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**Appendix**

**Surveying Protest Participants and Non-participants *in situ***

In a moving demonstration (march), three pointers, each accompanied by a team of interviewers, are distributed to cover the front, the middle and the back of protesting group. To ensure a fair dispersion of questionnaires over the marching column, pointers count the rows of participants in the moving cortege, selecting every nth row, to ensure that the same number of rows is skipped throughout the demonstration, so that the whole procession is covered (Klandermans et al 2010). During standing demonstrations (rallies) three pointers distribute interviewers around the square where the protest event is taking place. Hence, the crowd and space of a standing demonstration was always divided into three sampling areas. Pointers instructed their interviewers to survey from the outer circle in the direction of the center of the square. As pointers walked toward the center of the square they need to count their steps and assign another surveyor every n-steps, increasing the number of steps as they approached the center. Pointers sent out interviewers to the left and the right of the ‘line’ he is following, and interviewers were spread more to the left and right at the edge of the crowd than in the center. Pointer could also decide to start ‘back-to-back’ at the center of a square and spread themselves from the center to the periphery of the crowd of the crowd, diminishing the number of steps towards the periphery of the group. Finally, when the crowd was in a rectangular square or broad avenue pointers counted lines of protestors to assign surveyors similar to the method they followed during moving demonstrations (marches). The area was divided into three survey areas and each pointer went through the crowd counting lines of protestors and sent out interviewers to the left and the right of this middle line. They could start covering the crowd from the front to the back and from left to right or from the back of the front and from right to left.

**Surveyed Demonstrations**

***Commemoration of the 1968 Student Movement***

The annual commemoration of the 1968 student movement takes place on October 2. Every year the ideals and victims of the movement are remembered. Over the years the movement has fought for more transparency and participation not only in university life but also in national politics. It is considered the movement that gave birth to the struggle for democracy and human rights in the country (Trevizo 2011), as the disappearance and death of so many students brought the demands for an independent investigation and justice against brutal state repression to the forefront of the movement’s agenda. Since then, each year, surviving leaders and students of the 1968 movement, together with their sympathizers and supporters, hold a rally in the Tlatelolco Plaza and march to Mexico City’s central square to commemorate the movement’s demands and remember its martyrs. In 2011, when the event was surveyed, the press reported that thousands of people participated and that the event was heavily policed.[[1]](#footnote-1) The event lasted 4 hours and involved the blocking of Eje Central, one of the major avenues in the city.

***May Day Rallies***

Since 1925, Mexico’s workers have joined other movements around the world for the annual commemoration of International Workers’ Day, May 1. The yearly commemorative rally has been used by the corporatist labor movement to show its strength in numbers. With the emergence of union dissidence, the event has included the participation of independent unionists. In 2012, when May Day was surveyed, both sets of rival union federations and confederations took their turns holding separate rallies in the Mexico City’s central square, the *zócalo*. Official unions affiliated with the PRI rallied first. They left the square an hour before independent unionists arrived through a parallel street. The press reported that about 20,000 people participated.[[2]](#footnote-2) The *zócalo* and main avenues leading to it were blocked for over 7 hours.

***LGBT Pride Day***

The LGBT Pride Day in Mexico City has been celebrated since 1979. Since then, the LGBT community in Mexico has used the event to raise awareness about sexual minorities, sexually transmitted diseases, denounce homophobia and demand the legalization of same-sex marriages, adoption, and social security. Nevertheless, it can still be considered a celebratory ritual demonstration, given its festive character. In 2012 in particular, organizers of the June 2 Pride Parade wanted to make a clear statement about the apolitical character of the event.[[3]](#footnote-3) The press reported hundreds of thousands of participants.[[4]](#footnote-4) LGBT organizations, entertainment places, and bars organize the event. They also sponsor the parade music, carts, buses, and trucks. The Parade began at 9am and lasted until 6pm. The main avenue, *Reforma,* was blocked during the duration of the parade. After the parade is over, bars open their doors to continue the celebration even after hours. The celebratory nature of the event attracts not only members and supporters of the LGBT community in Mexico but also from around the world. Heterosexual sympathizers and supporters, family, relatives, and friends also take part—motivated in part by solidarity and partly by their desire to attend the festival and parties around the event.

***Pre-electoral March #YoSoy132***

The pre-electoral march against Peña Nieto was organized by the online student movement *#YoSoy132*. The movement was launched after Peña Nieto delivered an invited talk at the private Jesuit Universidad Iberoamericana in Mexico City on May 19, 2012. At the end of his talk, students questioned Peña Nieto’s repression, during his term as governor of the State of Mexico, of a movement opposing the construction of an airport in San Salvador Atenco. The protest escalated to the point of forcing him to flee the university campus. The PRI and Televisa, the most important TV network in the country, tried to portray the protests as an event orchestrated by opposition groups. The students responded with a video in which 131 students identified themselves as participants in the event.[[5]](#footnote-5) Soon thereafter, students from other public and private universities showed their support, and the *#YoSoy132* movement began mobilizing against Peña Nieto and in favor of freedom of the press and independent sources of information. The march was surveyed on June 10, 2021. The press reported almost a hundred thousand participants.[[6]](#footnote-6) Participants marched from the zócalo to the Monument of Mexico’s Independence, *El Ángel*, through *Reforma*. The avenue was blocked for the duration of the event, 5 hours approximately.

***Post-electoral AMLO Rally***

After the electoral results were made official, Andrés Manuel López Obrador held a postelection rally on September 9, 2012 to contest the election. The press reported that the *zócalo* was packed.[[7]](#footnote-7) According to official calculations the plaza can hold about 900,000 people.[[8]](#footnote-8) During the rally, he also formally launched the agenda of the nascent *Movimiento de Regeneración Nacional* (National Regeneration Movement, MORENA), which later became a new political party.[[9]](#footnote-9) Survey teams spent about 5 hours conducting fieldwork during the event.

***MORENA March against the Energy Reform***

On September 22, 2013, MORENA, still a social movement, organized a march against the national energy reform plan. Groups from all over the country were brought to Mexico City in buses to defend the national oil industry. The event was remarkably well organized and festive, with regional bands from each Mexican state playing, and the ambiance was more celebratory than contentious. The press reported that thousands of people attended.[[10]](#footnote-10) The event took place on *Reforma* and the survey lasted for over 5 hours, time in which the avenue remained blocked to regular traffic.

**Further Data Details**

***Organizational Membership:*** The question reads: “Could you please tell me if in the last twelve months you were a member of the following organizations. If you are a member of several organizations listed below, please only tell me in which of them you are most active.” Possible answers include: (a) church/religious organization, (b) union/professional organization, (c) political party, (d) women’s organization, (e) sport/cultural organization, (f) environmental organization, (g) LGBT organization, (h) community/neighbor organization, (i) charity organization, (j) peace-seeking organization, (k) anti-discrimination/pro-migrant organization, (l) human/civic rights organization, (m) other. The questionnaire allows respondents to define their membership as active (participating in events) and passive (paying fees or just signing up). I ran separate models with each type of organizational membership. Results were not significantly different. Thus, I decided to consider both types of participation as the same. I also ran additional models filtering out cultural organizations, which could be considered as potentially non-political. Again, no significant differences emerged.

***Past Participation:*** The question reads: “Could you please tell me what other actions have you taken to promote or prevent a change in the last twelve months?” Possible answer include: (a) contacted a politician/local or national government official, (b) signed a petition/public letter, (c) donated money to a political organization/group, (d) boycotted certain products, (e) worn or displayed a campaign badge/sticker, (f) joined a strike, (g) taken part in direct action (such as: blockage, occupation, civil disobedience), (h) used violent forms of action (against property or people).

**Comparing CCC and WVS Data**

**Table 1A. Descriptive Statistics CCC vs WVS Surveys**

**Means and (standard errors)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **CCC Protest Participants** | **WVS Protest Participants** | **CCC Protest Non-participants** | **WVS Protest Non-participants** | **CCC** **Value Scale** | **WVS** **Value Scale** |
| Organizational membership | 0.53(0.50) | 0.20(0.40) | 0.23(0.42) | 0.09(0.29) | 0-1 | 0-1 |
| Political experience | 0.53(0.50) | 0.28(0.29) | 0.26(0.44) | 0.04(0.11) | 0-1 | 0-1 |
| Interest in politics | 2.89(1.04) | 2.51(1.00) | 2.26(0.95) | 2.04(0.91) | 0-4 | 0.4 |
| Political efficacy | 3.85(1.12) |  | 3.37(1.28) |  | 0-4 |  |
| Trust in authorities | 0.14(0.13) | 0.46(0.14) | 0.17(0.14) | 0.43(0.13) | 0-1 | 0-1 |
| Satisfaction w/democracy | 2.43(2.82) | 5.77(3.11) | 3.30(3.01) | 6.25(2.95) | 0-10 | 0-10 |
| Left-right ideology | 2.65(2.82) | 5.93(2.98) | 4.61(2.73) | 6.26(2.69) | 0-10 | 0-10 |
| Personal recruitment | 2.27(0.44) |  | 0.11(0.32) |  | 0-1 | 0-1 |
| Education | 3.40(1.08) | 4.99(2.51) | 3.40(1.03) | 4.24(2.30) | 0-6 | 0-8 |
| Social status | 2.38(0.99) | 2.70(1.06) | 1.88(0.93) | 2.71(1.01) | 0-5 | 1-5 |
| Age | 38.82(15.44) | 41.59(15.38) | 36.98(14.12) | 36.75(14.80) | 14-82 | 18-93 |
| Gender | 0.65(0.47) | 0.62(0.49) | 0.41(0.49) | 0.50(0.50) | 0-1 | 0-1 |

In Table 1A, we can observe the comparability of the CCC and the 2012 Mexico World Value Survey (WVS) datasets. While the CCC Survey provides more information over protest participants than the WVS, we can observe comparable respondents’ socio-demographics across surveys. Again, all groups report on average a high school level of education, a self-identification with the working class, an average age ranging between 36 and 41, and in both surveys, men tend to take part in protest activity more than women and at the same proportion.

There are, however, important differences in all other indicators between both datasets. These differences show protest surveys capture protest participants characteristics better. Surveyed protestors appear to be slightly more interested in politics (2.89 vs 2.51 in a 0–4 scale) than the nationally surveyed population. They also appear to be more involved in organizations (0.53 vs 0.20 in a 0-1 scale), have higher political experience than the national average (0.53 vs 0.28 in a 0-1 scale), trust less the different authorities that compose the political system (0.14 vs. 0.46 in a 0-1 scale), be more dissatisfied with the functioning of democracy (2.43 vs 5.77 in a 1-10 scale), and hold a more left-leaning ideology (2.65 vs 5.93 in a 1-10 scale).

Mexico City protest non-participants also show more political experience than the general population sampled in the WVS (0.26 vs. 0.04 in a 0-1 scale). They tend to be more interested in politics (2.26 vs. 2.04 in a 0-4 scale) and are more involved in organizations (0.23 vs. 0.09 in a 0-1 scale). They also express less satisfaction with democracy (3.30 vs. 6.25 in a 1-10 scale, less trust in state authorities (0.17 vs. 0.43 in a 0-1 scale), and a more left-leaning political ideology than the general population (4.61 vs. 6.26 in a 1-10 scale). These differences should not surprise us as Mexico City residents are more politically oriented and are more exposed to protest activity than residents in the rest of the country. It is also well-known that Mexico City is the most left-leaning city in the country. Hence, a more left-leaning ideology among surveyed protest participants and non-participants is no surprise either.

**Adjusted Wald Tests for Each Predictor**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Protest Participation Predictors** | **F-Values, Prob > F** |
| Organizational membership | F (5, 230) = 1.97, Prob > F = 0.08 \* |
| Political experience | F (5, 230) = 0.84, Prob > F = 0.52 |
| Interest in politics | F (5, 230) = 3.95, Prob > F = 0.002 \*\*\* |
| Sense of efficacy | F (5, 230) = 1.32, Prob > F = 0.26 |
| Extreme left ideology | F (5, 230) = 1.07, Prob > F = 0.38 |
| Trust in authorities | F (5, 230) = 3.49, Prob > F = 0.005 \*\*\* |
| Satisfaction with democracy | F (5, 230) = 2.52, Prob > F = 0.03 \*\* |
| Personal recruitment | F (5, 230) = 3.23, Prob > F = 0.0077 \*\*\* |
| Education | F (5, 230) = 2.79, Prob > F = 0.02 \*\* |
| Self-identified social class | F (5, 230) = 10.75, Prob > F = 0.0000 \*\*\* |
| Age | F (5, 230) = 5.31, Prob > F = 0.0001 \*\*\* |
| Gender | F (5, 230) = 2.40, Prob > F = 0.04 \*\* |

\*\*\* *ρ* < 0.01; \*\* *ρ* < 0.05; \* *ρ* < 0.10
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