



METHODOLOGY

American Communities Project/Ipsos Fragmentation Study, 2025 About the Study

This study was conducted between August 18 – September 4, 2025, by Ipsos for Michigan State University using the probability-based KnowledgePanel® for thirteen segments (see table below) and telephone interviewing using random digit dialing using a smart-cell and land line list targeting counties in the Aging Farmlands and Native American Lands. In the Native American Lands, only cellphone sample was used. In the Aging Farmlands, 75% of interviews were conducted via cellphone and 25% were conducted on landlines. The survey on the KnowledgePanel was fielded from August 18 – September 1, 2025, the survey using random digit dialing telephone interviews fielded from August 18 – September 4, 2025. This poll is based on a nationally representative probability sample of 5,489 general population adults age 18 or older in the United States, broken down per segment in the table below.

The margin of sampling error for this study is plus or minus 1.8 percentage points at the 95% confidence level, for results based on the entire sample of adults. The margin of sampling error per region is in the table below.

Segment	Method	Number of Interviews	Margin of Error (MoE)
African American South	Online via the KnowledgePanel®.	N = 334	+/- 5.8 percentage points
Big Cities		N = 511	+/- 4.5 percentage points
College Towns		N = 367	+/- 5.7 percentage points
Evangelical Hubs		N = 326	+/- 5.7 percentage points
Exurbs		N = 371	+/- 5.5 percentage points
Graying America		N = 395	+/- 5.5 percentage points
Hispanic Centers		N = 353	+/- 5.7 percentage points
LDS Enclaves		N = 365	+/- 6.8 percentage points
Middle Suburbs		N = 374	+/- 5.4 percentage points
Military Posts		N = 337	+/- 5.8 percentage points
Rural Middle America		N = 365	+/- 5.5 percentage points
Urban Burbs		N = 447	+/- 4.9 percentage points
Working Class Country		N = 344	+/- 5.5 percentage points
Aging Farmlands	Random Digit Dialing Telephone	N = 300	+/- 7.7 percentage points
Native American Lands		N = 300	+/- 7.5 percentage points
Total Interviews		N = 5,489	+/- 1.8 percentage points

In our reporting of the findings, percentage points are rounded off to the nearest whole number. As a result, percentages in a given table column may total slightly higher or lower than 100%. In questions that permit multiple responses, columns may total substantially more than 100%, depending on the number of different responses offered by each respondent.





METHODOLOGY

The survey was conducted using KnowledgePanel, the most well-established online probability-based panel that is representative of the adult U.S. population. Our recruitment process employs a scientifically developed addressed-based sampling methodology using the latest Delivery Sequence File of the USPS – a database with full coverage of all delivery points in the US. Households invited to join the panel are randomly selected from all available households in the U.S. Persons in the sampled households are invited to join and participate in the panel. Those selected who do not already have internet access are provided a tablet and internet connection at no cost to the panel member. Those who join the panel and who are selected to participate in a survey are sent a unique password-protected log-in used to complete surveys online. As a result of our recruitment and sampling methodologies, samples from KnowledgePanel cover all households regardless of their phone or internet status and findings can be reported with a margin of sampling error and projected to the general population.

The data for the total sample were weighted to adjust for gender by age, race/ethnicity, education, metropolitan status, household income, and 15 American Communities Project segments in their correct proportion. The demographic benchmarks were from the 2018-2022 5-year American Community Survey (ACS)

- Gender (Male, Female) by Age (18–29, 30–44, 45–59 and 60+)
- Race/Hispanic Ethnicity (White Non-Hispanic, Black Non-Hispanic, Other, Non-Hispanic, Hispanic, 2+ Races, Non-Hispanic)
- Education (Less than High School, High School, Some College, Bachelor or higher)
- Metropolitan status (Metro, non-Metro)
- Household Income (Under \$25,000, \$25,000-\$49,999, \$50,000-\$74,999, \$75,000-\$99,999, \$100,000-\$149,999, \$150,000+)
- In clusters with high concentration of Latino residents: English language dominance (English dominant, Bilingual, Spanish dominant, non-Hispanics)
- 15 ACP segments in their correct proportion

The detailed weighting plan begins on page 3.



METHODOLOGY

American Communities Project (ACP) – Final Weighting Summary

The target population for this study was a general population study of adults 18 and older in the United States with an approximately equal number of completes across 15 geographic clusters. The geographic clusters were defined by FIPS code and included the following:

- 1 African American South
- 2 Aging Farmlands
- 3 Big Cities
- 4 College Towns
- 5 Evangelical Hubs
- 6 Exurbs
- 7 Graying America
- 8 Hispanic Centers
- 9 LDS Enclaves
- 10 Middle Suburbs
- 11 Military Posts
- 12 Native American Lands
- 13 Rural Middle America
- 14 Urban Burbs
- 15 Working Class Country

The study was conducted online using Ipsos's KnowledgePanel® (KP) in all but 2 clusters, Aging Farmlands and Native American Lands, which utilized random digit dialing. In Aging Farmlands, a dual frame landline and cellphone approach was used, whereas Native American Lands was exclusively cellphone sample.

KP Sample

1. We calculated the base weights for all selected KP sample within each of the 13 geographic clusters.
2. Within each cluster, base weights for the qualified completes were adjusted using raking to benchmarks for the 18+ population in each cluster on the following demographic variables:
 - a. Gender (Male, Female, Other) by Age (18-29, 30-44, 45-59, 60+)
 - b. Race/ethnicity (White/non-Hispanic, Black/non-Hispanic, Other/non-Hispanic, Hispanic, 2+Race/non-Hispanic)
 - c. Education (Less than High School, High School graduate, Some college, Bachelor's degree or higher)
 - d. Household Income (<\$25,000, \$25,000-49,999, 50,000-74,999, 75,000-99,999, 100,000-149,999, \$150,000 or higher)
 - e. In clusters with high concentration of Latino residents: English language dominance (English dominant, Bilingual, Spanish dominant, non-Hispanic)

METHODOLOGY

Please note that depending on the distribution and cell counts, some categories of raking variables were collapsed. The categories varied by cluster. Please see appendix section for specific breaks used for each cluster.

3. Benchmarks were from the 2018-2022 5-year American Community Survey (ACS)
4. The weights were trimmed and scaled within cluster to sum to the unweighted sample size of the cluster. (**areawt**)

Phone Sample Native American Lands – Cellphone Only Sample

1. Prior to weighting, the distributions of the variables used for weighting were examined and missing data were imputed using hot deck imputation.
2. Base weights were then calculated for the sampled cell telephone numbers as follows:

$$BW = \frac{\text{Universe count of cluster}}{\text{Sample phone numbers}}$$

3. Next, we adjusted the base weights to reflect the selection of an eligible respondent within the household.
 - a. Number of 18+ adults in the household (1, 2, 3+)
 - b. $BW2 = BW * \text{Number of 18+ adults in the household}$
4. Base weights for the qualified completes were adjusted using raking to benchmarks for the 18+ population of the Native American Lands on the following demographic variables:
 - a. Gender (Male, Female) by Age (18-44, 45-59, 60+), and Other, any age
 - b. Race/ethnicity (White/non-Hispanic, non-White)
 - c. Education (High school graduate or less, Some college, Bachelor's or higher)
 - d. Household Income (<\$50,000, 50,000-99,999, \$100,000 or higher)
5. Benchmarks were from the 2018-2022 5-year ACS.
6. The weights were trimmed and scaled to sum to the unweighted sample size. (**areawt**)

Phone Sample Aging Farmlands

1. Prior to weighting, the distributions of the variables used for weighting were examined and missing data were imputed using hot deck imputation.
2. Base weights were then calculated for the sampled landline and cell telephone numbers separately as follows:

$$BW = \begin{cases} \frac{\text{Universe count of landline telephone for Aging Farmland cluster}}{\text{Sampled landline telephone for Aging Farmland cluster}} \\ \frac{\text{Universe count of cell telephone for Aging Farmland cluster}}{\text{Sampled cell telephone for Aging Farmland cluster}} \end{cases}$$

3. Due to the overlapping nature of the cellphone and landline frames, respondents were grouped into the following telephone status categories:
 - a. Landline Only (LLO),
 - b. Dual User (DU) from LL sample,
 - c. DU from cell sample, and
 - d. Cellphone only (CPO).

METHODOLOGY

4. We adjusted for multiple telephones in the household. Benchmarks for this multiplicity adjustment were secured from the July-December 2024 telephone status estimates derived from the National Health Interview Survey ([Wireless Substitution: Early Release of Estimates from the National Health Interview Survey, July-December 2022 \(cdc.gov\)](#)). The Midwest and West Census Regions were aggregated to provide benchmarks as they most closely aligned with this geographic distribution of the Aging Farmlands cluster.

Region	Landline only	Dual Users	Cellphone only
Midwest	1.5	17.2	81.3
West	1.4	17.5	81.1
Benchmark Used*	1.5	17.3	81.2

*Sample consisted of 66% Midwest and 34% West. Benchmark used the weighted average of the two regions.

**Telephone status was rescaled to exclude those with no telephones.

5. An adjustment factor was then calculated for each telephone status.
 - a. If phone_status=LLO: *Adjustment factor = LLO Benchmark/BW LL only*
 - b. If phone_status=DU from LL: *Adjustment factor = DU Benchmark/BW LL DU*
 - c. If phone_status=DU from cell: *Adjustment factor = DU Benchmark/BW Cell DU*
 - d. If phone_status=CPO: *Adjustment factor = CPO Benchmark/BW CPO only*
6. This multiplicity adjustment factor was then applied to each separate BW to get separate BW2 for each sample as follows:

$$BW2 = BW * \text{Adjustment factor (depending on phone status)}$$
7. Next, the landline and cellphone samples were blended using the following formula:
 - a. If phone_status=LLO: *phweight = BW2*
 - b. If phone_status=DU from LL: *phweight = $\lambda * BW2$*
 - c. If phone_status=3 DU from cell: *phweight = $(1 - \lambda) * BW2$*
 - d. If phone_status=4 CPO: *phweight = BW2*

where λ reflects the proportion of dual users coming from the landline sample. This factor is

determined as $\lambda = \frac{n_{LLDU}}{DEF_{LLDU}}$. The cellphone proportion was calculated as

$(1 - \lambda)$. This ensured that dual users were not overrepresented.

8. Next, the weights were adjusted to reflect the selection of an eligible respondent within the household as follows:

$$Baseweight = phweight * \text{Number of 18+ adults in the household (1,2,3+)}.$$

METHODOLOGY

9. These adjusted base weights for the qualified completes were further adjusted using raking to benchmarks for the 18+ population of the Native American Lands on the following demographic variables:
 - a. Gender (Male, Female, Trans/Non-binary/Prefer to self-identify/Others) by Age (18-44, 45-59, 60+)
 - b. Race/ethnicity (White/non-Hispanic, non-White)
 - c. Education (Some college or less, Bachelors or higher)
 - d. Household income (Under \$50,000, \$50,000 to \$99,999, \$100,000 and over)
10. Benchmarks were from the 2018-2022 5-year ACS.
11. The weights were trimmed and scaled to sum to the unweighted sample size. (**areawt**)

The KP weights and Phone weights were stacked into a single variable named **areawt**. This is the weight to use when analyzing each geographic cluster separately.

National Sample

Since each of the community was scaled to their unweighted sample size, we needed to put each area in their correct proportions compared to national benchmarks. We calculated an adjustment factor for each area using the formula below:

$$\text{Adjustment Factor} = \frac{\text{Proportion of Community Based on Benchmark}}{\text{Unweighted Proportion of the Community}}.$$

We then multiplied this adjustment factor to the **areawt** to get the national weight called **natwt**. Then, the national weighted demographic distributions were compared to benchmarks. We found small deviations (less than ±1 percentage point) from benchmarks due to the weight trimming that was applied to the **areawt** for some areas.

When analyzing the national sample, statistical software for analyzing data from complex samples should be used for proper variance estimation. The typology variable should be specified as a strata variable.

Appendix A

This section lists the specific weighting variables and categories used for the 13 area clusters that utilized KP sample.

1. African American South
 - a. Gender (Male, Female) by Age (18-29, 30-44, 45-59, 60+)
 - b. Race/ethnicity (White/non-Hispanic, non-White)
 - c. Education (High School graduate or less, Some college, Bachelor's degree or higher)
 - d. Household Income (<\$50,000, 50,000-99,999, 100,000 or higher)

METHODOLOGY

2. Big Cities

- a. Gender (Male, Female) by Age (18-29, 30-44, 45-59, 60+)
- b. Race/ethnicity (White/non-Hispanic, Black/Other/2+Race non-Hispanic, Hispanic)
- c. Education (High School graduate or less, Some college, Bachelor's degree or higher)
- d. Household Income (<\$50,000, 50,000-99,999, 100,000 or higher)
- e. English language dominance (English dominant, Bilingual or Spanish dominant, non-Hispanic)

3. College Towns

- a. Gender (Male, Female) by Age (18-29, 30-44, 45-59, 60+)
- b. Race/ethnicity (White/non-Hispanic, Black/non-Hispanic, Other or 2+Races/non-Hispanic, Hispanic)
- c. Education (High School graduate or less, Some college, Bachelor's degree or higher)
- d. Household Income (<\$25,000, \$25,000-49,999, 50,000-74,999, 75,000-99,999, 100,000-149,999, \$150,000 or higher)

4. Evangelical Hubs

- a. Gender by Age (Male 18-44, Male 45-59, Male 60+, Female 18-29, Female 30-44, Female 45-59, Female 60+)
- b. Race/ethnicity (White/non-Hispanic, non-White)
- c. Education (High School graduate or less, Some college, Bachelor's degree or higher)
- d. Household Income (<\$50,000, 50,000-99,999, 100,000 or higher)

5. Exurbs

- a. Gender (Male, Female) by Age (18-29, 30-44, 45-59, 60+)
- b. Race/ethnicity (White/non-Hispanic, Black or Other or 2+Races/non-Hispanic, Hispanic)
- c. Education (Less than High School, High School graduate, Some college, Bachelor's degree or higher)
- d. Household Income (<\$25,000, \$25,000-49,999, 50,000-74,999, 75,000-99,999, 100,000-149,999, \$150,000 or higher)

6. Graying America

- a. Gender by Age (Male 18-29, Male 30-44, Male 45-59, Male 60+, Female 18-44, Female 45-59, Female 60+)
- b. Race/ethnicity (White/non-Hispanic, Black or Other or 2+Races/non-Hispanic, Hispanic)
- c. Education (High School graduate or less, Some college, Bachelor's degree or higher)
- d. Household Income (<\$25,000, \$25,000-49,999, 50,000-74,999, 75,000-99,999, 100,000-149,999, \$150,000 or higher)

METHODOLOGY

7. Hispanic Centers

- a. Gender (Male, Female, Other) by Age (18-29, 30-44, 45-59, 60+)
- b. Race/ethnicity (White/non-Hispanic, Black or Other or 2+Races/non-Hispanic, Hispanic)
- c. Education (Less than High School, High School graduate, Some college or higher)
- d. Household Income (<\$50,000, \$50,000-99,999, \$100,000 or higher)
- e. English language dominance (English dominant, Bilingual, Spanish dominant, non-Hispanic)

8. LDS Enclaves

- a. Gender by Age (Male 18-44, Male 45-59, Male 60+, Female 18-29, Female 30-44, Female 45-59, Female 60+)
- b. Race/ethnicity (White/non-Hispanic, non-White)
- c. Education (High School graduate or less, Some college or higher)
- d. Household Income (<\$49,999, \$50,000-99,999, \$100,000 or higher)

9. Middle Suburban

- a. Gender (Male, Female, Other) by Age (18-29, 30-44, 45-59, 60+)
- b. Race/ethnicity (White/non-Hispanic, non-White)
- c. Education (High School graduate or less, Some college, Bachelor's or higher)
- d. Household Income (<\$25,000, \$25,000-49,999, 50,000-74,999, 75,000-99,999, 100,000-149,999, \$150,000 or higher)

10. Military Posts

- a. Gender by Age (Male 18-44, Male 45-59, Male 60+, Female 18-29, Female 30-44, Female 45-59, Female 60+)
- b. Race/ethnicity (White/non-Hispanic, Black or Other or 2+Races/non-Hispanic, Hispanic)
- c. Education (High School graduate or less, Some college, Bachelor's or higher)
- d. Household Income (<\$49,999, \$50,000-99,999, \$100,000 or higher)

11. Rural Middle America

- a. Gender by Age (Male 18-29, Male 30-44, Male 45-59, Male 60+, Female 18-44, Female 45-59, Female 60+)
- b. Race/ethnicity (White/non-Hispanic, non-White)
- c. Education (High School graduate or less, Some college, Bachelor's or higher)
- d. Household Income (<\$25,000, \$25,000-49,999, 50,000-74,999, 75,000-99,999, 100,000-149,999, \$150,000 or higher)

12. Urban Burbs

- a. Gender (Male, Female) by Age (18-29, 30-44, 45-59, 60+)
- b. Race/ethnicity (White/non-Hispanic, Black/non-Hispanic, Other or 2+ Races/non-Hispanic, Hispanic)
- c. Education (Less than High School, High School graduate, Some college, Bachelor's degree or higher)
- d. Household Income (<\$25,000, \$25,000-49,999, 50,000-74,999, 75,000-99,999, 100,000-149,999, \$150,000 or higher)



METHODOLOGY

13. Working Class Country

- a. Gender by Age (Male 18-29, Male 30-44, Male 45-59, Male 60+, Female 18-44, Female 45-59, Female 60+)
- b. Race/ethnicity (White/non-Hispanic, non-White)
- c. Education (High School graduate or less, Some college, Bachelor's degree or higher)
- d. Household Income (<\$49,999, \$50,000-99,999, \$100,000 or higher)

