Int. j. adv. multidisc. res. stud. 2025; 5(4):682-689

Received: 05-06-2025
Accepted: 15-07-2025

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

Social relationships and Innovations Between Bantu Majorities and Pygmy Minorities in the Southern Cameroonian Forest

[1] Emmanuel Itong A Goufan, [2] Achille Garance Kameni Ngaleu, [3] Nathalie Mpeck

[1] Department of Psychology, Faculty of Arts, Letters and Social Sciences, University of Ebolowa, Cameroon
[2] Department of Sociology, Faculty of Arts, Letters and Social Sciences, University of Douala, Cameroun
[3] Department of Management of Education, Faculty of Sciences of Education, University of Yaoundé 1, Cameroun

Corresponding Author: **Emmanuel Itong A Goufan**

Abstract

Contrary to popular belief, the Pygmies are an "active minority" in the sense of Moscovici (1979) [22]. But, paradoxically, confronted to hegemonic Bantu majorities, the innovations they drive are very recessive. Of the reasons given, the most controversial is the precariousness of the Bantu/Pygmy relationships. The hypothesis to be tested is then that the visibility of innovations resulting from the negotiation of the conflict between Bantus and Pygmies depends on the quality of the social relationship they maintain. This was operationalized in 4 research hypotheses all confirmed by the Chi-square test of empirical data collected through questionnaire from a representative sample of 120 bucolic Bantus from the districts of Djoum, Oveng and Mintom II. This result led us to conclude that the social relationship is a determining variable in the negotiation of the social conflict between a majority and a minority socio culturally different: the more mutually satisfying it is, the less is the pressure to conformity, and the more innovations are visible, vice versa.

Keywords: Social Relationship, Social Innovation, Social Influence, Social Conflict

Introduction

The Pygmies are the most primitive, most marginal and most marginalized minority social group in Cameroon (Abega and Bigombé Logo, 2006) [1]. In order to remedy this situation, projects for their modernization and social integration were developed and implemented in 1975, 1996 and 1988 by the various Ministries in charge of Social Affairs. The authorities aimed to subject the Pygmies to strong social pressure to open them up to the world, to emancipate them and to comply with official standards. But, aware of their civic and social inferiority in a context of modernity, by voluntary transgression of official standards and/or by inability to conform to them, they have, until today, remained almost rooted in their culture and closed to the world. Indeed, convinced that any relationship with the Bantus would be "a misalliance which will lead, in the long or short term, to ethnocide, parasitism or social paternalism, so much will they have lost identity and bearings" (Althabe, 1965: 15) [2], the pygmies respond to these pressures to conformity either by the "yes of refusal", or by total indifference, or by retreat and/or isolation in the unfathomable depths of the evergreen virgin forest. Hence the Bantu/Pygmy social conflict, also called "the Pygmy problem".

In reality, this conflict reflects the difficulty of conciliation between two social logics or thoughts: that of the Bantu which is part of a perspective of conformity to official standards, and that of the Pygmies which is situated in a perspective of preservation of their sociocultural identity. The failure of these projects and the "consistency" of the social behavior of the pygmies are proof that they are an "active minority" in the Moscovici (1979) [22] sense of the term. But, curiously, the social changes they propose are barely noticeable, hardly apparent, and thus not very evident. The problem of the present study is this recessive character.

In the search for an explanation, the genetic and intercultural points of view clash. The first is supported by Thomas (1979) [37], Nguina Mawong (1981), Kazadi (1981) [12], Thuret (1996) [38] and Voiris (1997) [40] who, drawing on the theses of Moscovici (idem), explain this recessiveness of change by an absence of "dissidence" on the part of the pygmy minorities. Because, faced with the hegemonic Bantu majorities: they neither desire nor create disagreement; they do not pose by imposing themselves; they do not feel the need to assess their resources and rights; they do not seek to be heard, to make themselves known and

recognized, to provoke adherence to their principles and beliefs.

The second point of view is supported by Nlem Nlem (1992) who finds, not only that Bantus and Pygmies are not part of the same community, but also and above all, that their social relationship is very precarious. This is also the opinion of Ludwig (1993) [17] who believes that in a situation of intercultural contact, the conditions of the social relationship maintained by the groups determine the visibility of the minority. The objective of the present study is to verify the relevance of this point of view.

The social relationship: Definition, types and determinants

To better understand the concept of relationship, it must be compared to that of link and that of interaction (Marc and Picard, 1989). A link is the object (concrete or abstract) of the relationship; it is what unites individuals or groups together, by imposing constraints and behaviors on them. Interaction, for its part, designates reciprocal actions, exchanges whose impact is significant on the social life of people or groups in relation. It is the concretization, the manifestation of a relationship, or that by which it does so. In short, the link is a reification of the relationship while interaction is the exchange of mutual actions. Thus, the relationship is the process of putting individuals or groups in contact or linking. Its description necessarily involves not only its content, but also and above all, the protagonists. In this sense, the relationship is understood as a system obeying rules and standards. It therefore has a historical, dynamic, social, physical, affective, cognitive dimension, etc., which will define a framework and a situation for it, and which will fundamentally distinguish the forms of relationship. However, we retain two major categories of relationship which are the interpersonal relationship or "relationship to the other" and the social relationship.

The social relationship or "relationship to difference" is the relationship of a unique and specific social group to another social group which is also unique and specific; it is a relationship between individuals whose nature and characteristics are irreducible to the will of one, but to that of all the protagonists. The belonging of each to socioculturally different and often opposing situations and conditions will manifest the unequal nature of this social relationship. Indeed, the individual is here eclipsed in favor of his group of belonging, and considered only in relation to him. The relationship is then analyzed and determined by belonging to a social category, an ethnic group, a clan, a family, a race, etc. Several factors will therefore influence it by creating sociocultural distances between the protagonists. These distances are manifested through language, dress, lifestyle and social behavior, social habits, etc. The relationship is then defined as a dynamic process that leads to relationships by which groups determine themselves. It therefore defines a set of more or less intermittent interactions, consisting of mutual exchanges over a more or less long period, affecting each other synchronously and diachronically and based on cooperation. Any social relationship is not only defined by a system of standards that differentiate the behaviors and activities of each in their relationships with others, but also a function of the relative weight of constraints and the socially occupied positions of potential partners. Also, it imposes roles on the latter, develops and evolves in a place, in structures and in specific conditions, obeys rules that are developed in reference to standards, to consensually developed behaviors and dependent on the structures, institutions, organizations specific to each group. The establishment of a social relationship therefore depends on a social framework and a social situation (Moser, 1994) [26].

The framework of a social relationship is the set of physical factors socially constructed by the groups in the relationship, solely and specifically for it. These are therefore all the physical organizational structures put in place uniquely to make it viable. Indeed, any social relationship takes place in a specific physical, human and social environment. This environment will contribute to the creation of a framework specific to the social relationship, which is manifested through structures that dictate specific behaviors to the actors.

The situation of a social relationship is the set of physical, cultural, social, economic and cognitive factors that determine the nature, the conditions of existence, the quality and the evolution of the social relationship. Some of these elements are the product of the culture and the mode of organization specific to each protagonist. Others are natural elements. In fact, a social relationship, because it is a socially determined position report, is organized according to certain psychological, social and natural elements that determine interactive or relational behavior. Therefore, the way in which groups apprehend their relationships is mainly a function of their perceptions, their experiences, their knowledge, their expectations, their anticipations, their social status, their interpretations of the observable and unobservable behavior of "the other" in particular.

As a result, not only will social relations and interactive behaviors be selective and will be linked to norms and/or physical, economic and sociocultural values that are not necessarily the same in all groups (Camilleri and Vinsonneau, idem), but also, any social relationship will be subject to the weight of the mutual perception of the values specific to each protagonist. Each group brings into the relationship or interaction its thoughts, feelings, emotions, social representations; each group makes attributions, categorizations; reacts according to these and those that it assumes in the other. All these factors constitute an interactional repertoire on the basis of which the group will anticipate its future relations: interactional behavior obeys mutually shared norms that are cognitive and affective frames of reference, a kind of constraints opposed to individual or personal behavior, and to a subjective evaluation of the behavior of the protagonist.

Thus, this framework and this situation "determine the quality of the social relationship, its characteristics, its conditions of connection and consolidation". Because, social groups form and consolidate a relationship much more easily and quickly if the framework and the situation of the latter are mutually satisfactory to them" (Moser, idem: 28-29). The conditions of a deep social relationship are then: a) the reduction of the spatial distance between the groups; b) the regularity of meetings or the opportunities for physical meetings between the members of the groups; c) the reciprocity of physical attraction between the groups; d) the reciprocity, the similarity and the complementarity of cultural, social and economic factors. One of the most fundamental psychosocial phenomena of the social relationship is social influence.

Social influence: Definition, types, determinants and modalities

Influence is defined as a psychological pressure that pushes individuals or groups to change their behavior, ideas, attitudes, confronted to other individuals or groups. It is the force of domination, the influence, the ascendancy, the power that an individual or a group has over another, to the point of making them change their behavior. But, in reality, it only becomes "social" when the change occurs after becoming aware of the behavior of others (Ludwig, idem). Thus, it is social influence that is at the origin of the transformation of perceptions, judgments and reactions that appear as the result of social interactions: social influence only acts in a situation of social relationship (the social relationship is prior to social influence). At least this is what is thought not only by Lemaine (1966) [14] for whom contacts with others modify the relationships that individuals maintain between themselves and with the outside world, but also by Faucheux and Moscovici (1972) who demonstrated that perspective and cognitive laws are dependent on the laws governing individual and collective relationships.

We distinguish: a) reciprocal social influence which is established between groups in a situation where neither is psychologically and/or numerically in the majority nor in the minority (Shérif, 1971); b) majority social influence which is established between groups in a situation where one is psychologically and/or numerically in the majority, one is a pressure group and the other a pressured group (Asch, 1959) [4]; c) minority social influence which is established between groups in a situation where the pressure group is psychologically in the minority and the pressured group is numerically in the majority (Moscovici, ibid.). Based in particular on imitation, contagion, social comparison, the production of norms and cognitive dissonance, the effects of social influence are reactance (Fischer, ibid), social anomie and deviance. Its main social functions are the formation of norms (Sheriff, idem), socialization (Festinger, 1954) [7], social control (Asch, idem), communication or exchange (Jones, 1965) [11] and innovation Moscovici (1984). Social influence leads to social conflict.

Social conflict and its negotiation

The term conflict designates the situation where a group of individuals is tossed between external and contradictory stimuli that push it to make a decision that does not satisfy its own tendencies; a situation where social groups disagree about a specific social object, present or absent, imaginary or real, concrete or abstract. Therefore, social conflict is also a psychosocial conflict. It therefore concerns all social situations characterized by a contradiction of interests, because the protagonists are social groups with a clear awareness of their differences, their specific objectives, their sociocultural belonging. Although the manifestation of social conflictis observed at the level of the relationship between the ego and thealter, it comes from the relationship of each group with the object of conflict, that is, from the contrary or opposing judgments that the latter make about this object. Ultimately, social conflict is a disagreement that occurs between two social groups when one tries to exert social pressure on the opinions, beliefs and behaviors of the other to lead it to adopt opinions, beliefs, behaviors contrary to its own ideals, objectives, customs and habits; a situation where more or less equivalent forces, drives, tendencies, needs and social instincts of opposite directions act at the same time on given groups.

There are three norms for any social conflict, which are: a) the norm of objectivity, which refers to the need to make exact and objective judgments about an object in question, so that the decision to be taken is universally accepted; b) the preference norm which relates to the need to make judgments on a social object in question based on one's own tastes, one's own sensitivity; c) the originality norm which relates to the need to make judgments on a social object in question based on the novelty it presents.

There are also five styles of behavior that the protagonists of social conflict can adopt: a) investment which is the fact for the protagonist to put all his energy into an action, and interaction; b) autonomy which is the possibility for the protagonist to decide without referring to a power, a hierarchy, a norm other than his own; c) consistency which relates to the coherence, solidity, strength, stubbornness in the behavior of the protagonist (Mugny: 1974a) [27]; d) rigidity which is the resistance of the protagonist to the efforts of change imposed on him by the situation or his opposite number (Paicheler and Bouchet, 1973) [32]; Ricateau, 1971) [33]; e) equity, which is the virtue of someone who has a natural sense of justice, impartiality, and respect for the rights of all and each (Mugny, 1974b) [28]. Thus, the object of the social and the alter are, on the part of the ego, objects of often contradictory social cognitions. (Ouellet, ibid), hence the social influence that gives rise to conflict and which, in turn, requires its negotiation.

Negotiation of social conflict is the search for compromise in the resolution of the conflict. To negotiate is to discuss, to examine with a view to deciding in the event of conflict; it is the psychosocial process that involves the confrontation of the points of view of the protagonists who each demonstrate the need to prevail, to arrive at a compromise or a change. There are three outcomes to this negotiation: a) normalization, which refers to the search for consensus by leading the protagonists to accept the lowest common denominator of their ideas and opinions (Moscovici and Neve, idem.); b) conformity that leads an individual or group to adhere to the behaviors, ideas and beliefs of the majority even though they do not agree with these ideas, behaviors and beliefs (Moreland an Levine, 1982) [20]; c) innovation that leads an individual or group to adhere to the behaviors, ideas and beliefs of the minority even though they do not agree with these ideas, behaviors and beliefs. Innovation is therefore novelty, creation, change, destruction of habitual modes of behavior and the establishment of new modes (Deschamps, 1980) [6].

Propagation and visibility of innovations

In a heterogeneous social group, the propagation of social innovations is a collective phenomenon comparable to that of rumor (Rogers and Shomaker, 1971) [34]. Theoretically, it is the group with its own dynamics that is first affected or that, in a collective movement, decides first to innovate. The first individuals to decide are the pioneers. They take risks, venture without the support of others. This minority "who decide first", and who in their action leads the majority is characterized by: charisma; a high level of education; a high social level and/or characterized by upward social mobility; increased curiosity; an active public life or at least active participation in groups, organizations and social, cultural

and/or political events. They have a greater taste for risk and adventure. The second are the innovators. They voluntarily adopt the new behavior. The next are the "early majority", composed of reasonable, thoughtful people. They have a higher social status than pioneers. This status allows them to "legitimize" innovations. Then comes the "late majority", made up of skeptics who decide without really believing in it. Finally, we have the "latecomers" who are traditionalists, conformists, but who, in the end, are obliged to follow, with a few exceptions, the evolution of things.

The spread of social innovations would therefore follow a mechanism psychosocial whose stages are: a) the stage of knowledge where the minority learns of the existence of the new object or of the inseparable trio idea-behavior-object. This first knowledge, to be taken into account, must not be in too great dissonance with the ideas, representations, value systems and behaviors of the individual; b) the stage of persuasion, decision-making where the relationships of the individual stimulate, arouse his interest, introduce the novelty into the social system, legitimize this novelty to the extent that parents, neighbors, friends and acquaintances conform to it. The novelty from then on becomes the object of individual deliberation; c) the stage of decision where the social activity of the minority provides him with social support which reassures him and facilitates his adoption. Thus, social innovations are often considered as acculturations: the phenomenon of acculturation is consubstantial with that of innovation. But innovation is not an abstraction, it is the concrete, visible manifestation of change. According to Moser (idem.), for an innovation to be clearly visible, the advantage it contains must be clearly visible; it must be complementary to the entire social system; its complexity must be negligible; its "tryability" must be easy; its adoption must be rapid.

Innovation and acculturation among native majorities.

Native majorities are sensitive to the strangeness of foreign minority, and especially to the gap that appears between their two cultures. Although their perceptions of the difference are affected by the bias of egocentrism, these will induce specific behaviors that are particularly penalizing for these minorities with overly "consistent" behavior, in particular neutralization and penalization. Neutralization consists, for the majority working on acculturation or who innovate, of trying, in a first reflex of conservation, to neutralize the destabilizing effect of the novelty. Hence the behaviors of domestication of cultural difference to strip it of its trying and/or threatening character. This neutralization can be carried out by: a) assimilation which consists of ignoring the difference or erasing it by spontaneously integrating it into a habitual code of interpretation; b) the search for consonance which is an effort to appropriate or resist the change of familiar structures; c) categorization which is the classification of the difference in an existing cultural category, or among elements judged equivalent from a certain point of view. In addition to a reductive categorization which tends to ignore its own particularities in order to retain only those of its group of belonging, there is also a " fabricating categorization" which graciously grants the other the traits which one needs to identify him; d) pejoration which consists of manifesting behaviors tending to make the strange and the foreign "harmful".

Penalization is the tendency to minimize cultural convergences and accentuate divergences, by distorting reality through the manipulation of differences and similarities. These manipulations allow members of the majority not only to shift onto members of the minority their frustrations, tensions and other negative elements that threaten their integrity and cohesion, but also to apprehend them and signify them as inferior, in order to construct, maintain or restore a self-image that they would have devalued by adopting the novelty.

All these processes relating to groups in a situation of acculturation also appear as the basis of the mechanisms of denaturation of difference. Indeed, majorities consider themselves as the totalizing and self-sufficient supergroup, and as a result, moderate differences and pejorations. On the other hand, minorities consider themselves as dependent subgroups, and as a result, they exaggerate differences and pejorations. From then on, the movements of assimilation of difference generate ethnocentrism whose effect, on the side of the majority, is excessive conformism, and on the side of the minority, total dissonance.

These perversions of social relations are most often observed in the interactions between the so-called modern majorities and the so-called village or primitive minorities. In these relationships, minorities develop defense strategies against the degradation of their values, customs and habits which are among others: a) the avoidance of questioning which is manifested by the removal of the target of depreciation; b) the concealment of the stigmatized; c) the retreat of the stigmatizer/stigmatized couple; d) the neutralization of the stigmatizer; e) the development of the "polemical identity"; f) the orientation towards compromise. Thus, it appears that the more a group is sensitive to the influence of the other, the more it tends to acculturate, and therefore to innovate.

Explanatory theories

Our research orientation is based on two theories:

1) Moscovici's theory of active minorities (1979) which states that for a minority to be a source of influence and succeed in provoking significant social innovations, it must: a) possess objective and coherent counter-norms; b) be in disagreement with the majority; c) enjoy the social support of a fringe of the majority; d) be motivated to protect itself, to make itself heard, to want and provoke change and adherence to its principles and beliefs; e) be in dissent with the majority. Doms and Moscovici (ibid.: 87) add that "to bring about manifest social changes within the community of which they are a part, individuals or subgroups must have a coherent alternative, actively strive to make themselves visible and to make themselves known through consistent behavior." Thus, social change is determined by the behavioral style of the person proposing a norm to the group.

2) Ludwig's theory of social change (ibid.) which posits that the meaning, direction and outcome of the negotiation of a social conflict depend largely on the nature and quality of the relationships that bind the protagonists. It stipulates in these broad outlines: that in a situation of intercultural contact, the behavior of social groups is essentially a function of the quality of their social relationships and their attitudes toward the object of conflict. Thus, at the end of a social conflict, "social change occurs all the more clearly when groups communicate and have sociocultural

convergences" (Ludwig, 1994: 13) [18]. Considering the conditions of connection and consolidation that make a good social relationship listed by Moser (idem.), Ludwig (idem: 93) then postulates "that a good social relationship between socioculturally different protagonists increases the influence of the minority".

Methodology of the study

We adopted the hypothetico-deductive approach and, taking into account our conceptual and theoretical framework presented above, we formulated a general hypothesis (HG), operationalized into 4 research hypotheses (HR) as it is showed under

Table 1: Summary table of the operationalization of the HG

Hypotheses	Variables	Variable indicators	Modalities of the variables
HG: The visibility of social innovations resulting from the negotiation of the Bantu/Pygmy conflict depends on the conditions of their social relationship	VD: Social innovations	Changes observed in the customs and practices of the Bantu after they have become aware of the Pygmy customs and practices compared with the same social objects	- highly visible - visible - recessive - highly recessive
	VI: Conditions of the social relationship	- physical conditions - cultural conditions - social conditions - economic conditions	- highly satisfactory - satisfactory - unsatisfactory - highly unsatisfactory
HR 1: The visibility of social innovations resulting from the negotiation of the Bantu/Pygmy conflict depends on the physical conditions of their social relationship	VD: same	same	same
	VI: Physical conditions	- spatial distance - contacts and/or opportunities for physical contact - structures and infrastructures	- highly satisfactory – satisfactory - unsatisfactory - highly unsatisfactory
HR 2: The visibility of social innovations resulting from the negotiation of the Bantu/Pygmy conflict depends on the economic conditions of their social relationship	VD: same	same	same
	VI: Economic conditions	- profits generated - financial difficulties generated - activities generated	- highly satisfactory – satisfactory - unsatisfactory - highly unsatisfactory
HR 3: The visibility of social innovations resulting from the negotiation of the Bantu/Pygmy conflict depends on the social conditions of their social relationship	VD: same	same	same
	VI: Social conditions	- social habits induced - social behaviors induced - social organization induced	- highly satisfactory – satisfactory - unsatisfactory - highly unsatisfactory
HR 4: The visibility of social innovations resulting from the negotiation of the Bantu/Pygmy conflict depends on the cultural conditions of their social relationship	VD: same	same	same
	VI: Cultural conditions	- artistic and intellectual Practices induced - beliefs, opinions, feelings ideas attitudes, etc. induced	- highly satisfactory – satisfactory - unsatisfactory - highly unsatisfactory

The research began with a pre-survey. Based on the information collected and the analysis of the content of the recorded speeches, we opted for an opinion poll. Given our availability, we drew, by random and stratified sampling, a sample of 120 individuals from the study population. The empirical data were collected using a pre-coded 32-item questionnaire. This was, in fact, a contextualized version of verbal scales reduced to 4 and based on the Likert (1980) aggregation principle. The subject had to position himself according to his degree of agreement or disagreement on the opinion expressed by the item. Before the actual administration of the questionnaire, we tested it on a hundred Bantus of Eastern Cameroon. This pre-test was followed by a series of two interviews during which we intensified to the maximum the means of analysis of the functioning of the statements of the items, as well as the reactions of the subjects. This allowed us to improve the psychometric qualities of our instrument. Given the intellectual comfort of the subjects, we opted for the questionnaire by interview. The poll rate in the sample was 99.33% and 0.01 % in the population. Once collected, the data were analyzed using SPSS version 15 software

Cross-tabulation						
Number						
		The relationships you have with the pygmies are, on a physical conditions, very satisfactory				Total
		Very true	True	False	Very false	
The innovations brought to your customs and traditions by the pygmies are very visible within your community	Very true	22	5	0	0	27
	True	0	26	0	0	26
	False	0	0	33	0	33
	Very false	0	0	0	34	34
Total		22	31	33	34	120

Chi-square tests			
	value	ddl	Asymptotic significance (two-tailed)
Pearson chi-square	322,007[a]	9	0,000
Likelihood ratio	303,648	9	0,000
Linear by linear association	115,270	1	0,000
Number of valid observations	120		
a. 2 cells (12.5%) have a theoretical sample size less than 5. The minimum theoretical sample size is 4.77			

Results and analysis

1) For HR 1

Symmetrical measures			
		Value	Approximate significance
Nominal by Nominal	Contingency coefficient	0,854	0,000
Number of valid observations		120	
a. The null hypothesis is not considered			
b. Use of the asymptotic standard error in the null hypothesis.			

Thus HR1 is confirmed. There is a very strong contingency link between the visibility of social innovations and the physical conditions of the social relationship

2) For HR2

Cross-tabulation						
Number						
		The relationships you have with the pygmies are, on a economic conditions, very satisfactory				Total
		Very true	True	False	Very false	
The innovations brought to your customs and traditions by the pygmies are very visible within your community	Very true	22	4	0	0	26
	True	0	25	0	0	25
	False	0	2	32	0	34
	Very false	0	0	1	34	35
Total		22	22	31	33	34

Chi-square tests			
	value	ddl	Asymptotic significance (two-tailed)
Pearson chi-square	307,344[a]	9	0,000
Likelihood ratio	282,903	9	0,000
Linear by linear association	113,443	1	0,000
Number of valid observations	120		
a. 2 cells (12.5%) have a theoretical sample size less than 5. The minimum theoretical sample size is 4.58			

Symmetrical measures			
		Value	Approximate significance
Nominal by Nominal	Contingency coefficient	0,848	0,000
Number of valid observations		120	120
a. The null hypothesis is not considered			
b. Use of the asymptotic standard error in the null hypothesis.			

Thus, the HR2 is confirmed. There is a very strong contingency link between the visibility of social innovations and the economic conditions of the social relationship

3) For HR3

Cross-tabulation						
Number						
		The relationships you have with the pygmies are, on a social conditions, very satisfactory				Total
		Very true	True	False	Very false	
The innovations brought to your customs and traditions by the pygmies are very visible within your community	Very true	22	0	0	0	22
	True	0	31	0	0	31
	False	0	0	33	0	33
	Very false	0	0	0	34	34
Total		22	31	33	34	120

Chi-square tests			
	value	Ddl	Asymptotic significance (two-tailed)
Pearson chi-square	360,000[a]	9	0,000
Likelihood ratio	329,523	9	0,000
Linear by linear association	119,000	1	0,000
Number of valid observations	120		
a. 1cells (6,2%) have a theoretical sample size less than 5. The minimum theoretical sample size is 4.03			

Symmetrical measures			
		Value	Approximate significance
Nominal by Nominal	Contingency coefficient	0,866	0,000
Number of valid observations			
a. The null hypothesis is not considered			
b. Use of the asymptotic standard error in the null hypothesis.			

Thus, HR3 is confirmed. There is a very strong contingency link between the visibility of social innovations and the social conditions of the social relationship

4) For HR4

Cross-tabulation						
Number						
		The relationships you have with the pygmies are, on a cultural conditions, very satisfactory				Total
		Very true	True	False	Very false	
The innovations brought to your customs and traditions by the pygmies are very visible within your community	Very true	22	6	0	0	28
	True	0	21	0	0	21
	False	0	4	29	0	33
	Very false	0	0	4	34	38
Total		22	31	33	34	120

Chi-square test			
	value	Ddl	Asymptotic significance (two-tailed)
Pearson chi-square	264,002[a]	9	0,000
Likelihood ratio	250,477	9	0,000
Linear by linear association	108,541	1	0,000
Number of valid observations	120		
a. 1cells (6,2%) have a theoretical sample size less than 5. The minimum theoretical sample size is 3,85.			

Symmetrical measures			
		Value	Approximate significance
Nominal by Nominal	Contingency coefficient	,866	0,000
Number of valid observations			
a. The null hypothesis is not considered			
b. Use of the asymptotic standard error in the null hypothesis.			

Thus, HR4 is confirmed. There is a very strong contingency link between the visibility of social innovations and the cultural conditions of the social relationship.

Interpretation and discussion of the results

Our results can be explained by the fact that the Bantus are hegemonic groups who have their own standards, and who try to impose them on the Pygmy minorities. But, in doing so, they are subjected in return and from the Pygmies, to pressure to make themselves understood or to accept their counter-norms. Thus, the heterodox Pygmy minorities lead the Bantus to completely break with some of their attitudes and beliefs, while the orthodox Pygmy minorities force them to simply adapt them. This change is therefore determined by the consistent behavioral style of the Pygmies which is felt by the majority as an indication of certainty, the expression of a firm will, of a commitment to a coherent choice, dissidence. In addition, the Bantus and the Pygmies live in the same ecosystem. Also, they each maintain specific relationships with modernity, the object of the conflict. They also maintain relationships "to difference" between them which can be positive or negative. But, in all cases, the innovations are important, perceptible and obvious when the sociocultural distance between the two groups is reduced, and vice versa.

But, the critique contextualizes the choice of dissent and social relationship as determinants of minority social influence, and proposes cognitivedissonance, dependence. According to it, the individual (or group), exposed to a new stimulus or situation, acquires a set of behaviors among which some are adequate and others less so. Adequate behaviors will tend to develop and consolidate while inadequate behaviors will tend to disappear. The repetition of this exposure will cause a familiarity effect favorable to innovation (Homans, 1974) [10]. In addition, individuals or groups are attracted to people from whom they can expect positive reinforcements and avoid those who provide them with negative reinforcements. Innovation is therefore the result of a learning process to the extent that an association is formed between the pleasant feeling provided by the behavior of others and the person or group responsible for it (Lott and Lott, 1972) [16].

The critique also maintains that the social relationship is a problem of exchange and interdependence. From then on, the group receives, but also invests in the relationship. Social innovations are therefore determined by the reward and the expectation of reward that results from it (Kelley and Thibault, 1978) [13]. These authors explain that the visibility of the 16 innovations by the feeling of dependence or interdependence felt by the partners. They affirm that any social relationship is a function of the benefits it provides to the group. These benefits are evaluated in relation to the level of expectation of each partner who judges any relationship exceeding this level to be positive. Thus, innovations depend on the satisfaction of both partners, their visibility increases with the increase in rewards, the low cost and the low level of expectation compared to possible alternatives and comparisons (Rusbult, 1980) [35].

Conclusion

In this study, it was a question of determining the reasons for the ambivalence of innovations resulting from the negotiation of the Bantu/Pygmy conflict. At the end of the analyses, we concluded that the social innovations operated by the Bantu majorities are more evident when the relations they maintain with the Pygmy minorities are mutually satisfactory. The quality of the social relationship is thus added to the style of behavior and dissent to increase the influence of the minority. However, the alterations observed and the discussion initiated show the limits of our work and the absolute necessity of deepening it, not only by an extension in the geographical space, but also by taking into account certain parameters, in particular the correlations between all our independent variables, the impact of norms and prejudices, stereotypes, rumor, etc. We could also approach the Pygmy problem from the angle of the public/private paradigm. This deepening could generate strong interesting research that will not only bring more relevance and objectivity to our present conclusions, but will also allow us to rethink and properly address the psychosocial problems concerning the indigenous, bohemian, marginal and/or marginalized primitive groups of Cameroon, in particular the pygmies, this minority whose innovations are denigrated in public and exalted in private.

References

1. Abega SC, Bigombe Logo P. La marginalisation des Pygmées d'Afrique centrale, Maisonneuve et Larousse, Africaine d'édition, 2006.
2. Althabe G. Changements sociaux chez les Pygmées Baka de l'Est-Cameroun, in Cahier des études africaines. 1965; 20:561-592.
3. Asch SE. Les effets de la pression des groupes sur la modification et la distorsion des jugements, in D. Ludwig, Psychologie sociale expérimentale: l'influence sociale, Reims: Université de Reims Champagne Ardenne, 1951.
4. Asch SE. A perspective on social psychology", in S. Koch (editor), Psychology: A study of a science. 1959; 3:363-384.
5. Camilleri C, Vinsonneau G. Psychologie et culture: concepts et méthodes (sous la direction de G. Moser), Paris: Armand Colin, 1996.
6. Deschamps C. L'identité sociale et les rapports de domination (suivis de réponses, commentaires et critiques), Revue Suisse de Sociologie. 1980; 25:109-140.
7. Festinger L. Théorie des processus de comparaison sociale, in C. Faucheux et S. Moscovici (1972), Psychologie sociale théorique et expérimentale, Paris: Mouton, 1954.
8. Festinger L. Cognitive Consequences of Forced Compliance. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 1959; 58:203-210.
9. Fischer G-N. Les concepts fondamentaux de la psychologie sociale, 2e édition, Paris: Dunod, 1996.
10. Homans GC. Social Behaviour: its Elementary Form, New-York: Harcourt Brace Yoranovich, 1974.
11. Jones EE. Conformity and Tactic of Integration. Sciences. 1965; 149:144-150.
12. Kazadi M. Méprisés et admirés: l'ambivalence des relations entre les Bacwa et les Bahemba, Africa Politique. 1981; 69:15-25.
13. Kelly HH, Thibault JW. Interpersonal Relation. A Theory of Independence, New-York: Willey, 1978.
14. Lemaine G. Inégalité, comparaison, incompatibilité: esquisse d'une théorie de l'originalité sociale, Bull. de Psychol. 1966; 20:17-52.

15. Likert R. New Patterns of Management. New-York: McGrawHill, 1980.
16. Lott AJ, Lott BE. The Power of Linking: Consequences of Intrepersonnal Attitudes Derived from a Liberalized View of Secondary Reinforcement, Advance in Experimental Social Psychology. 1972; 6:109-148
17. Ludwig D. Psychologie sociale expérimentale, Reims: Université de Reims Champagne Ardenne, 1993.
18. Ludwig D. L'influence sociale: le point de vue interculturel, Reims: Université de Reims Champagne Ardenne, 1994.
19. Marc C, Picard D. L'interaction sociale, Paris: PUF, 1989.
20. Moreland C, Levine JM. Socialization in Small Groups: Temporal Changes in Individual Group Relation, in L. Berkowitz, Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (vol. 15), New-York Academic Press, 1982.
21. Moscovici S. Introduction à la psychologie sociale, vol. 2, les décisions collectives, Paris: Larousse, 1973.
22. Moscovici S. Psychologie des minorités actives, Paris: PUF, 1979.
23. Moscovici S. Psychologie des relations à autrui, Paris: Nathan université, 1994.
24. Moscovici S, Lage E. L'influence minoritaire dans un contexte d'originalité des jugements, Sociometry. 1975; 32:365-379.
25. Moscovici S, Neve R. Study in Social Influence. Those Absent are in Right: Convergence and Polarization of Answers in Course of Social Interaction, European Journal of Social Psychology. 1971; 31:370-376.
26. Moser G. Les relations interpersonnelles, Paris: PUF, 1994.
27. Mugny G. Importance de la consistance dans l'influence de communication minoritaire « congruentes » et « incongruentes» sur des jugements d'opinions, E.P.S.E: Université de Genève, 1974a.
28. Mugny G. Notes sur le style de comportement rigide, E.P.S.E: Université de Genève, 1974b.
29. Mugny G. Majorité et Minorité: Le niveau de leur influence, Université E.P.S.E.de Genève, 1974c.
30. Mugny G. Négociation et influence minoritaire, E.P.S.E: Université de Genève, 1973.
31. Ouellet A. Processus de recherche. Une introduction à la méthodologie de la recherche, 2e édition, Bruxelles P.U.G, 1999.
32. Paicheler G, Bouchet Y. Attitude Polarization, Familiarization and Groups Process, European Journal of Personality. 1973; 3(1):83-90.
33. Ricateau P. Processus de catégorisation d'autrui et les mécanismes d'influence sociale, Bull. de Psychol. 1971; 24:909-916.
34. Rogers EM, Shocmaker FF. Communication of Innovation. A Cross-Cultural Approach, New-York: Free Press, 1971.
35. Rusbult CE. A Longitudinal Test of the Investment Model: The Development (and deterioration) of Satisfaction and Commitment in Heterosexual Involvement, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 1980; 45:110-117.
36. SheriF M. Influence réciproque et normalisation », Bull. du CERP. 1971; 3,4:237-253.
37. Thomas JMC. Emprunt ou parenté ? À propos des parlers des populations forestières de Centrafrique, Paris: Selaf, 1979.
38. Thuret M. Sédentarisation des Pygmées Aka-Mbenzele et discours identitaires, Paris: E.H.E.S.S, 1996.
39. Vinsonneau G. Appartenances culturelles et sub-culturelles, inégalités sociales et variation des expressions identitaires. Études expérimentales réalisées parmi quelques populations en position sociale affaiblissantes, Thèse de Doctorat D'État (non publiée), Paris V, 1993.
40. Voiris V. Les peuples des forêts tropicales, systèmes traditionnels et développement rural en Afrique Centrale, Grande Amazonie et Asie du Sud-Est, Bruxelles: PUG, 1997.