**Revision Memo**

Omar Lizardo, Rory McVeigh, and Sarah Mustillo, Editors, American Sociological Review

Re: “Measuring Stability and Change in Personal Culture Using Panel Data”

Thank you for the opportunity to revise and publish our work. We appreciate the reviewer’s additional comments and the clear guidance from them and the editors about how to improve the manuscript. We have addressed their comments, which we detail here.

We agree with Reviewer 3 and the editors that we did not offer an ex ante definition of core and periphery beliefs. We now explicitly address this in the theoretical background section on core and periphery beliefs (pages 11-12), using prior research to make clear predictions about which political beliefs should be core and which should be periphery, and what that means in terms of active updating and consistency. We believe this revision will address any confusion.

We appreciated Reviewer 2’s suggestion to modify the figures, and all figures that include measures of consistency or updating now include additional labels mapping the measure to the conceptual term.

For validation and replication purposes, we also include a note pointing readers to the first author’s github repository for this project, which contains all code used in the paper, including R code for how we cleaned and coded the GSS panel data and code for the analyses. This note is attached to the first paragraph of the Analysis Steps (page 22), but if the editors have guidelines for how best to present this information, we welcome their suggestions.

**Blinded Decision Letter**

The reviews are in on your manuscript "Measuring Stability and Change in Personal Culture Using Panel Data," and it is time for us to make a decision. Based on the reviewers’ comments and our own reading of the manuscript, our decision is to conditionally accept the paper for publication in American Sociological Review (ASR). Congratulations on your scholarship and the fine job done in revising the manuscript.  
  
We sent your paper two of your previous readers (2 and 3 below). As you can see, both reviewers feel that you made significant progress with the manuscript, and both believe that the paper now merits publication. Reviewer 2 is offering some minor suggestions that should help clarify your presentation of key results. Reviewer 3 (point 1) is raising an important issue that merits your attention, since it seems like you are not offering a principled (ex ante) distinction of the difference core and periphery beliefs, and thus linking them definitionally to the outcome rather than empirically. This needs to be clarified in your next draft. Since space/article length is not an issue, you can sidestep the other two suggestions for streamlining/editing offered by this reader.  
  
Finally, to encourage replication and validation of published research, consider adding a footnote offering access to the data, coding syntax, statistical commands, or selected narrative materials. Such supplemental materials might, for example, be posted on your own website. Alternatively ASR will consider posting them on its “Supplemental Materials” website. Please note that acceptance of your paper is not conditional on your providing access to these materials.  
  
Once you have had the chance to read and digest the reviewers’ comments, please let us know when we might be able to expect the next draft. We ask that you try your best to resubmit within [\_\_TWO\_\_] months. If this seems like this timeline would cause undue burden, let us know.  
  
To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/asr> and enter your Author Center, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions."  Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision."  Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.  
  
You may also click the below link to start the revision process (or continue the process if you have already started your revision) for your manuscript. If you use the below link you will not be required to login to ScholarOne Manuscripts.  
  
\*\*\* PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. \*\*\*  
  
<https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/asr?URL_MASK=24e7593181c841e598e5b792a95d2dff>  
  
  
You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript.  Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer.  
  
Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Center.  
  
When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided.  You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript.  In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).  
  
IMPORTANT:  Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript.  Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.  
  
Submission of the manuscript to another professional journal while it is under review by ASR is regarded by the American Sociological Association (ASA) as unethical, and significant findings or contributions that have already appeared (or will appear) elsewhere must be clearly identified. All persons who publish in ASA journals are required to abide by these ASA guidelines and ethics codes. We thus assume that this paper or a substantially similar version of this paper is not under review elsewhere and that portions have not been published elsewhere in whole or in part. Please let us know if either of these conditions is not true.  
  
Again, congratulations on your fine research. We look forward to seeing the next draft. We will review the next draft in-house and make a decision on that basis.  We are excited about the prospects for this paper and feel it has the potential to make a  significant contribution to several fields in sociology.  
  
  
Sincerely,  
Omar Lizardo, Rory McVeigh, and Sarah Mustillo  
Editors, American Sociological Review  
[asr@nd.edu](mailto:asr@nd.edu)  
  
  
Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:  
  
Reviewer: 2  
  
Comments to the Author  
It was a pleasure to review the revisions on this paper. My original review suggested more substantive engagement with research on public opinion to address both the framing of the results and some empirical and methodological questions. To me, the revisions to the beginning of the paper and the conclusion strike an excellent balance of breadth and brevity, clearly signaling which bodies of literature are most closely aligned with AUM and SDM without getting lost in the details of each. This is exactly what my previous comments about the literature review had in mind.  
  
The new “comparison to other approaches” section and the discussion of panel conditioning (p. 18) are both great. On panel conditioning, I really appreciate the way the authors have integrated this literature’s insights into potential evidence for AUM and SDM, rather than treating conditioning merely as a confounding issue.  
  
I have three very minor additional suggestions for the paper:  
- I appreciate the authors’ introduction of “consistency” for the beta estimates and the clarity of their discussion comparing this to “updating.” On some of the figures, I would suggest changing the axis labels from “Beta estimates” and “Phi estimates” to “Beta estimates (consistency)” and “Phi estimates (updating)” (or something similar) to help the reader carry these ideas from the text to the figures. This would be particularly helpful in figures 4 and 6. These figures are excellent, but I found myself having to mentally map quadrants for “high consistency/high updating,” “low consistency/high updating,” etc. as I read them.   
  
-If possible, I would like to encourage the authors to share their code in an open-access repository or a supplementary file so that others can implement analysis of active updating in panel data sets other than the GSS.  
  
-On page 17, line 47, there is an error in the Ansolabehere citation.   
  
Reviewer: 3  
  
Comments to the Author  
Review of Measuring Stability and Change in Personal Culture Using Panel Data REVISION  
  
This study provides an empirical test of how individuals’ culture (as measured in values, attitudes and behaviors) over time. Specifically it assesses the extent to which this change is more appropriately characterized as a hardened stability versus a consistent updating, as well as how these models may operate differently across the life course and measures of culture. Using three waves of GSS data, the results suggest that the underlying stability model is the primary pattern, meaning people tend to develop a particular set of values and beliefs that is resistant to change. The authors did an effective job at addressing my primary concerns in this revision. The added explanation of why clarifying the stability versus updating pattern is broadly compelling. Further, the explanation of the primary pattern of results versus exceptions added to the clarity of the overall findings. I still have a few minor issues that I address below.     
  
1. I found the core-periphery model explanation a bit confusing and potentially problematic. Mainly the definition and distinction between core and peripheral values was a bit murky. My assumption would be that something such as a party identification would be a “core” value (e.g., I am a Democrat), while specific policy decisions would be more peripheral (e.g., executive rights to appoint justices). In this way, people would be stable in their identification and bring political policy beliefs in line with this, which seems consistent with one of the cited studies that was concluded as showing “increased alignment between partisan identification and policy positions, but little increase in the correlation between specific policy positions.” If I am reading this interpretation correctly it would say that partisan identification was stable (e.g., high correlation with policy), while policy positions were more variable (e.g., low correlation over time with each other). But then, they authors claim “among items tapping issues of politics, most policy issues should show little active updating, but partisan affiliation should demonstrate the highest level.” This statement seems to contradict the previous, suggesting that affiliation is peripheral? So people would change party identification more over time than their stance on particular policies? Overall this seems counterintuitive and needs more clarification.  
  
Slightly more problematically was the apparent claim that the definition between core versus peripheral is in fact determined by the pattern of stability versus updating. That is, the results would define the independent variable. As the authors state “beliefs and behaviors that exhibit stable dispositions are more likely to be “core” beliefs than those that exhibit active updating.” Again, perhaps I’m reading this wrong, but this assertion seems to assess that the determination of core versus peripheral is driven by the predicted pattern of results, which of course would lead to an obvious tautology. The authors should be able to identify which of the measures are “core” beliefs and which are “peripheral” before running the analyses, and then use the results to assess the validity of the hypothesis. Thus, the main issue seems to be how would core versus peripheral be defined a priori.  
  
This issue is extended into the measures section as there is no discussion of which items would be used as indicating core beliefs or peripheral beliefs.  
  
Finally, this model is not discussed to the extent the other possibilities (e.g., age vs cohort).  
  
2. Given the improved set up, the “Research Questions and Expectations” section seemed redundant and unnecessary. Similarly, the “Comparison to Other Approaches” didn’t seem fully necessary as the explanation of the proposed model was satisfactory. If space is a concern I could definitely see cutting this section.  
  
  
3. The conclusions got a bit long and made it difficult to see the most important points. I would encourage the authors to hone the argument in this section to the most salient take aways.