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Abstract

This chapter concerns an exploratory survey conducted both in Turkey and the UK to find out more about the little researched contemporary lives of the relatively marginalised transnational Alevi community. By conducting the survey in both countries the aim was to describe the lives of Alevis in each, as well as to compare those who migrate with those who stay in Turkey. The main themes of the survey were demographic characteristics, family life, migration, identity, social activities and transnational connections. The case focuses on the challenges experienced in designing one survey to describe a transnational community which could be used in both Turkey and the UK. These include issues of questionnaire design, the best method of administering the survey, and how to access participants, particularly when they are suspicious of your motives, as well as the ethical, political, technical and practical issues to be faced at all stages of the research process and required of a successful survey. The chapter describes the issues arising at different stages of the research and the technical difficulties resulting from using Turkish and English language versions of the survey. It also reflects on the expectation gap between what the community imagined a survey on Alevis would cover and its actual content. Through presenting this research and the challenges we faced we hope students will better understand the complexities of doing surveys and can avoid some of the pitfalls associated with research on transnational migrant communities.

Learning Outcomes

By the end of this chapter, students should be able to:

1. identity and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of using an exploratory survey to gain an understanding of the characteristics of a community which has been little researched;
2. outline the practical steps involved in the design and analysis of a transnational survey;
3. identify the problems involved in selecting a sample from a population about which there is little information and explain how they might be overcome;
4. explain the necessity of appropriately operationalising concepts in survey research;
5. identify the ethical and political dilemmas of survey research and explain how they might be addressed;
6. explain why the aims of a survey may be perceived differently from the perspective of the researchers and the respondents and describe how this might affect the survey results.

Case Study

**Background to the Project**

Research never occurs in a vacuum and decisions about what to research and how to conduct it usually arise from the researchers’ interests in particular issues and from particular political and theoretical perspectives (Gomm, 2003). The research discussed here follows on from previous qualitative research conducted by sociologists at the University of Westminster with and for the London Alevi ethno-religious community[[1]](#footnote-1). Cetin (2016) conducted an ethnographic study of the high rates of suicide amongst young men within this community in the early 2000s which highlighted the anomic condition of the second generation[[2]](#footnote-2) and the need to address the community’s sense of marginalisation. This was followed by an action research[[3]](#footnote-3) project in collaboration with the community who were concerned about the perceived ‘negative identity’ of Alevi youth (Jenkins & Cetin, 2017). A key issue raised by the young people was that they felt that nobody knew about their religion so they wanted Alevism to be included in Religious Education (RE) classes. We collaborated with local schools to provide such lessons, lessons which significantly contributed to a greater sense of belonging for the Alevi pupils in school. The RE lessons also had an impact on the Alevi communities in the UK and Turkey and their campaign for greater inclusion and recognition of Alevis in both societies. It was this that provided the motivation to conduct a survey to find out more about the Alevi communities in the UK and Turkey and how they interact. Sociologists from the University of Westminster together with two academics from Kocaeli University in Turkey applied for research funding to conduct an exploratory transnational survey. This chapter will discuss the different stages of the research process and concentrate on the practical, political, ethical and technical challenges of designing, conducting and analysing an exploratory transnational survey of the Alevi community in London and Turkey.

**Why choose the survey method?**

The main reason for conducting a survey is to gather as much information as possible in order to provide a snapshot of facts about the participants, such as their age, gender, occupation, etc. and their behaviour and attitudes, at the moment in time when the survey is conducted (de Vaus, 2014). Typically surveys can be descriptive, explanatory or both, and tend to be conducted on a large-scale aiming to be representative of the population as a whole. A literature search revealed that what previous research there was on Alevi communities was qualitative and small-scale such as Shankland’s (2003) anthropological study of an Alevi village in Turkey, Sokefeld’s (2008) ethnography of the Alevi community in Germany and Geaves’ (2003) research on Alevis in London. However, the need to gather information from as many Alevis as possible ruled out conducting qualitative research and pointed towards a survey as the most appropriate method, albeit one that would be relatively small scale and exploratory although larger than could be achieved using a qualitative methodology. Whilst qualitative research is often associated with exploratory research where little is known about what is being researched, in fact surveys still have a role. In this regard it is worth noting that there is a tendency in research methods textbooks to represent quantitative and qualitative research as lying at opposite ends of the theoretical and empirical spectrum but as Bryman (2016) points out the differences between them can be much reduced in the process of actually doing research.

The key aim of the survey was to gain an insight into the lives of the Alevi communities both in Turkey and the UK and to be able to produce transnational data capable of generating a fuller description of them than is currently available. The current lack of such data arises largely because they are a relatively marginalisedcommunity both in Turkey and the UK, although for different reasons. Alevis are discriminated against on religious grounds in Turkey where, despite in theory having no official state religion, the majority of the population is Sunni Muslim and Islam has been the main reference point for citizenship and national identity, resulting in a history of persecution. In the UK, the first-generation Alevi migrants were predominantly asylum seekers escapingpersecution in Turkey and because they came from Turkey most British people assumed they were ethnically Turkish or Kurdish, and therefore Muslim, and subsumed them under these identities. Moreover, many Alevis in the UK were, and remain, anxious about disclosing their Alevi identity in case they are subject to discrimination here too.

The survey aimed to describe the Alevis through identifying patterns of Alevi family and kinship, and by mapping their migration pathways and settlement in the UK. In particular, we wanted to know if their patterns of settlement in the UK were influenced by their place of origin in Turkey and to produce the first maps of the community. The main themes we introduced to describe the community concerned their family life, educational backgrounds and current occupations, an exploration of their sense of identity and belonging within and between the two countries, and an assessment of the strength of their familial, social, political, cultural and religious connections locally and transnationally. Moreover, we wanted to find out whether gender and generation were factors affecting their experience and integration in Turkey and the UK. Finally there was a more practical aim to the survey which went beyond the purely academic. This was to help the UK Alevi community present a convincing case to be treated as a separate religious group in the UK National Census for which they needed some proof of the size of the community and to describe its main characteristics and religious identity.[[4]](#footnote-4) For these reasons, the survey aimed to discover as much information as possible about the community including how many Alevis live in the UK along with the sort of data that the Census normally provides about households. However, it was recognised from the start that the survey had to have a limited ambition and would be small scale and exploratory since so little was known about this community to begin with.

**Designing the Survey**

In doing research with any community, especially when they have requested assistance, it is vitally important to listen to their assessment of the issues and what they want to achieve from the research, otherwise it is too easy to come in with expert knowledge, take over and possibly cause them distress or harm. In this research we adopted an anti-discriminatory perspective which meant that it was collaborative, resisting power relations that often exist between the research ‘experts’ and the ‘researched’, and entailed working together with the community at all stages of the research to ensure that it met their needs and served their interests (Truman, 2004).

In designing the survey, we soon discovered significant and unexpected conceptual, political, ethical, practical and technical challenges. As already noted the survey had a practical aim to provide evidence from the UK community to support the case for their inclusion in the National Census and so we needed to design the survey in a way that closely mirrored the Census with regard to household information as well as including specific issues around Alevi religion and identity. However, as you may know, the Census is a very long questionnaire which only runs every ten years[[5]](#footnote-5) and thus we could not hope to reproduce this amount of detail to describe the Alevi community. Therefore, we immediately encountered the problem of deciding which were the most important questions to ask. The scale of the problem was evident in our first draft which contained 185 questions (84 pages). Like the Census, it was divided into two sections: one only for the head of household who was asked to describe who lived in the house and give details about the property type and ownership, etc.; and one for individual members in the household to complete about their migration, education, employment, health, leisure and transnational connections. The heads of households completed both sections while everyone else completed only the second. When we ran a pilot study[[6]](#footnote-6) our biggest problem was that our participants rapidly lost interest in completing it because of its length. Similarly, when we conducted the survey in Turkey, participants also complained about the length of the survey. Despite cutting it significantly to 103 questions for the English version, with lots of skip questions[[7]](#footnote-7), it was, as we later found, still far too long and rumours quickly spread about how time consuming it was to complete and this became one of the main issues that put people off from participating in the research.

Along with questions that mirrored the National Census, we needed specific questions about Alevi religion and identity and also questions concerning migration and generational differences. With regard to the latter we had formed a number of hypotheses concerning generational differences in relation to integration and the strength of transnational connections. In deciding what questions to ask it was necessary to operationalise our concepts so that we could test these hypotheses (de Vaus, 2014).[[8]](#footnote-8) Let us look at the concept of ‘generation’.

In migration research, the concept of generation is never clear-cut in terms of what divides one generation from another. However, there is more of a consensus that first generation refers to the persons who arrive in the country of settlement as adults while the second generation refers to people who were born in the country of settlement or migrate as children (Rumbaut 2004). This survey also adopted Rumbaut’s definition of generational differences so the second-generation Alevis were defined as either born here or came to the UK at a young age with their parents and were educated here. Through having access to education, they could speak the language and had access to different opportunities and experiences which could affect their level of integration into British society when compared to their first-generation peers. In relation to issues of religious identity, community integration and transnational connections concepts were operationalised via a series of questions about such things as the frequency of attendance at religious ceremonies, whether respondents socialised with other Alevis, and how often they talked through social media with family in Turkey.

**Selecting the Sample**

The first problem we encountered in developing our survey was the absence of any prior research data or reliable official statistics on the Alevi community with regards to location, numbers or characteristics. The majority of the Alevi community come from Turkey and despite being the second largest minority in that country, with approximately 20 million out of a total population of 75 million (Erol 2012), they have never been officially recognised there and appear in official statistics in Turkey as ethnically Turkish and religiously Muslim (Karakaya-Stump, 2017). This meant that when they migrated to the UK they were also classified as Turkish and Muslim. It was therefore impossible to establish sampling frames (that is a list of the members of the population) from which to select our samples in Turkey and London and therefore impossible to assemble a representative sample.[[9]](#footnote-9)

**Challenges in Accessing Participants for the Research**

In the absence of a sampling frame both in Turkey and the UK, samples were selected through non-probability sampling (de Vaus, 2014). In view of the increasingly sensitive political situation in Turkey, key informants were used to identify participants. These are people with influence in the community who can be trusted to vouch for the researchers’ good intentions and put them in contact with participants (Payne and Payne 2004). The survey was conducted first in 2015 in two Alevi regions in Central Turkey. In one area, one of the researchers was an Alevi and had family living there, hence he could be counted as an ‘insider’ or member of the community. For this reason, it was expected that as people knew him they would be more willing to participate. However, this was not straightforwardly the case because the researcher was also seen as an ‘outsider’ (Song and Parker, 1995). His status had changed because he had migrated to the UK and thus in the village was seen as ‘English’, especially as he was working for a UK university. Despite knowing the researcher, a rumour went around the village saying that the information was being collected for the British Government and would be used to stop them getting financial support from relatives abroad.

You can imagine how much harder it was for the non-Alevi researcher who was even more of an ‘outsider’. He relied upon a key informant to introduce him but he too was viewed with suspicion, making it more difficult to find people willing to participate. He tried to overcome this challenge by giving a public talk to the community prior to conducting the survey in which he explained why the questions were being asked. Even so, one elderly man accused him of identifying Alevis so that he could ‘mark their doors’[[10]](#footnote-10) to single them out for discrimination because historically this had been their experience. The point here is that in terms of ease of gaining access to research participants, the researcher’s identity is not fixed and depends on the context as to whether they are seen as an ‘insider’ or an ‘outsider’ (Song and Parker, 1995). Given these difficulties, and for reasons already explained, it was never going to be possible to assemble a representative sample and in the end we had to settle for a modest 45 Alevi participants in the Turkey sample. However, this provided us with much data which allowed us to develop a sense of family life and their interdependence with family members in other parts of Turkey and abroad.

Originally, it was our intention to administer the survey through face-to-face interviews in both London and Turkey, especially as it would have been considered impolite in Turkey to get participants to fill in a questionnaire when many of them had only limited literacy and digital skills. We also found out through feedback from the Turkey sample that the respondents had been uncomfortable answering many of the more personal questions and therefore decided for the UK survey that it would be easier for the participants to complete the survey by themselves thus avoiding any such embarrassment. Prospective respondents were selected from two different areas in London (Hackney and Enfield) where there was a sizeable Alevi community with the intention of interviewing 150 people using volunteers from the community to help us. However, we thought it might be quicker and easier if we also put the UK survey online. The advantages of this approach was the hope of achieving a larger sample by extending it beyond London to Alevi communities across the UK which also offered the possibility of gaining a better estimate of the size of the UK Alevi population. We anticipated that by advertising the survey and providing access to it through the Britain Alevi Federation and community centre websites, participants would also be less suspicious of our motives. In the end a few interviews were conducted face to face but the majority of the questionnaires were administered through self-completion online.

Although we were confident of the support of the community in doing the survey, both because we were doing it as part of their campaign for inclusion in the Census and also because we already had a good relationship through our previous research, nevertheless we still encountered some of the same suspicions about our motives expressed by the Turkish sample. As a result rumours started to spread that we would pass the information on to the government and therefore people should not participate. As a further obstacle, in one community centre where internal political divisions had emerged whilst we were conducting the research, the research became identified with one faction which meant the non-participation from the other despite our best attempts to engage with them. This inevitably further reduced the response rate and our final UK sample consisted of 227 participants.[[11]](#footnote-11) This was however considerably more than the 150 originally proposed but still not as many as we had hoped to have achieved by putting it online.

Two particular types of bias arose from the online administration of the survey and the non-probability accidental sample that it produced. The first was a generational one: being more digitally literate, 68% of the participants were in the 35-54 age group. This meant that we had a younger age group than might have been achieved through interviews. The second bias occurred because of the promotion of the survey through the Britain Alevi Federation and community centres which meant that a large number of respondents were inevitably already involved with the cultural and religious aspects of Alevism and thus the survey did not reach Alevis who are not connected with the community. This clearly affected the picture we obtained of the level of community involvement and integration.

**Managing the expectation gap**

A problem we had not anticipated, because we had consulted closely with the community about the aims and content of the survey, was the creation of an expectation gap about what the survey should be about. The community had largely expected the survey to concentrate on, and in fact be a means of affirming, their ethno-religious identity and so thought that the questions should all be about the content of Alevi identity, beliefs and practices. Of course we did include sections on identity, with questions addressing the languages spoken at home, national identity and religious and cultural practices, but the majority of the survey questions (mirroring the National Census) were more about the respondents’ everyday lives such as questions on employment status, housing and financial status, something which they saw as particularly irrelevant and even intrusive. On reflection, we now feel that the aims and purpose of the survey were not made clear enough in the way we originally set them out, allowing this expectation gap to occur.

This returns us to our earlier point about the importance of the community being actively involved in the research process and the need to gain their cooperation and demonstrate the benefits of the research. However, there is a delicate balance to be struck here and there can be a tension between academic and local expectations. Inevitably, this tension is more acute in a survey where the researchers have the power to decide what questions to include. This can be frustrating for the community when these questions do not seem relevant to them in giving them a voice. A consequence of this expectation gap was the lower participation rate than might have been possible which made it less easy to make an accurate estimate of the size of the community. More positively, and to redress this balance, we have now produced a leaflet in Turkish summarising the key findings and as a result of the dissemination of the findings from our survey at community events, we are currently receiving further feedback indicating that the community does want us to produce a revised version of the survey to continue this work. We are consulting with them about what changes they want to see and which questions they want to include with a view to producing a much shorter survey that might attract many more participants.

**Ethical, practical and technical issues**

In order to make sure that research is conducted ethically, professional associations like the British Sociological Association (2017) produce ethical guidelines for research. Additionally, universities require researchers to submit proposals for approval by an ethics committee. Following standard procedure, we introduced the survey to prospective respondents so that we could secure the informed consent of participants by explaining the reasons for conducting the research and how we would use the data, ensuring confidentiality and anonymity. We explained that some questions were sensitive and need not be answered if respondents did not want to. However, it was our online survey which posed particular ethical dilemmas associated with collecting so much personal data about the participants online. In particular, ethical approval was delayed until we could find a way of satisfying data protection concerns and here ethical concerns became centred on technical issues.

Originally, we had separated the survey into two parts with the head of household section as Part 1 and the individual section as Part 2 but the ethics committee advised us that the UK survey had to be divided into three parts because we had asked for participants’ postcodes in order to map where Alevis are living, but this is highly sensitive data. They suggested that this question should be in a separate section asking only if the participants were Alevi and to state their postcode. Respondents then had to continue to the next section (Part 2 for heads of households or Part 3 for individual members) through a separate link where they had to copy an identifier code from Part 1 in order to fill in the rest of the survey. This would keep the data linked for the researchers but not for anyone attempting to hack into the data. Whilst this protected the identity of the respondents, in practice it meant that we lost a lot of potential participants who thought that Part 1 was the complete survey and did not realise that they had to continue to Parts 2 and 3 to complete it. Over 500 participants completed Part 1 but this fell to 227 for Parts 2 and 3 which contained by far the most questions. Whilst this was disappointing for us, protection of the participants’ data was paramount.

**Analysing and comparing the Turkish and UK data**

As already explained, the survey was conducted first in Turkey in 2015 and following the feedback on the length of the survey the English survey was cut by more than a third. This meant that we ended up with more detail about the Turkey sample than the English one which made the comparison between the two more difficult. The need to make the UK survey available in Turkish as well as in English in order to reach participants who might find it difficult to complete it in English produced further difficulties. As a result we ended up with three surveys to analyse: the Turkey survey, the UK Turkish version and the UK English version. Whilst the decision to produce a Turkish version of the UK survey proved a good one — many more participants completed it in Turkish than if had it been in English alone and also incidentally prevented the sample from being skewed towards participants with a high level of English literacy —, this however generated many difficulties in merging the two UK versions of the survey and in analysing the data. After its administration it became clear that there were discrepancies in the numbering and sequencing of questions between the two language questionnaires. For example, in Turkish, there is an extra category of uncles and aunts depending on whether they are from the maternal or paternal side of the family which does not exist in English. This meant there were two more possible responses in the Turkish version compared to the English with the consequence that on merging the two surveys the responses did not match up. This was resolved by merging the two categories in the Turkish version into one to match the UK version and then merging the surveys. However, this meant considerable extra time and effort in combining and preparing the data for download into a statistical package such as SPSS.

Further difficulties arose with design faults in the questionnaire despite piloting it before releasing the final survey. Firstly, there were a number of open questions to which participants gave answers in different formats making them very hard to compare. For example, the question asking for the postcode was left blank for participants to complete rather than supplying six boxes for them to insert the letters and numbers of their postcode. This resulted in some giving the full postcode, some only the first part, and some stating the area where they lived with greater or less detail (for example a London borough or just an area in the borough)[[12]](#footnote-12). This made it much harder to map the precise areas of settlement of participants because the software required the full postcodes. We lost a lot of useful data by asking for postcodes in this imprecise way. In addition, we did not ask for the house number, which meant that we had no way of matching the responses of the heads of households with the responses of the individual members of the same households. Respondents giving the same postcode might or might not live in the same house as several houses were covered by a single postcode. This meant that we were unable to easily compare data within and across households.

We also experienced difficulties with the two sections of the questionnaire, one only for heads of households to complete and the other for everyone to complete. In the heads of household section we asked for gender and age and then asked the same questions in the individual section but ensuring that those who had completed the heads of household section skipped those questions when they came to the individual section. This created difficulties because the gender and age of the respondents were split between the first part of the survey for heads of households and the second part of the survey for everyone else making it difficult to compare these variables with others across the survey. We solved this problem by merging the gender questions from each section into a new single question for the sample as a whole and did the same for age. In this way, we could use gender and age as a variable to compare with other questions such as education, occupation, and identity for statistical purposes.

**Evaluation of the survey**

This exploratory survey took over two years to design, conduct and analyse giving us an appreciation of the care that must be taken to prepare and administer a survey that is fit for purpose. In the process, we generated a large amount of useful data from both the UK and Turkey surveys which can be used both separately to gain an insight into the lives of the Alevi community in each country and together to compare their different experiences and opportunities afforded by transnational migration or by staying at home. Our survey does not have the advantages of a larger survey but this was not the point at this stage. We have established that we need to make sure we have clearer aims for the final survey and realise that we were over ambitious in our initial aims of the research. We recognise that in revising the survey we need a clearer sense of what the community want to know and how the information obtained will serve their needs. We have produced a leaflet to disseminate the findings back to the community and to request their feedback on how we might generate a bigger sample and produce questions that can describe the community as a whole. Fortunately we are finding considerable enthusiasm to continue with the survey. Collaborative action research is a process and we continue to value the mutual knowledge, respect and usefulness gained from working together to promote social inclusion and social justice. We continue to work together to decide the future of the survey and feel that as result of doing this exploratory study, we can overcome many of the difficulties we might experience next time around. We continue to support the Alevi cause in Turkey and the UK and the case for the Alevis to be included in the 2031 census.

We hope that you have found this case study interesting and useful in identifying both the value and pitfalls of conducting surveys transnationally and on a marginalised community.

Exercises and Discussion Questions

1. What are the advantages and disadvantages of choosing a survey method rather than an ethnographic study to gain information about a community like the Alevis where there is little prior research?
2. How do you describe a community sociologically? Individually, think about what you would define as your community (ethnic or religious?) and how you would describe it to others?
3. If you were researching a community about which little was known, what sort of questions would you want to ask?
4. What were the ethical and political problems encountered in doing this research?
5. Identify the main pitfalls in this survey and how you might overcome them?
6. When doing research how important is it to explain the purpose of the research to those who are being researched and how much should the research be guided by their wishes and expectations? What problems might arise?
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1. Alevis are a distinct ethno-religious group, mostly coming from Turkey, who have historically suffered persecution and attempts at both assimilation and exclusion in that country. They first started coming to London in the late 1980s often, but by no means exclusively, as asylum seekers. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Cetin uses Durkheim’s concept of anomie to explain the suicidal behaviour of the second-generation Alevi young men. This arises from their detachment from the ties that bind people to each other and society which would normally prevent someone from taking their own life. He identifies the following factors as contributing to the anomic condition: underachievement and dropping out at school; involvement in violence, gangs and drugs; unemployment or low paid work; failed personal relationships with girlfriends and distance from the family and ethnic community. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Action research is literally research in action, meaning that there are three stages to it: firstly background research to identify the problem, secondly the introduction of a strategy to solve the problem, and finally monitoring and evaluating the outcomes to see if the solution works (Truman, 2004) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. see for example the case for the Sikh community’s recognition as a distinct ethnic as well as a religious community <http://www.britishsikhreport.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/British-Sikh-Report-2015.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. By law, each household must complete the detailed questions about who lives there, what type of housing, what each member of the household is doing, their financial status, education, employment, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. A pilot study is a test run of the questionnaire before actually conducting it to check if the questions are clear and unambiguous and if any problems arise in understanding them or any technical issue with, for example, being able to insert answers, follow instructions, etc. The pilot study is conducted on a smaller sample of participants who are typical of the people who will be completing the questionnaire and they are asked to answer the questions and feedback their opinions about the questions and any other issues that arise. The researchers can then review and amend the questionnaire before conducting it on the final sample population and thereby avoid making any obvious mistakes (Bryman, 2016). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. For example: “Do you have any children? If not then skip to the next section”. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. This refers to the process of translating concepts (such as generational difference, religious identity and observance, community integration, transnational connections) into measurable indicators (such as place of birth and where educated for generation; and social, familial and business contacts with Turkey, voting in Turkish elections and usage of Turkish media for transnational connections). [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. In order to achieve a representative sample where every participant stands an equal chance of being selected, probability sampling is the best approach. However, this requires a sampling frame which is an official list of the participants such as from the electoral (voting) register or the postal address register of where people live (Bryman, 2016). [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Alevis’ doors were marked and houses identified the night before the massacre of Alevis at Maras in 1978 undertaken by ultra nationalists and religious fundamentalists with the tacit support of the Turkish state. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. As we explain later over 500 participants started to complete the survey but only 227 went on to complete the most important parts of it which could be used for analysis. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. In fact this was not only a technical problem since some of those respondents who were suspicious of our motives in conducting the survey did not want to give their full postcode even though we had explained carefully that we needed the precise information to be able to produce a map of the community. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)