The quantitative part of our study is based on a survey of 8 pages and 56 questions; the English version is reproduced at the end of this appendix. Although heavily inspired both from questions used by Sommier and Agrikoliansky (2005) and Della Porta (2009), and for some of them from the World Values Survey, the conception of the questionnaire was also collective within the research team, in order to address issues relative to specific national contexts (for instance, what could be the questions measuring religious practice when comparing someone praying five times a day, like a pious Muslim, to someone going once a week to his place of worship – which in France would mean a strong adhesion to Catholicism?).

The questionnaire included a large biographical portion pertaining to the respondent’s international experience, funding of travel expenses, position in the organization, status as an employee (or not) of an NGO, etc. The multinational composition of the research team (48 researchers, from the final year of master's degree to academics, from 8 nationalities1), along with our attention to linguistic diversity, guaranteed not only the extensive reach of the study but also its acceptance by an activist audience sometimes eager to denounce ethnocentrism. It also gave rise to numerous heuristic debates over the coding of socio-professional categories, which corresponded to different realities depending on the nationalities surveyed.

To achieve a balance among respondents and keep away from highlighting English- and French-speaking participants, we conceived and distributed the questionnaire in five languages: English, French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Wolof (the national language of Senegal). This meant planning both self-administered and administered questionnaires (since speaking only Wolof is more or less equivalent to being illiterate and therefore being unable to even read Wolof).

Between February 6th (opening ceremony and inauguration march) and the 11th, the questionnaire was handed out to nearly 1,100 people: this meant that every member of the team had to administrate around 25

---

1 Mostly from France and Senegal, but also from Algeria, Italy, Australia, Mexico, Ecuador, and Colombia.
questionnaires in 6 days, which was the guarantee of a quality work as the questionnaire was particularly long (56 questions, 305 variables), and also allowed the team member to carry out their own research through interviews, observation, and ethnography.

The administration of the questionnaire was twofold, as it was a theoretical choice to avoid overselecting academically inclined participants at the event, and therefore we administered the questionnaire either at workshops or at other forum locations.

A selection was done of surveying 100 of the nearly 900 workshops in the program, trying to respect the thematic and geographic proportions in the sample. If a workshop was canceled the pollsters would call their referent to have another attributed. Once in the room or under the tent, in order to avoid the classical biases of selecting participants who the pollsters would feel close to (in terms of gender, race, class, age, etc.), each pollster had to use a set of random routines to select the persons to whom the questionnaires would be addressed. Choosing first a person waiting at the beginning, then the 5th nearest to the door, in the case of refusal his/her neighbor near the door, and that twice again. Once the workshop had begun, beginning with the second rank from the left, in the case of refusal his/her neighbor, and again in the case of refusal; then 4th rank on from the right, in the case of refusal his/her neighbor, and again in the case of refusal; then 6th rank in the middle, in the case of refusal his/her neighbor, and again in the case of refusal; then back to the 8th rank on the left, etc. Everyone had learned the same sentence in five languages to explain the survey to the interviewee: “Hello, I am participating in a collective research from the universities of Dakar, Paris Sorbonne, and Saint-Louis. Would you mind answering this questionnaire?” (if yes) “My questions will bear on your trajectory, your participation to the World Social Forum and social movements, your perception of social struggles.” Everyone had learned the same sentences in four languages at least.

Another part of the survey was directed to people outside the workshops, either in marches, resting places or small food shops. Another routine was adopted then to select the interviewees. During marches one had to select the 5th person counted before a banner, and then his/her neighbor if he/she refused to answer. For other places a route had to be chosen, the pollster had to stop after three drinking/eating places, to poll the person who had just paid, then his/her neighbor if he/she refused to answer, then to stop after three free rest places (under a tree, on a bank or stairs, or on the side of the road, interviewing the first person at the right of a group, and then the next; then stop after three activist stands, 3rd person on the left,
etc.; then stop after three sales outlets, poll the person who had just paid, and then back to the routine of the beginning. Pollsters had to present themselves with this sentence, memorized in the five languages: “Hello, are you here for the Forum?” (if yes) “I am participating in a collective research from the universities of Dakar, Paris Sorbonne, and Saint-Louis. Would you mind answering this questionnaire?” (if yes) “My questions will bear on your trajectory, your participation to the World Social Forum and social movements, your perception of social struggles.”

At the beginning of the interview, one had to follow the formulation of the questions strictly in the order of the questionnaire. Then, and only if the interviewee said he/she did not understand, the meaning of a question could be explained.

It is important to note that the opposition between surveying in and outside workshops is not exactly the same as between administered and self-administered questionnaires, even if people preferred to fill out the questionnaires in workshops in order not to bother others. But typically, a Wolof speaker would need to answer questions from a Wolof speaking pollster, talking discreetly. On the other hand, some people preferred to fill out the questionnaires themselves while having a drink outside, for instance.

Each anonymous questionnaire was stamped as “self-administered” (if the person had filled it out alone) or “administered,” mentioning the workshop where it had been collected (which authorized specific exploitations), if it included annotations (this often happened in self-administered questionnaires, the usual mode of administration in workshop, where people sit, take notes...).

Each evening, every pollster (including the editors of this book) gave back their questionnaires, indicating his/her name, the proportion of administered and self-administered questionnaires, the total number of persons solicited (in order to estimate the response rate, which was 73%), and indicated the difficulties and reactions to the survey, which were analyzed during the collective evening debriefings.

We would finally like to underline the value of multinational research teams combined to a lack of more plentiful funding, which obliged us to keep the division of labor to a minimum within our research group. These moments of scientific and communitarian utopia, marked by shared enthusiasm, helped to create a really committed research team, in which everyone had done some coding... A good way of keeping in mind all the steps of the scientific approach!

---

2 In order to poll people who identified with the WSF even if not being in the workshops.