**Hi Professor Bashevkin,**

**hi Professor Dassonneville,**

**Thanks again for the very detailed feedback, which was much needed. This memo summarizes the main changes I have applied to the proposal.**

**1. Better conceptual definitions**

I now define politics in the introduction (more than a partisan game; includes actions that preserve the policy status quo as well as actions which aim at disrupting it, including contentious politics and interest groups which seek to influence the rules — from the international level to the local level) before defining political interest, political participation, political engagement and other related concepts. Some of these concepts have also been broadened to include interest group involvement, voluntary association work, protest politics, etc. I clarify that I will use the words "political interest" when referring to studies that use it, but I warn readers they should keep in mind this concept is strongly tied to *partisan politics* – even when authors do not talk explicitly about "partisan politics". I use *interest in partisan politics* when it is explicitly used by studies.

**2. Clarification of the research question and theory**

My research question is now “How do gender differences in interest for different political topics emerge?” My theory is that children’s interest for specific political topics comes mainly from socialization by their same-gender parent and peers. The puzzle is briefly explained in the introduction and developed in the hypotheses section, including a discussion of the role of agency/communality.

I removed hypotheses about teachers and social media influencers, although I still discuss their potential role in the literature review. This leaves me with two hypotheses instead of six:

***Hypothesis 1****: Children’s interest for specific political topics is more affected by political discussions with their same-gender parent than other-gender parent.*

***Hypothesis 2****: Children’s interest for specific political topics is more affected by political discussions with their same-gender peers than other-gender peers.*

Since other aspects of political engagement are mostly kept away after the introduction, I also stopped talking about social learning theory (which is centered on behaviour) to instead focus on the "parental socialization" theory, which is more centered on the transmission of political interest. I could also have called it "role model socialization" theory, but I removed hypotheses about teachers and social media influencers, so I kept parents only.

**3. Introduction**

I reorganized the introduction to put front and center the idea that men are not the normative type – and that political interest should be disaggregated into different political topics, some in which women express more interest and some in which men express more interest. I make it clear that political interest emerges during childhood as a result of institutional and structural factors, but also more importantly socialization, and more specifically socialization by same-gender individuals (parents and peers). I then contend that from adolescence onwards, political interest remains stable through life. I then introduce the puzzle, and I speak a bit about challenges for women's voice to be heard in partisan political life.

**4. Focus on political interest in the literature review**

I refocused the section on political socialization agents: I now discuss almost exclusively studies which have political interest as a DV (as opposed to political knowledge, political participation, etc.).

**5. Justification of Canada as a case study**

I make it clearer that studies in North America have used a one-item measure of political interest, contrary to some recent European and Middle Eastern studies. Research relying on multi-faceted uses of political interest needs to be done in a different context. The gender gap in the aggregate measure of political interest has been fairly stable in Canada despite recent increases in the proportions of women elected at the provincial and federal levels.

**5. Re-organization of the section on determinants of gender differences in political interest**

This section is now divided in 3 for 3 types of factors: structural, institutional & individual. In individual factors, I include biological factors, life-cycle factors and socialization. While all of these factors have been found to play a role in the development of political interest in some contexts, socialization is found to be the most convincing one.

**6. Broader discussion on discrimination and marginalization**

Among other things, I further discuss biased media coverage against high-profile women politicians, uncivil tweets against them, women's lower income, discrimination by gatekeepers, but also discrimination against men by voters in municipal elections. I added a few more studies deconstructing the concept of political interest by gender, topic and ethnicity.

**7. Changes in data collection plans**

Without parents' data, I would only be able to assess what political topics parents are interested in by asking their children – which reduces data quality quite importantly. I decided to drop the focus groups instead, since they only provide complementary data, but I can easily revert both decisions if needed.

For the student survey, plan A is to rely on experimental data for a new citizenship education program by CIVIX – Rep Day – and plan B is to design my own survey, focusing on the variables included in the questionnaire.

I focus my survey questions on individual-level and socialization variables, including parents/peers' interest for various topics but also degree of agency/communality.

**8. Shorter document**

I reduced the number of pages to 16 – in Word format.