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Abstract

Word count: 317

8 March, now known as International Women’s Day, is a day for feminist claims where demonstrations are organized in over 150 countries, with the participation of millions of women all around the world. These demonstrations can be viewed as collective rituals, and thus focus attention on the processes that facilitate different psychosocial effects. This work aims to explore the mechanisms (i.e., behavioral and attentional synchrony, perceived emotional synchrony and positive and transcendent emotions) involved in participation in the demonstrations of 8 March 2020, collective and ritualized feminist actions, and their correlates associated with personal well-being (i.e., affective well-being and beliefs of personal growth) and collective well-being (i.e., social integration variables: situated identity, solidarity and fusion), collective efficacy and collective growth and behavioral intention to support the fight for women’s rights). To this end, a cross-cultural study was conducted with the participation of 2,854 people (age 18 to 79; M = 30.55; SD = 11.66) from countries in Latin America (Mexico, Chile, Argentina, Brazil, Peru, Colombia, and Ecuador) and Europe (Spain and Portugal), with a retrospective correlational cross-sectional design and a convenience sample. Participants were divided between demonstration participants (n = 1271; 94.0% female) and non-demonstrators or followers, who monitored participants through the media and social networks (n =1583; 75.87% female). Compared to non-demonstrators and to males, female and non-binary gender respondents had greater scores in mechanisms and criterion variables. Further random-effect model meta-analyses revealed that the perceived emotional synchrony was consistently associated with more proximal mechanisms, as well as with criterion variables. Finally, sequential moderation analyses showed that proposed mechanisms successfully mediated the effects of participation on every criterion variable. These results indicate that participation in 8M marches and demonstrations can be analyzed through the literature on collective rituals. As such, collective participation implies positive outcomes both individually and collectively, which are further reinforced through key psychological mechanisms, in line with a Durkheimian approach to collective rituals.

Contribution to the field

In consonance with Durkheim’s theoretical proposal (1912/2008), Collins (2004), and empirically contrasted in previous research (e.g., Páez et al., 2015), we analyzing the participation in the 8 March 2020 demonstrations from the perspective of collective rituals. We explore the mechanisms (i.e., behavioral and attentional synchrony, perceived emotional synchrony and positive and transcendent emotions) in the demonstrations of 8M (collective and ritualized feminist actions), and their correlates; as are personal and collective well-being, collective efficacy, collective growth and behavioral intention to support the fight for women’s rights. To this end, a cross-cultural study was conducted with the participation of 2,984 people from nine countries, in Latin America and Europe, with a retrospective cross-sectional design and a convenience sample. This study provides insight to understand the psychological mechanisms, and their relationships generated during collective participation in 8M demonstrations. Also, shed light on the relevant role of the experience of collective effervescence that improves personal and social well-being, social integration, and empowerment of all participants, with more intensity in the reference group (women). Finally, the shared cognitive and emotional experience serves to renew commitment to the community, to improve well-being and to strengthen both the individuals and the groups involved.
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Abstract (Max. 350 words)

8 March, now known as International Women's Day, is a day for feminist claims where demonstrations are organized in over 150 countries, with the participation of millions of women all around the world. These demonstrations can be viewed as collective rituals, and thus focus attention on the processes that facilitate different psychosocial effects. This work aims to explore the mechanisms (i.e., behavioral and attentional synchrony, perceived emotional synchrony and positive and transcendent emotions) involved in participation in the demonstrations of 8 March 2020, collective and ritualized feminist actions, and their correlates associated with personal well-being (i.e., affective well-being and beliefs of personal growth) and collective well-being (i.e., social integration variables: situated identity, solidarity and fusion), collective efficacy and collective growth and behavioral intention to support the fight for women's rights). To this end, a cross-cultural study was conducted with the participation of 2,854 people (age 18 to 79; $M = 30.55$; $SD = 11.66$) from countries in Latin America (Mexico, Chile, Argentina, Brazil, Peru, Colombia, and Ecuador) and Europe (Spain and Portugal), with a retrospective correlational cross-sectional design and a convenience sample. Participants were divided between demonstration participants ($n = 1271$; 94.0% female) and non-demonstrators or followers, who monitored participants through the media and social networks ($n = 1583$; 75.87% female). Compared to non-demonstrators and to males, female and non-binary gender respondents had greater scores in mechanisms and criterion variables. Further random-effect model meta-analyses revealed that the perceived emotional synchrony was consistently associated with more proximal mechanisms, as well as with criterion variables. Finally, sequential moderation analyses showed that proposed mechanisms successfully mediated the effects of participation on every criterion variable. These results indicate that participation in 8M marches and demonstrations can be analyzed through the literature on collective rituals. As such, collective participation implies positive outcomes both individually and collectively, which are further reinforced through key psychological mechanisms, in line with a Durkheimian approach to collective rituals.
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Introduction

In this work, we aim to study the relationship between participation in the 8M demonstrations and personal and collective well-being, and to explore the psychosocial mechanisms involved in this relationship. 8 March (8M), now known as International Women's Day, is a date to commemorate the long history of struggle and sacrifice to obtain women's rights. While there is debate between multiple versions claiming historic origins, the most popular one is associated with working-class women's demonstrations, the Suffragist Movement (Castaño-Sanabria, 2016), and/or the tragic fire at a textile factory in New York in 1911, where more than one hundred women employees perished (Ortega, 2019). However, the most plausible interpretation of 8M's historic origins falls under the socialist movement claiming labor rights (Awcock, 2020; Perci, 2014).

Despite many years of fighting for women's rights, acknowledgement of equality amongst all human beings at the Human Rights Convention of 1945, the International Bill of Human Rights for women of 1979 and multiple conventions (e.g., Fourt World Conference on Women in Beijing, 1995, see United Nations, 1996) and legislations seeking to tackle inequality between men and women over the past 75 years, persistent gender-based discrimination can be easily identified most everywhere in the world. Numerous data and research studies confirm that, still in the 21st century, being a woman is a social burden with consequences in all areas (e.g., WEF-World Economic Forum, 2020).

For all these reasons, 8M is, par excellence, the day for feminist claims, organizing marches and demonstrations in over 150 countries, with the participation of millions of women (along with some men and other people of non-binary identities). It draws noteworthy social and media visibility all around the world (e.g., Franco, 2018).
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as it states its nonconformity with the patriarchal structure that discriminates against
women. Feminism today, a social movement with a long, extensive, diverse and
globalized, transnational and intersectional history, is difficult to define based on one
sole focus, since different ideological factions and very different socio-structural,
realities co-exist within the social movement (e.g., Curiel, 2019; García-Jiménez et al.,
2016; Pellicer & Asin, 2018). In line with other research, this study is based on the
premise that feminism must be understood as a social movement based on the belief that
women and men are equal and must have the same rights, and whose ultimate objective
is to put an end to the subordination of women (Basow 1992; Pellicer & Asin, 2018).
Additionally, demonstrations are a public and collective display of a collective's
opposition to, or dissatisfaction with policies and practices of institutions and
governments; as such, it is a customary and relevant tactic in all social movements
(Tarrow, 2011). Previous research on activism and collective action have proven that
collective participation is an essential source of well-being (Boffi et al., 2016; Hopkins
et al., 2016; Klar & Kasser, 2009), providing feelings of connection, feeling of
community, and increased perception of social support. This, in turn, has been proven to
have a substantial impact on psychological well-being (e.g., Berkman et al., 2000;
Townley et al., 2011), especially for disadvantaged groups (e.g., Finch & Vega, 2003;
Noh & Kaspar, 2003).
In this work, we study the relationship between participation in the 8M
demonstrations, affective well-being, the connection with values and beliefs, social
cohesion and integration, individual and collective empowerment and the intention of
pro-social behavior focused on the struggle for women's rights. Firstly, we propose that
8M demonstrations, with a long tradition of annual periodicity (fixed and pre-
established date), stereotyped synchronic behavior or gestures (e.g., the raised hands
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building a triangle, dances), consolidated common symbols (purple color, iconography, and identification symbols) and shared values can be partially conceived of as collective rituals (Collins, 2004; Watson-Jones & Legare, 2016). Considering that they are a “mechanism of mutually focused emotion and attention producing a momentarily shared reality, which thereby generates solidarity and symbols of group membership” (Collins, 2004, p. 7). Moreover, collective rituals are symbolic, repetitive, and stereotyped behaviors that occur within a specific space-and-time frame (Páez et al., 2015). They foment shared meaning aimed at building a sense of community, social solidarity and conformity with group values (Collins, 2004; Durkheim, 1912/2008). They provide a sense of community and connection, high social and emotional interaction in addition to opportunities for citizen participation and shared meaning (e.g., Berkman et al., 2000; Hobson et al., 2018). However, we must not fail to mention that demonstrations have a certain degree of spontaneity; their rules are not rigid, and they have instrumental objectives, such as demanding or supporting legislative changes, which are the objectives of social movements (Basabe et al., 2004; Tarrow, 2011).

Consequently, we propose that the 8M demonstrations in favor of women's rights as collective rituals be characterized by increased social interaction, a shared meaning intended to create a feeling of community (de Rivera & Mahoney, 2018), and social solidarity based on a shared objective. While it has been demonstrated that participation in collective rituals or collective ritualized actions improves personal well-being (e.g., Páez et al., 2015; Tewari et al., 2012) and collective well-being (e.g., Zumeta et al., 2016), surprisingly, we find no previous work that has focused on studying the 8M demonstrations from this perspective.

With this research, we shall examine different psychosocial mechanisms involved in this relationship, integrating different theoretical perspectives: rituals and
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Collective effervescence (e.g., Collins, 2004; Durkheim 1912/2008; Páez et al., 2015), positive psychology (e.g., Fredrickson, 2009, Zickfeld et al., 2019), including relevant aspects of collective-action theory (e.g., van Zomeren et al., 2008), and the social-identity approach (Drury & Reicher, 2009; Novellli et al., 2013; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). An initial mechanism during the process of emotional connection must necessarily be cognitive-behavioral; the behavioral and attentional synchrony, meaning synchronized behavior (e.g., frequency, rhythm, movement), as well as shared and focused attention, can promote shared emotions, and act as forerunners to collective effervescence (Wlodarczyk et al., 2020 in this monograph). Another mechanism that is essentially affective is emotional effervescence or perceived emotional synchrony (PES), a feeling of convergence and alignment in emotional responses that occurs amongst participants at a collective meeting (Durkheim, 1912/2008; Páez et al., 2015; Xygalatas et al., 2016). A third mechanism is the intense concurrent positive emotional experience (e.g., Fredrickson, 2009), and the fourth are positive self-transcendent emotions, meaning emotions that project our being outward and promote connection with others (e.g., Haidt, 2003; Stellar et al., 2017) in the context of social interaction.

Finally, based on the theory of collective action and social change (van Zomeren et al., 2008), we posit that participation in the collective action intended to reduce injustice/inequality and to change the status quo (Dixon et al., 2017) can have positive effects on well-being and empowerment, both personally (beliefs of individual growth) and as a collective, increasing group efficacy (Carbone & McMillin, 2019; Ohmer, 2010; Zabala et al., 2020 in this monograph) and positive collective growth (Bilali et al., 2017; McNamara et al., 2013; Wlodarczyk et al., 2016).

1.1 Participation in 8M demonstration, antecedents of perceived emotional synchrony and collective effervescence.
Collins (2004) states that co-presence and shared attention as the result of participating in collective rituals, create a shared reality and reinforce inter-subjectivity, creating effervescence through shared ideas and emotions. This is based on Émile Durkheim’s concept of collective effervescence, which includes attentional convergence (i.e., shared focus of attention) and behavioral and expressive synchrony (coordination of movements and gestures) and, especially, emotional synchrony (coordination and convergence of all emotional facets). After synchronizing and coordinating their attention and behavior, participants also synchronize their emotions, feeling something intense and similar that grows more intense due to mutual feedback (Durkheim, 1912/2008). Perceived emotional synchrony (PES) is therefore an emotional experience had by participants during collective meetings. It represents the experience and feeling of bonding with others (Páez et al., 2015; Rimé et al., 2020). In this regard, PES is successor to the notion raised by Durkheim (1912/2008) in the classic concept of collective effervescence, the intense shared emotional experience. PES implies a feeling of convergence and alignment of emotional responses that take place between participants in a collective meeting (Xygalatas et al., 2016; Rimé et al., 2020). This is the effect of perception of similarity, convergence and intensification of emotional evaluations, corporal and affective reactions, a subjective feeling, and action tendencies (see Rimé et al., 2020). PES shows the emotional feeling of bonding that participants in 8M may experience in feeling bonded with the Others in terms of affect, thought, and more often, physical action and movement.

In this regard, we postulate that participation in the 8M demonstration causes collective effervescence, which provides communion or fusion of all feelings in a shared affective experience, and sharing emotions intensifies said affective experience. PES is the result not only of the experience of shared emotions felt, but also the entire
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experience of collective synchronization of all different facets of the affective
experience.

1.1.1 PES and Positive Emotions: self-transcendence and self-reference

PES is the joy of demonstrating and increased emotions of high excitement with
clearly positive components (joy, euphoria) amongst those participating in a successful
collective meeting, whether a demonstration, a ritual or any other kind of meeting
(Hopkins et al., 2016; Moscovici, 1988). However, the affective content of the PES
experience (meaning, the intense emotion that is shared) may vary depending on the
specificity of the collective situation occurring (Páez et al., 2015). For example, with
8M demonstrations, moral indignation, hope and the joy of participating may prevail,
while in other contexts, the dominant emotional content may imply, for example, pride
in a religious or secular ritual of glorification (e.g., Draper, 2014; Hopkins et al., 2016;
Sullivan, 2014), and in a more negative context, fear and rage might prevail, as occurs
in certain political rituals, or even pain, sadness and guilt, as occurs in certain religious
rituals (Sullivan, 2014).

Moreover, we can expect that collective effervescence will be related to the
emotional experience of self-transcendence. It has been proven that a subset of positive
emotions (sometimes called "emotions of self-transcendence," "moral emotions" or
"other positive emotions of worship") are able to mobilize people to connect with others
in their environment or society. These emotions are elevation or moral inspiration,
compassion, gratitude, feeling moved by love and wonderous awe when witnessing a
grandiose social object (Algoe & Haidt, 2009; Haidt, 2003; Van Cappellen & Rimé,
2014). These are emotions sparked by assessments focused on others, based on shifting
attention toward the needs and concerns of others (for example, suffering, virtue, moral
inspiration and awe, love and being close to others), so they decrease the prominence of
the individual self and promote bonding with other people and social groups (Haidt,
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2003; Stellar et al., 2017; Van Cappellen & Rimé, 2014). They are related to the interests or well-being of either society as a whole or, at least, the people who are neither the judge nor agent (Haidt, 2003). As a result, they constitute powerful determining factors in pro-social behavior or behavior to help others (Cusi et al., 2018; Goetz et al., 2010; Pizarro et al., 2018). As such, they are in clear contrast with positive emotions that are the result of self-referential assessments (focused on the self) as occurs when the self has experienced a positive emotion (joy) or great success (pride).

1.2 Participation in Demonstrations as social belonging and well-being

Previous studies have shown that PES is associated with social identification, social integration, fusion identity, enhanced personal and collective empowerment, positive affect, and positive shared beliefs among participants (Collins, 2004; Páez et al., 2015, Wlodarczyk et al., 2020). These results were similar for positive valence events (folk celebrations) and mixed- or negative-valence events (Páez et al., 2015; Wlodarczyk et al., 2020, Zumeta et al., 2016). The present study focuses on the social and individual effects of collective feminist demonstrations. Therefore, we argue that participation in these collective gatherings will enhance identification with feminist organizations, foster collective efficacy and growth in the aftermath of the demonstrations, and finally, will increase pro-social behaviors. Additionally, we will pay attention to the role played by emotional bonding in the way that such effects occur.

Firstly, it has been shown that participation in collective emotional gatherings increases identification with other co-present participants, and also reinforces a broader sense of social identity (i.e., ethnic identification, Gasparre et al., 2010; Kahn et al., 2015) and enhances pro-social behaviors (Rosanno, 2012). Furthermore, it has been suggested that rituals and collective gatherings may “fuel” identity fusion with other members of the group (Swann et al., 2012). Identity fusion, or blurring of the self-others
boundary between the personal and collective self, encourages people to channel their personal agency into group behavior, motivating pro-group behavior, both aggressive and altruistic, and is related to well-being (Gómez, et al., 2011; Swann et al., 2012; Zabala et al., 2020 in this monograph). Secondly, participation in collective emotional gatherings enhances different facets of social belonging, such as social integration (Weiss & Richard, 1997) and perception of social support (Páez et al., 2007), and increases social cohesion by reinforcing positive inter-group stereotypes (Kanyangara et al., 2007), which reinforces a positive emotional climate (Bouchat et al., 2020; De Rivera & Páez, 2007; Pelletier, 2018; Rimé et al., 2020) and predicts solidarity (Hawdon & Ryan, 2011). Thirdly, participation elicits positive individual emotions (Neville & Reicher, 2011) and collective emotions (Páez et al., 2007; Páez et al., 2013), and predicts increases in well-being (Tewari et al., 2012). Fourthly, it empowers participants, and consequently increases their personal and collective sense of efficacy, self-esteem and post-stress growth (Drury & Reicher, 2005, Páez et al., 2007, Rime et al, 2020; Zabala et al., 2020 in this monograph; Zumeta et al., 2016). Finally, collective gatherings reinforce agreement with "sacred" symbols and values (Collins, 2004; Fischer et al., 2014; Gabriel et al., 2020; Páez et al., 2007).

These effects would be explained by the PES and the emotions experienced at the demonstration. In this sense, 8M demonstrations in comparison with non-demonstrations will report not only higher well-being, but also higher perceived attentional and behavioral synchrony, perceived emotional synchrony, more positive and transcendent emotions, and more agreement with the values promoted by the movement. Following Páez et al. (2015) and Wlodarczyk et al. (2020 in this monograph), we propose and will contrast a sequential model. First, participation in demonstrations affords attentional and behavioral synchrony (and mass and social
Collective effervescence during 8-M demonstrations

media facilitate perception of said demonstration). Second, attentional and behavioral
synchrony, along with bottom-up processes such as expressive and verbal affect-loaded
behavior, and top-down process such as shared appraisals of issues, goals and values,
elicit collective effervescence or shared, convergent and coordinated emotional
responses (i.e. perceived emotional synchrony). Even if shared, convergent and
coordinated emotional states could be negative or ambivalent; emotional synchrony in
general intensifies emotions and fuels the “joy of being together,” or intense positive
emotions as the initial consequences of PES. Moreover, because collective gatherings
and rituals connect people with large categories and social goals, emotional synchrony
during demonstrations and ceremonies elicits positive self-transcendent emotions as a
second consequence. Finally, because collective gatherings are loaded-value, emotional
synchrony and intensification of positive and self-transcendent emotions are conducive
to “contact with the sacred” or salience and adhesion to cultural values (see Wlodarczyk
et al, 2020 in this monograph for the discussion of antecedents, content of emotional
synchrony, proximal and distal effects). Additionally, we expect that these effects will
be more pronounced among women, who are the target or central category of the theme
of the social movement in question.

In sum, if participation in 8M demonstrations are ritualized forms of collective
participation, and if they evoke a feeling of PES and intense emotions due to this, we
could expect that demonstrators, compared to individuals who are non-participants but
followers, will experience more perceived emotional synchrony and more positive and
self-transcendent emotions, and will manifest greater social cohesion (social identity,
identity of fusion, and solidarity) and more agreement with the values promoted by the
ritualized collective action.
Collective effervescence during 8-M demonstrations

This hypothesis is consistent with a previous and continuous line of research about participation and the role of PES (Collective Effervescence Measure) as a predictor or mediator of the positive causal effects of participation in rituals and collective gatherings (derived from the theoretical tradition of Durkheim, 1912; Collins, 2004). It must be noted that previous longitudinal studies (pretest-during-posttest) have shown that PES predicts the positive effects of participation (e.g., Bouchat et al., 2020; Pizarro et al., 2020; von Scheve et al., 2017; Wlodarczyk et al., 2020; Zabala et al., 2020).

1.3 Objectives and Hypotheses

The objective of this work is to explore the psychosocial mechanisms (behavioral and attentional synchrony, PES, and positive and self-transcendent emotions) involved in participation in demonstrations on 8 March 2020, collective and ritualized feminist actions, and their psychosocial correlates. These correlates are affective well-being, connection with values and beliefs, social well-being based on cohesion and social integration (situated social identity, identity fusion with demonstrators and feminists, in-group solidarity and identity fusion with women), empowerment (collective efficacy and beliefs in individual and collective growth) and the intention of pro-social behavior aimed toward the fight for the rights of women in different countries.

To this end, we studied participation in 8M demonstrations. First, we verified the differences between the demonstrators and the non-demonstrators (audience or mass-media followers), as well as differences based on gender, using mean comparison. Moreover, we calculated average effect sizes with random effects for the countries total. Finally, by using a sequential measurement model, we examined the mediator effect (indirect effects) of each one of the psychosocial mechanisms, including PES in relation
to each criterion variable. The criterion variables were: the experience of transcendence,
the situated social identity, identity fusion (demonstrators, feminists, and women),
solidarity, collective efficacy, individual and collective positive growth and, lastly, the
tention to help fight for women's rights. Indirect effects of age and political-position
variables were controlled out of all variables in the model. The sequential mediation
model set forth above (Cusi et al., 2018; Goetz et al., 2010; Pizarro et al., 2018) is
shown in Figure 1.

Accordingly, the following hypotheses were raised: (H1) During the 8M,
behavioral and attentional synchrony will occur, along with emotional synchrony (PES-
collective effervescence); moreover, positive emotions will be activated with high
intensity, including emotions of transcendence, both in demonstrators and in non-
demonstrators and followers alike. (H2) The psychosocial mechanisms will be linked to
the effects: the experience of self-transcendence, situated social identity, and identity
fusion with collectives representing the ritual (marchers, feminists, and women),
solidarity with women, collective efficacy, individual and collective growth and the
intention of behavior linked to the movement for women's rights (Páez et al., 2015;
Rimé et al., 2020; Wlodarczyk et al, 2020; Zumeta et al., 2016). (H3) The
demonstrators and women (in comparison with non-demonstrators and men) will
display higher scores both in the psychosocial mechanisms involved and in criterion
variables, due to the effects of emotional activation from participating and from women
being the central identity of the demonstration and social movement. (H4) Participation
in 8M demonstrations will increase in accordance with values, personal well-being
(positive individual growth), and collective or social well-being, including aspects of
cohesion and social integration (social identity, identity fusion, and solidarity with
women), and of collective empowerment (collective efficacy, positive collective
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growth) and the intention of helping behavior (Albanesi et al., 2007; Basabe et al.,
2004). This will be mediated by PES antecedents (attentional and behavioral
synchrony), PES, the intense positive emotions, and emotions of self-transcendence (see
Figure 1).

1.4 Materials and Methods

1.4.1 Participants

A cross-sectional, correlational study design was used. A cross-cultural study is
provided, including samples from Latin America (Mexico, Chile, Argentina, Brazil,
Peru, Colombia, and Ecuador) and Europe (Spain and Portugal). In all nine countries,
the 8M demonstrations showed similar characteristics. Symbolic elements were shared,
as well as the use of choreography and dance, and a common language in favor of
women's rights. A brief ethnographic description is presented in the supplementary
Table VII. The age range of participants is from 18 to 79 years, with 44.50% having
attended the marches or demonstrations, as opposed to non-demonstrators¹, audience or
followers on 8M. In both groups, the female percentage who responded to the survey
was a majority, even more so and especially amongst the group of demonstrators (see
Table 1).

[INSERT TABLE 1]

Table 2 displays descriptive analysis, including mean and standard deviation for
age and frequency distribution, by gender and participation in the 8M demonstrations
for each country. As shown in the table provided, the proportion of female respondents
in all countries was substantially higher than that of male and non-binary individuals.
Specifically, the proportion of females ranged from 75.5% in the case of Peru to 88.9%

¹ Individuals who did not attend the demonstrations but followed them on the media and through social
networks take on the role of audience or followers of 8M demonstrations.
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in Brazil. Regarding the level of participation in the 8M demonstrations, it fluctuates from 12.1% in the Colombian sample to 74.9% in the Chilean sample. The proportion of respondents that participated in the 8M demonstrations was higher than 50% in four of the nine countries assessed (i.e., Chile [74.9%], Portugal [62.7%], Ecuador [56.3%], and Spain [51.4%]). For more information, see supplementary material (Table I).

[INSERT TABLE 2]

1.4.2 Procedure

Contact was established with social psychology research groups in Latin America and in Europe for a cross-cultural sample. With the Qualtrics Survey Platform®, online surveys were prepared both in Spanish and in Portuguese, accessed via a link. After the demonstrations on 8 March, the links were shared with those who participated directly in the 8M-2020 demonstrations (demonstrators) and people who had followed the demonstrations through mass media and social networks (non-demonstrators, audience, followers). The data were collected between 8 March and 30 March² 2020 in nine different countries, and the approximate time spent on the survey was 30 minutes. The sample collected was convenience sample.

The procedure for data collection in all countries was similar; convenience sampling was used in all locations and QR codes from the Qualtrics application were shared through a snowball scheme (See Supplementary Material, Table VIII). The sample differences between countries are mostly related to the number of collaborating research groups in each country. In Argentina, Chile and Spain, the samples are larger because two or more groups were involved in the sample collection.

All study participants read and accepted informed consent. The data recorded was alphanumerically code to ensure anonymity following the Organic Law on the

² The 90.3% of the sample responded to the questionnaire within seven days of the 8M demonstrations.
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Protection of Personal Data (BOE-A-2018-16673), and compliance with the regulation of the Ethics Committee for Research Involving Human Beings (CEISH) by the University of the Basque Country.

1.4.3 Measurements

The scales used in this research are based on a proposal made by Wlodarczyk and collaborators (2020, on this issue) for an integrative measurement of collective effervescence experiences. Supplementary material includes confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for each instrument showing appropriate adjustment rates for the one-dimensional structure at all scales (Table II) and a reliability analysis (α Cronbach) for each instrument by country (Table III).

Mechanisms

Antecedents to Collective Effervescence: Shared Attention and Behavioral Synchrony. Based on Collins (2014), Rennung and Göritz (2016) and Gabriel et al., (2017), two ad hoc items were developed to measure the shared attention and behavioral synchrony, antecedents of collective effervescence (e.g., the participants focused their attention on the same symbols, objects and events). A Likert scale was used, with a response range of 1 (Totally disagree) to 7 (Totally agree). The reliability coefficient was adequate (Cronbach’s α = .729).

Perceived Emotional Synchrony (PES). A reduced version of six items was used (see Wlodarczyk et al., 2020) of the perceived emotional synchrony scale (Páez et al., 2015) to assess the degree of infection or sharing emotion experienced, and perception of emotional synchrony with the other co-participants (e.g., We felt more intense emotions because we all went through the same experience). Response ranges go from 1 (Totally disagree) to 7 (Totally agree). Cronbach's coefficient was high (α = .883).

Proximal and distal effects
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**Positive Emotions.** Two types of positive emotions were assessed. **Intense Positive Emotions.** Research was conducted on the prototypical positive emotions from the N (2013) scale with three items referring to feeling *Realized, Happy, and Alive* during the 8M demonstration. The response range went from 1 (*Nothing*) to 7 (*Totally*). Cronbach's reliability coefficient was high (α = .932). **Transcendent Emotions.** Participants were asked about the transcendent emotions they felt in relation to the 8M demonstration. Adapted version of the DES scale (based on Fredrickson, 2009; Zickfeld et al., 2019) with five Likert-style items (e.g., *In Awe, Amazed, Overwhelmed by something grand, Morally inspired, and Uplifted*). The response range went from 1 (*Nothing*) to 7 (*Totally*). Cronbach's reliability coefficient was very high (α = .955).

**Connection/Agreement with values and beliefs**

**Transcendent Experience.** Four Likert-style items were used to research (e.g., *I felt like there was something transcendent, associated with values and ideals, above the action*) the degree of transcendence experienced by the subjects in relation to the 8M demonstration (Gabriel et al., 2020). Response ranges went from 1 (*Totally disagree*) to 7 (*Totally agree*). The reliability coefficient was very satisfactory (α = .922).

**Social cohesion and social integration.**

**Situated Social Identity.** Participants were asked about their degree of identification with the demonstrators (Novelli et al., 2013) by means of three items (e.g., *I identified with the demonstrators*). Response ranges went from 1 (*Totally disagree*) to 7 (*Totally agree*). The reliability coefficient score was very high (α = .946).

**Pictorial Identity Fusion.** To assess identity fusion, the pictorial scale of identity fusion was used (Gómez et al., 2011). Based on the measurement “Inclusion of other in the self (IOS) Scale” (Aron et al., 1992), this consisted of a pictorial item that shows the perception of closeness or fusion with a reference group. Three items were
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included (Which picture best describes your relationship with...), one for each reference

group, two situated within the context (participants in the specific demonstration and

feminists), and another one as a general category, with women (e.g., all the women in

the world?). The five response options range from A to E, where A symbolizes a lesser

perception of closeness or fusion (i.e., circles without overlapping), and E is a greater

closeness or fusion (i.e., completely overlapping circles).

In-Group Solidarity. Three items with statements were used to assess solidarity

and commitment to women (e.g., I feel (morally) committed to women), taken from

Leach et al. (2008)'s Social Identity scale, with a response range of 1 (Totally disagree)
to 7 (Totally agree). The reliability coefficient was satisfactory (α = .908). This version

of the scale has been applied in different research works, demonstrating reliability and

structural validity with a common dimension (Bobowik et al., 2013).

Empowerment

Collective Efficacy. Four items extracted from Van Zomeren and collaborators

(2010) were used in relation to perception of the efficacy of the reference group, in this

case, the women (e.g., I think that together with women and men, we can change the

current situation). The response range goes from 1 (Totally disagree) to 7 (Totally

agree) and the reliability coefficient (α Cronbach) was high (α = .919).

Positive Growth. In order to assess positive growth, we were used six items of

positive growth scale from Páez (2011): three items for Positive Individual Growth

(e.g., I have changed my priorities about what is important in life), with a high

reliability coefficient (α = .933); and three items for Positive Collective Growth (e.g.,

We have increased participation and political and ethical commitments for others). The

response range goes from 0 (No change to 5 (Very great), with a reliability coefficient

that is also high (α = .917).
Collective effervescence during 8-M demonstrations

Pro in-group behaviors

Pro-women behavior. Intention of behavior to help women (ad hoc). Seven Likert-style items were created to assess the participants' behavior intention in future participation in actions, organizations and initiatives for women's rights (e.g., Committing 2 hours per week to collaborate with an association that organizes marches). The response range goes from 1 (Nothing) to 5 (A lot). The reliability coefficient was high (Cronbach’s α = .890).

Sociodemographic information. Participants provided information regarding their participation in 8M (0 = non-demonstrator/followers/audience, 1 = demonstrator) and their sociodemographic features: age, gender (1 = female, 2 = male, 3 = non-binary), education level (1 = none or incomplete primary education, 2 = primary studies, 3 = lower and upper secondary education, 4 = first stage of tertiary education, 5 = second stage of tertiary education), and political position (1 = extreme left to 7 = extreme right, including the possibility of responding 0 = no response or no position).

1.4.4 Design and Analyses

For this retrospective correlational cross-sectional and transnational research, we obtained descriptive statistics, reliability (Cronbach's alpha) and correlations, and mean comparisons (GML) with SPSS® 26.0. To test indirect effects only on female participants, we used mediation analysis (Model 6), using the macro PROCESS 3.3 (Hayes, 2013). We used a bootstrapping estimation method based on 10,000 repetitions (Preacher & Hayes, 2004). The level of significance used was p < .05. We performed the confirmatory factorial analysis with JASP® 0.11 to verify the adequate adjustment to the one-dimensional theoretical structure of each scale.

In the analysis by countries, we applied meta-analytical techniques, following Cumming’s (2012) guides. We used Pearson’s r, calculated by countries, as the measurement of the size of the effect. We conducted a random-effects meta-analyses.
model. We explored the average effect size (magnitude) of the relationship between PES and each criterion variable, and heterogeneity indexes. To evaluate the effect sizes, the following criteria were adopted: \( r < .18 \) was small, \( .18 < r < .32 \) was medium, and \( r > .32 \) was large. This approach was undertaken due to the problematic use of Cohen's (1977) rule of thumb (for further discussion, see Correll et al., 2020, Funder & Ozer, 2019, and Gignac & Szodorai, 2016). Confidence intervals (CIs) of 95% and average effect size \( r \), are indicators of the validity of the magnitude of the effect or of the validity of the relation between the variables. Heterogeneity/homogeneity in effect sizes by country were calculated with the \( Q \) statistic. The following tests were also added: the Rosenthal test, fail-safe \( N \), which reports the number of studies that must be added for the size of the average effect to be statistically insignificant, and Egger's regression tests to detect possible publication or selection biases (see Rubio-Aparicio et al., 2018), all with Comprehensive Meta-Analysis 3.0 software (CMA; Borenstein et al., 2005).

1.5 Results

1.5.1 Descriptive and correlational analysis

Table 3 displays descriptive statistics (i.e., means and standard deviations) of each of the variables studied and the Pearson product-moment correlations between them. Missing values did not exceed 5% in any variable (except in political orientation [6.5%]). All key variables show mean values above the midpoint of the scale (e.g., 3.50); the relatively high scores displayed by respondents on the measure of solidarity towards women should be underlined (\( M = 6.10, SD = 1.28 \)). Furthermore, all variables of interest were positively and significantly associated with each other. The size of correlation coefficients indicates the presence of moderate-to-strong positive associations between the variables analyzed. The rank of correlations fluctuates from the lowest correlation obtained for identity fusion with women and behavioral
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synchrony ($r = .187, p < 0.001$) to the highest one found between intense positive
emotions and self-transcendence emotions ($r = .901, p < 0.001$), confirming H1 and H2.
For correlations $r > .70$, we tested the collinearity index (see supplementary material,
Table II). All the values obtained are adequate (tolerance > 0.1, VIF < 10; Rovai et al.,
2013)

[Insert Table 3 here]

Differences related to Participation and Gender in Criterion Variable

Mean comparisons between demonstrators and non-demonstrators. As seen in
Table 4, all key variables displayed significant differences based on whether or not
respondents participated in 8M demonstrations. Compared to those who did not
participate in 8M protests, demonstrators were found to display greater scores in each of
the explanatory variables (behavioral and emotional synchrony, positive and self-
transcendent emotions) and the outcomes or indicators of personal and social well-being
(contact with values, social cohesion and integration, personal and collective growth
and expectations of participation in the women’s social movement). Socio-demographic
variables such as gender, age, and political positioning scale have been controlled for. It
is worth noting that the largest differences were observed in the experience of intense
emotions ($\eta^2 = .219$), pro-women behavior ($\eta^2 = .195$), situated social identity ($\eta^2 =
.181$), and identity fusion with demonstrators ($\eta^2 = .195$). The differences between
female protesters and non-protesters (followers) are equally significant in all variables
when the sample of female participants is analyzed. The female demonstrators display
the highest score in all the variables studied (see supplementary material, Table IV).
The small sample of male and non-binary demonstrators does not allow an effective
means comparison.
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Gender differences. The gender differences for each key variable score for the total sample are listed in Table 4. In general, when compared to male, both female and non-binary gender respondents were found to score significantly higher on most of the variables of interest (i.e., intense positive emotions, self-transcendent emotions, self-transcendent experience, situated social identity, identity fusion with demonstrators, identity fusion with feminists, solidarity towards women, collective efficacy, positive individual growth, positive collective growth, and pro-woman behavior). Socio-demographic variables such as age and political positioning have been controlled for. The largest differences were found for identity fusion with feminists ($\eta^2 = .072$), pro-woman behavior ($\eta^2 = .072$), situated social identity ($\eta^2 = .063$), and experience of intense positive emotions ($\eta^2 = .062$). When compared to male and non-binary gender respondents, female demonstrators were also found to display greater levels of identity fusion with women ($\eta^2 = .042$). This was also the case for intense positive emotions ($\eta^2 = .032$), self-transcendent emotions ($\eta^2 = .029$) and perceived emotional synchrony ($\eta^2 = .025$), overall, the effect size of gender differences was small. Differences between female and male participants were significant ($p < 0.001$) regarding such variables, except collective efficacy and positive individual growth. Please see supplementary material for more details (Table V). These results confirm H3, showing that both demonstrators and women (in comparison with non-demonstrators and men) displayed higher scores in all variables.

[Insert Table 4 here]

1.5.2 Pooled Effect Sizes of PES by countries

The analysis of correlations by country displayed, in general, positive relations between PES and the criterion variables. Psychosocial mechanisms are positively and
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significantly associated with PES, with correlations between $r = .45$ and $r = .77$ in all countries included in this research. Descriptive statistics and correlations by country may be viewed in supplementary material (Table II).

We next calculated the pooled effects of $r$ of perceived emotional synchrony with all key variables. The data obtained revealed that perceived emotional synchrony displayed moderate-to-high positive and significant relationships with all variables (see Table 5).

Perceived emotional synchrony showed strongest associations with self-transcendent experience ($r = .65$) and emotions ($r = .65$), behavioral synchrony ($r = .65$), and intense positive emotions ($r = .61$). Furthermore, less intense but strong relationships were found for perceived emotional synchrony with situated social identity ($r = .59$), positive collective growth ($r = .47$), identity fusion with demonstrators ($r = .43$), social identity dimension of solidarity towards women ($r = .43$), pro-woman behavior ($r = .41$), positive individual growth ($r = .41$), collective efficacy ($r = .41$), and identification or identity fusion with feminists ($r = .40$). The lowest of the effects was found in relation to identity fusion with women ($r = .27$). All pooled effect sizes were statistically significant\(^3\).

The analysis of heterogeneity reveals the existence of two sizes of homogeneous effect in the nine countries of analysis. The first and with less variability, is in the relation between PES and group efficiency [$r = .41$; $Q(8) = 4.23$, $p = .181$; $I^2 = 0.00$],

\(^3\) Additionally, we did a linear regression analysis for each of the outcome variables including the condition of participation, PES and other socio-demographics variables (gender, age and political positioning) as independent variables. In eight of ten outcome variables, PES obtained the highest standardized beta as compared to the other covariates, being the main explanatory variable (Table VI, supplementary material).
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and the other is regarding the relationship between identity fusion and/or proximity to women \([r = .25; Q(8) = 4.23, p = .836; I^2 = 29.67]\). It is important to note that the analysis yielded non-significant Egger’s regressions in all cases (see Table 5), which excludes the existence of asymmetrical relations between effect sizes and standard errors. This observation, along with solid Rosenthal’s fail-safe \(N\) tests values (ranging from 338 in perceived emotional synchrony-identity fusion with women, to 8,907 in perceived emotional synchrony-behavioral synchrony), suggests consistent effects of the associations as well as the absence of potential selection biases with the samples used.

1.5.3 Model of Multiple Serial Mediation

We applied a model of multiple serial mediation (Model 6; Hayes’ PROCESS Macro for SPSS [Hayes, 2013]). However, as expected, there were more participants in the female category than in the male or other categories. To control this circumstance, multiple serial mediation was carried out using only women. The total effect of participation in 8M demonstrators (vs. non-demonstrators) on each dependent variable and total indirect effects are provided in Table 6. The demonstrators (vs. non-demonstrators) in the 8M protests was significantly related to higher scores on all dependent variables. These effects ranged from \(b = 0.19\) on identity fusion with women to \(b = 0.93\) on pro-woman behavior. Furthermore, participation (vs. non-participation) in 8M demonstrations was also significantly associated with all proposed mediating variables (with the exception of perceived emotional synchrony \([b = -0.04]\)). In particular, as seen in Figure 1, demonstrators (vs. non-demonstrators) at the protests were related to higher behavioral synchrony \((b = 0.52)\), intense positive emotions \((b = 0.80)\), and self-transcendent emotions \((b = 0.07)\). Regarding the connection between the mediating and dependent variables, our results revealed that not all paths emerged as...
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Our results showed that behavioral synchrony was only significantly related to increased solidarity towards women ($b = 0.06$) and self-transcendent experience ($b = 0.04$). Perceived emotional synchrony was associated with a greater self-transcendent experience ($b = 0.22$), situated social identity ($b = 0.14$) and identity fusion with demonstrators ($b = 0.06$), and feminists ($b = 0.05$). Similar results were found in the case of intense emotions. The experience of intense emotions was related to higher scores on the same variables (with coefficients ranging from .12 in self-transcendence experience to .31 in identification with feminists), as well as with increased pro-woman behavior ($b = 0.48$). Unlike the precedent mediators, self-transcendent emotion levels were significantly associated with all dependent variables (standardized coefficients ranged from .24 in identity fusion with feminists to .53 in self-transcendent experience and collective efficacy).

All total indirect effects emerged as significant because the 0 value was not included in any of the CIs generated. Therefore, our results confirmed that behavioral synchrony, perceived emotional synchrony, intense positive emotions, and self-transcendent emotions successively mediate the associations of participation (vs. non-participation) in 8M demonstrations with all dependent variables. Indirect effects ranged from $b = 0.30$ (in the case of identity fusion with women) to $b = 0.73$ (in situated social identity). Overall, participation in 8M protests was indirectly related to the self-transcendence experience, situated social identity, identity fusion with demonstrators, feminists and women, solidarity towards women, collective efficacy, and pro-woman behavior via its linkages with behavioral synchrony, perceived emotional synchrony, intense positive emotions, and self-transcendent emotions. After controlling for the effects of the mediator variables, the direct effects of participation (vs. non-participation) on solidarity towards women and collective efficacy were not significant.
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thus indicating the existence of complete mediations. Partial meditations were found for
the rest of dependent variables (i.e., self-transcendent experience, situated social
identity, identity fusion with demonstrators, feminists, and women, and pro-woman
behavior). Hypothesis 4 has only been partially confirmed.

Conclusions

Globally, this study is consistent with Durkheim’s theoretical proposal
(Durkheim, 1912/2008), later developed by Collins (2004), analyzing the 8M
demonstrations from the perspective of collective rituals. Participation in these
ritualized collective actions is related to a series of positive effects on well-being, both
individually and collectively. At the same time, such the participation in these ritualized
collective actions is linked to a series of psychosocial mechanisms (behavioral and
attentional synchrony, PES and intense self-referential and self-transcendent emotions),
which have been empirically studied in previous research with other collective rituals
and meetings (e.g., Páez et al., 2015; Gabriel et al., 2017; 2020; Wlodarczyk et al.,
2020).

The results obtained reveal that participation in collective rituals and gatherings,
with emotional sharing and convergence; reinforce most of the attributes of subjective
and psychological well-being (Diener et al., 2011; Ryff, 2014; Vázquez & Hervás,
2009). Compared with non-demonstrators (followers), demonstrators report higher
levels of well-being, such as subjective well-being or personal affective well-being
(positive and self-transcendent emotions), a greater meaning in life or sharing
transcendental values (agreement and contact with values), a sense of contextual and
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social identity that is coherent and strong (social identification and fusion identity),
mastery or high collective self-efficacy, or positive relations with others, and social
integration by means of participating in a women's movement. Some socio-demographic
variables such as gender, age, and political positioning were controlled for in an effort
to avoid the effect of previous differences between the comparison groups. In the
comparison by gender, there were higher female scores, especially regarding
antecedents and perceived emotional synchrony (albeit the effect size is small). This
partially confirms that participation in 8M demonstrations had a greater effect on
women (female). It is likely that the experience is intensified when one recognizes
herself as part of the target collective of the event.

All the explanatory variables, particularly attentional and behavioral synchrony,
perceived emotional synchrony and positive emotions (self-referential and self-
transcendent) are related to personal and social well-being, social integration, and
empowerment. In addition, the PES was significantly but heterogeneously associated
with the vast majority of the criterion variables and predicted them, except identity
fusion with women and collective efficacy, which revealed homogeneous effect sizes in
all countries. A recent meta-analysis on collective effervescence (Rimé et al., 2020)
supports the fact that there is a stable and solid association of perceived emotional
synchrony and results related to personal and social well-being, agreement with values,
social integration, empowerment, and pro-social behavior. In line with Włodarczyk et
al.'s (2020 in this monograph) work, behavioral and attentional synchrony, PES
antecedents, appeared to be related with a large effect size. In the same fashion, in line
with previous related research, the results revealed that PES is highly associated with
the intense positive emotional experience experienced during collective participation in
all samples, the joy created when sharing with others (Páez et al., 2015; Włodarczyk et
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al., 2020; Zabala et al., 2020), and with self-transcendent emotions (Cusi et al., 2018; Fiske et al., 2019; Pizarro et al., 2018). All psychosocial mechanisms studied showed large effect sizes (> .60). Moreover, PES has a positive, large-magnitude relation with the experience of transcendence, generated upon contact with collective symbols and values (Gabriel et al., 2020; Van Cappellen & Rimé, 2014). Large effect sizes were found, although more moderate in general, with variables related to cohesion and social integration, such as social identity or identity fusion, in concordance with previous research (e.g., Bäck et al., 2018; Khan et al., 2015). In general, these were greater in magnitude when in relation to the variables of situated or contextual social identity, meaning identification with other participants. On the other hand, in a broader sense of social identity (Gasparre et al., 2010), meaning solidarity toward women, there was a large effect size, but there was not in identity fusion with women, which revealed a medium-sized effect, although an effect that was homogeneous in cross-cultural terms. With the variables related to empowerment, PES displayed positive and significant relations with effect sizes above .40, showing that participation promotes the perception of collective efficacy in a homogeneous fashion at a transnational level, as well as beliefs of both individual and of collective growth (Páez et al., 2015; Wlodarczyk et al., 2020) in a heterogeneous fashion. This is also associated with a large, heterogeneous magnitude with the intention to help women.

In this regard, the analysis of sequential mediation conducted on the sample of women supports a model wherein participation facilitates attentional and behavioral synchrony, sparks collective effervescence or perceived emotional synchrony, boosts positive and transcendent emotions, facilitates agreement and contact with values and the sacred, and drives all the results. Specifically, these results indicate that participation in demonstrations reinforces positive, self-transcendental emotions above emotional
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synchrony. Participation in demonstrations through PES and intense positive emotions feeds into contact with values, situated and in-group social identity, and identity fusion. Lastly, participation through feelings of self-transcendence reinforces all the results. The results underscore the importance of experiences and emotions of self-transcendence because of the perceived emotional synchrony, which encourages the positive effects of collective meetings. Recent research provides empirical evidence in this same direction (Cusi et al., 2018; Pizarro et al., 2018). However, some results are striking. For example, the suppression effect found in identity fusion with women, which may be due to the characteristics intrinsic to the ritualized 8M demonstration, where one of the march's main pillars are women's claims and the active fight for civil rights.

We acknowledge the main limitations of this study. Firstly, we worked with a convenience sample, which is a limitation regarding inferences about the general population. Moreover, data collection in natural contexts makes more difficult to obtain large samples, diverse samples (age and gender), balanced numbers between countries (Brazil, Portugal, and Ecuador have smaller sample sizes), and types of participants in each country (Colombia and Brazil have lower percentages of demonstrators). Given the nature of 8M, the female population is over-represented, while male demonstrators are very few. Secondly, due to the correlational nature of the study and the characteristics mentioned above, some of the results may reflect previous differences between demonstrators and non-demonstrators, not necessarily linked to participation in the demonstrations, even with the statistical control that we undertook (age, gender, and political positioning). We suggest that future research should include pre-post measures or control groups to minimize this limitation. Thirdly, the sample also appears to be biased in favor of those willing to participate in in 8M-2020 (demonstrations and non-
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demonstrations) and the study, as well as toward a representative profile, given that
attention was focused on assessing the impact of participation. It would be useful to
include other study groups (e.g., control group) to assess these effects, beyond the
subjective perception of participation, and include the impact of 8M on the community
in general. This aspect, in addition to a longitudinal design, would allow control for
possible prior differences between the compared groups (e.g., demonstrations vs non-
demonstrations); in this correlational study, the effects of socio-demographic variables
and political orientation have been controlled for. Lastly, collective effervescence and
its relationship with the mid- and long-term effects of participation would be one of the
objectives to include in future research. According to previous literature, these effects
are limited over time. Páez and collaborators (2015) and Durkheim (1912/2008)
indicated that a necessary condition for a collective ritual’s effects to persist over time is
regularity (frequency).

Despite the limitations of this study, we believe that significant contributions
derive from the current research study. Firstly, we are not aware of previous studies that
analyze quantitative relationships between psycho-emotional effects of participating in
international social mobilizations, as the ritualized demonstrations of 8M. There is a
scar of peer-reviewed quantitative studies on the 8M participation and its psycho-
emotional correlates, or its relation to variables such as individual and collective well-
being, social cohesion or individual and collective growth, among others. Secondly, this
work shows the relevance of psycho-emotional mechanisms in both participants and
followers. This aspect has been largely neglected in the scientific literature (Hobson et
al., 2018), given that being an audience through mass media and social networks
(followers) is a new form of participation. Indeed, it is a step forward in the long and
active line of research on the participation in rituals and collective meetings and
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collective effervescence study, specially, being the first time that it is included in a
natural context an integrative measurement proposal made by Wlodarczyk and
collaborators (2020). From a social perspective, we believe that it is relevant to
emphasize the positive aspects (well-being and collective well-being, social integration,
collective empowerment, and behavioral intention to support others) associated with
participation in ritualized demonstrations.

In sum, this research provides valuable insight to understand the psychological
and emotional mechanisms (and their relationships) generated during collective
participation in ritualized collective actions such as 8M demonstrations. These findings
could also shed light on the relevant role of the experience of collective effervescence
that improves personal and social well-being, social cohesion and integration, and
empowerment of all participants, with more intensity in the reference group (in this
case, women). Finally, the shared cognitive and emotional experience in ritualized
collective actions serves to renew commitment to the community, to improve well-
being and to strengthen both the individuals and the groups involved. These shared
emotional experiences may prove to be useful tools to promote social change and the
transformation of societies, with the ultimate goal of working toward equality and
prosocial models through collective political participation.
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Table 1. Demographic characteristics of sample

| Characteristics     | Full Sample  | Demonstrators | Non-Demonstrators |
|---------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Age: M(SD)          | 30.55 (11.66)| 32.04 (11.88) | 29.35 (11.34)     |
| Gender              |              |               |                   |
| Female              | 83.8%        | 94.0%         | 75.9%             |
| Male                | 14.8%        | 4.1%          | 23.4%             |
| Non-binary          | 1.3%         | 1.9%          | 0.9%              |
| Education           |              |               |                   |
| High                | 86.4%        | 89.0%         | 84.4%             |
| Low                 | 13.6%        | 11.0%         | 15.6%             |
| Political positioning|             |               |                   |
| Left                | 65.8%        | 85.6%         | 47.3%             |
| Centre              | 23.3%        | 13.9%         | 32.0%             |
| Right               | 1.4%         | 0.5%          | 2.3%              |
| No positioning      | 9.5%         | 0%            | 18.5%             |
| N                   | 2854         | 1271          | 1583              |

Note: N = 2854. Valid percentage (%) are reported. Education: Dichotomized based on four levels (High = University, Low = Primary, Secondary, Tertiary). Political positioning: Continuous categorized scale 1 - 7 (Left = 1 and 2, Middle = 3, 4 and 5, Right = 6 and 7).
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Table 2
Descriptive analysis for each country sample

| Country    | N   | Age M (SD) | % Female | % Demonstrations | Continent   |
|------------|-----|------------|----------|------------------|-------------|
| Argentina  | 207 | 22.0 5.3   | 87.0%    | 24.2%            | Latin America |
| Brazil     | 72  | 35.5 14.8  | 88.9%    | 23.6%            | Latin America |
| Chile      | 475 | 29.7 11.3  | 86.5%    | 74.9%            | Latin America |
| Colombia   | 190 | 23.6 9.8   | 75.3%    | 12.1%            | Latin America |
| Ecuador    | 103 | 34.6 10.2  | 78.6%    | 56.3%            | Latin America |
| Spain      | 457 | 37.0 14.2  | 84.0%    | 51.4%            | Europe       |
| Mexico     | 1032| 30.1 9.4   | 86.0%    | 39.7%            | Latin America |
| Peru       | 245 | 29.8 11.9  | 75.5%    | 32.2%            | Latin America |
| Portugal   | 67  | 33.4 13.9  | 77.6%    | 62.7%            | Europe       |

Note: N = 2843 (11 subjects eliminated for not reporting your country).
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Table 3.
Descriptive analysis and correlations among target variables

| Variables                          | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8    | 9    | 10   | 11   | 12   | 13   | 14   | 15   | 16   | 17   | 18   |
|-----------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Participation                     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Behavioral synchrony              |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Perceived Emotional Synchrony    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Intense Positive Emotions        | .236** | 1   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Self-transcendent Emotions       |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Self-transcendent Experience     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Situated social identity         |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Identity Fusion demonstration’s  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Identity Fusion Feminist’s       |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Solidarity with Women            |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Identity Fusion Women            |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Collective Efficacy              |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Positive Individual Growth       |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Positive Collective Growth       |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Pro-women behavior              |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Political Orientation            |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Gender                           |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Age                              |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |

Note: Participants (0 = non-demonstrator/followers/audience, 1 = demonstrator), gender (1 = female, 2 = male, 3 = non-binary), political position (0 = no position, 1 = extreme left to 7 = extreme right).

* p ≤ .05; ** p ≤ .001.
Table 4.
Differences related to Participation and Gender in Criterion Variables.

| Variables                        | Participation-related differences | Gender differences |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|
|                                  | Demonstrators | Non-demonstrators | F   | p      | η² | Female | Male | Non-Binary | F   | p    | η² |
| 1. Behavioral synchrony          | 5.5(1.24)     | 4.87(1.56)        | 122.989 | <.001 | .044 | 5.23(1.44) | 4.76(1.59) | 5.24(1.37) | 17.050 | <.001 | .013 |
| 2. Perceived Emotional Synchrony | 5.82(1.15)    | 5.39(1.66)        | 40.663  | <.001 | .015 | 5.66(1.41) | 5.06(1.75) | 5.44(1.64) | 28.357 | <.001 | .021 |
| 3. Intense Positive Emotions     | 6.03(1.09)    | 4.20(2.01)        | 693.241 | <.001 | .207 | 5.15(1.83) | 3.85(2.02) | 5.53(1.46) | 85.616 | <.001 | .061 |
| 4. Self-transcendent Emotions    | 6.18(0.98)    | 4.64(2.02)        | 529.356 | <.001 | .166 | 5.45(1.72) | 4.27(2.08) | 5.66(1.57) | 77.126 | <.001 | .055 |
| 5. Self-transcendent Experience  | 5.89(1.17)    | 4.62(1.90)        | 360.784 | <.001 | .120 | 5.30(1.67) | 4.25(1.93) | 5.59(1.45) | 64.828 | <.001 | .047 |
| 6. Situated social identity      | 5.99(1.13)    | 4.24(2.12)        | 584.689 | <.001 | .181 | 5.17(1.89) | 3.80(2.07) | 5.39(1.69) | 89.645 | <.001 | .063 |
| 7. Identity Fusion Demonstrators | 4.12(0.97)    | 2.94(1.33)        | 554.985 | <.001 | .173 | 3.57(1.29) | 2.68(1.26) | 3.39(1.34) | 81.544 | <.001 | .058 |
| 8. Identity Fusion Feminist      | 4.19(0.94)    | 3.03(1.37)        | 558.975 | <.001 | .174 | 3.66(1.30) | 2.65(1.27) | 4.03(1.31) | 106.437 | <.001 | .074 |
| 9. Solidarity with Women         | 6.55(0.73)    | 5.78(1.47)        | 230.200 | <.001 | .080 | 6.18(1.23) | 5.63(1.43) | 6.21(1.31) | 33.810 | <.001 | .025 |
| 10. Identity Fusion Women        | 4.18(0.88)    | 3.92(1.05)        | 28.412  | <.001 | .111 | 4.13(0.96) | 3.50(0.97) | 3.91(1.18) | 72.084 | <.001 | .052 |
| 11. Collective Efficacy          | 6.30(0.89)    | 5.65(1.52)        | 169.220 | <.001 | .060 | 5.98(1.27) | 5.57(1.60) | 6.13(1.33) | 16.251 | <.001 | .012 |
| 12. Positive Individual Growth   | 4.53(1.40)    | 3.65(1.72)        | 218.086 | <.001 | .076 | 4.14(1.60) | 3.31(1.75) | 4.18(1.75) | 44.520 | <.001 | .032 |
| 13. Positive Collective Growth   | 5.18(0.98)    | 4.24(1.55)        | 281.587 | <.001 | .096 | 4.75(1.33) | 3.93(1.66) | 4.84(1.38) | 60.583 | <.001 | .044 |
| 14. Pro-women behavior           | 4.08(0.83)    | 3.00(1.25)        | 642.991 | <.001 | .195 | 3.58(1.16) | 2.68(1.24) | 4.00(1.10) | 103.079 | <.001 | .072 |

Note. Different superscripts represent significant differences (at least \( p < .05 \)) conducted as post-hoc DMS tests. \( n \) (Demonstrators) = 1091; \( n \) (Non-Demonstrators) = 1568; \( n \) (Women) = 2212; \( n \) (Male) = 414; \( n \) (Non-Binary) = 33. In Participation-related differences, gender, age, and political positioning scale have been controlled for. In Gender differences, age and political positioning scale have been controlled for.
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Table 5. Pooled Effect Size between PES and Criterion variables

| Variables                        | Effect Size 95% CI | Heterogeneity | Fail-safe N | Egger’s Regression |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|
|                                  | $r$    | Low | Up | $Q(8)$ | $p$ | $I^2$ | $n$ | Intercept | $t(7)$ | $p$ |
| 1. Behavioral Synchrony         | .64    | .586| .695| 40.57  | <.001 | 80.28 | 3266| -.179     | 0.99   | .355 |
| 2. Intense Positive Emotions    | .61    | .567| .657| 23.84  | .002  | 66.44 | 2800| 0.41      | 0.28   | .788 |
| 3. Self-transcendent Emotions   | .65    | .599| .697| 33.58  | <.001 | 76.18 | 3305| -.20      | 0.11   | .923 |
| 4. Self-transcendent Experience | .65    | .602| .697| 31.83  | <.001 | 74.87 | 3403| -2.25     | 1.51   | .175 |
| 5. Situated Social Identity     | .59    | .517| .652| 51.35  | <.001 | 84.42 | 2632| -2.81     | 1.48   | .183 |
| 6. Identity Fusion Demonstrators| .43    | .365| .492| 28.05  | <.001 | 71.48 | 1184| -1.62     | 1.09   | .310 |
| 7. Identity Fusion Feminist     | .40    | .312| .476| 45.46  | <.001 | 82.40 | 1010| -1.79     | 0.93   | .383 |
| 8. Solidarity with Women        | .43    | .361| .489| 28.31  | <.001 | 71.74 | 1179| -2.11     | 1.50   | .176 |
| 9. Identity Fusion Women        | .24    | .201| .286| 10.22  | .250  | 21.72 | 328 | -0.09     | 0.09   | .927 |
| 10. Collective Efficacy         | .40    | .368| .430| 3.42   | .905  | 0.00  | 932 | -0.79     | 1.66   | .140 |
| 11. Positive Individual Growth  | .41    | .335| .478| 34.94  | <.001 | 77.10 | 1087| -2.52     | 1.66   | .141 |
| 12. Positive Collective Growth  | .47    | .407| .523| 25.23  | .001  | 68.30 | 1431| -2.03     | 1.55   | .166 |
| 13. Pro-women Behavior          | .41    | .333| .483| 38.82  | <.001 | 79.39 | 1099| -2.42     | 1.47   | .185 |

Note. $N = 2843, k = 9$, number of studies included in the analysis. Fail-safe N: indicates Rosenthal's fail-safe N analysis.
Table 6.
Sequential mediation; total indirect effect and total effect.

| DV                                      | e    | f    | j    | k    | l    | o    | p    | Total indirect effect | Total effect |
|-----------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------------------------|--------------|
| Self-transcendent Experience            | .53**| .05* | .04**| .22**| .12**| .02  | -.03*| .70(.03) CI 95% [.63, .76] | .76(.06) CI 95% [1.13, 1.40] |
| Situated Social Identity                | .48**| .17**| .01  | .14**| .24**| -.02*| .03**| .73(.03) CI 95% [.67, .80] | .91(.07) CI 95% [1.59, 1.89] |
| IF Demonstrators                       | .32**| .35**| .002 | .06* | .25**| -.006| -.009| .57(.02) CI 95% [.51, .63] | .92(.05) CI 95% [1.10, 1.30] |
| Identity Fusion Feminist                | .24**| .34**| -.02 | .05* | .31**| -.02 | -.04*| .54(.02) CI 95% [.48, .60] | .88(.05) CI 95% [1.04, 1.25] |
| Solidarity with Women                   | .51**| .06  | .06* | .03  | .05  | -.006| .03* | .56(.03) CI 95% [.50, .63] | .63(.05) CI 95% [0.67, 0.88] |
| Identity Fusion Women                   | .24**| -.11*| .01  | .05  | .06  | .02  | .0003| .30(.03) CI 95% [.24, .36] | .19(.04) CI 95% [0.10, 0.27] |
| Collective Efficacy                    | .52**| .01  | .03  | .03  | .03  | -.009| -.01 | .53(.03) CI 95% [.47, .60] | .55(.05) CI 95% [0.60, 0.82] |
| Individual Growth                     | .40**| .34**| -.01 | .03  | .21**| -.07**| -.04*| .58(.02) CI 95% [.52, .64] | .93(.04) CI 95% [0.99, 1.17] |
| Collective Growth                     | .53**| -.01 | -.02 | .05* | .08* | -.01 | -.08**| .57(.03) CI 95% [.50, .63] | .55(.06) CI 95% [0.76, 1.02] |
| Pro-women Behavior                    | .48**| .11* | -.03*| .11**| .12**| -.01 | -.05**| .58(.03) CI 95% [.52, .65] | .69(.05) CI 95% [0.82, 1.04] |

Note. *p ≤ .05; **p ≤ .001. CI 95%. Standardized effects (Partially standardized total indirect effect). f = Total direct effect. N = 2217.
**FIGURES**

*Figure 1.* Model of multiple serial mediation with female sample.  
*Note:* Standardized direct effects were reported. * p < .05, ** p < .01.
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## Table I.
Socio-demographics data by country

| Country     | N   | M     | SD    | F   | M  | Non-Binary | Education<sup>a</sup> | Political positioning<sup>b</sup> |
|-------------|-----|-------|-------|-----|----|------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
|             |     |       |       |     |    |            | High     | Low     | Left | Middle | Right | No positioning |
| SPAIN       | 461 | 36.87 | (14.17)| 84.0%| 14.7%| 1.3%       | 85.6%    | 14.4%    | 65.8%| 23.3%   | 1.4%   | 9.5%          |
| Demonstrators | 238 | 36.84 | (14.89)| 92.4%| 5.9% | 1.7%       | 88.7%    | 11.3%    | 85.6%| 13.9%   | 0.5%   | 0.0%          |
| Non-demonstrators | 223 | 36.90 | (13.40)| 75.3%| 23.8%| 0.9%       | 82.0%    | 18%      | 47.3%| 32.0%   | 2.3%   | 18.5%         |
| MEXICO      | 1047| 29.98 | (9.39) | 86.0%| 13.6%| 0.4%       | 97.2%    | 2.8%     | 20.8%| 38.5%   | 2.2%   | 38.5%         |
| Demonstrators | 413 | 31.16 | (9.01) | 96.4%| 2.9% | 0.7%       | 97.4%    | 2.6%     | 35.2%| 61.6%   | 3.1%   | 0.0%          |
| Non-demonstrators | 634 | 29.21 | (9.56) | 79.2%| 20.5%| 0.3%       | 96.0%    | 4.0%     | 12.7%| 25.5%   | 1.7%   | 60.1%         |
| PERU        | 248 | 29.64 | (11.94)| 75.3%| 21.2%| 3.3%       | 95.0%    | 5.0%     | 28.4%| 41.2%   | 7.4%   | 23.0%         |
| Demonstrators | 81  | 30.63 | (13.73)| 91.4%| 3.7% | 4.9%       | 94.9%    | 5.1%     | 61.8%| 36.8%   | 1.3%   | 0.0%          |
| Non-demonstrators | 167 | 29.16 | (10.98)| 67.7%| 29.9%| 2.4%       | 94.6%    | 5.4%     | 13.2%| 43.1%   | 10.2%  | 33.5%         |
| COLOMBIA    | 203 | 23.19 | (9.84) | 75.3%| 23.2%| 1.6%       | 75.9%    | 24.1%    | 9.5% | 32.8%   | 3.0%   | 54.7%         |
| Demonstrators | 23  | 24.04 | (6.83) | 78.3%| 17.4%| 4.3%       | 85.7%    | 14.3%    | 61.9%| 38.1%   | 0.0%   | 0.0%          |
| Non-demonstrators | 180 | 23.08 | (10.17)| 76.1%| 22.8%| 1.1%       | 72.1%    | 27.9%    | 3.3% | 32.2%   | 3.3%   | 61.2%         |
| BRAZIL      | 72  | 35.56 | (14.75)| 88.9%| 9.7% | 1.4%       | 87.5%    | 7.0%     | 75.4%| 11.6%   | 0.0%   | 13.0%         |
| Demonstrators | 17  | 42.41 | (15.14)| 100% | 0.0% | 0.0%       | 0.0%     | 100%     | 92.9%| 7.1%    | 0.0%   | 0.0%          |
| Non-demonstrators | 55  | 33.44 | (14.10)| 85.5%| 12.7%| 1.8%       | 0.0%     | 100%     | 70.9%| 12.7%   | 0.0%   | 16.4%         |
| PORTUGAL    | 67  | 33.42 | (13.86)| 77.6%| 11.9%| 10.4%      | 0.0%     | 85.0%    | 73.2%| 8.9%    | 3.6%   | 14.3%        |
Collective effervescence during 8-M demonstrations

| Country     | Demonstrators | Mean (SD) | Non-demonstrators | Mean (SD) |
|-------------|---------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|
| **ARGENTINA** | 50 | 23.56 (6.57) | 159 | 21.56 (4.78) |
| Demonstrators | 209 | 22.04 (5.32) | 25 | 31.88 (14.55) |
| Non-demonstrators | 478 | 29.61 (11.31) | 45 | 32.38 (7.99) |
| **CHILE** | 358 | 29.87 (10.92) | 120 | 28.82 (12.41) |
| Demonstrators | 478 | 29.61 (11.31) | 25 | 31.88 (14.55) |
| Non-demonstrators | 103 | 34.65 (10.22) | 45 | 32.38 (7.99) |
| **ECUADOR** | 58 | 36.41 (11.43) | 45 | 32.38 (7.99) |

Note: Valid % are reported. *Dicotomized from four levels (High = University, Low = Primary, Secondary, Tertiary). Continuous scale 1 - 7 categorized (Left = 1 and 2, Middle = 3, 4 and 5, Right = 6 and 7).
Table II
Confirmatory Factor Analysis fits for each scale.

| Instrument                        | Items | $\chi^2$ | gl | CFI  | RMSEA | IC 90% RMSEA | SRMR | $\Omega$ |
|-----------------------------------|-------|----------|----|------|--------|--------------|------|----------|
| Perceived Emotional Synchrony     | 6     | 35.580   | 8  | .995 | .052   | .035, .070  | .011 | .818     |
| Intense Positive Emotions         | 3     | 0.001    | 0  | 1.00 | .000   | .000, .000  | .001 | .933     |
| Self-transcendent Emotions        | 5     | 23.223   | 4  | .999 | .041   | .026, .058  | .004 | .956     |
| Self-transcendent Experience      | 4     | 0.165    | 1  | 1.00 | .000   | .000, .037  | .001 | .927     |
| Situated Social Identity          | 3     | 0.001    | 0  | 1.00 | .000   | .000, .000  | .001 | .946     |
| Solidarity with Women             | 3     | 0.001    | 0  | 1.00 | .000   | .000, .000  | .001 | .911     |
| Collective Efficacy               | 4     | 2.031    | 1  | 1.00 | .019   | .000, .059  | .003 | .922     |
| Positive Individual Growth        | 3     | 0.001    | 0  | 1.00 | .000   | .000, .000  | .001 | .930     |
| Positive Collective Growth        | 3     | 0.001    | 0  | 1.00 | .000   | .000, .000  | .001 | .930     |
| Pro-women behavior                | 5     | 93.932   | 8  | .994 | 0.81   | .066, .098  | .017 | .930     |

*Note.* The fit indices utilized were Chi squared ($\chi^2$); Degrees of freedom (gl); Comparative Fit Index (CFI); RMSEA, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA); Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR); $\Omega$ (McDonald’s omega). Seven variables have excluded from this analysis for not having the recommended number of items (>3) to perform the CFA (Participation, Behavioral synchrony[2 items, $r = .57$], Identity Fusion demonstration, Identity Fusion Feminist, Identity Fusion Women, Political Orientation, and Subjective SES).
Table III.

*Correlational analysis with PES and Cronbach alpha for each criterion variable by country*

| VARIABLES                        | Argentina | Brazil | Chile | Colombia | Ecuador | Spain | Mexico | Peru | Portugal |
|----------------------------------|-----------|--------|-------|----------|---------|-------|--------|------|----------|
| Behavioral synchrony             | .59**     | .61**  | .54** | .74**    | .56**   | .65** | .71**  | .71**| .57**    |
| Intense Positive Emotions        | .47**     | .70**  | .58** | .58**    | .54**   | .62** | .63**  | .69**| .76**    |
| Transcendent Emotions            | .47**     | .77**  | .61** | .65**    | .54**   | .67** | .67**  | .73**| .72**    |
| Transcendent experience          | .60**     | .63**  | .62** | .62**    | .59**   | .65** | .71**  | .77**| .54**    |
| Situated social identity         | .48**     | .62**  | .53** | .50**    | .46**   | .63** | .68**  | .73**| .57**    |
| Identity Fusion demonstration    | .33**     | .32**  | .41** | .34**    | .46**   | .42** | .49**  | .62**| .33**    |
| Identity Fusion Feminist         | .42**     | .32**  | .32** | .30**    | .47**   | .37** | .49**  | .62**| .01      |
| Solidarity with Women            | .28**     | .19    | .32** | .13      | .34**   | .18** | .24**  | .29**| .20      |
| Identity Fusion Women            | .42**     | .40**  | .32   | .37**    | .41**   | .42** | .54**  | .49**| .40**    |
| Collective Efficacy              | .41**     | .32**  | .380* | .37**    | .32**   | .39** | .42**  | .44**| .42**    |
| Positive Individual Growth       | .40**     | .15    | .45** | .36**    | .29**   | .35** | .50**  | .60**| .37**    |
| Positive Collective Growth       | .41**     | .39**  | .40** | .48**    | .42**   | .44** | .55**  | .59**| .37**    |
| Pro-women behavior               | .42**     | .15    | .33** | .38**    | .35**   | .40** | .52**  | .58**| .41**    |

| VARIABLES                        | Scale Alphas (α) |
|----------------------------------|------------------|
| Behavioral synchrony*            | .66 (.49)        |
| Intense Positive Emotions        | .92              |
| PES                              | .81              |
| Transcendent Emotions            | .96              |
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|                           | .88 | .88 | .85 | .93 | .91 | .90 | .93 | .95 | .91 |
|---------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Transcendent experience   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Situated social identity  | .95 | .92 | .91 | .93 | .89 | .93 | .95 | .96 | .93 |
| Identity Fusion demonstration’s | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   |
| Identity Fusion Feminist  | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   |
| Solidarity with Women     | .91 | .89 | .86 | .90 | .86 | .91 | .92 | .88 | .80 |
| Identity Fusion Women     | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   |
| Collective Efficacy       | .90 | .88 | .90 | .90 | .87 | .91 | .92 | .93 | .86 |
| Positive Individual Growth| .93 | .90 | .92 | .93 | .91 | .92 | .92 | .94 | .95 |
| Positive Collective Growth| .89 | .93 | .87 | .92 | .88 | .94 | .90 | .94 | .94 |
| Pro-women behavior        | .89 | .85 | .84 | .89 | .84 | .86 | .89 | .94 | .85 |

| N                       | 207 | 72  | 475 | 190 | 103 | 457 | 1032 | 245 | 67  |

*Note:* Behavioral synchrony*: inside the parentheses reported total correlation of items corrected (2 items).
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### DATA FOR EACH GENDER

#### Table IV.

**Mean comparison between demonstrators and non-demonstrators for each gender (GML)**

| Variables                        | Female |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |
|----------------------------------|--------|----------|-----------|-------|----------|-----------|-------|----------|-----------|-------|----------|-----------|
|                                  |        | M        | SD        | F     | p        | η²        | M     | SD       | F         | p     | η²       | M         |
| Behavioral synchrony             |        | D's      | 5.61      | 1.25  | 156.40   | <.001     | .061  | 4.85     | 1.50      | .17   | .676     | .000      |
|                                  |        | Non D's  | 4.90      | 1.54  |          |           |       | 4.75     | 1.61      |       | 4.97     | 2.01      |
|                                  |        |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |
|                                  |        | D's      | 5.86      | 1.16  | 41.07    | <.001     | .017  | 5.03     | 1.42      | 0.00  | .968     | .000      |
|                                  |        | Non D's  | 5.50      | 1.60  |          |           |       | 5.04     | 1.79      |       | 5.55     | 2.25      |
|                                  |        |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |
|                                  |        | D's      | 6.05      | 1.10  | 666.69   | <.001     | .216  | 5.06     | 1.54      | 22.04| <.001    | .049      |
|                                  |        | Non D's  | 4.37      | 1.98  |          |           |       | 3.69     | 2.02      |       | 5.11     | 2.00      |
|                                  |        |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |
|                                  |        | D's      | 6.21      | 0.99  | 496.37   | <.001     | .170  | 5.48     | 1.31      | 2.67  | <.001    | .046      |
|                                  |        | Non D's  | 4.81      | 1.96  |          |           |       | 4.11     | 2.11      |       | 5.11     | 2.00      |
|                                  |        |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |
|                                  |        | D's      | 5.92      | 1.20  | 332.54   | <.001     | .121  | 5.25     | 1.33      | 15.83| <.001    | .036      |
|                                  |        | Non D's  | 4.76      | 1.86  |          |           |       | 4.13     | 1.95      |       | 5.12     | 2.21      |
|                                  |        |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |
|                                  |        | D's      | 6.01      | 1.16  | 536.15   | <.001     | .181  | 5.26     | 1.41      | 3.38  | <.001    | .067      |
|                                  |        | Non D's  | 4.42      | 2.10  |          |           |       | 3.62     | 2.08      |       | 4.80     | 2.39      |
|                                  |        |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |
|                                  |        | D's      | 4.17      | 0.95  | 571.47   | <.001     | .192  | 3.24     | 1.14      | 1.98  | .001     | .025      |
|                                  |        | Non D's  | 3.04      | 1.34  |          |           |       | 2.61     | 1.27      |       | 3.00     | 1.51      |
|                                  |        |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |
|                                  |        | D's      | 4.21      | 0.95  | 478.43   | <.001     | .166  | 3.55     | 1.05      | 29.99| <.001    | .066      |
|                                  |        | Non D's  | 3.15      | 1.38  |          |           |       | 2.54     | 1.26      |       | 3.73     | 1.58      |
|                                  |        |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |
|                                  |        | D's      | 6.57      | 0.76  | 214.46   | <.001     | .084  | 6.25     | 0.91      | 1.19  | .002     | .044      |
|                                  |        | Non D's  | 5.85      | 1.46  |          |           |       | 5.56     | 1.47      |       | 5.71     | 2.02      |
|                                  |        |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |
|                                  |        | D's      | 4.20      | 0.87  | 16.68    | <.001     | .007  | 3.55     | 0.97      | 0.14  | .709     | .000      |
|                                  |        | Non D's  | 4.04      | 1.05  |          |           |       | 3.49     | 0.98      |       | 3.93     | 1.28      |
|                                  |        |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |
|                                  |        | D's      | 6.32      | 0.91  | 148.79   | <.001     | .060  | 6.06     | 0.95      | 4.90  | .027     | .011      |
|                                  |        | Non D's  | 5.69      | 1.48  |          |           |       | 5.52     | 1.66      |       | 5.80     | 1.98      |
|                                  |        |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |
|                                  |        | D's      | 4.57      | 1.38  | 143.86   | <.001     | .058  | 4.12     | 1.55      | 11.55| .001     | .027      |
|                                  |        | Non D's  | 3.80      | 1.68  |          |           |       | 3.22     | 1.75      |       | 3.62     | 2.07      |
|                                  |        |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |
|                                  |        | D's      | 5.21      | 0.98  | 254.79   | <.001     | .099  | 4.72     | 1.22      | 12.47| <.001    | .029      |
|                                  |        | Non D's  | 4.37      | 1.48  |          |           |       | 3.84     | 1.68      |       | 4.20     | 2.08      |
|                                  |        |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |       |          |           |
|                                  |        | D's      | 4.09      | 0.84  | 481.85   | <.001     | .172  | 3.72     | 0.85      | 4.30  | <.001    | .087      |
|                                  |        | Non D's  | 3.13      | 1.22  |          |           |       | 2.55     | 1.24      |       | 3.43     | 1.46      |

*Note: D's = Demonstrators; Non D's = Non-Demonstrators, followers. Female: n(Demonstrators) = 1205. n(Non-Demonstrators) = 1222 / Male: D's = 48. Non D's =376 / Non-binary: D's = 24. Non D's =15.*
Table V. Gender comparison by participation type (GML).

|                          | Female          | Male            | Non-Binary | F   | p     | \(\eta^2\) | Demonstrators | Male            | Non-Binary | F   | p     | \(\eta^2\) |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------|-----|-------|------------|---------------|-----------------|------------|-----|-------|------------|
|                          | M (SD)          | M (SD)          | M (SD)     |     |       |            | M (SD)        | M (SD)          | M (SD)     |     |       |            |
| Behavioral synchrony     | 5.61 (1.25)b    | 4.85 (1.50)a    | 5.15 (1.36)| 1.54| <.001 | .016       | 5.86 (1.16)b  | 5.03 (1.42)a    | 5.11 (1.56)a | 16.60| <.001 | .025       |
| Perceived Emotional Synchrony | 6.05 (1.10)b  | 5.06 (1.54)a    | 5.54 (1.62)| 21.24| <.001 | .032       | 6.13 (1.09)b  | 5.13 (1.36)a    | 5.45 (1.63)a | 19.00| <.001 | .029       |
| Intense Positive Emotions | 6.21 (.99)b    | 5.48 (1.31)a    | 5.45 (1.63)| 19.00| <.001 | .032       | 6.14 (1.09)b  | 5.14 (1.36)a    | 5.45 (1.63)a | 19.00| <.001 | .032       |
| Self-transcendent Emotions | 6.01 (1.16)b  | 5.26 (1.41)a    | 5.43 (1.53)| 12.77| <.001 | .020       | 6.14 (1.09)b  | 5.14 (1.36)a    | 5.45 (1.63)a | 19.00| <.001 | .029       |
| Self-transcendent Experience | 6.01 (1.16)b  | 5.26 (1.41)a    | 5.43 (1.53)| 12.77| <.001 | .020       | 6.14 (1.09)b  | 5.14 (1.36)a    | 5.45 (1.63)a | 19.00| <.001 | .029       |
| Situated social identity | 6.01 (1.16)b  | 5.26 (1.41)a    | 5.43 (1.53)| 12.77| <.001 | .020       | 6.14 (1.09)b  | 5.14 (1.36)a    | 5.45 (1.63)a | 19.00| <.001 | .029       |
| Identity Fusion demonstration’s | 6.01 (1.16)b  | 5.26 (1.41)a    | 5.43 (1.53)| 12.77| <.001 | .020       | 6.14 (1.09)b  | 5.14 (1.36)a    | 5.45 (1.63)a | 19.00| <.001 | .029       |
| Identity Fusion Feminist | 6.01 (1.16)b  | 5.26 (1.41)a    | 5.43 (1.53)| 12.77| <.001 | .020       | 6.14 (1.09)b  | 5.14 (1.36)a    | 5.45 (1.63)a | 19.00| <.001 | .029       |
| Solidarity with Women    | 6.01 (1.16)b  | 5.26 (1.41)a    | 5.43 (1.53)| 12.77| <.001 | .020       | 6.14 (1.09)b  | 5.14 (1.36)a    | 5.45 (1.63)a | 19.00| <.001 | .029       |
| Identity Fusion Women    | 6.01 (1.16)b  | 5.26 (1.41)a    | 5.43 (1.53)| 12.77| <.001 | .020       | 6.14 (1.09)b  | 5.14 (1.36)a    | 5.45 (1.63)a | 19.00| <.001 | .029       |
| Collectif Efficacy       | 6.01 (1.16)b  | 5.26 (1.41)a    | 5.43 (1.53)| 12.77| <.001 | .020       | 6.14 (1.09)b  | 5.14 (1.36)a    | 5.45 (1.63)a | 19.00| <.001 | .029       |
| Positive Individual Growth | 6.01 (1.16)b  | 5.26 (1.41)a    | 5.43 (1.53)| 12.77| <.001 | .020       | 6.14 (1.09)b  | 5.14 (1.36)a    | 5.45 (1.63)a | 19.00| <.001 | .029       |
| Positive Collective Growth | 6.01 (1.16)b  | 5.26 (1.41)a    | 5.43 (1.53)| 12.77| <.001 | .020       | 6.14 (1.09)b  | 5.14 (1.36)a    | 5.45 (1.63)a | 19.00| <.001 | .029       |

Note: Different superscripts represent significant differences (at least p < .05) conducted as post-hoc DMS tests. n(Demonstrators) = 1271; n(Non-Demonstrators) = 1583; n(Female) = 2393; n(Male) = 423; n(Non-Binary) = 38, after conducting post-hoc DMS tests. Age and political positioning scale have been controlled.
Table VI.
Regression analysis for the outcome variables

| Dependent Variables               | PES                     | Participation in demonstrations | Gender                  | Age                      | Political Position                  |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
|                                   | $b$ | 95% IC [LL, LU] | Beta | $b$ | 95% IC [LL, LU] | Beta | $b$ | 95% IC [LL, LU] | Beta | $b$ | 95% IC [LL, LU] | Beta | R    | $R^2$ |
| Self-Transcendence Experience     | 0.76** | [0.73, 0.79] | .64 | 10.00** | [0.90, 10.09] | .28 | -0.13* | [-0.24, -0.20] | .03 | -0.006** | [-0.009, -0.002] | .05 | -0.06** | [-0.09, -0.04] | .06 | .74 | .55** |
| Situated Social Identity          | 0.75** | [0.72, 0.79] | .57 | 10.46** | [10.35, 10.57] | .36 | -0.27** | [-0.39, -0.14] | .06 | 0.006** | [0.002, 0.011] | .04 | -0.12** | [-0.15, -0.09] | -.10 | .72 | .52** |
| Identity fusion’s demonstrators   | 0.36** | [0.33, 0.39] | .40 | 10.02** | [0.09, 10.11] | .38 | -0.25** | [-0.35, -0.15] | .08 | 0.001 | [-0.003, 0.004] | .001 | -0.05** | [-0.08, -0.03] | -.07 | .61 | .37** |
| Identity Fusion Feminist’s        | 0.33** | [0.30, 0.36] | .37 | 10.04** | [0.09, 10.13] | .38 | -0.28** | [-0.38, -0.18] | .09 | 0.004* | [-0.38, -0.18] | -.04 | -0.06** | [-0.09, -0.04] | -.08 | .58 | .34** |
| Solidarity with Women             | 0.36** | [0.33, 0.39] | .42 | 00.62** | [0.53, 0.72] | .05 | -0.08 | [-0.19, 0.02] | .03 | 0.005 | [0.01, 0.07] | .04 | -0.04** | [-0.07, -0.02] | -.06 | .51 | .26** |
| Identity Fusion Women             | 0.13** | [0.11, 0.16] | .20 | 0.15* | [0.07, 0.23] | .07 | -0.39** | [-0.48, -0.30] | -.16 | -0.001 | [-0.002, 0.004] | .01 | -0.01 | [-0.04, -0.01] | -.02 | .29 | .09** |
| Collective Efficacy               | 0.35** | [0.32, 0.38] | .39 | 0.58** | [0.48, 0.67] | .21 | 0.03 | [-0.09, 0.14] | .01 | -0.003 | [-0.01, 0.00] | -.09 | -0.07** | [-0.10, -0.04] | -.09 | .47 | .22** |
| Positive Individual Growth        | 0.44** | [0.41, 0.48] | .40 | 0.75** | [0.64, 0.87] | .22 | -0.21* | [-0.35, -0.08] | -.05 | -0.012** | [-0.02, -0.01] | -.08 | -0.09 | [-0.12, -0.06] | -.09 | .51 | .26** |
| Positive Collective Growth        | 0.44** | [0.41, 0.47] | .47 | 0.77** | [0.67, 0.86] | .26 | -0.20** | [-0.31, -0.10] | -.06 | -0.01* | [-0.012, -0.005] | -.07 | -0.08** | [-0.10, -0.05] | -.09 | .59 | .34** |
| Pro-women behavior                | 0.32** | [0.29, 0.34] | .39 | 10.01** | [0.93, 10.10] | .41 | -0.21** | [-0.30, -0.12] | -.07 | -0.005** | [-0.008, -0.002] | -.05 | -0.10** | [-0.12, -0.08] | -.14 | .61 | .37** |

Note. A significant $b$ weight indicates the *beta* weight correlation are also significant. $b$ represents unstandardized regression weights. Beta indicates the standardized regression weights. LL and UL indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively. Participants ($0 = $non-demonstrator$/$followers$/$audience, $1 = $demonstrator$), gender ($1 = $female, $2 = $male, $3 = $non-binary$), political position ($0 = $no position, $1 = $extreme left to $7 = $extreme right$),* indicates $p < .05$. ** indicates $p < .01$
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Table VII.
Brief Ethnographic description 8M-2020 Demonstrations by country.

| Country | Ethnographic description | Synchronized emotional expression | Context of repression |
|---------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Argentina | Collective protest actions, as well as massive political gatherings in public places, are integral to Argentina’s political culture. In the case of the demonstration on March 8, under the slogan “not one less” the rejection of gender violence is expressed. In 2020, the most prominent chant was “The Rapist Is You”. As is traditional in Argentine marches, the rejection of the budget adjustment and the precariousness of labor was also expressed. The 2020 demonstration had moderately less support than that of 2019, presumably because of the pro-abortion identification that currently prevails in the movement, with which not all Argentine feminists identify. A large part of the scarves, banners and other symbols used in 2019 was violet, representing the feminist struggle, while in 2020, the color green, typical of the pro-abortion movement, stood out. | • choreography “Un violador en tu camino” (A rapist in your way) • Manifesto reading • Synchronized singing • Performances • Mask-covered faces | No violence is reported during demonstrations or repressive actions by the security forces. |
| Brazil | March 8, 2020, a rainy day, was marked by protests in the streets of Salvador for more rights. Several feminist collectives, trade union movements, and leftist political parties that brought together women of all ages walked along the edge of the beach with the slogan “Women against Bolsonaro, for our lives, democracy, rights and justice for Marielle (councilwoman murdered in Rio de Janeiro) January 14, 2018) and Dandaras (transvestite murdered in 2017)”. They also protested against the increase in femicides, the dismantling of Social Security, and the negligence of the Bolsonaro government. Amid the demonstrations and shouts of “Mariele lives”, outside Bolsonaro and not him, banners and posters acquire a political tone, with criticism of the government of Jair Bolsonaro, women for democracy, against fascism, patriarchy, the defense of women's rights, the legalization of abortion, for the end of racism and prejudice against LGBT people. Many of the women who participated in the march wore feminist collective T-shirts and protest stickers. A group of young people linked to the popular youth uprising accompanied the walk with percussion, performance, and protest songs. | • choreography “Un violador en tu camino” (A rapist in your way) • Synchronized singing • Performances • Batucada | Besides some isolated events, there was no violence or repressive actions during 8M |
| Chile | In Chile, specifically in Antofagasta, the 8M demonstrations were massive but mostly separatist. In them, music was a central element; chants, choreographies related to the Chilean-born project “Un violador en tu camino” (A rapist in your way) were observed. The people used colors that were most representative of feminist struggles, but also costumes and banners. On this occasion, people and collectives who had never before attended the 8M demonstration were observed. In general, women emphasized gender violence and harassment, but they also mentioned the body as a space for liberation from | • choreography “Un violador en tu camino” (A rapist in your way) • Synchronized singing • Performances • Mask-covered faces | In general, there were events of police violence in some cities during the demonstrations. However, in most cities, these events were limited, and the |
social mandates. The recurrent slogans referred to sexual and reproductive rights and violence against women. The level of emotional intensity was high, and accompanied by symbolic and artistic expressions.

Colombia

The commemoration of 8M in Colombia takes place in a context of large-scale social mobilizations that began in September 2019 and included strikes, blockades of highways, and a strong repressive reaction by the police. Student organizations and indigenous movements supported this demonstration. Commemorative events were conducted during the previous days (March 6 and 7) and a massive demonstration in the main cities of the country that included the performance of the project "Un violador en tu camino" (a rapist in your way), graffiti, dances, songs and the dissemination of reports about gender violence. In general, large groups of women, activists, and feminists attended the demonstration. There was a large presence of female university students. In some cities such as Barranquilla (one of the cities where the sample was collected), the demonstrations lasted until the next day with academic activities and protests in government buildings, demanding justice for the femicide that had occurred in the country.

Ecuador

In Ecuador, especially in Quito, a massive demonstration brought together women of all ages mainly to demand the protection of their rights and to denounce the femicides that had occurred in previous months. The demonstration was attended by groups of native women, who denounced the inequality as women and as native people. At different times during the demonstration, there were performances and artistic demonstrations that included the Chilean choreography "Un violador en tu camino" (A rapist in your way) and mask in allusion to the artistic work "La ciudad de las mujeres innoles" (The city of ignoble women), by Rosa Amelia Poveda, which reflects on gender violence.

Spain

In Spain, the 8M demonstrations were massive and mostly by women, although not separatists. In different cities, from previous days and the same day of the demonstration, the choreography of "(Un violador en tu camino) a rapist on a road" was carried out several times. During the demonstration, the colors purple and green prevail in the assistants, who go organizing by groups supporting different causes (Against gender violence, racism, migration, pro-abortion). Also present were the batucada, as every year, as well as cultural expressions, performances, and songs.
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Mexico
In general, the 8M demonstration was massive and had great national exposure. In different cities of Mexico, it was possible to observe expressions of protest and repudiation by women tired of the gender-based aggressions that result in a serious problem of femicide of at least 10 women every day in the country. Family members and friends of the victims were present at the demonstrations demanding justice. The mobilizations were emotional and full of symbolism, including choreography, body movements, shouts, etc., since many of them reached memorials dedicated to the murdered women. There were also minutes of silence and large bonfires with flags remembering the feminist struggles and gender violence. In some cities such as Coahuila (one of the cities where the sample was collected), the 8M demonstration was massive for the first time and separatist (only women in the demonstration). The demonstration, and the women's general strike the following day, was felt strongly and consolidated the visibility of a profound gender problem in the country.

- choreography “Un violador en tu camino” (A rapist in your way)
- Ceremony in memory of victims
- Synchronized singing
- Batucada
- Mask-covered faces

There were small physical confrontations with opposing organizations (pro-life). There was violence towards stores, monuments, offices, and police.

Peru
The demonstrators, mostly women, and from LGTBIQ+ collectives, are mobilizing along the most important highways in the center of the capital city and other cities. In addition to banners and chants alluding to the struggle for women's rights, banners and chants are usually prepared for the event, as well as costumes and makeup that recall milestones in this movement, as well as historical events that have given strength to the collectives' demands, some of which are the forced sterilizations or disappearances and emblematic femicides. The protesters generally organize in groups that defend certain agendas with greater emphasis (the feminist struggle, gender violence, the rights of the transgender collective, etc). The event usually combines the space of protest and claiming with the use of artistic expressions, mainly music and performance. The colors purple and green stand out in the clothing and paraphernalia, as well as black and red as a sign of remembrance and mourning for femicide and gender violence in general.

- choreography “Un violador en tu camino” (A rapist in your way)
- Batucada
- Performance
- Mask-covered faces

No events of repression or violence by police forces were observed during the 8M demonstrations.

Portugal
The 2020 Women's Day, in Portugal, was marked with demonstrations all over the country and by a feminist strike. The feminist organization “Rede de Março” (March Network; a national platform that brings together collectives, associations, political organizations, unions and individual people), promoted the national feminist strike (called for the second consecutive year), and organized simultaneous protests and demonstrations, in the cities of Amarante, Aveiro, Braga, Coimbra, Évora, Faro, Lisbon, Porto, Viseu, Vila Real and Ponta Delgada. In parallel, the Democratic Women's Movement (MDM) organized a single event in the Portuguese capital, Lisbon that included a march and a concentration, calling women from all over the country, from north to south. In both initiatives attended both women and men, national and foreign citizens, coming together for a common goal. The initiatives were marked essentially by

- choreography “Un violador en tu camino” (A rapist in your way)
- Batucada
- Performance

There was no repression of any kind during the demonstrations.
demands against gender discrimination, gender inequality and gender-based violence that persists in the streets, in schools, and in the workplace. The events also drew attention to the scourge of domestic violence, and to the need for more preventive and combat policies and actions against it. The events were colored mostly by purple; songs, speeches, and shouts of protesters filled participants held posters and banners, and the environment of the events.
## Table VIII.

*Data Collections Strategy 8M-2020 studies by Country.*

| Country   | Data Collection Strategy |
|-----------|--------------------------|
| Argentina | The data collection was done for convenience. The survey was shared via a link to the Qualtrics application that was distributed, after a brief explanation of the study, to university students who reported attending the demonstration. They also shared the link with acquaintances who participated in the march. In addition, the link was shared via social media, e-mails, and email to participants and people who had followed the demonstrations through the media and social networks (non-demonstrators, supporters). The data was collected between March 8 and March 13, 2020 and the approximate time to complete the survey was 30 minutes. |
| Brazil    | The data collection was done for convenience. The survey was shared through social networks, emails and electronic media to participants and people who had followed the demonstrations through the media and social networks (Non-protesters, supporters). The data was collected between March 8 and March 17, 2020 and the approximate time to complete the survey was 30 minutes. |
| Chile     | Data collection was conducted for convenience. The survey was shared through a link on social media, among students of the Universidad Católica de Chile, friends, and colleagues (snowball sampling). The data was collected between March 8 and 20, 2020, and the approximate time to complete the survey was 25 minutes. |
| Colombia  | The data collection was conducted for convenience. The survey was shared by providing a link and a QR code to the Qualtrics application that was distributed during the demonstrations to participants and interested audience members after a brief explanation of the study. The link was also shared via email to social psychology students and they were asked to share the link with their friends and family. The data was collected from March 8th to 15th and the approximate time to complete it was 30 minutes. |
| Ecuador   | The data was collected between March 8 and 12 through an online link sent for convenience to members of groups and organizations close to the subject, as well as through social media to the general population. In both cases, e-mail and WhatsApp were also used. |
| Spain     | The data collection was done for convenience. The survey was shared through a link and a QR code of the qualtrics application that was distributed during the demonstrations to interested attendees after a brief explanation of the study. Also, the link of responses was shared through social networks, emails and electronic media to participants and people who had followed the demonstrations through the media and social networks (Non-protesters, followers). The data was collected between March 8 and March 13, 2020 and the approximate time to complete the survey was 30 minutes. |
| Mexico    | In Mexico, the survey was done with a procedure of convenience, which consisted of creating a micro-site where the purpose of the study, the treatment and safeguard of the data, a brief summary of the informed consent, and the assertion of the scientific (and non-remunerated) use of the participants were explained. The micro-site had a short link that was shared by social networks (personal and laboratory pages) on FB, Twitter accounts, and in the present and past groups of online classrooms. Also, it was sent to a mailing list. In all cases people were asked to respond to the survey, and also to share it with their own contacts. |
| Peru      | The data was collected between March 8 and 10 through an online link sent for convenience to members of groups and organizations close to the subject, as well as through social media to the general population. In both cases, e-mail and WhatsApp were also used. |
| Portugal  | The data collection was done for convenience. The survey was shared through a Link and a QR code from the qualtrics application that was shared to the general population, resident in Portugal, through Facebook and Instagram Ads, Facebook groups, and WhatsApp. The data was collected between March 8 and 13, 2020 and the approximate time to complete the survey was 30 minutes. |
Figure 1. Model of multiple serial mediation with female sample.

Note: Standardized direct effects were reported. * p < .05, ** p < .01.