that of the *duality of structure*, which relates to the *fundamentally recursive character of social life*, and *expresses the mutual dependence of structure and agency*. (Giddens, 1979: 69 italics in original) The relationship between structure and agency is a dialectical relationship in which both structure and agency interact with each other to influence change in society. This dialectical relationship forms the basis of Giddensian thought.

In order for an individual or agent to cause change in a society, based on the duality of structure, “rules and resources are drawn upon by actors in the production of interaction, but are thereby also reconstituted through such interaction” (Giddens, 1979:

71). In this process of social change, an individual uses the available resources and rules. However, the uniqueness of Giddensian thought is the manner in which the rules and resources are changed in the process of social change. Drawing upon Giddens, Cohen defines the duality of structure as “the essential recursiveness of social life as constituted in social practices: structure is both the medium and the outcome of the reproduction of practices” (Cohen, 1989: 42). Therefore, as an individual brings about social change, the rules that the agent used are also changed in the process.

The duality of structure is one of the most important aspects of Structuration Theory. Giddens is unique in his treatment of the recursive nature of structure and agency and the rules and resources used in the process of change. This provides an important insight into geopolitics by extension into migration under transitional conditions. As a state employs resources and rules for societal change, it not only modifies the overall structure of the world, but it also modifies the rules and resources, allowing other states to use those resources in future attempts to introduce change into the world system through, for example, natural resources or global terrorism.

It is important to remember that both the structure and agency interact to change society. This is one of the fundamental points of Giddensian thought. Therefore, a structurationist approach to migration must confront this point. Halfacree (1995) emphasizes this point in his discussion of the influence migration has on structuration of patriarchy in American society. In this study he emphasizes that when women acquiesce to the migration decision of the man, they are promoting this system of patriarchy (Halfacree, 1995: 170). This is also true in studies of nationalism and migration. Migration of minority groups promotes the majority’s structuration of society by

eliminating competition in the nation building process. This “unmixing” of ethnic groups is emphasized by Brubaker (1995). Rather than negotiating the changing nature of national identity, the minority group leaves the region, thus eliminating their influence of national development.

Another issue in this study is the identification of the determinants that motivate migration. Moon (1995) addresses this issue in his call for a new paradigm of migration studies based on the idea of moorings. Moorings are defined as “those social expressions which not only allow a person to materialize his or her physical, psychological and emotional well-being, but also serve to bind a person to a particular place (Moon, 1995: 514). According to Moon (1995: 514-518), people desire to find a location that satisfies their needs and values. When the residential characteristics of a place do not meet their needs, they consider migration. It is important to note that these moorings are unique to individuals and locations. Therefore, it is important to understand the contextual nature of migration for each location.

Moon’s (1995) study identifies the need for a new paradigm of migration and suggests “moorings” as the appropriate approach. However, he does not provide an example of how this can be accomplished. A Giddensian framework informs this discussion through the emphasis on the dualistic nature of society change. Therefore, it is important to understand both individual and societal characteristics in order to gain a more complete picture of migration. This is especially important in explaining forced and impelled migrations as defined by Petersen (1958).

The use of moorings provides insights into forced and impelled migrations that generally exist in transitional societies. As societies change, moorings are affected. This

is especially true in the former Soviet Union where societies have dramatically changed since 1991 (Wolfel, forthcoming). Career opportunities have been curtailed as a result of the collapse of the single, centrally planned economic system. The role of cultural affiliations has been restructured as the titular nationalities of the newly independent states have seized the opportunity to create states that promote their conception of a nation. Also, the new states have structured citizenship laws that have limited the capacity of non-titulars to influence societal change. These events have eroded the moorings of Europeans in Central Asia and made migration a viable option for these people.

Dialectic of Control

In his structuration theory, Giddens explains the power relationships between actors in his dialectic of control. According to Giddens, “all social actors, no matter how lowly, have some degree of penetration of the social forms which oppress them” (Giddens, 1984: 72). In structuration theory, all actors have some power in influencing the structuration of society. If a person has no power, then, based on Giddens’ definition, that person “ceases to be an agent” (Giddens, 1984: 149).

Power is an important component in Giddens’ social theory because power is available to all agents, all they need to understand is what their power source is and how to use it. In order to understand the influence of agents, it is necessary to understand the resources available to them. Giddens defines resources as “the media whereby transformative capacity is employed as power in the routine course of social action; but they are at the same time structural elements of social systems as systems, reconstituted through their utilisation in social interaction” (Giddens, 1984: 92). Resources are

advantages that certain agents have that can influence societal change. However, what makes Giddensian thought significant is the emphasis on the changing nature of resources in a society. As a group uses a resource, it changes society and, in the same process, changes the resources that can be used in the future because society adapts to the use of the resource.

Giddens considers power to be an important influence on the structuration of a society. Power is treated differently in Giddensian thought than in other social theories, because, in structuration theory, all agents possess power. Since all agents have the ability to influence societal change, people who have no power cease to be agents. This has important ramifications in migration studies. When individuals lose their ability to influence society, they cease to be agents and may see movement to another society as the only opportunity for regaining their status as agents.

The redevelopment of national identity within countries has been a major influence on migration and a Giddensian perspective on power adds important insights to this discussion. With the institutionalized alienation that often accompanies national development, minorities have seen their status as agents, in the Giddensian use of the term, diminished. As a result, many members of a minority group leave one country and migrate to a location where they have some opportunities for participating in the structuration of society. An example of this process is in Central Asia where a large number of Russian-speakers have left the region and returned to Russia (Laitin, 1998).

Institutions

Institutions are another factor that influences the structuration of social systems. Cohen (1989) defines social institutions as used in structuration theory as “routinised

practices that are carried out or recognised by the majority of members of a collectivity” (Cohen, 1989: 39). These groups of practices are routine actions that are used by agents for influencing societal change.

Giddens identifies four types of societal institutions. Each of them is influenced by signification, domination and legitimation (Giddens, 1984: 107). The four types of institutions are (Giddens, 1984: 107):

1. Symbolic orders/modes of discourse
2. Political Institutions
3. Economic Institutions
4. Law/Modes of Sanction

Agents utilize each class of these institutions in an effort to influence the structuration of society. Institutions differ from resources in that they are employed more routinely and are more deeply ingrained in a society than resources. However, both sets of events are major influences on the structuration of society.

Many institutions influence migration throughout the world. Discrimination against minorities has forced many people to return to their ethnic homelands. This constant threat of discrimination (Wolfel, forthcoming) has caused many people to migrate from prosperous regions, creating non-economically motivated migration decisions.

A second institution that has influenced migration is a set of networks between people outside their homelands and friends or family members located in their ancestral homelands. Networks are emphasized by Massey et al. (1993) as an important research stream in migration studies. Goss and Lindquist (1995) emphasize the institutionalization

of networks in their study of migration in the Philippines. In their study, they conceptualize individual migrants as knowledgeable agents undertaking action within pre-established institutions with recognized rules. These networks provide information that helps potential migrants decide if migration would improve their utility function or overall improvement of their condition.

A final set of institutions that influence migration is geopolitics. For example, Russia has maintained a strong regional presence in Central Asia, through economic and military means. Russia has entered into regional alliances with Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. This has created some sense of security and stability for the Europeans in these states. Russia has also provided peace-keepers in Tajikistan, providing security and political stability for the country and region. All of the geopolitical practices have appeared to have been designed to keep Central Asia within the Russian sphere of influence (Shaw, 1999: 248). This has added a degree of security for Europeans in Central Asia. If the countries of Central Asia should come into geopolitical conflict with Russia, this could set off a mass exodus from Central Asia to Russia.

Time/Space Relations

Giddens emphasizes in his social theory that time and space are important influences on the structure of society. Giddens has prominently declared that one of the main faults with social theory is its lack of concern with issues related to the history and place-specific characteristics of a location. According to Giddens this concentration on time-space intersections is a “fundamental theme” of his theory (Giddens, 1984: 54). Gregory (1994) echoes this sentiment in his discussion of structuration theory. Gregory claims that Giddens makes the “claim that people make not only histories but also

geographies: that time-space relations are not incidental to the constitution of societies and the conduct of social life” (Gregory, 1994: 114-15 italics in original). The constitution, or development, of society is bound not only into the people and the structure of the society, but the structuration of society is also influenced by the historical and geographical processes that influence a society.

All social activities are positioned in three key relationships. These are referred to as “three intersecting moments of difference” by Giddens (1984: 54). Giddens sees social activity as always being constituted in these three moments. The moments are (Giddens, 1984: 54):

1. temporally
2. paradigmatically (invoking structure which is present only at its instantiation)
3. spatially.

Each of these relations is important to understanding social change. The history and geography of a region are essential to understanding social change as they are strong influences on the range of actions available to agents. This emphasis on time and space relations is one of Giddens most significant contributions to social theory.

In any study of migration, it is necessary to look at a set of unique origin and destination factors that influence migration. This is especially important in transitional societies where regions are often charting different courses from colonization. In these regions, the history and geography of the place are essential to understanding political, social, and economic changes that are occurring there. Based on Structuration Theory, the unique nature of regions and their methods of influence societal structuration would

lead to different motives and patterns of migration. Therefore, it is essential not to make universal conclusions about migration, because each region and each era confront the transition process in a unique manner. While several of the processes influencing migration throughout the world are similar, it is problematic to attempt to explain migration with a single, universal theory since regions are unique.

Conclusion

Using this conception of migration, it is necessary to review migration from both the individual and societal perspective. The individual agent is making decisions based on personal characteristics. Proximate determinants of migration often address these issues, as one can study the characteristics of the individual and the needs of the individual in a migration decision.

It is also important to understand that people do not make completely rational decisions about migration. The individual also makes decisions that create unintended consequences. Unintended consequences are paramount in Giddens' theory. An example of this is the perpetuation of patriarchy in a society through migration decisions. This is not the intention of the migrant, but often is the consequence.

Structure was also an important influence on migration. The changing economic and political landscapes tend to unleash a large amount of migration. This contributes to the importance of structural determinants of migration on the migration decision-making process.

The duality of structure is another important aspect of Giddensian thought. In a study of migration, the interaction between proximate and structural determinants of migration demonstrates the importance of the duality of structure. One cannot think of

proximate and structural determinants as operating independently of each other. Both of these determinants interact to bring about societal change. The decline of conditions or locational characteristics migrants value (moorings) may cause people to migrate to regions where they perceive their needs can be fulfilled. The decline of economic conditions has decreased employment prospects in some regions. It is in this environment that people begin to protest, generating support for legislation supporting national development promoting the dominance of a majority's nation. The migration of minority groups also promotes the majority's structuration of society by eliminating competition in the nation building process.

The dialectic of control is closely related to the duality of structure. Giddens emphasizes that all agents have some source of power. When they lose power, they cease to be agents. With the institutionalized alienation that often accompanies national and economic development, many agents see migration as their only opportunity to regain their status as agents. Often they migrate to a country that they perceive as having economic opportunities or possessing a national identity that is compatible to their own identity.

Societal changes are influenced by institutions that exist in a society and how agents use them. Institutions are routinized practices that are used by agents to bring about social change. Many institutions are in place that influence migration. Discrimination has forced many people to return to their ethnic homelands. This constant threat of discrimination has caused many people to migrate from prosperous regions, creating irrational migration decisions.

A second institution that has influenced migration is a set of networks between people outside their homelands and friends or family members located in their ancestral homelands. These networks provide a set of information that helps potential migrants decide if migration would improve their utility function.

A final set of institutions that influence migration is geopolitics. Geopolitical relations have fostered links between countries. The connections between countries fosters migration due to increased interaction and connectivity. Examples of this process include migration between Russia and Central Asia (Dunlop, 1994) and migration between the United States and Mexico (Conway and Cohen, 1998).

The final element in Giddens' Structuration theory is the importance of time/space relations on the constitution of society. Giddens emphasizes that regions are unique and reconstitute society in different manners. Therefore, in any study of migration, it is necessary to look at a set of unique origin and destination factors that influence migration. The unique nature of regions provides a starting point from which an analysis of the migration patterns can be explained

Migration is a complex process throughout the world and becomes more complicated in a society that is undergoing a transition. The characteristics of the migrant and the societal characteristics both at the origin and destination are important determinants of migration. Also, the method by which society changes and the resources people use to bring about change are important. Finally, the role of institutions and the characteristics of a location are major influences on migration decisions and patterns. All of these issues together influence migration. The new era of global change requires a theory that can address all of these issues as influential on migration.

This theory provides a foundation on which future research can build. The different natures of societies represent a fertile comparative research agenda on migration. Also, the manner by which institutions influence migration in different regions can be discussed. The role of power is an essential concept in Structuration Theory, and its role in migration decisions is important. Finally, the manner by which the structuration of society is accomplished and how it influences migration provides a research agenda that can link proximate and structural determinants of migration. Migration is a critical issue in modern world development. Giddens' work offers key insights into the migration decision making process and works to integrate many potential studies of migration.

Acknowledgements

This paper was presented at the 2002 NESTVAL Conference, New Bedford, MA. The author wishes to thank Dan Knudsen, Dennis Conway and Gillian Acheson for their comments on this paper. All remaining mistakes are the responsibility of the author.

Bibliography

- Bond, Andrew. (1994). "Outmigration, Economic Dislocation and Reassessment of the Labor Resource in the Russian Far North." Post-Soviet Geography. 35(5): 299-305.
- Boyle, Paul, et al. (1998). Exploring Contemporary Migration. Harlow, Essex, UK: Longman.
- Brubaker, Rogers. (1995). "Aftermaths of Empire and the Unmixing of Peoples: Historical and Comparative Perspectives." Ethnic and Racial Studies. 18(2): 189-218.
- Conway, Dennis and Jeffery H. Cohen. (1998). "Consequences of Migration and Remittances for Mexican Transnational Communities." Economic Geography. 74(1): 26-44.
- Cloke, Paul, et al. (1991). Approaching Human Geography: An Introduction to Contemporary Theoretical Debates. New York: Guilford.
- Cohen, Ira J. (1989). Structuration Theory: Anthony Giddens and the Constitution of Social Life. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Dunlop, John. (1994). "Will the Russians Return from the Near Abroad?" Post-Soviet Geography. 35(4): 204-215.
- Gardner, Robert W. (1981). "Macro level Influences on the Migration Decision Making Process." in: DeJong, G.F. and R.W. Gardner eds. Migration Decision-Making. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Giddens, A. (1979) Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis. Berkley: University of California Press.

- Giddens, A. (1984). The Constitution of Society. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Giddens, A. (1993). The Giddens Reader. ed. Philip Cassell. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Goss, Jon and Bruce Lindquist. (1995). "Conceptualizing International Labor Migration: A Structurationist Perspective." International Migration Review. 29(2): 317-351.
- Gregory, Derrick. (1994). Geographical Imaginations. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Halfacree, Keith. H. (1995). "Household Migration and the Structuration of Patriarchy: Evidence From the USA." Progress in Human Geography. 19(2): 159-182.
- Laitin, David. (1998). Identity in Transition: The Russian-Speaking Populations in the Near Abroad. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Lawson, Victoria. (1995). "Beyond the Firm: Restructuring Gender Divisions of Labor in Quito's Garment Industry Under Austerity." Environment and Planning D: Society and Space. 13: 415-444.
- Lee, Everett S. (1969). "A Theory of Migration." in: J.A. Jackson ed. Migration. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp.282-297.
- Massey, Douglas, et al. (1993). "Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal." Population and Development Review. 19: 431-466.
- Moon, Bruce. (1995). "Paradigms in Migration Research: Exploring 'Moorings' as a Schema." Progress in Human Geography. 19(4): 504-524.
- Petersen, William. (1958) "A General Typology of Migration." American Sociological Review. 23: 256-266.

- Plane, David. (1992). "Age-Composition Change and the Geographical Dynamics of Interregional Migration in the U.S." Annals of the Association of American Geographers. 82(1): 64-85.
- Plane, David and Peter Rogerson. (1991). "Tracking the Baby Book, The Baby Bust, and the Echo Generations: How Age Composition Regulates US Migration." Professional Geographer. 43(4): 416-430.
- Ravenstein, E. G. (1885). "The Laws of Migration." Journal of the Statistical Society. 48: 167-219.
- Rogers, A., et al. (1978). "Model Migration Schedules and their Applications." Environment and Planning A. 10: 475-502.
- Rogerson, Peter. (1984). "New Directions in the Modeling of Interregional Migration." Economic Geography. 60: 111-121.
- Shaw, Denis. (1999). Russia in the Modern World: A New Geography. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Shaw, R. Paul (1975). Migration Theory and Fact. Philadelphia: Regional Science Research Institute.
- Sjaastad, L. A. (1962). "The Costs and Returns of Human Migration." Journal of Political Economy. 70: s80-s93.
- Tammaru, Tiit and Orjan Sjoberg. (1999). "On the Move: Explaining Migration in Estonia During the Transition Period." International Journal of Population Geography. 5: 241-260.

- Thapa, Poonam and Dennis Conway. (1983). "Internal Migration In Contemporary Nepal: Models Which Internalize Development Policies. Papers of the Regional Science Association. 53: 27-42.
- Todaro, Michael. (1978). Internal Migration in Developing Countries: A Review of Theory, Evidence, Methodology and Research Priorities.
- Vanderkamp, John. (1977). "The Gravity Model and Migration Behaviour: An Economic Interpretation." Journal of Economic Studies. 4(2): 89-102.
- Wolfel, Richard. (2001). Mobility in Transition: Migration in the Former Soviet Union During an Era of Political and Economic Transformations. Ann Arbor: UMI.
- Wolfel, Richard. (forthcoming). "Transition and the Beached Diaspora: Proximate and Structural Determinants of Migration Between Uzbekistan and Russia During the Early Transitional Era." Journal of Central Asian Studies. Forthcoming.
- Wolpert, Julian. (1966). "Migration as an Adjustment to Environmental Stress." Journal of Social Issues. 22(4): 92-102.
- Zolberg, Aristide R., et al. (1986). "International Factors in the Formation of Refugee Movements." International Migration Review. 20(2): 151-169.