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**Table A1. Score of parties included in the analyses**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Election** | **Vote share**  **(Real)** | **Vote share**  **(Sample)** | **Avg. expectations of chances of winning according to respondents** |
| **2011 Ontario (provincial)** |  |  |  |
| OLP | 38% | 39% | 5.9 |
| PC | 35% | 37% | 5.6 |
| ONPD | 23% | 21% | 3.8 |
| GPO | 3% | 4% | 0.9 |
|  |  |  |  |
| **2012 Quebec election (provincial)** |  |  |  |
| PQ | 32% | 34% | 5.7 |
| PLQ | 31% | 26% | 4.6 |
| CAQ | 27% | 27% | 4.6 |
| QS | 6% | 10% | 2.1 |
| ON | 2% | 2% | 0.8 |
| PVQ | 1% | 2% | 1.2 |
|  |  |  |  |
| **2015 Ontario (federal)** |  |  |  |
| CLP | 45% | 45% | 5.9 |
| CPC | 35% | 31% | 5.4 |
| NPD | 17% | 20% | 4.5 |
| GPC | 3% | 3% | 1.5 |
|  |  |  |  |
| **2015 British Columbia (federal)** |  |  |  |
| CLP | 35% | 34% | 5.6 |
| CPC | 30% | 28% | 5 |
| NPD | 26% | 31% | 5 |
| GPC | 8% | 7% | 2.6 |
|  |  |  |  |
| **2015 Quebec (federal)** |  |  |  |
| CLP | 36% | 33% | 5.4 |
| NPD | 25% | 25% | 5.7 |
| BQ | 19% | 22% | 4 |
| CPC | 16% | 17% | 3.6 |
| GPC | 2% | 3% | 1.5 |

2011 Ontario election

After the 2011 Ontario provincial election, the incumbent OLP Premier, Dalton McGuinty, was re-elected with 38% of the vote~~s~~ and 50% of seats. The PCO formed the official opposition with 35% of the vote~~s~~ and 35% of seats. The ONDP came third with 23% of the vote and 16% of seats, while the GPO received 3% of the vote and no seat.

2012 Quebec election

In the 2012, the incumbent PLQ premier, Jean Charest, called an early election in the midst of a social conflict involving student mobilization and corruption scandals. The PQ won the election with 32% of the vote and 43% of the seats, forming a minority government. The closest opponents were the PLQ, which received 31% of the vote and 40% of seats. The CAQ came third with 27% of the vote and 15% of seats, and lastly QS received 6% of the vote and less than 1% of seats. Finally, the ON and the PVQ obtained respectively 2% and 3% of votes but failed to win any seats in the Quebec legislature.

2015 Canada election

In the 2015 Canadian federal election, incumbent Prime Minister Stephen Harper of the CPC lost against the LPC and its leader Justin Trudeau. The CPC received 32% of the vote and 29% of seats. The LPC won with 39% of the vote and 54% of seats. The score of the party is mainly due to its landslide victory in Ontario where it received 45% of the vote and 66% of seats. The BQ, which only competes in Quebec, came third with 5% of the national vote (19% in the province) and 3% of seats. The NDP obtained 24.2% of the vote and 19.7% of seats. Finally, the GPC obtained 3% of the vote and one seat (their leader, Elizabeth May, in British Columbia). No other party received more than 1% of the vote at the national level.

**Table A2. Regressions with weights**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **(Model 3)** | **(Model 4)** |
| Polarisation between viable parties | 0.18\* | 0.11 |
|  | (0.07) | (0.09) |
| Preference for viable parties (favourite v/s least favourite) |  | 0.57\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.07) |
| Preference for favourite parties (non-viable v/s viable) |  | -0.55\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.06) |
| Age | 0.01 | 0.01 |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| Female | -0.04 | -0.04 |
|  | (0.16) | (0.18) |
| University degree | 0.43\* | 0.42\* |
|  | (0.17) | (0.19) |
| Political sophistication | -0.05 | -0.03 |
|  | (0.07) | (0.07) |
| Partisan | -0.48\*\* | -0.25 |
|  | (0.17) | (0.19) |
| Difference in perceived chances | 0.22\*\*\* | 0.28\*\*\* |
|  | (0.03) | (0.04) |
| Survey fixed effects | YES | YES |
| Constant | -2.02\*\*\* | -1.04 |
|  | (0.51) | (0.56) |
| N | 757 | 757 |
| Pseudo *R*2 | 0.072 | 0.200 |

*Note: Entries are coefficients from a logit regression predicting the probability of non-viable party supporters to cast a strategic vote (similar to Table 3). Standard errors are in parentheses.*

*\** *p*<0.05, \*\* *p*<0.01.

**Table A3. Regressions without controls**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **(Model 3)** | **(Model 4)** |
| Polarisation between viable parties | 0.16\* | 0.07 |
|  | (0.07) | (0.08) |
| Preference for viable parties (favourite v/s least favourite) |  | 0.51\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.06) |
| Preference for favourite parties (non-viable v/s viable) |  | -0.48\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.05) |
| Constant | -0.62\*\*\* | 0.47\* |
|  | (0.17) | (0.23) |
| Observations | 757 | 757 |
| Pseudo *R*2 | 0.005 | 0.127 |

*Note: Entries are coefficients from a logit regression predicting the probability of non-viable party supporters to cast a strategic vote (similar to Table 3). Standard errors are in parentheses. \** *p*<0.05, \*\* *p*<0.01.

**Table A4. Regressions with alternative measure of viability**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **(Model 3)** | **(Model 4)** |
| Polarisation between viable parties | 0.19\*\* | 0.09 |
|  | (0.06) | (0.08) |
| Preference for viable parties (favourite v/s least favourite) |  | 0.56\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.06) |
| Preference for favourite parties (non-viable v/s viable) |  | -0.48\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.05) |
| Age | 0.01 | 0.01 |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| Female | 0.04 | -0.13 |
|  | (0.17) | (0.19) |
| University degree | 0.32 | 0.41\* |
|  | (0.18) | (0.20) |
| Political sophistication | 0.15\* | 0.22\*\* |
|  | (0.07) | (0.08) |
| Partisan | -0.30 | -0.12 |
|  | (0.18) | (0.21) |
| Difference in perceived chances | 0.10\*\* | 0.22\*\*\* |
|  | (0.04) | (0.04) |
| Survey fixed effects | YES | YES |
| Constant | -2.37\*\*\* | -2.29\*\*\* |
|  | (0.58) | (0.65) |
| Observations | 606 | 606 |
| Pseudo *R*2 | 0.035 | 0.206 |

*Note: Entries are coefficients from a logit regression predicting the probability of non-viable party supporters to cast a strategic vote (similar to Table 3). Standard errors are in parentheses.*

*\** *p*<0.05, \*\* *p*<0.01.

**Table A5. Regressions with left-right placements instead of party like/dislike scores**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **(Model 1)** | **(Model 2)** |
| Polarisation between viable parties | 0.19\*\* | 0.09 |
|  | (0.06) | (0.08) |
| Proximity to favourite viable party – Proximity to least favourite viable party |  | 0.56\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.06) |
| Proximity to favourite non-viable party – Proximity to favourite viable party |  | -0.48\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.05) |
| Age | 0.01 | 0.01 |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| Female | 0.04 | -0.13 |
|  | (0.17) | (0.19) |
| University degree | 0.32 | 0.41\* |
|  | (0.18) | (0.20) |
| Political sophistication | 0.15\* | 0.22\*\* |
|  | (0.07) | (0.08) |
| Partisan | -0.30 | -0.12 |
|  | (0.18) | (0.21) |
| Difference in perceived chances | 0.10\*\* | 0.22\*\*\* |
|  | (0.04) | (0.04) |
| Survey fixed effects | YES | YES |
| Constant | -2.37\*\*\* | -2.29\*\*\* |
|  | (0.58) | (0.65) |
| Observations | 606 | 606 |
| Pseudo *R*2 | 0.035 | 0.206 |

*Note: Entries are coefficients from a logit regression predicting the probability of non-viable party supporters to cast a strategic vote (similar to Table 3). Standard errors are in parentheses. \** *p*<0.05, \*\* *p*<0.01.

**Table A6. Regressions without Quebec**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **(Model 1)** | **(Model 2)** |
| Polarisation between viable parties | 0.16 | 0.02 |
|  | (0.10) | (0.11) |
| Preference for viable parties (favourite v/s least favourite) |  | 0.59\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.08) |
| Preference for favourite parties (non-viable v/s viable) |  | -0.51\*\*\* |
|  |  | (0.07) |
| Age | 0.00 | 0.01 |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| Female | -0.08 | -0.17 |
|  | (0.19) | (0.21) |
| University degree | 0.56\*\* | 0.57\* |
|  | (0.20) | (0.22) |
| Political sophistication | -0.04 | -0.03 |
|  | (0.08) | (0.08) |
| Partisan | -0.28 | -0.01 |
|  | (0.20) | (0.23) |
| Difference in perceived chances | 0.25\*\*\* | 0.30\*\*\* |
|  | (0.04) | (0.05) |
| Survey fixed effects (without Quebec) | YES | YES |
| Constant | -2.24\*\*\* | -1.24 |
|  | (0.59) | (0.65) |
| N | 495 | 495 |
| Pseudo *R*2 | 0.080 | 0.203 |

*Note: Entries are coefficients from a logit regression predicting the probability of non-viable party supporters to cast a strategic vote (similar to Table 3). Standard errors are in parentheses.*

*\** *p*<0.05, \*\* *p*<0.01.

**Table A7. Questions used in the surveys**

Party Liking

Please rate each of the following political parties in [province] on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means you really dislike that party and 10 means that you really like that party.

Expectations

Please rate the chances of each party’s candidate winning the seat in your local riding on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means no chance at all and 10 means certain to win.

Partisanship

Do you usually think of yourself as close to any particular political party in [province]?

- Yes

- No

- Don’t know

Education

What is the highest level of education that you have completed?

-Less than secondary school

-Graduated from secondary school

-Certificate or diploma from community college, CEGEP.

-Completed some university study, but no degree

-University certificate or diploma below bachelor level

-Graduate or professional degree above bachelor level

Vote choice

Which party did you vote for?

Left-right placement

In politics people sometimes talk of left and right. Where would you place each of the party in [province] on a 0 to 10 scale where 0 means far left and 10 means far right?

In politics people sometimes talk of left and right. Where would you place yourself on this scale on a 0 to 10 scale where 0 means far left and 10 means far right?

Political sophistication

*Canada 2015*

Below there are names of four parties and pictures of eight different people. Four of the people are party leaders in the FEDERAL election, one from each party. Match leaders with Conservative Party of Canada/New Democratic Party of Canada/Liberal Party of Canada/Green Party of Canada/Bloc Québécois.

Can you indicate which party is associated with the following slogans?

-Protect our economy

-Ready for change

-It’s time for real change

-A Canada that works. Together.

*Ontario 2011*

Below there are names of four parties and pictures of eight different people. Four of the people are party leaders in the FEDERAL election, one from each party. Match leaders with Conservative Party of Ontario/New Democratic Party of Ontario/Liberal Party of Ontario.

Can you indicate which party is associated with the following slogans?

-Forward together

-It’s time for change in Ontario

-You can choose the change you want

*Quebec 2012*

Below there are names of four parties and pictures of eight different people. Four of the people are party leaders in the FEDERAL election, one from each party. Match leaders with Parti libéral du Québec/Parti Québécois/Québec solidaire.

Can you indicate which party is associated with the following slogans?

-A nous de choisir

-Debout

-Pour le Québec

-C’est assez, c’est le temps que ça change