

**Loyalty Across Levels:
Provincial and Federal Partisanship in Canada**

Laura B. Stephenson
Department of Political Science
University of Western Ontario

Éric Bélanger
Department of Political Science
McGill University

Paper prepared for delivery at the annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association
Carleton University, Ottawa, May 27-29, 2009

This paper considers the effect of party system differences on the cross-level influence of partisanship. Many authors have noted that federalism has a weakening effect on partisan identification, as it increases the likelihood that voters will identify with different parties at each level of government. Some have argued that “split-level identification” may be a rational response to the different policy domains and electoral issues at each level (Blake 1982). Others have argued that inconsistency in partisanship across levels can be a sign of flexible partisanship (Clarke et al. 1979, etc.). Still others have suggested that different identifications are simply an inevitable result when party systems (and party competition) differ across levels of government (Bowler 1990; Bélanger and Stephenson 2009). Regardless of its origins, scholars do agree that the influence of partisanship on vote choice decreases with split level identification. However, a consistent finding is that party preferences at one level have an effect on identification and vote choice at the other level (Stewart and Clarke 1998; Martinez 1990; Clough 2007; Esselment 2007), although the congruence between the federal and provincial party systems affects the reinforcement effect that voting behaviour at one level has on partisanship at the other level (Martinez 1990; see Bowler 1990 for a theoretical treatment). This paper seeks to thoroughly examine these effects in recent Canadian elections.

To date, the study of cross-level partisanship in Canada has mostly made use of national data. Furthermore, it has focused on understanding change among all partisans in the aggregate. In this paper, we address both of these limitations. First, we use national and provincial level data from two different provinces – Ontario and Quebec – one of which has a party system that is congruent with the federal system, and one which is arguably quite different. We explore both the incidence and effect of party support at the federal level on the incidence and effect of partisanship at the other level, for both provincial identification and vote choice. Second, we consider whether these effects vary across parties. That is, is there a difference in the effect of party system incongruency by party? In so doing, we provide a clearer picture of the effect of both the incidence of cross-level partisanship in a congruent and incongruent context as well as the effect of cross-level partisanship *by party* in each context.

Cross-Level Partisanship

In some federal systems, it has been argued, voters inhabit “two political worlds” simultaneously (Uslaner 1990). In many ways, this is to be expected. Federal countries are characterized by a differentiation of political responsibilities and duties at the different levels of government, and were often brought into existence in order to accommodate within-country variation. Theoretically, this institutional design allows governments to maximize their

responsiveness to the needs of citizens. It also has an effect on how citizens relate to politics and political parties, by multiplying the pieces of information that are required in order for voters to be active participants in their own governments. There is conflicting evidence about whether citizens conceive of the different levels of government as distinct entities (see Perlin and Peppin 1971 for a positive result; see Cutler 2008a for a discussion of the limits of this recognition).

Researchers have found that federalism has an effect on the nature and incidence of partisanship. This effect has sparked the interest of many scholars due to the central role that partisanship plays in vote choice decisions (for example, the model of vote choice developed in Campbell et al. 1960). Across countries and years, partisanship's consistent effect on vote choice (it is "the golden arrow of behaviour research", according to Clough (2007)) is undeniable. In the Canadian case, Johnston et al. (1992: 4) acknowledge that "party identification is always the single best predictor of the vote." Knowing that federalism impacts this fundamental relationship, much research has examined the parameters of the effects. Some researchers have even argued that measures of provincial party preferences should be included in models of federal vote choice (Archer 1987; Bowler 1990).

In the case of the United States, the party systems at the national, state and even local level are very similar. Two main parties compete for power. Nonetheless, researchers have found evidence of cross-level partisan inconsistency. Jennings and Niemi (1966) argued that federalism, and the fragmentation of political parties that it contributes to, leads to a weakening effect on partisanship. Perkins and Guynes (1979) provide a causal argument for this, showing that when voters perceive inconsistencies in the policy stances of a political party at different levels, they are more likely to adopt different partisan identifications. Hadley (1985), too, finds that split-level identification became more significant in the South after the prominence of southern Democrats decreased at the national level.

A great deal of research has also been conducted with respect to the Canadian case. Unlike in the US, however, Canada provides a new degree of complexity. While the American parties may be fragmented due to federalism, some Canadian provinces have completely different party systems, with different numbers and types of parties with varying competitiveness.¹ In general terms, BC and Quebec are the most different at the provincial level, whereas the Atlantic provinces are the most similar (Clarke and Stewart 1987). This variation, having different party systems at the provincial level, was seen as a key explanation for the high incidence of cross-level inconsistency in Canada (LeDuc et al. 1984) by Uslaner

¹ Esselment (2007) suggests that the issue of party system differences is actually about party viability. Where parties are not viable at both levels of government, voters are often forced to consider holding two different party preferences.

(1990). He finds that the “crazy-quilt party system” in Canada is the result of strong provincial political cultures (Uslaner 1990: 977) which led to varying identification patterns. However, even in provinces where the party systems are quite similar, inconsistent partisanship across levels of government still exists (Clarke and Stewart 1987; Martinez 1990). Thus, it appears that partisan inconsistency is affected by both federalism and the party system (a potential by-product of federalism), although the two effects have yet to be untangled empirically.

The causal mechanism that has been identified as driving the negative effect of federalism on the strength of partisanship is related to reinforcing use and behaviour. Just as the act of voting has a habitual component (Gerber et al. 2003), for a partisan identification to be useful and strong, it is important that it can be used in the different electoral contexts in which a voter is called upon to participate. When partisanship is useful for guiding vote choice in elections at different levels, one’s identification is reinforced and the usefulness of partisanship as a simplifying vote heuristic can be amplified. This argument has been made in the US (Converse 1976; Markus and Converse 1979) and in Canada (Jenson 1975). In the Canadian case, specifically, it has been argued that the differences in federal and provincial party systems, as well as the common lack of parties at the local level, contributes to an overall weaker partisanship than in the United States.² Indeed, holding different partisan loyalties at different levels of government has been taken by some scholars as a marker of weaker (flexible) partisanship (Clarke et al. 1979, 1984, 1991, 1996; LeDuc et al. 1984), indicating a voter who is less loyal to his/her chosen party.

The validity of considering cross-level consistency as a marker of flexible partisanship has been questioned (Blake 1982; Bélanger and Stephenson 2009). Because there are many provinces in which voters do not have the opportunity to vote or identify with the same party at both the federal and provincial level, considering each of these voters to be flexible may overstate the case, as their identities might be quite strong even though they differ across levels. Some authors argue that those who identify with different parties at different levels are more sophisticated voters, as they are able to differentiate between the different policy and issue domains at each level and make a rational choice over the party options (Blake 1982). Martinez (1990) finds that political sophistication contributes to such a pattern of partisanship by increasing the voter’s capacity to differentiate between the issues and parties at each level of government. Uslaner (1989) also found that split-level identifiers feel more efficacious with respect to the political system, suggesting that the choice to identify with separate parties is a sign of conscientious political interest, rather than simply a weak partisan attachment.

² There is a debate over whether or not Canadian partisanship is actually weaker than in the US. See Gidengil et al. (2006) for a discussion.

Regardless of whether it is a sign of weak partisanship or a marker of conscientious, rational choice, the key fact to consider is that scholars continue to find that party preferences at the provincial level affect preferences at the other (Stewart and Clarke 1998; Martinez 1990; Clough 2007; Esselment 2007). Voting for a party at one level has been found to exert a real influence on party preferences and voting behaviour at other levels. In fact, this finding holds even when the party systems are not similar (Clough 2007). However, beyond knowing that cross-level partisanship has an effect in all cases, little work has directly focused on considering the differences in the incidence *and* the effect of inconsistency in provinces with different degrees of similarity.³ Furthermore, much of the research that does exist focuses on the effect of provincial-level behaviour on federal level identification (for example, see Clough 2007 and Martinez 1990). Indeed, Clough (2007) used her research to consider whether provincial party attachments could explain the persistence of support for minor parties at the federal level, in contradiction to Duverger's Law. There is no reason to expect, however, that the cross-level influence should be unidirectional, from provincial to federal. If one identifies with a party that is a major contender at the national level, but only a minor consideration at the subnational level, why should federal partisanship not still have an effect on subnational party preferences? The persistence of a unique provincial party system could be an indication that federal partisan preferences have a weak effect on provincial preferences (Cutler 2008b). The question that needs to be answered is how these effects compare. This paper takes up this question, looking for evidence of the influence of federal party preferences over provincial partisanship.

Aside from the unidirectional nature of the existing research, we also seek to extend the literature by considering the effects of cross-level partisanship on support for political parties *individually*, rather than at the aggregated level of the party system. As noted above, it has been found that when party systems are similar across levels the reinforcing effects of partisanship are stronger. However, most research to date treats the party systems as single units, and by extension suggests that all of the parties should be affected in the same way, rather than exploring the possibility that the effects may differ by party (for a notable exception, see Esselment 2007). Support for a disaggregated investigation comes from recent work on partisanship (Bélanger and Stephenson 2009) that found significant variation in the intensity and loyalty of partisans across the political parties. Intensity of partisan identity, as well as greater loyalty, appear to follow those parties that are most ideologically oriented. This has the effect of dividing the Liberals, a traditional brokerage party, from the NDP, Reform, Alliance and Bloc Québécois in terms of how partisans are influenced by partisanship in their behaviours.

³ Martinez (1990) considers the reinforcing effect of voting behaviour at the provincial level of partisan identification at the federal level in congruent and incongruent provincial contexts, but he does not consider the incidence of cross-level partisanship.

In summary, this paper seeks to examine three different questions related to cross-level partisanship in Canada. First, what is the incidence of cross-level partisanship in provinces with congruent and incongruent party systems? Second, what effect does federal party preference have on behaviour at the provincial level in these two different contexts, and does it differ from the effect of provincial behaviour on federal identification? Finally, is there any differentiation across parties in both the incidence and effect of cross-level partisanship?

To answer these questions, we mostly focus on the distinct provincial party systems of Quebec and Ontario, and examine the incidence of federal partisanship on provincial identification and vote choice in those two provinces. As mentioned above, extant studies of cross-level partisanship in Canada have mainly looked at the reverse pattern of incidence – that of the effect of provincial identification on federal behaviour. There are two exceptions to this trend in the literature. Nevitte (1984) examined patterns of cross-level partisanship in Quebec during the 1970s and found a decrease in partisanship congruence in that province. He cited two reasons for this phenomenon: the increasing difference between the Quebec provincial party system and the federal one, and the fact that Quebec nationalist voters had no nationalist party to vote for at the federal level. With the advent of the federal Bloc Québécois in the 1990s, that conclusion certainly needs to be reassessed. Cutler (2008b) recently tested for the impact of federal party identification on provincial vote choice in the 2003 Ontario election. He showed only a very weak effect of the former on the latter, concluding that Ontario provincial elections were “first-order elections” whose outcomes are explained by provincial factors rather than national ones. This is an intriguing finding that demands replication, which this paper is able to provide not only for Ontario but also Quebec.

Data, Measures, and Methods

Our study relies on data from two post-electoral surveys conducted at the time of the 2007 Quebec and Ontario provincial elections. Both surveys were carried out by Montreal-based polling firm Léger Marketing.⁴ For the Ontario study, a representative sample of 1000 individuals were interviewed by phone between October 11 and 28, 2007. The Quebec survey’s design was slightly different in that it combined a phone sample with a web sample (total n=2175). The telephone interviews were conducted between April 4 and 15, 2007, with a representative sample of 1003 individuals. The web portion of the survey was carried out between April 5 and 11, 2007, with a sample of 1172 internet users randomly drawn from Léger Marketing’s web panel of 150,000 Quebecers. The web sample was stratified by gender, age,

⁴ Both surveys were designed by the authors and Jean Crête, Richard Nadeau and Brian Tanguay. The studies were funded by SSHRC and IRPP.

and mother tongue so as to limit any representation bias.⁵ All analyses presented in this paper use the weighted data. Finally, our main conclusions are cross-checked with data from the 2006 Canadian Election Study, although the two provincial surveys obviously have a larger number of observations than the CES.

In this paper, we are interested in the individuals' federal and provincial partisanship. In both surveys, we have only one measure of federal partisanship, namely recalled federal vote choice. That is, we asked survey respondents to recall which party they voted for in the January 2006 federal election. Although answers to recalled vote questions are usually fraught with bias (see Weir 1975; Himmelweit et al. 1978; Fournier et al. 2001), the amount of time elapsed between the federal election and the Quebec and Ontario elections is not overly long (14 and 20 months, respectively) and so should not have affected the answers as much as usual.⁶ In previous studies, Nevitte (1984) also used recalled federal vote, but Cutler (2008b) was able to use an actual measure of federal partisan identification. The reader must bear in mind this slight difference when comparing our results to Cutler's own.

We use two operationalizations of provincial partisanship. The first measure is one of party identification, based on answers to the following question: "In provincial politics, do you usually identify yourself with [list of parties], or no party?" This partisan identification measure is very much like the one used in most studies of voting behaviour. The second measure is declared provincial vote choice. With these two indicators, we are able to assess whether federal partisanship is similarly related to provincial party identification *and* vote choice, and whether this pattern of relationship is similar for both provincial systems.

The basic methodological approach used in this paper is to determine the extent to which federal partisanship determines/predicts provincial partisanship. This causal pattern of relationship has been chosen because, timewise, the federal election of 2006 occurred *before* the two provincial elections examined here. While looking at the relationship the other way around, from provincial to federal, might be informative, conceptually it does not satisfy one of the key conditions for causality, that current behaviour can only be affected by past behaviour. This is the rule that we have adopted herein. An additional, and related, reason that motivated this choice is that in the 2006 CES survey, the only measure of provincial partisanship available is a *vote intention* variable (unlike in Clough 2007).

⁵ The survey results obtained with the phone and web samples differ slightly on a number of accounts. For a thorough examination of these differences, see Stephenson and Crête (2008).

⁶ Indeed, the frequency distributions of recalled federal vote choice are quite close to the actual outcomes in both provinces. For Quebec, the results all fall within 1.5 points of the actual outcome save for the Liberal vote (which is overrepresented by 3 points). There is a bit more variation for Ontario, where the Conservative vote is underrepresented by 4 points and the Liberal vote overrepresented by 6 points.

Findings

Our first research question, and the natural first step in assessing the relationship between federal and provincial partisanship, is to consider the incidence of consistent cross-level partisanship. To do so, we simply cross-tabulate the two, reported for Quebec in Table 1, and for Ontario in Table 2. Determining loyalty for Ontario is straightforward, as the two party systems are basically identical. The only minor difference is that the new federal Conservative party does not entirely correspond to the Progressive Conservative party that is still found in Ontario and in several other provinces. Loyalty in Quebec can also be assessed, despite the party system differences. The Green party is the simplest case, as it competes at both levels in Quebec. However, even though they do not share any organizational ties since the 1960s, the federal Liberals and the provincial *Libéraux* still share the same name and “brand,” so to speak. The federal Bloc Québécois has always been pictured as the Parti Québécois’ “little cousin” in Ottawa, since they share the same political goal (Quebec independence) and often swap candidates and staff at election times. As well, in more ways than one the Conservative Party of Canada shares strong ideological ties with the right-wing Action Démocratique du Québec (ADQ), and it would be natural for the two parties to share some of their constituencies. NDP partisans are perhaps the only ones not having a clear provincial home in Quebec, although the party has an ideological profile that is sometimes close to the one adopted by the recently created left-leaning party Québec Solidaire.

How many consistent or “loyal” partisans are found in those two provinces? Table 1A reveals that half the Quebec partisans (49%) can be characterised as loyal. If we exclude provincial non-partisans, the proportion of loyal partisans jumps to two thirds (67%). If we further restrict the focus to the three main federal parties competing in Quebec (Liberal, Bloc, Conservative), this proportion rises to 71%. Table 1B cross-tabulates federal vote with provincial vote. It indicates that loyalty, defined using vote choice, reaches 60% in Quebec. This proportion rises to 65% if we consider the three main parties only. By comparison, we find in Table 2A that 57% of Ontario partisans can be labelled as loyal. This proportion reaches 87% if we exclude provincial non-partisans. In Table 2B, we find that three quarters (74%) of Ontario voters display the same choice of party at both levels.

All in all, the results indicate that partisan loyalty is higher in Ontario, the province whose party system is the one closest in nature to the federal system. Yet, given the notable differences between the Quebec provincial party system and the federal one, we did not expect as much consistency in Quebec as we find in Table 1. Another surprising finding relates to the fact that Ontarians appear less likely than Quebecers to develop a provincial party identification. Finally, it should be noted that in both provinces, loyalty is greater when one considers provincial party identification instead of provincial vote choice. This is evidence that

federal partisans do not always necessarily vote for “their” party in provincial elections. Factors other than simple identification with a party can determine vote choice, and this appears to be true of cross-level partisans as well.

Given our third research question concerns cross-party variation, some party-specific results are worthy to report. In Quebec, the strong link between the two Liberal parties is impressive, with as many as 74% of federal Liberals voting for the “same” party at the provincial level. The connection between Bloc and PQ partisans is also clear, as is the relationship between Green party supporters at both levels. What may be more surprising in Quebec is the relatively high proportion of loyal partisans found with the Conservative Party (coupled with the ADQ). Not surprisingly, the NDP clearly lacks a provincial “brother” in Quebec, as its partisans appear highly dispersed in their attachments (although NDP partisans are those most likely to identify with and support Québec Solidaire). Provincially, they appear to be “floating voters,” with as many as 38% of them not identifying with any provincial party. This situation for the NDP is totally reversed in Ontario. There, the NDP is the party with the most loyal partisans and with the lowest proportion of provincial non-partisans. Green partisans in Ontario also display an impressive level of loyalty (95% consistency in their vote choice). The Liberals and Conservatives also have partisans who are loyal at both levels, although not as many as the NDP or the Greens. Interestingly, despite the differences between the conservative parties at each level, the loyalty rate is almost as high as for the Liberal party. Thus, we find that there is variation in the degree of cross-level consistency across parties in *both* provinces, with some exhibiting strong consistency (such as the Liberals) in each system. This suggests that the overall congruency of the federal and provincial party systems may not be the real source of cross-level partisan differences; the congruency between the parties themselves may be the key factor.

The next step in our investigation is to estimate the actual impact that federal partisanship has on provincial behaviour, our second research question. We are interested in assessing several points: is federal vote choice a strong predictor of provincial partisanship and vote choice? is this impact similar in both provinces? is it comparable across parties? To answer these questions, we ran a series of binomial logistic regressions in order to estimate the effect of a series of independent variables on both provincial party identification and vote choice.⁷ The results obtained for Quebec appear in Table 3, while those obtained for Ontario are presented in Table 4. For each regression, we included as a predictor a dummy variable measuring a vote for the same (or for the “closest”, in Quebec) party at the previous federal election. In addition, we included a number of sociodemographic characteristics (age, gender, education, income, and religious attendance, plus language in Quebec) as well as some

⁷ Very similar results are obtained if we use multinomial logit instead as the regression method.

ideological opinion variables (left-right attitudes and moral conservatism, plus nationalism in Quebec), retrospective economic perceptions, the most important campaign issues in each provincial election (reasonable accommodations, healthcare, education, and the environment in Quebec; healthcare, education, the environment, and faith-based schools in Ontario), and leader evaluations.⁸

The regression results indicate that all else being equal, federal partisanship is significantly related to provincial party identification and vote choice. This is true in both provinces, and for all parties. The only exception to this pattern is identification with Québec Solidaire, which is not significantly predicted by NDP vote choice (Table 3A); but notice that the impact of NDP partisanship on a vote for Québec Solidaire *is* statistically significant (Table 3B). The systematic link found here between federal and provincial vote choice in Ontario is surprising in light of Cutler's (2008b) earlier finding, but this may be partly due to the fact that our measure of federal partisanship is not the same as his.

Logistic regression coefficients need to be transformed into probability changes in order for us to have some sense of the magnitude of the effects. The changes in probabilities associated with the federal vote variable are provided in Table 5, for both provinces. In general, we observe that cross-level effects are important in both provinces, but that they are much greater in Ontario than in Quebec, a result consistent with the congruency of the party systems argument. Also, we find that the impact of loyalty is stronger for provincial party identification than for provincial vote choice. This is true in both provinces, except for "third parties" in Quebec (ADQ, Québec Solidaire, Greens). This, however, may be a peculiarity of the 2007 Quebec election which saw the rise of third parties, and especially the ADQ, due to the temporary crumbling of traditional party support (Bélanger and Nadeau 2008).

Considering variation across the parties, it is interesting to note that in Quebec, the relationship between holding a federal BQ preference and identifying with the PQ is the strongest, whereas the federal Conservative-provincial ADQ relationship is the strongest with respect to vote choice. These results are particularly interesting since both of these relationships are less direct than the Liberal or Green relationships, in which parties at both levels at least have the same labels. Not surprisingly, given our earlier findings of incidence, the federal NDP-provincial QS relationship is the weakest. In Ontario, the strength of the effects between the pairs of parties also differs by party, but to a lesser degree. The PC-CPC relationship with respect to identification is the weakest, whereas the NDP-provincial vote relationship is the weakest. However, whereas each of the other relationships is weaker for

⁸ These independent variables are the same (with only a few omissions) as those employed by Bélanger and Nadeau (2008) in their study of vote choice in the 2007 Quebec provincial election, using the same survey data. See their appendix for variable codings.

voting than partisanship, the Green relationships seem to be equally strong. Again, it appears that there are party-specific factors that need to be considered when assessing consistency across levels.

Another way to assess the strength of cross-level partisanship in Quebec and Ontario is to look at the second choice of those partisans that were found to be “unloyal.” These results are displayed in Table 6. In Table 6A, it is again surprising to see the relative importance of cross-level consistency in Quebec: unloyal partisans would go back to “their” party as a second choice in relatively large numbers. About 61% of unloyal Liberals and 68% of unloyal *Bloquistes* indicate they would do so, and as many as 77% of “unloyal” Conservatives opt for the ADQ as their second choice. Even greater “second choice consistency” is found in Ontario, with 80% of unloyal Liberals and 96% of unloyal NDPers mentioning their party. The Conservatives do not fare as well, though, with only two thirds mentioning they would opt for the provincial Progressive Conservatives as their second choice. This may be due to the ideological differences between the two parties across the levels. However, it is intriguing (if not ideologically peculiar) that almost all of these unloyal federal Conservatives who do not mention the PC party as their second choice name the NDP or the Greens, two left-leaning party alternatives.

As a way of understanding the significance of our findings, we consider the CES (federal) data as a comparator. Table 7 reports cross-tabulations of federal vote choice with provincial vote intention for each of the four main regions of Canada: Quebec, Ontario, the four Atlantic provinces, and the four Western provinces. For Quebec and Ontario, we find practically the same proportions of loyal partisans: about two thirds (66%) in Quebec and three quarters (74%) in Ontario. Yet, the party-specific results are not entirely consistent with some of the above findings. In Quebec, the Conservative-ADQ connection is not as strong as in Table 1B; this may well be due to the ADQ not having emerged yet (in January 2006) as a serious party contender in the province. In Ontario, the Conservative-PC connection appears stronger than in Table 2B, while cross-level loyalty among NDPers is not as impressive as above.

As a final comparative consideration of the effect of congruency on the relationships we have examined, Tables 7C and 7D present the results for the two other regions in Canada. Recall that Atlantic Canada is often considered to have the most congruent party systems, while Quebec and BC have the least. In Table 7C we find that loyalty patterns in the Atlantic provinces are more similar to those found in Ontario than in Quebec, while loyalty patterns in the West (Table 7D) are closer to those observed in Quebec. Party system congruence certainly helps explain these findings. However, we would like to note that once again, Quebec seems

far from the outlier that we would expect given the literature on cross-level partisanship and the apparent divergence between that province's party system and the federal one.⁹

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper was to shed light on the effects of federal party preferences on political choices at the provincial level. We were interested in delving further into the issue of party system congruency across levels, and also considering whether there was evidence of differences across political parties. In short, our findings indicate two clear answers.

First, federal preferences do impact provincial preferences, both in partisanship and vote choice. Federal choices have significant impacts on provincial identification and voting behaviour. These results hold across the two provinces that we study, despite the differences in party system congruency.

Second, consistency and loyalty vary by party, especially in Quebec. This finding suggests that the parties themselves may have something to do with cross-level consistency, rather than just the congruency of the entire party system. Despite the lack of strong organizational ties and even the sometimes very different party "labels" used by political parties in Quebec, partisans in that province do display a relatively high degree of loyalty. In many ways, this seems attributable to Quebec's provincial party system having aligned itself with the federal one in recent years. With the creation of a sovereigntist party at the federal level (the Bloc Québécois) and the apparition of a right-wing provincial party (the ADQ), each party has a provincial or federal counterpart, except perhaps the NDP. However, as much as the incidence of consistency gives us reason to reconsider the traditional arguments about congruency, the differences that we find between Quebec and Ontario suggest that having a counterpart at the other level of government does not, on its own, guarantee the same type of loyalty and relationships as "same" parties enjoy. Consider the relationship between the federal Conservatives and provincial ADQ, or the provincial PQ and the federal BQ. Perhaps it is only a matter of time before the similarities between Quebec provincial parties and federal parties are more firmly cemented in the minds of voters; if so, then we should expect stronger and more consistent relationships in the future. It is unknown, however, what role labels and party cues play in producing or hindering the consistency of people's behaviour. If labels matter, then ideological similarity may not be enough. Much more work needs to be done to untangle the many issues that surround loyal cross-level partisanship.

⁹ Binomial regressions similar to those presented in Tables 3 and 4 were performed with the 2006 CES data (results not shown). In these analyses, the systematic link between federal and provincial partisanship stands out again in both Quebec and Ontario. The only main difference is the weaker Conservative-ADQ connection, which might be evidence again that the patterns of party competition at one level can affect cross-level partisanship.

References

- Archer, Keith. 1987. "A Simultaneous Equation Model of Canadian Voting Behaviour." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 20(3): 553-572.
- Bélanger, Éric, and Richard Nadeau. 2008. "La montée des tiers partis au Québec à l'élection de 2007: conjoncture ou tendance?" *IRPP Choices* 14(17): 1-36.
- Bélanger, Éric, and Laura B. Stephenson. 2009. "Parties and Partisans: The Influence of Ideology and Brokerage on the Durability of Partisanship in Canada." In Cameron D. Anderson and Laura B. Stephenson (eds.), *Perspectives on the Canadian Voter: Puzzles of Influence and Choice*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, in press.
- Blake, Donald E. 1982. "The Consistency of Inconsistency: Party Identification in Federal and Provincial Politics." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 15(4): 691-710.
- Bowler, Shaun. 1990. "Consistency and Inconsistency in Canadian Party Identifications: Towards and Institutional Approach." *Electoral Studies* 9(2): 133-145.
- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. New York: Wiley.
- Clarke, Harold D., and Marianne C. Stewart. 1987. "Partisan Inconsistency and Partisan Change in Federal States: The Case of Canada." *American Journal of Political Science* 31(2): 383-407.
- Clarke, Harold D., Jane Jenson, Lawrence LeDuc, and Jon H. Pammett. 1979. *Political Choice in Canada*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited.
- Clarke, Harold D., Jane Jenson, Lawrence LeDuc, and Jon H. Pammett. 1984. *Absent Mandate: The Politics of Discontent in Canada*. Toronto: Gage.
- Clarke, Harold D., Jane Jenson, Lawrence LeDuc, and Jon H. Pammett. 1991. *Absent Mandate: Interpreting Change in Canadian Elections*. 2nd ed. Toronto: Gage.
- Clarke, Harold D., Jane Jenson, Lawrence LeDuc, and Jon H. Pammett. 1996. *Absent Mandate: Canadian Electoral Politics in an Era of Restructuring*. 3rd ed. Toronto: Gage.
- Clough, Emily. 2007. "Two Political Worlds? The Influence of Provincial Party Loyalty on Federal Voting in Canada." *Electoral Studies* 26(4): 287-296.
- Converse, Philip. 1976. *The Dynamics of Party Support: Cohort-Analyzing Party Identification*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Cutler, Fred. 2008a. "Whodunnit? Canadian Voters, Intergovernmentalism, and Responsibility." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 41(3): 627-654.

Cutler, Fred. 2008b. "One Voter, Two First-Order Elections?" *Electoral Studies* 27(3): 492-504.

Esselment, Anna. 2007. "Canadian Political Parties and Integrating Links: An Undoing of Disentanglement?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Atlantic Provinces Political Science Association, Fredericton, NB.

Fournier, Patrick, Richard Nadeau, André Blais, Elisabeth Gidengil, and Neil Nevitte. 2001. "Validation of Time-of-Voting-Decision Recall." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 65(1): 95-107.

Gerber, Alan S., Donald P. Green, and Ron Shachar. 2003. "Voting May Be Habit-Forming: Evidence from a Randomized Field Experiment." *American Journal of Political Science* 47(3): 540-550.

Gidengil, Elisabeth, André Blais, Joanna Everitt, Patrick Fournier, and Neil Nevitte. 2006. "Is the Concept of Party Identification Applicable in Canada? A Panel-Based Analysis." Paper presented at the ECPR 34th Joint Sessions of Workshops, Nicosia.

Hadley, Charles D. 1985. "Dual Partisan Identification in the South." *Journal of Politics* 47(1): 254-268.

Himmelweit, Hilde T., Marianne Jaeger Biberian, and Janet Stockdale. 1978. "Memory for Past Vote: Implications of a Study of Bias in Recall." *British Journal of Political Science* 8(3): 365-375.

Jennings, M. Kent, and Richard G. Niemi. 1966. "Party Identification at Multiple Levels of Government." *American Journal of Sociology* 72(1): 86-101.

Jenson, Jane. 1975. "Party Loyalty in Canada: The Question of Party Identification." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 8(4): 543-553.

Johnston, Richard, André Blais, Henry E. Brady, and Jean Crête. 1992. *Letting the People Decide*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

LeDuc, Lawrence, Harold D. Clarke, Jane Jenson, and Jon H. Pammett. 1984. "Partisan Instability in Canada: Evidence from a New Panel Study." *American Political Science Review* 78(2): 470-484.

Markus, Gregory B. and Philip Converse. 1979. "A Dynamic Simultaneous Equation Model of Electoral Choice." *American Political Science Review* 73(4): 1055-70.

Martinez, Michael. 1990. "Partisan Reinforcement in Context and Cognition: Canadian Federal Partisanship, 1974-79." *American Journal of Political Science* 34(3): 822-845.

Nevitte, Neil. 1984. "Le réalignement fédéral-provincial et l'interaction électorale au Québec: 1962-1979." In Jean Crête (ed.), *Comportement électoral au Québec*. Chicoutimi: Gaëtan Morin, pp.243-277.

Perkins, Jerry, and Randall Guynes. 1979. "Federalism and Partisanship." *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 9(3): 57-73.

Perlin, George, and Patti Peppin. 1971. "Variations in Party Support in Federal and Provincial Elections: Some Hypotheses." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 4(2): 280-286.

Stephenson, Laura B., and Jean Crête. 2008. "Internet Survey Methodology in a Canadian Setting: An Evaluation of Mode Effects." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago.

Stewart, Marianne C., and Harold D. Clarke. 1998. "The Dynamics of Party Identification in Federal Systems: The Canadian Case." *American Journal of Political Science* 42(1): 97-116.

Uslaner, Eric M. 1989. "Multiple Party Identifiers in Canada: Participation and Affect." *Journal of Politics* 51(4): 993-1003.

Uslaner, Eric M. 1990. "Splitting Image: Partisan Affiliations in Canada's 'Two Political Worlds'." *American Journal of Political Science* 34(4): 961-981.

Weir, Blair T. 1975. "The Distortion of Voter Recall." *American Journal of Political Science* 19(1): 53-62.

Table 1. Cross-level partisanship in Quebec

1A) Federal vote and provincial party identification in Quebec

<i>Provincial Party Identification</i>	<i>2006 Federal Election Party Choice</i>				
	Liberal	Conservative	Bloc	NDP	Green
	%	%	%	%	%
None	26.9	31.9	21.3	38.2	38.8
Liberal	57.4	21.5	2.2	12.0	0.0
Parti Quebecois	3.6	6.1	58.0	6.6	3.4
ADQ	9.4	39.7	12.4	25.1	12.0
Quebec Solidaire	1.1	0.1	5.3	13.8	6.6
Green Party	1.5	0.7	0.8	4.4	39.1
Total	100	100	100	100	100
N=1,665	402	387	689	117	69

1B) Federal vote and provincial vote in Quebec

<i>2007 Provincial Election Party Choice</i>	<i>2006 Federal Election Party Choice</i>				
	Liberal	Conservative	Bloc	NDP	Green
	%	%	%	%	%
Liberal	74.2	30.9	3.8	16.6	10.8
Parti Quebecois	4.7	8.7	63.0	15.1	6.1
ADQ	15.4	58.3	23.0	41.4	14.4
Quebec Solidaire	1.0	0.1	6.7	15.0	10.0
Green Party	4.9	2.0	3.6	12.1	58.8
Total	100	100	100	100	100
N=1,500	340	348	643	107	61

Table 2. Cross-level partisanship in Ontario

2A) Federal vote and provincial party identification in Ontario

<i>2006 Federal Election Party Choice</i>				
	Liberal	Conservative	NDP	Green
<i>Provincial Party Identification</i>	%	%	%	%
None	36.1	40.2	21.2	45.3
Liberal	56.2	6.3	5.3	6.7
PC	3.6	51.1	1.1	5.5
NDP	2.6	1.8	68.7	1.8
Green Party	1.5	0.6	3.6	40.7
Total	100	100	100	100
N=744	339	236	140	29

2B) Federal vote and provincial vote in Ontario

<i>2006 Federal Election Party Choice</i>				
	Liberal	Conservative	NDP	Green
<i>2007 Provincial Election Party Choice</i>	%	%	%	%
Liberal	73.4	18.4	10.2	3.2
PC	9.2	70.2	3.1	0.0
NDP	9.7	5.7	79.2	2.3
Green Party	7.7	5.7	7.6	94.5
Total	100	100	100	100
N=622	291	194	115	22

Table 3. Influence of federal vote on provincial identification in Quebec

3A) Influence on provincial party identification

	Liberal	Parti Quebecois	ADQ	Quebec Solidaire	Green
French	-0.99** (0.26)	2.13** (0.71)	2.27** (0.41)	-0.70 (0.63)	-1.64** (0.53)
Age	1.68* (0.73)	2.47** (0.71)	-3.02** (0.66)	-1.11 (1.30)	-7.05** (1.76)
Female	0.60** (0.21)	0.33 (0.19)	-0.11 (0.18)	-0.01 (0.37)	-0.87* (0.41)
Education	0.33 (0.51)	-0.92 (0.49)	0.05 (0.45)	-0.56 (0.93)	0.54 (0.94)
Income	0.45 (0.33)	0.89** (0.31)	-0.65* (0.30)	-0.87 (0.59)	0.62 (0.55)
Prel	0.03 (0.34)	-0.68 (0.38)	0.56 (0.32)	2.86** (0.74)	-2.67** (0.95)
Qnat	3.97** (0.50)	-5.77** (0.50)	2.60** (0.38)	0.03 (0.90)	0.48 (0.83)
Etlenr2	0.16 (0.55)	-1.20* (0.51)	0.28 (0.49)	-1.83 (1.04)	0.11 (1.00)
Patsynd2	0.34 (0.65)	0.16 (0.61)	-0.09 (0.53)	-0.38 (1.33)	-1.87 (1.26)
Cmoral	0.18 (0.43)	0.24 (0.44)	-1.17** (0.40)	-2.50** (0.91)	2.41** (0.83)
Ecn	1.54** (0.33)	0.43 (0.32)	-1.17** (0.29)	-2.19** (0.68)	0.09 (0.58)
Acc	-0.47 (0.37)	-0.16 (0.35)	0.22 (0.35)	0.06 (0.60)	-0.55 (0.63)
IssHealth	0.57* (0.30)	0.28 (0.23)	-0.35 (0.22)	-0.21 (0.53)	-0.14 (0.63)
IssEduc	0.79 (0.43)	0.16 (0.40)	-0.55 (0.46)	0.64 (0.54)	-1.02 (0.91)
IssEnviro	-2.02** (0.55)	-0.30 (0.34)	-0.45 (0.38)	0.56 (0.53)	2.53** (0.43)
Leader	5.65** (0.54)	4.76** (0.51)	4.06** (0.32)	4.90** (0.64)	1.64 (0.86)
Federal Vote	1.30** (0.23)	1.85** (0.21)	0.92** (0.19)	0.79 (0.51)	3.57** (0.47)
Constant	-6.40** (0.78)	-3.35** (1.02)	-6.15** (0.76)	-1.28 (1.41)	-0.28 (1.31)
Pseudo- R^2	0.58	0.57	0.40	0.49	0.49
Log Likelihood	-330.15	-381.66	-441.06	-124.47	-124.47
N	1389	1389	1389	1389	1389
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.					

3B) Influence on provincial vote choice

	Liberal	Parti Quebecois	ADQ	Quebec Solidaire	Green
French	0.04 (0.34)	1.27 (0.67)	-0.19 (0.36)	1.47 (1.19)	0.17 (0.56)
Age	2.24* (0.91)	0.78 (0.75)	-1.33 (0.72)	0.90 (1.56)	-0.96 (1.35)
Female	0.56* (0.26)	0.27 (0.21)	-0.27 (0.21)	-0.60 (0.45)	0.01 (0.36)
Education	0.70 (0.60)	-0.77 (0.52)	0.28 (0.51)	1.03 (1.10)	-0.29 (0.88)
Income	-0.59 (0.40)	0.24 (0.34)	0.01 (0.33)	-0.78 (0.69)	0.88 (0.55)
Prel	0.36 (0.41)	0.72 (0.42)	-0.85* (0.40)	-0.98 (1.01)	-0.12 (0.77)
Qnat	2.01** (0.56)	-2.82** (0.56)	-0.48 (0.42)	-0.59 (1.11)	2.42** (0.70)
Etlenr2	-0.33 (0.68)	-1.09* (0.55)	1.01 (0.54)	2.03 (1.21)	-1.81 (0.99)
Patsynd2	0.34 (0.80)	0.00 (0.67)	0.68 (0.61)	-4.30* (1.70)	-2.22 (1.21)
Cmoral	0.33 (0.54)	-0.56 (0.48)	0.13 (0.45)	0.98 (1.04)	-1.30 (0.80)
Ecn	1.39** (0.39)	0.04 (0.36)	-0.94** (0.32)	0.62 (0.78)	-2.29** (0.58)
Acc	-0.96* (0.44)	-0.38 (0.38)	0.89* (0.40)	0.03 (0.76)	-0.61 (0.56)
IssHealth	-0.27 (0.32)	-0.23 (0.25)	-0.00 (0.23)	-0.26 (0.58)	-0.10 (0.51)
IssEduc	0.02 (0.52)	0.67 (0.46)	-1.04 (0.57)	0.09 (0.71)	-0.56 (0.82)
IssEnviro	-1.05 (0.62)	-0.21 (0.39)	-1.26** (0.47)	0.291 (0.64)	1.57** (0.44)
Prov Party ID	2.90** (0.28)	2.39** (0.24)	3.63** (0.29)	3.45** (0.53)	3.99** (0.54)
Leader	3.21** (0.59)	3.26** (0.49)	2.51** (0.31)	4.50** (0.69)	2.97** (0.83)
Federal Vote	1.06** (0.29)	0.88** (0.26)	1.28** (0.25)	1.37* (0.58)	2.58** (0.53)
Constant	-5.75** (0.94)	-2.74** (1.04)	-3.29** (0.80)	-5.87** (2.01)	-1.22 (1.31)
Pseudo- R^2	0.65	0.57	0.53	0.59	0.52
Log Likelihood	-249.99	-332.84	-367.18	-97.20	-145.04
N	1246	1246	1246	1246	1246
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.					

Table 4. Influence of federal vote on provincial identification in Ontario

4A) Influence on provincial party identification

	Liberal	Progressive Conservative	NDP	Green
Age	-1.34 (0.85)	1.20 (1.10)	-2.53 (1.36)	-3.67 (1.99)
Female	0.23 (0.26)	-0.40 (0.33)	0.12 (0.42)	0.30 (0.56)
Education	1.41* (0.63)	-1.93* (0.81)	-1.78 (1.10)	-0.19 (1.49)
Income	-0.47 (0.38)	-0.18 (0.52)	-0.80 (0.62)	0.01 (0.82)
Prel	-0.03 (0.39)	0.34 (0.50)	-0.99 (0.66)	-1.62 (1.05)
Etlentr2	0.28 (0.63)	1.08 (0.76)	-3.44 (1.19)	2.38 (1.31)
Patsynd2	-1.01 (0.76)	4.08** (0.99)	-2.63** (1.37)	-3.27* (1.63)
Cmoral	0.23 (0.53)	-1.14 (0.70)	1.27* (0.94)	0.58 (1.09)
Ecn	0.10 (0.35)	-0.77 (0.44)	0.03 (0.53)	0.15 (0.75)
IssHealth	-0.58 (0.35)	0.56 (0.43)	0.35 (0.58)	-0.76 (0.98)
IssEduc	0.22 (0.34)	0.63 (0.45)	-1.31* (0.56)	0.75 (0.67)
IssEnviro	-0.44 (0.54)	0.39 (0.73)	0.75 (0.80)	0.92 (0.87)
IssSchool	-0.03 (0.45)	-1.16 (0.69)	0.51 (0.73)	0.25 (1.10)
Leader	3.04** (0.41)	3.31** (0.48)	1.96** (0.57)	2.35* (1.06)
Federal vote	2.93** (0.26)	3.11** (0.36)	4.81** (0.47)	4.79** (0.70)
Constant	-2.29 (0.78)	-5.03** (1.06)	0.44 (1.48)	-1.69 (1.64)
Pseudo- R^2	0.46	0.58	0.64	0.46
Log Likelihood	-221.49	-137.80	-98.27	-61.80
N	594	594	594	594
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.				

4B) Influence on provincial vote choice

	Liberal	Progressive Conservative	NDP	Green
Age	1.85 (1.09)	-0.62 (1.40)	-0.45 (1.31)	1.00 (1.38)
Female	-0.27 (0.33)	0.16 (0.43)	-0.75 (0.44)	1.36* (0.48)
Education	0.16 (0.81)	0.34 (1.07)	1.08 (1.07)	1.47 (1.12)
Income	0.60 (0.48)	-1.26 (0.65)	-0.73 (0.60)	0.01 (0.65)
Prel	-0.99 (0.51)	1.12 (0.69)	1.34* (0.64)	-0.34 (0.65)
Etlentr2	-0.99 (0.82)	1.94 (1.02)	-0.63 (1.01)	-0.67 (1.12)
Patsynd2	-0.02 (1.01)	-0.17 (1.27)	-0.54 (1.33)	1.06 (1.21)
Cmoral	1.53* (0.70)	-0.28 (0.87)	-1.59 (0.88)	0.28 (0.87)
Ecn	0.57 (0.48)	1.93** (0.66)	-1.26* (0.56)	-0.76 (0.59)
IssHealth	0.11 (0.42)	-1.27 (0.60)	0.44 (0.54)	-0.49 (0.61)
IssEduc	0.94* (0.44)	-0.22 (0.62)	-0.33 (0.62)	-0.77 (0.67)
IssEnviro	-1.17 (0.74)	-1.77 (0.91)	-0.44 (0.84)	1.92** (0.62)
IssSchool	-0.42 (0.56)	-0.67 (0.75)	0.39 (0.66)	0.80 (0.62)
Prov Party ID	2.67** (0.35)	3.20** (0.54)	3.68** (0.59)	6.16** (1.42)
Leader	3.11** (0.53)	3.95** (0.69)	1.88** (0.57)	3.15** (0.93)
Federal vote	1.52** (0.36)	2.12** (0.46)	1.41* (0.55)	3.07* (1.24)
Constant	-5.08** (1.06)	-5.06** (1.36)	-1.81 (1.43)	-5.30** (1.43)
Pseudo- R^2	0.58	0.68	0.59	0.47
Log Likelihood	-142.25	-89.70	-100.36	-94.30
N	496	496	496	496
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.				

Table 5. Changes in probabilities associated with the independent variable “federal vote choice” based on the regressions of Tables 3 and 4

5A) In Quebec (from Tables 3A and 3B)

<i>Effect on</i>	Liberal	PQ	ADQ	QS	Green
Provincial identification	0.16	0.31	0.10	0.01	0.12
Provincial vote	0.15	0.12	0.27	0.02	0.15

5B) In Ontario (from Tables 4A and 4B)

<i>Effect on</i>	Liberal	Prog.-Cons.	NDP	Green
Provincial identification	0.61	0.42	0.65	0.51
Provincial vote	0.35	0.26	0.15	0.50

Table 6. Provincial second choice of “unloyal partisans”

6A) In Quebec

<i>2006 Federal Election Party Choice</i>					
	Liberal	Conservative	Bloc	NDP	Green
<i>Second Choice Provincial Party</i>	%	%	%	%	%
Liberal	61.1	4.1	4.6	14.4	3.4
Parti Quebecois	9.9	3.5	67.6	9.5	2.8
ADQ	11.3	76.7	12.3	18.7	11.3
Quebec Solidaire	9.9	6.7	5.8	27.5	1.0
Green Party	7.8	9.0	9.8	29.9	81.6
Total	100	100	100	100	100
N=491	72	113	77	206	23

6B) In Ontario

<i>2006 Federal Election Party Choice</i>				
	Liberal	Conservative	NDP	Green
<i>Second Choice Provincial Party</i>	%	%	%	%
Liberal	79.7	3.3	3.9	42.3
PC	3.5	66.8	0.0	0.0
NDP	12.7	14.6	96.1	0.0
Green Party	4.1	15.3	0.0	57.7
Total	100	100	100	100
N=127	66	42	18	1

Table 7. Cross-level partisanship in Canada's four main regions (from 2006 CES data)

7A) In Quebec

	<i>2006 Federal Election Party Choice</i>				
	Liberal	Conservative	Bloc	NDP	Green
<i>2006 Provincial Vote Intention</i>	%	%	%	%	%
Liberal	90.9	48.7	2.5	37.2	28.6
Parti Quebecois	1.8	21.6	88.8	28.2	17.1
ADQ	7.3	29.7	8.7	28.2	34.3
Green Party	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.4	20.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100
N=544	119	126	237	42	19

Note: The party Québec Solidaire did not exist at the time of the 2006 federal election

7B) In Ontario

	<i>2006 Federal Election Party Choice</i>			
	Liberal	Conservative	NDP	Green
<i>2006 Provincial Vote Intention</i>	%	%	%	%
Liberal	73.6	12.4	21.2	43.1
PC	14.3	84.4	9.4	8.3
NDP	11.0	2.4	67.1	19.4
Green Party	1.1	0.8	2.4	29.2
Total	100	100	100	100
N=738	285	275	138	39

7C) In the four Atlantic provinces

	<i>2006 Federal Election Party Choice</i>			
	Liberal	Conservative	NDP	Green
<i>2006 Provincial Vote Intention</i>	%	%	%	%
Liberal	65.1	4.5	27.9	28.6
Conservative	26.9	85.4	16.3	0.0
NDP	8.0	7.6	53.5	28.6
Green Party	0.0	2.6	2.3	42.9
Total	100	100	100	100
N=231	95	85	47	4

7D) In the four Western provinces

<i>2006 Federal Election Party Choice</i>				
	Liberal	Conservative	NDP	Green
<i>2006 Provincial Vote Intention</i>	%	%	%	%
Liberal	52.7	23.7	7.7	24.7
Conservative	9.6	69.7	8.0	16.1
NDP	36.3	5.1	82.2	18.3
Green Party	1.4	1.6	2.2	40.9
Total	100	100	100	100
N=752	153	351	198	50

Note: Provincial Conservative includes the Saskatchewan Party