**Comments – Proposal Alex**

First of all, congrats Alex, we talked about your project a lot, you know I really like it, and I’m glad I can comment your proposal. It’s really nice to see the evolution of your project, which is getting clearer and clearer so I don’t have any major things to say but hopefully some suggestions or tips that may be helpful for the next steps. So I have few comments regarding the more theoretical part of the proposal, and then I’ll move to few comments on your hypotheses and your method.

***THEORY***

1. You start by explaining how *political engagement* is used as an umbrella term and refers to different forms of commitment to politics, but then you shift the discussion by narrowing down on *political interes*t more specifically (your puzzle focuses on political interest only – could it be broadened to political engagement?).

If focus on political interest – I think you should better explain how you came to this. So is it for practical reasons? Is it because you think that political interest has an impact on all other forms of political engagement? So I think you could develop a little more here and makes it a bit clearer.

2. Maybe you should stress the main takeaways from each of your four agents of socialization which are peers, school, parents and media. Your literature review is impressive – it’s rich, we see that you’ve read a lot and that you really handle your topic. So congrats for this but it also makes the text very dense so I think to specify the main takeaway in each section (and what’s it’s missing from the literature, or what is still puzzling) would help to put more emphasis on the contribution of your project.

***HYPOTHESES***

Your draw on *social learning theory* and *gender homophily* to derive your hypotheses and explain how basically your agents of socialization become agents of socialization. I think it’s great. However, few things here that might help make it even more convincing:

* You refer to *social learning* *theory* mostly in your discussion on the role of *parents* and your definition of *social learning theory* applies specifically to parents as well. So I understand that you want to investigate what this theory can explain if applied to other actors, or agents, so it might be useful to specify, before moving to your hypotheses, how *social learning theory* would explain the effect of peers, school, and media.
* Similarly, you emphasize the role of *homophily* in your discussion on the role of peers only. Again, if you think *homophily* plays a role in explaining the impact of all your four agents of socialization, then here you might want to specify how is *homophily* would be at play regarding parents, media, and school.

So I guess what I’m trying to say is maybe it would be clearer to define these two theories first, and then briefly explain how each of your two theories would apply for all of your socialization agents before you derive your hypotheses.

Also, it was not totally clear for me why your hypotheses are focusing on political interest and political knowledge, and not other forms of political engagement such as voting, participation in informal politics and so on. So maybe this could be better explained.

Finally, I better explained my point in the commented version of your proposal I’ll send to you but it seems that you hypothesis number 6 tests two relationships, and then maybe you should break it down into 2 hypotheses. But I guess we can come back on this. It’s really a detail.

And still on the hypothesis number 6: you suggest a relationship between interest in partisan politics among men, translating into stronger ambition for political office and then gender gap in political representation – but I wonder here, besides socialization, how values and personality traits come into play. I think they also might be relevant, so maybe to take these variables in mind when gathering your data could be relevant. But you seem aware of that.

Side-question. Not a critique, but more out of curiosity: why removing the potential impact of voting advice applications such as Vote Compass?

I’m going over time but a last minute on the method section.

***METHOD***

On the method, I think your design is really strong and the survey experiment is great.

I wonder how you will measure knowledge and interest in specific issues among girls and boys and how it is transmitted from parents? Will you try to get some indicator of issue salience? I was wondering if you think about like open questions? I’m just dropping it but have you considered textual analysis? I think it could be a possible relevant avenue.

And also, I’m curious if you have panel data collected before and after the election– why not studying the effect your different IVs on turnout? Cause your design would allow you to test this as well and make a strong claim on how your different variables translate into gender differences (or not) not just in political interest and knowledge, but also in the act of voting.

So yes, that’s pretty it, I have other minor suggestions on paper that I’ll send to you but good job. Well done Alex ☺