

# THE FRAMEWORK OF EXCHANGE : ECONOMIC ANTHROPOLOGY IN RURAL AREAS OF THE SOFIA REGION

Carole TOTOZAFY,

*Doctoral School of Human and Social Science*

*Domain : Arts, Letters and Human Sciences of the University of Antananarivo, Madagascar*

Amour Normain RAKOTOBE,

*Doctoral student in Management Sciences*

*Doctoral school in Human and Social Sciences,*

*Doctoral Team in Dynamics of Management Organizations and Management of the University of Antananarivo, Madagascar*

Thierry Mamiarinjato RAKOTOBE,

*Doctor of Science in Social Anthropology*

*Lecturer at the University of Antananarivo*

*University of Antananarivo, Madagascar*

## ABSTRACT

*Exchange is a multicentric activity in the rural areas of Sofia Region. Not only there is a market exchange but also a gift exchange. The first one, market exchange is an exchange of commodities that goes as one (01) transaction. It has a generalized reciprocity with relationship of objects and the main objective is profit. As for the second one, it is a gift exchange with two (02) transactions. Instead of profit, the main motivation is prestige. Also, this nature of exchange creates relationships among the parties.*

**Keywords :** *exchange, gift, market, Sofia Region, Malagasy, anthropology*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

When discussing exchange, it is easy to think solely of the market, money, or economic transactions. Economics (the social science) predominates in this field. However, it is important to understand that exchange is multicentric, meaning it does not only exist in the market. It does not solely refer to monetary exchange aimed at profit[1]. There are several types of exchange. The potlatch described by Marcel Mauss[2], the kula[3] by Bronislaw Malinowski, the Moka[4] by Andrew Strathern, the market as defined and characterized by capitalist economics, or the *hena-drazana* found in Malagasy society are all examples of exchange. Even with this short list, the differences between each of these exchanges are numerous.

The term exchange, « *in its simplest form, can be defined as a transaction involving two transactors, A and B, and two objects, x and y*[5] » according to Christophe Gregory in his famous book on gifts and commodities. Here, this exchange is viewed from a broader perspective, encompassing more than just the economic sphere, which is the focus of this research. Indeed, the objective is to explore what « exchange » means in economic anthropology. What are its characteristics or components? As a hypothesis, it is proposed that exchange has two (02) main natures : market exchange and gift exchange. These natures of exchange are deduced from the analysis of data from rural areas of the Sofia Region in relation to the available documentation.

Indeed, each type of exchange differs in terms of the items exchanged (valuable or not), the presence or absence of procedures, the level of communication, the causes or expected outcomes (relationships between partners, prestige or rank), the available choices, the type of relationship, and the attitude in the exchange, as noted by Amartya Sen in *Against Injustice : The New Economics of Amartya Sen*[6]. In addition to that in *A Handbook of Economic Anthropology*[7], Yunxiang Yan classifies gift exchange into three basic distinctions : the presence or absence of a ceremony, the characteristics of the social actors, and the status of the actors (horizontal or vertical).

However, Christophe Gregory only considers two (02) types of exchange : the gift economy and the market economy. In his study of the Papua New Guinea people, he explained the differences between these two (02) types of exchange according to several criterias. For example, he discusses reciprocity, the motivation of the parties, the temporal dimension, etc. Here, variables were also considered as components of exchange. They were selected based on documentation and to best reflect the realities in the rural areas of Sofia Region. These are :

- The actors and forms exchanged ;
- The inherent procedures of the exchange ;
- The different functions of the exchange ;
- The concept of reciprocity in exchange.

To avoid confusion between the terms used in this research, « nature of exchange » is the term used to distinguish the gift economy from the market economy, or for some anthropologists, the gift sphere from the economic sphere. In contrast, the term « type of exchange » considers any exchange, whether within the framework of gifting or the market, whether it be *kula* or *tseña* (market in Malagasy). As for « variable of exchange », these are the main components of an exchange that differentiate it from other types or natures of exchange. This term reuses the definition from Amartya Sen's writings, particularly *Against Injustice: The New Economics of Amartya Sen* (2009) [6].

## 2. ACTORS AND FORMS OF EXCHANGE

First, attention must be paid to the actors of the exchange as well as the objects being exchanged. Who participate in the transactions or conduct the exchange ? What are their characteristics ? And what differentiate them according to the nature and types of exchange ? These are the questions covered here. As for the second point, the research will discuss what is exchanged, according to the various theories put forth by predecessors who have studied this subject.

### 2.1. Actors of the Exchange

Exchange implies the existence of actors who carry it out, which is why participants are one of the first elements to come to mind. Who ? Obviously, in this context, it refers to human beings. Exchange is a human activity. Here, the term « party » or « actor of exchange » is preferred over terms like « partners in exchange » to describe the participants in exchange. The reason behind that choice of word is because those involved in transactions are not necessarily partners. The details on this will be discussed further.

It is an activity that can be individual (between two individuals) or a collective activity, such as exchanges between groups. In individual exchange, each party or actor in the transaction acts or exchanges on their own behalf. In collective exchange, both sides of the transaction represent groups : a family, a household, a clan, etc. They are usually represented by an individual during the transaction. An example of this is the Nuer marriage described by Edward Evans-Pritchard in his famous book *The Nuer : A Description of the Modes of Livelihood and Political Institutions of a Nilotic People*[8]. According to him, Nuer marriage is an alliance between two families, where collective actors, represented by the bride and groom, engaged in exchange.

In the case of rural areas in the Sofia Region, both forms of exchange are observed. Economic exchanges between a purchasing household and a merchant household are collective exchanges since the buyer represents their household, just as the merchant represents theirs in the transaction. The same applies to *hena-drazana*, *tso-drano*, and all types of gifts related to *fomba* (customs in Malagasy). These types of gifts are collective in the sense that the actors represent their families, ancestors, communities, or households. An exception is noted for *latsakemboka* (pooling funds), which is individual when a member of a *fikambanana* (a traditional association) contributes in their own name. This gift becomes collective when the *fikambanana* representatives offer the total collected amount.

### 2.2. Forms of Exchange

The second component of exchange, regardless of its nature or type, is what is exchanged. Common practice tends to focus only on objects, but exchange here is not limited to the transaction of objects. In both gift and market economies, anything can be exchanged : objects, services, and money. What follows attempts to understand each of these components. The study begins with the most common form, the exchange of objects. Attention is given to the characteristics of objects when they are exchanged, particularly their alienability. Second, the research will discuss the exchange of services, specifically labor time, before concluding with monetary exchange.

#### 2.2.1. Alienability of Exchanged Objects

It is no secret that households in the rural areas of the Sofia Region exchange objects. Objects are offered as gifts and are also bought and sold in the market. Rice can be offered as *latsakemboka* or sold and bought in the market. The focus on this exchange's variable lies in the characteristics of the object being exchanged. Exchanged object can be either alienable or inalienable. Simply put, alienability refers to the transfer of ownership from one person to another. Marcel Mauss, in his book[9], asserts that objects given as gifts are inalienable, meaning the ownership or connection between the owner and the object is indissoluble. In contrast, in economic exchange, the object is alienable. Christophe Gregory summarizes this by saying : « *Commodities are alienable objects transacted by aliens ; gifts are inalienable objects transacted by non-aliens*[5] ». This citation leads to the reflection on the term

« commodity ». Commodity describes objects exchanged in the market. Proponents of political economy prefer this term, which refers more to price, over the term « goods » favored by Neoclassicists, which relates more to desire[5]. Additionally, today the term encompasses everything that can be bought or sold with money, including labor, land, services, etc.

### 2.2.2. Labor Time Exchange

Beyond object exchange, there is labor time exchange, referring to Christophe Gregory's terminology. Labor time exchange is specific to each of the two (02) natures of exchange. In gift exchange, labor time is given and returned, just like any other exchanged object. In rural areas of the Sofia Region, the most appropriate term is « help » or « mutual assistance », which is a manifestation of *fihavanana* (solidarity) in rural areas. In economics (the social science), there is both the slave's labor time and the labor time traded in the labor market. The latter is more relevant to the situation in the rural areas of the Sofia Region, where many people work as daily laborers, monthly or seasonal workers, or as government employees. These individuals exchange their labor time for a salary.

### 2.2.3. The Role of Money

As with the Tiv studied by Paul Bohannon, money as a standard of payment has a significant impact on Madagascar's economy. In the market economy, exchange actors do not trade one commodity for another but rather trade commodities for money. Money is what Paul Bohannon refers to as a standard of equivalence in his article *Some Principles of Exchange and Investment among the Tiv*. For him, it is a medium of exchange, a means of storing value, and also used for making payments. However, money does not serve as a medium of exchange in the gift economy. In the latter, money is the « object being exchanged ». Money, the standard of equivalence will be given and received as gifts in the rural areas of the Sofia Region.

In summary, depending on the nature of the exchange (gift or market) ; money, labor, and objects are exchanged. However, these do not determine the nature of the exchange[5]. Take money as an example ; it can take the form of a gift (*latsakemboka*, *hena-drazana*) and later become a means of payment in the market. It is also possible to conclude that the things, labor, and money exchanged constitute resources that can be transformed into economic capital in the sense described by Pierre Bourdieu[1]. Thus, material, human, and financial resources are obtained. These are the characteristics of the actors and, especially, the forms of what is exchanged.

## 3. PROCEDURES IN EXCHANGE

Regarding the variable of exchange procedures, two (02) points are emphasized as important here : the concept of time in conducting transactions and the existence or absence of a ceremony accompanying a transaction. Understanding each of these points helps grasp the nature of the exchange : whether it is a gift exchange or a market exchange.

### 3.1. Concept of Time in Transactions

In the market or *tseña*, transactions are simple : Buyer A gives money to Seller B, who, in turn, gives the purchased goods. The exchange, consisting of two (02) transactions, happens simultaneously and appears as a single transaction[5]. For the labor market, the case is somewhat similar since salary payment is made when the work is done. However, in a gift economy, two (02) transactions are distinctly separated in time before it can be considered a gift exchange. Take, for example, the *hena-drazana* that Party A gives to Party B during the funeral of a family member of B. The exchange is not complete because B has not yet offered a return gift to A. B will have to wait for another event (*fomba an-kafaliana* or *fomba an-karatsiana*) of A before they can repay their debt or reciprocate the gift they received. This final action by B not only closes the initial exchange (A's gift) but also initiates a new exchange between the two (02) parties.

This study does not suggest that all temporally spaced transactions are gift exchanges, nor that all immediate transactions imply market exchange. The difference between the two (02) natures of exchange in terms of time lies in the certainty or uncertainty of when the second transaction occurs. Indeed, in a market exchange, if the transactions are not immediate, the date of the second transaction is certain. In the investment market, when A invests an amount x, they know they are supposed to receive an amount y in a month or a year. However, in the case of a gift exchange, there is no specific date for the return of A's gift. It may take years or just a few days to be completed.

### 3.2. Ceremonies Accompanying Exchange

The presence or absence of a ceremony in an exchange reveals much about its nature. The existence of a ceremony indicates that it is a gift exchange. However, the absence of a ceremony does not always signify a market economy, as there are types of gift exchanges without ceremonies. For example, when a household in the rural areas of the Sofia Region makes a *latsakemboka* deposit, there is no ceremony. Christophe Gregory also proposes the existence of what he calls the procedure of objectification and the procedure of personification. In *Gifts and Commodities*, he considers that in a market economy, objectification dominates, while personification prevails in a gift economy. He explains that in market exchanges, people assume the social forms of the object, meaning that objects can be exchanged. In the gift economy, people assume the social forms of the parties, or more precisely, the social relationship between them[5].

## 4. FUNCTIONS OF EXCHANGE

Various functions of exchange were observed through both documentation and fieldwork. In economic anthropology, exchange creates and maintains social relationships, while in economics, it is driven by the motivation to maximize profit. Many scholars have developed their perspectives on exchange, and this section will explore the functions of exchange based on various research findings and observed realities in the rural areas of the Sofia Region.

### 4.1. Exchange and Types of Relationships

The connection between exchange and relationships is a recurring theme in economic anthropology. Many authors acknowledge a link between these two. The discussion begins with Marcel Mauss[2], who defined three (03) obligations associated with gift-giving: the obligation to give, the obligation to receive, and the obligation to reciprocate. Marshall Sahlins, in *Stone Age Economics*, proposes that « *a material transaction is usually a momentary episode in a continuous social relation* [10].» This concept applies not only to gift exchange but also to commercial trade. Andrew Strathern and Pamela Stewart, in *A Handbook of Economic Anthropology*, state that « *trade is not simply a utilitarian pursuit but one that allows individuals to make qualitative statements about social relationships*[7]». But what are these relationships? This section will explore them, beginning with the social relationship between the exchange actors and followed by the relationship between the exchanged items. While the relationship between the exchanged forms concerns only the market economy, the social relationship between the exchange actors pertains primarily to gift economies.

#### 4.1.1. Social Relationships Between Exchange Actors

Exchange creates, maintains, or nurtures the social relationship between the actors involved. This relationship has several facets, four (04) in total. First, gift exchange establishes and maintains peace. Marshall Sahlins explores this aspect of social relations through gift-giving in *The Spirit of the Gift* from his famous book *Stone Age Economics* (2017 edition). He writes, « *Those exchanges undertaken in seemingly voluntary guise... but in essence strictly obligatory on pain of private or open warfare... Similarly: 'to refuse to give/ to fail to invite is, like refusing to accept, equivalent to a declaration of war; it is to refuse alliance and communion* [11] ». For him, not participating in the gift exchange is akin to a declaration of war or a refusal of peace. On a lighter note, «*If friends make gifts, gifts make friends* [10] ».

Marshall Sahlins compares Marcel Mauss' concept of gift as a social prestation to Thomas Hobbes' social contract. In his 1968 article *Philosophie Politique de l'Essai sur le Don*, Marshall Sahlins defines the gift as a social contract for so-called primitive societies. Thomas Hobbes' social contract, according to him, is a societal pact in which the community voluntarily agrees to establish a super-person (notably the state) that exercises the power of force over all. Marcel Mauss' concept of gift as social prestation, however, encompasses multiple aspects: religious, economic, political. It is a total social fact, representing all aspects of society[7]. It is a social contract between the exchange parties. There is willingness, but no right to force. The gift does not imply any sacrifice of equality, and even less so of liberty. The groups allied through exchange each retain their strength, if not the inclination to use it [11].

For Melville Herskovitz[12], social bonds or relationships facilitate the circulation of goods among people. Nobel Prize-winning economist Amartya Sen, in *Against Injustice: The New Economics of Amartya Sen*, also agrees with this perspective. He argues that gift exchange could play a central role in fostering trust and cooperation between partners. He adds that this cooperation could be in the form of marriage or economic collaboration[13]. Indeed, a peaceful relationship between the parties is necessary to enable market exchange. In a sense, it is a prerequisite for commerce or market exchange. The gift as a social prestation for peace, facilitating the circulation of goods, aligns with the concept of *fihavanana* in the rural areas of the Sofia Region. Not participating in such exchanges is akin to stepping away from society (like a form of war) and its benefits (economic, cultural, etc.).

Second, social relationships can be either horizontal or vertical. Generally, an exchange is considered vertical when hierarchy and inequality are inherent in the exchange[7]. This is related to the social status of the two (02) exchange parties, and the exchange creates or perpetuates this hierarchy. Yunxiang Yan, in *A Handbook of Economic Anthropology*[7], considers this verticality inherent to gift exchanges. Horizontal exchange, on the other hand, occurs between two (02) actors of equal status. For instance, relationships among members of the same *fikambanana* can be considered horizontal, whereas the relationship between different *fikambanana* groups is vertical.

Third, gift exchange creates an unequal relationship of domination between the parties[5]. Christophe Gregory uses debt-related terms to clarify this point. When Party A gives a gift to Party B, A becomes B's creditor. When B reciprocates, he cancels his debt. The recipient is indebted and, therefore, dominated by the giver.

Fourth, according to Maurice Godelier in *L'énigme du Don*[14], gift is a means of instituting a double relationship of reciprocal dependence, which entails a number of social consequences for the protagonists, obligations, but also advantages. He adds that the desire of the parties to establish these bonds of solidarity and dependence drives the practice of gift exchange.

In summary, the social relationship between exchange actors is one of peace. Gift exchange establishes either a vertical or horizontal social relationship based on the status of each party. There is also an unequal relationship of domination and a mutual dependence between the parties. Across these various facets, the study highlights the importance of both the parties' willingness and the social obligation to participate in the gift exchange. Here lies a paradox: participation in gift exchange is voluntary, but it is also accompanied by a social obligation, making it mandatory. As Marshall Sahlins puts it, not participating in the gift exchange is similar to declaring war. In *Gifts and Commodities*, Christophe Gregory likens reciprocating a gift to repaying a debt [5].

This paradox is evident in rural areas of the Sofia Region. When asked about the obligations of gift exchange, respondents stated that the transactions are voluntary, much like market exchanges. Another name for *hena-drazana* is *fitia tsy mba hetra*, literally translated as « love is not a tax » meaning voluntary contribution. However, the act of recording the amount and name in a ledger and publicly displaying the gifts obliges everyone to participate in the gift exchange. This creates a prestige issue, with competition to outdo each other the next time. Thus, the obligation or debt arises.

#### 4.1.2. Relationship Between Exchanged Forms

Christophe Gregory refers to the relationship between exchanged items created by commercial exchange. He affirms that market exchange establishes a relationship of equality between objects at the time of the transaction [5]. When a household buys something from the market, the money exchanged for the purchased goods is of equal value. The market establishes this relationship of equality between two (02) different things, and this is where money, as a means of payment and standard of equivalence, comes into play.

In the market economy, the relationship between exchanged forms does not consider the status of the buyer or the seller. It certainly does not create a relationship of dependence or hierarchy between the exchange parties. There is no paradox about the will and obligation to participate in the exchange. Market exchange is not the foundation of peace, as the Malagasy saying goes, « *Varotra tsy raikitra tsy maharatsy fihavanana* » (an incomplete transaction does not ruin friendship). However, commerce cannot exist without a peaceful relationship between the parties involved. Gift exchange, which fosters peace, enables market exchange to exist. For example, a household does not buy rice from a merchant who did not attend the funeral of a family member. However, this situation is rare in rural areas of the Sofia Region since the entire community typically attends such events. Additionally, the gift is voluntary and not mandatory, so there are no repercussions on daily life.

#### 4.2. Objectives or Motivations for Exchange

Objectives or motivations for exchange suggest that individuals or groups, such as households, engage in exchange for reasons that drive them. Besides social relations and the exchange of forms, the purpose of the exchange is to meet certain objectives or motivations. For gift exchange, it is more about motivation. The household is motivated by the pursuit of prestige. As for market exchange, the appropriate term is objective, and the objective is profit maximization. These are word choices that this research uses to better distinguish the two.

##### 4.2.1. Gifts and the Pursuit of Prestige

Firstly, « *The gift economy, then, is a debt economy. The aim of a transactor in such an economy is to acquire as many gift-debtors as he possibly can and not to maximize profit, as it is in a commodity economy. What a gift transactor desires are the personal relationships that the exchange of gifts creates, and not the things themselves* [5] ». This excerpt from *Gifts and Commodities* clearly explains that what a person seeks in gift exchange are the relationships between people. In other words, 1 000 Ar or 200 Ar in the rural areas of the Sofia Region is worth almost nothing in the market economy. However, when the terms *latsakemboka* are added to the 1 000 Ar and *hena-drazana* to the 200 Ar, the money becomes an object to exchange in the gift economy. This money then creates social ties between the actors in the exchange. Here, 1 000 Ar and 200 Ar become very important as they signify an investment in prestige. As they say in the rural Commune of Ankaramy, it's not the amount that matters most, but the act of participating.

It can also be noted from this passage of Christophe Gregory's book about the concept of gift-debt : acquiring as many gift-debtors as possible. The focus groups conducted in rural areas of the Sofia Region do not like using the terms creditor and debtor. However, an individual or household gives a gift in the expectation of receiving something in return eventually. The number of debtors who come to repay their debts marks the creditor's prestige. The more people attending funerals and burials, the more prestige the creditor has. Even though Christophe Gregory stopped his reflection on the comparison of gift exchange to the collection of debtors, the facts are there : in rural areas of the Sofia Region, the ultimate goal of gift exchange is prestige. This prestige is materialized by the number of gift-debtors who come to repay their debts.

Regarding this pursuit of prestige, it is not just the number of debtors that confer prestige. The research also found during focus groups, albeit subtly, the importance of the quantity and quality of the gifts. The focus group respondents all denied that the amount of gifts given plays a role in determining the amount received in return later. However, the facts tell another story. Why keep a ledger, like an accountant, recording gifts received during *fomba an-karatsiana*? Why announce aloud the gifts received and who gave them ? To these questions, the respondents say it is to honor those who participated, so they might do better next time, and to make those who

did not give feel ashamed. The conclusion is evident : there is competition among givers, and it is a competition for prestige.

The total amount collected, as well as the total number of objects received, are also calculated and announced aloud. This equates to the prestige of the gift recipient, who is in competition with the prestige from previous fomba an-karatsiana. Indeed, the larger the total gifts, the greater the prestige. And as mentioned earlier, the total amount of gifts received depends on the gifts given in the past, thus linking directly to the recipient's prestige. Referring to Pierre Bourdieu [1], one could define this amount as social capital transformed into economic capital. Here, it is rather prestige capital, referring to the prestige to be maximized.

#### 4.2.2. Maximization of Profit

In comparison to the motivations of prestige and social relations, the objective of maximizing profit in market exchange seems more straightforward. The household goes to the market to buy or sell goods at the best price with minimal expense. However, it is not always so simple. First, in the rural areas of the Sofia Region, as in the rest of Madagascar, bargaining is a widespread practice in the tsema. Sometimes, to retain customers, traders sell cheaper than usual. There are also the famous cadoa, or extra quantities that the merchant offers. This can be seen as a gift given to encourage the client to continue their business relationship.

Moreover, it is not merely about profit maximization when it comes to prestige purchases. Economic rationality is no longer the guiding principle: efficiency, maximum profit under resource constraints, etc. The Malagasy people in the rural areas of the Sofia Region have their own rationality or logic. When a household invests in its prestige and buys goods (such as zebu, land, JBLs, etc.), it is not a matter of profit maximization but rather of considering the prestige the purchase will bring.

Maurice Godelier dedicated an entire book, *Rationality and Irrationality in Economics* [15], to demonstrate that profit maximization is merely a logic, an economic rationality in capitalist societies. There are other economic rationalities depending on the society. In the case of the rural areas of the Sofia Region, their economic rationality assumes that prestige is more valuable than the pursuit of profit. This economic rationality can be observed in rural areas across the country : in the northeastern rural communes according to Annah Zhu[16], and in the rural communes of the Highlands according to Antoine Delière[17], to name a few.

#### 4.3. Concept of Reciprocity in Exchange

The principle of reciprocity surrounding gift exchange emerged from Marcel Mauss's critique of his famous spirit of the gift. For example, Bronislaw Malinowski argued that it is the sanction surrounding the bonds of reciprocity that creates the obligation to give. For him, reciprocity is the foundation of social order in Melanesia. The same applies to Raymond Firth in New Zealand, where the notion of compensation and equivalent return is very important for the Maori[7]. So far, the concept of reciprocity has been limited to gift exchange. However, reciprocity is also applicable to market exchange. Let us consider Marshall Sahlins and his three (03) types of reciprocity, which he based on Karl Polanyi's work.

Marshall Sahlins defines reciprocity as a « vice-versa » movement between two (02) parties. He adds that the difference between the types of reciprocity is based on the social distances between the parties and the characteristics of the return transaction : return time, return equivalence, etc[10]. He also classifies three (03) types of reciprocity according to the degree of morality of each :

- Generalized reciprocity : purely altruistic, where Bronislaw Malinowski's pure gift is the ideal type. It is weak reciprocity because the obligation to return is vague. It is positive reciprocity, a gift that takes place between close individuals.
- Balanced reciprocity : falls in the middle, neither positive nor negative. The exchange or the two (02) transactions are simultaneous. There is no expectation of return. The market fits here. The exchange is impersonal.
- Negative reciprocity : as the name suggests, it is morally negative. One party tries to take something from the other at the latter's expense. This includes theft, fraud, betting, etc. [10]

Sahlins' approach to reciprocity places morality and social distances at the center of the explanation for the differences between each type. The closer the parties are, the more positive the reciprocity becomes. On one hand, this approach applies in the rural areas of the Sofia Region because only parties who know each other exchange gifts. On the other hand, balanced reciprocity or market exchange is possible even between family members, for example. The research concludes that generalized reciprocity, or gift exchange, is based on this social distance, while balanced reciprocity or market exchange does not require it to materialize.

Regarding morality, Sahlins somewhat demonizes market exchange in his classification of reciprocity. However, he adds later that « *Balanced reciprocity is a willingness to give for that which is received. Therein seems to be its efficacy as social impact*[10] ». Therefore, in this research, reciprocity in exchange is divided into two (02) types : generalized reciprocity and balanced reciprocity. All notions of morality, social distance (for market exchange), and negative reciprocity (because ultimately there is no vice-versa movement) are removed as Marshall Sahlins recommends.

### 5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the table below is created. It synthesizes all the variables discussed above to determine the different natures of exchange in the rural areas of the Sofia Region. As observed throughout this article, two (02) natures of exchange have been identified: gift exchange and market exchange. The following table explains and compares these two (02) natures of exchange based on the variables of exchange.

**Table -1 : Synthesis of Variables Comprising the Natures of Exchange**

Variables of exchanges	Caractéristiques de la variable	Nature of exchange	
		Gift exchange	Market exchange
Actors and objects exchanged	Actors	Exchange between : -Groups like a household represented by an individual -Between individual	
	Objects exchanged	-Objects -Labor -Money	Commodities : -Objects or goods -Labor -Money and its three functions in market
Procedure during transactions	Concept of time	Exchange = two (02) transactions	Exchange = one transaction
	Ceremonies	With or without	Without
Functions of exchange	Relationship	Relationship among exchange actors with multiple facets : -Peace relationship as a social contract that allows circulation of commodities -Horizontal or vertical social relationship -Unequal relationship of domination -Dependency relationship	Relationship based on peaceful interaction between the two (02) actors
	Objective and/motivation	Search for prestige : social relationship created leads to the accumulation of gift-debtors in terms of quantity (number of actors) and quality (quality of the gift)	Profit except in the case of purchases or investments for prestige
Concept of reciprocity		Generalized reciprocity	Balanced reciprocity

## 6. REFERENCES

- [1] Bourdieu, P. (1986). The Forms of Capital. Dans J. Richardson, *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 246-258). Westport: Greenwood Press.
- [2] Mauss, M. (1924). *Essai sur le Don: forme et raison de l'échange dans les sociétés archaïques*.
- [3] Malinowski, B. (1922). *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: an account of native enterprise and adventure in the archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea* (éd. 1ère édition). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul LTD.
- [4] Godelier, M. (1996). *L'énigme du Don*. Fayard.
- [5] Gregory, C. A. (2015). *Gifts and Commodities* (éd. 2e). Chicago: Hau Books.
- [6] Hénaff, M. (2009). Gift, Market, and Social Justice. Dans *Against Injustice: the New Economics of Amartya Sen* (p. 317). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [7] Carrier, J. G. (Éd.). (2005). *A Handbook of Economic Anthropology*. Edward Elgar.
- [8] Evans-Pritchard, E. E. (1940). *The Nuer: A Description of the Modes of Livelihood and Political Institutions of a Nilotic People*. (J. Johnson, Éd.) University Press Oxford.
- [9] Mauss, M. (1924). *Essai sur le Don: forme et raison de l'échange dans les sociétés archaïques*.
- [10] Sahlins, M. (2017). *Stone Age Economics*. Routledge Classics.

- [11] Sahlins, M. (1968, October-December). Philosophie Politique de l'Essai sur le Don. *L'Homme*, 8(4), 5-17.]
- [12] Herskovits, M. J. (1952). *Economic Anthropology. A Study in Comparative Economics*. New York: Kingsport Press.
- [13] Sen, A. (2009). Economics, Law, and Ethics. Dans R. Gotoh, & P. Dumouchel (Éds.), *Against Injustice: the New Economics of Amartya Sen* (p. 317). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [14] Godelier, M. (1996). *L'énigme du Don*. Fayard.
- [15] Godelier, M. (1966). *Rationality and Irrationality in Economics*. New York and London: Monthly Review Press.
- [16] Zhu, A. (2018). Hot Money, Cold Beer: Navigating the Vanilla and Rosewood Export Economies in Northeastern Madagascar. *American Ethnologist*, 45(2), 253-267.
- [17] Deliège, A. (2008). La Place de l'Economie de Marché dans une Société Rurale Malgache: l'Actualité des Travaux de Polanyi. *Revue Interventions économiques*(38), 27.

