

**TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2024**

**CONTACT:**

Ashley Koning, Director  
Office: 848-932-8940  
Cell: 908-872-1186  
[akoning@rutgers.edu](mailto:akoning@rutgers.edu)

All news releases are available at [https://eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu/press\\_releases/](https://eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu/press_releases/). Follow the Rutgers-Eagleton Poll on [Facebook](#) and [Twitter](#).

**New Jerseyans' Ratings of Where They Live and Neighborhood Safety Are Positive Overall, but Sharply Divided by Race, Ethnicity and Other Demographics**

**More than half say crime in their neighborhood has stayed the same, while 3 in 10 say it is worse; 4 in 10 are at least somewhat worried they will be a victim of crime**

NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J. (February 6, 2024) – While New Jerseyans as a whole rate the quality of life in their local area positively and feel safe where they live, perceptions vary widely based on who you ask and where they are located, according to the latest Rutgers-Eagleton Poll.

According to the December poll, 7 in 10 residents say their town or city is an “excellent” (25 percent) or “good” (44 percent) place to live, while an even greater number say the same about their neighborhood (34 percent “excellent,” 43 percent “good”). Residents also feel safe in their neighborhood at night (49 percent “very,” 39 percent “somewhat”) and especially during the day (71 percent “very,” 25 percent “somewhat”).

But it’s a different story for some groups, who – while still positive about their community – are much less likely than their counterparts to feel favorably about where they reside. Black residents and Hispanic residents are about 20 points less likely than white residents to rate their towns or cities (52 percent and 58 percent, respectively, versus 74 percent) or their neighborhoods (63 percent and 64 percent, respectively, versus 83 percent) as “excellent” or “good.”

Black and Hispanic residents are less likely than white residents to say they feel “very safe” in their neighborhood either day or night by double digits. Sixty-one percent of Blacks say they feel “very safe” during the day, as do the same number of Hispanics, compared with 77 percent of whites; 48 percent of Blacks and 34 percent of Hispanics feel “very safe” at night, compared with 57 percent of whites.

“When we drill further down into the overall positive ratings of one’s local area and feelings of safety, it looks more like a tale of two New Jerseys,” said Ashley Koning, an assistant research professor and director of the [Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling](#) (ECPIP) at [Rutgers University–New Brunswick](#). “While a majority of every group has a positive view of their town and neighborhood, the striking disparities between some demographics in the degree to which they feel this way are indicative of the all-too-real gaps that exist across the state when it comes to issues like residents’ general welfare and well-being in their communities.”

Region and socioeconomic status echo racial and ethnic differences, too.

New Jerseyans in the lowest income bracket (54 percent town, 60 percent neighborhood) and those with a high school education or less (59 percent, 66 percent neighborhood) are less likely than their counterparts to view their municipalities and neighborhoods as “excellent” or “good” places to live – often by double digits.

Residents living in urban areas of the state are less likely to rate their neighborhoods as “excellent” or “good” (63 percent) compared with those in other regions. In addition, women are less likely than men to rate their town or city positively (66 percent to 72 percent), while Democrats (75 percent) are more positive than Republicans (68 percent) and Independents (64 percent). Positivity about where one lives rises as age increases.

Across the board, the majority of every demographic group feels at least “somewhat safe” in their neighborhood during the day, though there are differences in degree.

Urbanites (55 percent), those in the lowest income bracket (58 percent), and those with a high school education or less (63 percent) are less likely than their counterparts to say “very safe.” Women are slightly less likely to feel “very safe” than men during this time (67 percent versus 75 percent). Nevertheless, 9 in 10 within each of these groups feels at least “somewhat safe” in daylight.

While majorities across all groups feel safe to some degree at night, urbanites (32 percent), those in the lowest income bracket (37 percent), and those with a high school education or less (39 percent) are some of the least likely to say they feel their neighborhood is “very safe” during this time. Women are less likely to feel safe at night than men (43 percent “very” versus 56 percent “very”).

“Perceptions of safety are divided along similar lines as overall ratings of where one lives. Those who feel safer in their town, city, or neighborhood tend to view the area more positively than those who don’t feel as safe,” said [Jessica Roman](#), a research associate at ECPIP. “We can infer that, unsurprisingly, feelings of safety play a role in how people feel about where they live.”

Views also differ widely as to how crime in one’s neighborhood compares with five years ago. Overall, 57 percent of New Jerseyans say crime has stayed the same, 10 percent say it has

gotten better, and 30 percent say it has gotten worse.

Black residents are about half as likely as their counterparts to say crime has gotten worse (15 percent); white residents are the least likely of their counterparts, by double digits, to say it has gotten any better (6 percent). Urbanites (19 percent), those in lower income households, and younger residents are all more likely than their counterparts to say they have seen an improvement in crime in their area. Views are influenced by partisanship: Republicans are the most likely partisans to say crime has gotten worse (42 percent), while Democrats are most likely to say it has stayed the same (62 percent).

Seven percent are “very worried” and another 33 percent are “somewhat worried” that they will become a victim of a crime; 41 percent are “not very worried” and 19 percent are “not worried at all.”

Women are slightly more likely than men to feel worried that they will become a crime victim (44 percent), coinciding with their lower likelihood of feeling safe. Worry declines as education rises.

Republicans (52 percent) are more likely to say they are worried about being a victim of a crime than either independents (41 percent) or Democrats (32 percent).

“Much like everything else, perceptions of safety and crime have also become influenced by partisanship,” noted Koning. “Partisan differences are unsurprising given the emphasis the Republican Party has put on law and order issues in recent election cycles.”

Results are from a statewide poll of 1,657 adults contacted through multiple modes, including by live interviewer on landline and cell phone, MMS text invitation to web, and the probability-based [Rutgers-Eagleton/SSRS Garden State Panel](#) from Dec. 13 to Dec. 23. The full sample has a margin of error of +/- 2.8 percentage points. The registered voter subsample contains 1,451 registered voters and has a margin of error of +/- 3.0 percentage points.

# # #

**Broadcast interviews:** Rutgers University–New Brunswick has broadcast-quality television and radio studios available for remote live or taped interviews with Rutgers experts. For more information, contact Jessica Ronan-Frisch at [jronan@eagleton.rutgers.edu](mailto:jronan@eagleton.rutgers.edu).

***ABOUT RUTGERS UNIVERSITY–NEW BRUNSWICK***

*Rutgers University–New Brunswick is where Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, began more than 250 years ago. Ranked among the world’s top 60 universities, Rutgers’s flagship university is a leading public research institution and a member of the prestigious Association of American Universities. It is home to internationally acclaimed faculty and has 12 degree-granting schools and a Division I Athletics program. It is the Big Ten Conference’s most diverse*

*university. Through its community of teachers, scholars, artists, scientists and healers, Rutgers is equipped as never before to transform lives.*

**ABOUT THE EAGLETON CENTER FOR PUBLIC INTEREST POLLING**

*Home of the Rutgers-Eagleton Poll, the Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling (ECPIP) was established in 1971 and is the oldest and one of the most respected university-based statewide polling operations in the United States. Now in its 52nd year and with the publication of over 200 polls, ECPIP's mission is to provide scientifically sound, nonpartisan information about public opinion. To read more about ECPIP and view all of our press releases, published research and data archive, please visit our website: [eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu](http://eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu). You can also visit our [Facebook](#) and [Twitter](#).*

**ABOUT THE EAGLETON INSTITUTE OF POLITICS**

*The Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling is a unit of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University–New Brunswick. The Eagleton Institute studies how American politics and government work and change, analyzes how the democracy might improve and promotes political participation and civic engagement. The Institute explores state and national politics through research, education and public service, linking the study of politics with its day-to-day practice. To learn more about Eagleton programs and expertise, visit [eagleton.rutgers.edu](http://eagleton.rutgers.edu).*

**ABOUT THE RUTGERS-EAGLETON/SSRS GARDEN STATE PANEL**

*[The Rutgers-Eagleton/SSRS Garden State Panel](#) is a probability-based panel of New Jersey adults age 18 or older. Members are recruited randomly based on statewide representative ABS (Address Based Sample) design. The ABS sample is drawn from the Delivery Sequence File (DSF) maintained by the U.S. Postal Service. Population coverage of the DSF is in the 98%-99% range. During the recruitment process, full demographic information on panelists is collected. This data is stored securely and used to determine eligibility for specific studies (if needed). The Rutgers-Eagleton/SSRS Garden State Panel is a multi-mode panel. Internet households participate via web while all non-internet households (including those who have internet but are unwilling to take surveys online) participate via phone. Panelists also have the option of taking surveys in their preferred language (English or Spanish).*

**QUESTIONS AND TABLES START ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE**

**Questions and Tables**

*The questions covered in this release are listed below. Column percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding. Respondents are New Jersey adults who self-reported being registered to vote unless otherwise noted; all percentages are of weighted results. Interpret groups with samples sizes under 100 with extreme caution.*

---

**T1 Overall, how would you rate each of the following as a place to live?**

**Your town or city**

<b>Excellent</b>	25%
<b>Good</b>	44%
<b>Fair</b>	22%
<b>Poor</b>	9%
<b>Don't know</b>	0%
<b>Unweighted N=</b>	1652

	Party ID			Gender		Race or Ethnicity				Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
<b>Excellent</b>	31%	20%	25%	27%	23%	29%	17%	16%	28%	19%	26%	24%	32%
<b>Good</b>	44%	44%	43%	45%	43%	45%	35%	42%	47%	43%	39%	46%	49%
<b>Fair</b>	18%	24%	24%	20%	23%	20%	31%	24%	20%	24%	24%	22%	17%
<b>Poor</b>	7%	12%	7%	7%	11%	5%	17%	18%	5%	14%	11%	8%	3%
<b>DK</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	602	655	382	850	790	1072	160	212	179	439	358	453	400

**Town/Neighborhood Safety and Crime  
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

	Income				Region					Education			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
<b>Excellent</b>	18%	22%	23%	37%	19%	26%	36%	20%	24%	20%	19%	26%	37%
<b>Good</b>	36%	49%	45%	44%	42%	44%	45%	45%	44%	39%	47%	47%	45%
<b>Fair</b>	27%	20%	26%	15%	27%	21%	16%	21%	23%	24%	24%	22%	16%
<b>Poor</b>	19%	9%	6%	4%	12%	9%	3%	14%	8%	16%	10%	5%	3%
<b>DK</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	332	455	296	424	224	616	255	285	272	381	393	408	467

**Town/Neighborhood Safety and Crime  
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

**T1 Overall, how would you rate each of the following as a place to live?**

**Your neighborhood**

<b>Excellent</b>	34%
<b>Good</b>	43%
<b>Fair</b>	17%
<b>Poor</b>	6%
<b>Don't know</b>	0%
<b>Unweighted N=</b>	1653

	Party ID			Gender		Race or Ethnicity				Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
<b>Excellent</b>	38%	29%	35%	38%	30%	41%	19%	23%	36%	25%	34%	34%	44%
<b>Good</b>	42%	43%	44%	43%	43%	42%	44%	41%	46%	44%	39%	44%	45%
<b>Fair</b>	14%	20%	17%	14%	19%	14%	25%	23%	13%	20%	20%	17%	9%
<b>Poor</b>	6%	8%	5%	5%	8%	3%	11%	12%	5%	10%	7%	5%	1%
<b>DK</b>	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	603	656	381	851	790	1072	160	212	180	439	359	454	399

	Income				Region					Education			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
<b>Excellent</b>	21%	33%	34%	48%	23%	34%	45%	31%	36%	23%	30%	39%	48%
<b>Good</b>	39%	44%	47%	42%	40%	44%	40%	45%	42%	43%	45%	45%	39%
<b>Fair</b>	27%	17%	14%	8%	25%	16%	13%	16%	15%	23%	18%	13%	11%
<b>Poor</b>	13%	7%	4%	1%	10%	5%	2%	9%	6%	11%	7%	3%	2%
<b>DK</b>	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	332	456	296	424	225	615	255	286	272	382	393	409	466

**Town/Neighborhood Safety and Crime  
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

**C1 Please tell us if you feel very safe, somewhat safe, not very safe, or not safe at all in each of the following circumstances:**

**Your neighborhood during the day**

<b>Very safe</b>	71%
<b>Somewhat safe</b>	25%
<b>Not very safe</b>	3%
<b>Not safe at all</b>	1%
<b>Don't know</b>	0%
<b>Unweighted N=</b>	1643

	Party ID			Gender		Race or Ethnicity				Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
<b>Very</b>	77%	66%	69%	75%	67%	77%	61%	61%	69%	71%	69%	69%	77%
<b>Somewhat</b>	20%	29%	26%	22%	28%	20%	30%	34%	25%	23%	25%	28%	22%
<b>Not very</b>	2%	3%	2%	2%	3%	1%	7%	3%	5%	4%	4%	2%	0%
<b>Not at all</b>	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	0%	2%	2%	1%	1%
<b>DK</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	601	653	376	850	781	1064	159	212	179	438	358	447	398

	Income				Region					Education			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
<b>Very</b>	58%	70%	73%	83%	55%	72%	85%	71%	76%	63%	70%	76%	80%
<b>Somewhat</b>	32%	28%	22%	16%	38%	25%	13%	22%	23%	30%	25%	23%	19%
<b>Not very</b>	6%	2%	3%	0%	4%	2%	1%	5%	2%	5%	3%	1%	0%
<b>Not at all</b>	3%	0%	2%	0%	3%	1%	1%	2%	0%	2%	2%	0%	0%
<b>DK</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	332	452	293	421	224	610	252	286	271	382	389	404	465



**Town/Neighborhood Safety and Crime  
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

**C1 Please tell us if you feel very safe, somewhat safe, not very safe, or not safe at all in each of the following circumstances:**

**Your neighborhood at night**

<b>Very safe</b>	49%
<b>Somewhat safe</b>	39%
<b>Not very safe</b>	8%
<b>Not safe at all</b>	3%
<b>Don't know</b>	1%
<b>Unweighted N=</b>	1644

	Party ID			Gender		Race or Ethnicity				Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
<b>Very</b>	53%	46%	48%	56%	43%	57%	48%	34%	41%	44%	46%	51%	57%
<b>Somewhat</b>	36%	39%	43%	36%	41%	36%	34%	43%	49%	38%	40%	41%	38%
<b>Not very</b>	7%	11%	5%	6%	11%	5%	9%	18%	8%	14%	9%	5%	3%
<b>Not at all</b>	3%	4%	3%	2%	4%	2%	9%	6%	2%	4%	5%	3%	2%
<b>DK</b>	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	600	650	381	847	785	1068	159	211	177	440	353	452	397

	Income				Region					Education			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
<b>Very</b>	37%	45%	50%	65%	32%	50%	63%	47%	55%	39%	48%	53%	60%
<b>Somewhat</b>	38%	44%	39%	33%	45%	40%	29%	41%	37%	41%	37%	41%	36%
<b>Not very</b>	16%	9%	7%	1%	16%	7%	4%	7%	7%	13%	11%	3%	3%
<b>Not at all</b>	7%	2%	5%	1%	6%	3%	3%	5%	2%	6%	4%	2%	1%
<b>DK</b>	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	333	455	292	420	225	610	252	285	272	381	393	404	463

**Town/Neighborhood Safety and Crime  
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

**C2 Compared to five years ago, do think crime in your neighborhood has gotten better, gotten worse, or stayed about the same?**

*Note: Responses from those who indicated they did not live in the same neighborhood five years ago were coded out.*

<b>Better</b>	10%
<b>Worse</b>	30%
<b>Stayed the same</b>	57%
<b>Don't know</b>	3%
<b>Unweighted N=</b>	1425

	Party ID			Gender		Race or Ethnicity				Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
<b>Better</b>	13%	11%	6%	11%	9%	6%	20%	16%	14%	19%	14%	4%	6%
<b>Worse</b>	22%	30%	42%	28%	32%	31%	15%	34%	31%	26%	30%	37%	23%
<b>Same</b>	62%	56%	50%	58%	56%	62%	60%	47%	49%	49%	53%	57%	69%
<b>DK</b>	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%	2%	6%	3%	5%	6%	2%	1%	3%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	507	557	348	738	678	951	128	166	151	334	290	421	378

	Income				Region					Education			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
<b>Better</b>	17%	13%	6%	7%	19%	9%	8%	12%	6%	13%	12%	5%	9%
<b>Worse</b>	28%	30%	36%	30%	26%	33%	27%	27%	32%	31%	29%	31%	28%
<b>Same</b>	50%	56%	57%	63%	51%	57%	63%	57%	59%	51%	56%	62%	61%
<b>DK</b>	5%	2%	1%	1%	4%	2%	2%	4%	3%	5%	2%	2%	2%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	277	398	256	364	185	542	221	243	234	332	351	352	387

**Town/Neighborhood Safety and Crime  
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

**C3 How worried are you, if at all, that you will be a victim of a crime?**

<b>Very worried</b>	7%
<b>Somewhat worried</b>	33%
<b>Not very worried</b>	41%
<b>Not at all worried</b>	19%
<b>Don't know</b>	1%
<b>Unweighted N=</b>	1651

	Party ID			Gender		Race or Ethnicity				Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
<b>Very</b>	5%	7%	11%	6%	8%	5%	8%	8%	11%	8%	7%	7%	6%
<b>Somewhat</b>	27%	34%	41%	30%	36%	32%	27%	40%	31%	33%	30%	39%	28%
<b>Not very</b>	48%	39%	31%	43%	38%	42%	35%	37%	43%	41%	41%	37%	43%
<b>Not at all</b>	19%	19%	17%	21%	16%	20%	30%	13%	14%	16%	21%	16%	22%
<b>DK</b>	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	602	656	380	852	787	1069	160	213	180	439	358	453	399

	Income				Region					Education			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
<b>Very</b>	11%	5%	10%	4%	5%	8%	7%	5%	9%	9%	6%	8%	4%
<b>Somewhat</b>	38%	34%	33%	28%	37%	33%	31%	30%	34%	38%	34%	31%	28%
<b>Not very</b>	31%	43%	44%	45%	41%	43%	38%	42%	37%	35%	41%	43%	46%
<b>Not at all</b>	20%	17%	13%	22%	17%	16%	24%	22%	18%	18%	19%	16%	21%
<b>DK</b>	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	333	455	297	423	224	615	254	286	272	383	392	408	465

**Methodology**

This Rutgers-Eagleton Poll was conducted from December 13 to 23, 2023 with a scientifically selected random sample of 1,657 New Jersey adults, 18 or older. Three samples were used for this study – a dual-frame RDD landline and cell samples, a separate cell RDD sample, and sample from the [Rutgers-Eagleton/Garden State Panel](#).

The Rutgers-Eagleton/Garden State Panel is a probability-based panel of New Jersey adults age 18 or older. Members are recruited randomly based on statewide representative ABS (Address Based Sample) design. ABS sample is drawn from the Delivery Sequence File (DSF) maintained by the U.S. Postal Service. Population coverage of the DSF is in the 98%-99% range. During the recruitment process, full demographic information on panelists is collected. The Rutgers/SSRS Garden State Panel is a multi-mode panel. For this poll, only Internet households were invited to participate via web; non-internet households were not included.

This study employed three recruitment methods: calling with live interviewers (n=521), one-to-one push-to-web texting (n=532), and web recruitment (n=604). Distribution of recruitment method in this sample is:

<b>Call</b>	31%
<b>Text-to-Web</b>	22%
<b>Web</b>	37%

Each of the three samples was base weighted and calibrated separately. The three samples were also combined and calibrated together, overall and by form.

The data were weighted to be representative of the residential adult population of New Jersey. The weighting balances sample demographics to target population parameters. The sample is balanced, by form and overall, to match parameters for sex, age, education, race/ethnicity, region and phone use. The sex, age, education, race/ethnicity, and region parameters were derived from 2022 American Community Survey PUMS data. The phone use parameter was derived from estimates provided by the National Health Interview Survey Early Release Program.<sup>1</sup>

The base weight for the dual-frame RDD sample corrects for different probabilities of selection across the telephone samples associated with the number of adults in each household and each respondent’s telephone usage patterns. This adjustment also accounts for the overlapping landline and cell sample frames and the relative sizes of each frame and each sample.<sup>2</sup>

Base weights for the Garden State Panel were the base weights associated with the initial recruitment sampling and the sampling from the panel for this particular data collection. The base weights for the RDD cell sample were set to 1.0.

The final stage of weighting calibrates sample demographics, overall and by form, to match target population benchmark distributions. This weighting was accomplished using SPSSINC RAKE, an SPSS

---

<sup>1</sup> NCHS, National Health Interview Survey, 2018–2020; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2017–2019.

<sup>2</sup> Buskirk, T. D., & Best, J. (2012). Venn Diagrams, Probability 101 and Sampling Weights Computed for Dual Frame Telephone RDD Designs. *Journal of Statistics and Mathematics*, 15, 3696-3710.

## Town/Neighborhood Safety and Crime Rutgers-Eagleton Poll

extension module that simultaneously balances the distributions of all variables using the GENLOG procedure. Weights were trimmed to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on survey estimates. The use of these weights in statistical analysis ensures that the demographic characteristics of the sample closely approximate the demographic characteristics of the target population.

Post-data collection statistical adjustments require analysis procedures that reflect departures from simple random sampling. We calculate the effects of these design features so that an appropriate adjustment can be incorporated into tests of statistical significance when using these data. The so-called "design effect" or *deff* represents the loss in statistical efficiency that results from a disproportionate sample design and systematic non-response. The total sample design effect for this survey is 1.39.

All surveys are subject to sampling error, which is the expected probable difference between interviewing everyone in a population versus a scientific sampling drawn from that population. Sampling error should be adjusted to recognize the effect of weighting the data to better match the population. In this poll, the simple sampling error for 1,657 New Jersey adults is +/-2.4 percentage points at a 95 percent confidence interval. The design effect<sup>3</sup> is 1.39, making the adjusted margin of error +/- 2.8 percentage points. Thus, if 50 percent of New Jersey adults in this sample favor a particular position, we would be 95 percent sure that the true figure is between 47.2 and 52.8 percent (50 +/- 2.8) if all New Jersey adults had been interviewed, rather than just a sample.

Sampling error is only one possible source of error in a survey estimate. Sampling error does not consider other sources of variation inherent in public opinion studies, such as selection bias, non-response bias, question wording, context effects, or reporting accuracy, which may contribute additional error.

This Rutgers-Eagleton Poll was fielded by SSRS through the Rutgers-Eagleton/SSRS Garden State Panel, Braun Research, Inc., using live interviewers, and Response Now using one-to-one push-to-web texting. Sample was provided by Dynata. The questionnaire was developed and all data analyses were completed in house by the Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling (ECPIP). Jessica Roman assisted with analysis and preparation of this report. The Rutgers-Eagleton Poll is paid for and sponsored by the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, a non-partisan academic center for the study of politics and the political process. Full questionnaires are available on request and can also be accessed through our archives at [eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu](http://eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu). For more information, please contact [poll@eagleton.rutgers.edu](mailto:poll@eagleton.rutgers.edu).

---

<sup>3</sup> Post-data collection statistical adjustments require analysis procedures that reflect departures from simple random sampling. We calculate the effects of these design features so that an appropriate adjustment can be incorporated into tests of statistical significance when using these data. The so-called "design effect" or *deff* represents the loss in statistical efficiency that results from a disproportionate sample design and systematic non-response.

**Town/Neighborhood Safety and Crime  
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

**Weighted Demographics  
1,657 New Jersey Adults 18+  
Overall Margin of Error = +/- 2.8 percentage points**

*Please note: Totals may equal slightly more or less than 100% due to rounding.*

		<b>deff</b>	<b>MOE</b>			<b>deff</b>	<b>MOE</b>
<b>Man</b>	49%	1.38	+/- 3.9%	<b>White</b>	55%	1.34	+/- 3.5%
<b>Woman</b>	51%	1.39	+/- 4.1%	<b>Black</b>	12%	1.32	+/- 8.9%
<b>18-34</b>	27%	1.45	+/- 5.6%	<b>Hispanic</b>	20%	1.28	+/- 7.6%
<b>35-49</b>	24%	1.32	+/- 5.9%	<b>Other</b>	14%	1.28	+/- 8.3%
<b>50-64</b>	27%	1.39	+/- 5.4%	<b>&lt;50K</b>	25%	1.38	+/- 6.3%
<b>65+</b>	22%	1.36	+/- 5.7%	<b>50K-&lt;100K</b>	31%	1.42	+/- 5.5%
<b>Democrat</b>	36%	1.41	+/- 4.7%	<b>100K-&lt;150K</b>	19%	1.37	+/- 6.7%
<b>Independent</b>	42%	1.37	+/- 4.5%	<b>150K+</b>	25%	1.35	+/- 5.5%
<b>Republican</b>	22%	1.38	+/- 5.9%	<b>Urban</b>	16%	1.36	+/- 7.6%
<b>HS or Less</b>	32%	1.27	+/- 5.7%	<b>Suburb</b>	35%	1.38	+/- 4.6%
<b>Some College</b>	26%	1.36	+/- 5.8%	<b>Exurban</b>	14%	1.39	+/- 7.2%
<b>College Grad</b>	20%	1.35	+/- 5.6%	<b>Phil/South</b>	18%	1.38	+/- 6.8%
<b>Grad Work</b>	22%	1.32	+/- 5.2%	<b>Shore</b>	17%	1.39	+/- 7.0%