

**2002 SURVEY OF  
NEW BRUNSWICK RESIDENTS**

*Conducted for:*



*Conducted by:*



*Data Collection:*

May 2002

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	
<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
METHODOLOGY .....	1
OVERVIEW OF THE REPORT .....	2
<b>2. THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN NEW BRUNSWICK .....</b>	<b>4</b>
NEW BRUNSWICK AS A PLACE TO LIVE .....	4
COMPARISON OF NEW BRUNSWICK TODAY WITH FIVE YEARS AGO.....	5
COMPARISON OF NEW BRUNSWICK TODAY WITH TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO.....	6
EXPECTATIONS FOR NEW BRUNSWICK FIVE YEARS FROM NOW .....	6
PERMANENT RESIDENTS ASSESS THEIR NEIGHBORHOODS .....	7
PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME IN NEW BRUNSWICK .....	8
PERCEPTIONS OF NEIGHBORHOOD CRIME.....	9
COMMITMENT TO NEW BRUNSWICK.....	9
SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE THE CITY .....	10
IMPACT OF REVITALIZATION ON THE POOR .....	11
SUMMARY .....	12
<b>3. NEW BRUNSWICK PUBLIC SCHOOLS .....</b>	<b>34</b>
PUBLIC / PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT.....	34
RATINGS OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS.....	35
RATINGS OF NEW BRUNSWICK HIGH SCHOOL .....	36
RATINGS OF NEW BRUNSWICK ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.....	36
SUMMARY .....	36
<b>4. EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS.....</b>	<b>44</b>
EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS AMONG NEW BRUNSWICK ADULTS .....	44
SUMMARY .....	45
<b>5. EVALUATIONS OF NEW BRUNSWICK INSTITUTIONS .....</b>	<b>49</b>
IMPORTANCE OF CULTURE TO REVITALIZATION.....	49
NEW BRUNSWICK TOMORROW .....	50
JOHNSON & JOHNSON .....	50
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY .....	51
SUMMARY .....	51

**APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT**

**APPENDIX B: SURVEY METHODOLOGY**

## LIST OF TABLES

	PAGE
<i>CHAPTER 2</i>	
Table 2.1: Overall Rating of New Brunswick .....	16
Table 2.2: Comparison of New Brunswick Today with Five Years Ago .....	18
Table 2.3: Comparison of New Brunswick Today with 25 Years Ago Before Revitalization Efforts Began.....	19
Table 2.4: Comparison of New Brunswick Today with Expectations for Five Years From Now.....	20
Table 2.5: Neighborhood Evaluations of Permanent Residents .....	21
Table 2.6: Permanent Residents' Perception of Recent Change in Quality of Neighborhood .....	23
Table 2.7: Residents' Perceptions of Crime in New Brunswick Compared to Other Areas .....	24
Table 2.8: How Safe Permanent Residents Feel in Own Neighborhood at Night.....	26
Table 2.9: Residents' Commitment to New Brunswick .....	28
Table 2.10: Reasons for Wanting to Move Out of New Brunswick.....	29
Table 2.11: Residents' Suggestions for Improving the City.....	30
Table 2.12: Will Revitalization Help or Hurt Low-Income Families.....	32
Table 2.13: Reasons Why Revitalization Will Help or Hurt Low-Income Families.....	33
<i>CHAPTER 3</i>	
Table 3.1: Type of School Attending (among Households with School-Age Children).....	38
Table 3.2: Rating of New Brunswick Public Schools .....	39
Table 3.3: Comparison of New Brunswick Public Schools With Two Years Ago .....	41
Table 3.4: Residents' Ratings of New Brunswick High School.....	42
Table 3.5: Residents' Ratings of New Brunswick Elementary Schools.....	43
<i>CHAPTER 4</i>	
Table 4.1: Permanent Resident Employment Profile.....	46
Table 4.2: Chief Wage Earner Employment Status .....	47
Table 4.3: Chief Wage Earner Gender.....	48
<i>CHAPTER 5</i>	
Table 5.1: Importance of Culture in Revitalization of New Brunswick .....	52
Table 5.2: Resident Attendance at New Brunswick Cultural and Arts Events in the Past Year .....	53
Table 5.3: Awareness of New Brunswick Tomorrow (Over Time) .....	54
Table 5.4: Approval of What NBT Is Trying To Do (Over Time).....	54
Table 5.5: Is NBT Succeeding in Improving New Brunswick (Over Time).....	54
Table 5.6: Awareness of New Brunswick Tomorrow .....	55
Table 5.7: Approval of What NBT Is Trying To Do .....	56
Table 5.8: Perception of Johnson & Johnson as Good or Bad for New Brunswick .....	57
Table 5.9: Perception of Rutgers as Good or Bad for New Brunswick.....	58
<i>APPENDIX</i>	
Table B.1: Profile of Permanent Residents	
Table B.2: Unweighted Profile of Permanent Residents	
Table B.3: Description of Neighborhood Areas in New Brunswick	

## LIST OF FIGURES

	PAGE
<i>CHAPTER 1</i>	
Figure 1.1: Racial Composition of Biennial Survey Participants.....	3
 <i>CHAPTER 2</i>	
Figure 2.1: New Brunswick is a Positive Place to Live .....	15
Figure 2.2: Comparison of New Brunswick Today with Five Years Ago .....	17
Figure 2.3: Positive Neighborhood Evaluations.....	22
Figure 2.4: Residents' Perceptions of Crime Compared to Two Years Ago .....	25
Figure 2.5: Residents' Commitment to New Brunswick .....	27
Figure 2.6: Will Revitalization Help or Hurt Low Income Families .....	31
 <i>CHAPTER 3</i>	
Figure 3.1: Rating of New Brunswick Schools .....	40

# 2002 SURVEY OF NEW BRUNSWICK RESIDENTS

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is the fourteenth in a series of biennial surveys of New Brunswick residents conducted by the Eagleton Institute's Center for Public Interest Polling (Eagleton) for New Brunswick Tomorrow (NBT). This regular survey of residents -- believed to be the longest running community survey in the nation -- serves to capture perceptions of the quality of life in New Brunswick, as well as reactions to the changes and developments that have occurred in the city as a result of revitalization over the past twenty-seven years. The survey was conducted by telephone May 6 to 20, 2002 with a random sample of 800 New Brunswick residents.

The 2002 survey demonstrates that improvements in New Brunswick permanent residents' opinions about the city have continued to grow and many indicators represent all-time highs in the history of these surveys. These results build upon the upturn in perceptions first noted in the 1998 results.

The 2002 survey addressed the following topics: perceptions of quality of life in New Brunswick, opinions of schools, and evaluations of the city's prominent institutions. The survey focuses on the opinions of permanent residents. Readers are encouraged to review the full report for detailed information.

### Perceptions of Quality of Life

- ☐ Sixty-four percent of the city's permanent residents give New Brunswick an overall rating of excellent (12%) or good (52%) as a place to live. This is an all-time high mark in the history of these biennial surveys. When revitalization and redevelopment efforts were just starting, only one-third of the residents said that the city was a positive place to live (34% in the 1978 survey). Positive ratings come from majorities among all racial/ethnic groups in the city.
- ☐ When compared with the New Brunswick of five years ago, 52 percent of residents say the city is better, up 25 percentage points from those who said the same ten years ago in 1992.
- ☐ Going back to when revitalization began, most long-term residents continue to believe that the city has improved. Sixty-four percent of long-term residents conclude that New Brunswick is a better place to live than it was 25 years ago.
- ☐ Most residents are optimistic about continued improvements, with 66 percent saying the city will be a better place to live five years from now. This in contrast to 1992, when only 50 percent of residents felt the city would improve.

## Neighborhood Evaluations

- ☐ Positive ratings of residents' own neighborhoods continue, with 2-in-3 holding the opinion that their neighborhood is excellent (21%) or good (46%), marking a continued return to pre-1990 levels. Additionally, twice as many residents say their neighborhood has gotten better (31%) than say it has gotten worse (14%).

## Crime and Safety

- ☐ A majority of residents (55%) feel that New Brunswick has the same amount (37%) or less (18%) crime than other towns in the area. Thirty-two percent of city residents say there is more crime in New Brunswick than in other areas, representing a 20 percentage point drop from the 1992 survey in residents holding this opinion.

## Commitment to New Brunswick

- ☐ Over 3-in-5 permanent residents (62%) say they would prefer to continue living in New Brunswick.
- ☐ When asked about what should be done to improve New Brunswick, addressing safety and crime issues are mentioned by 36 percent of permanent residents (down from 62% in 1992). As in past surveys, other suggestions include improving housing (29%), continuing economic development efforts (24%), and improving the city's schools (20%).

## Impact of Revitalization

- ☐ More city residents continue to believe revitalization efforts will help low-income residents (39%) than believe it will hurt them (30%). This marks a strong contrast with the 1992 survey, when more residents said that revitalization will hurt (42%) rather than help (28%) low-income residents, representing a 23 percentage point swing in the "help/hurt" gap among residents holding these attitudes.

## Public Schools

- ☐ Positive ratings of New Brunswick's public schools (40%) stand at their highest levels since these surveys started. Moreover, the gap between positive and negative ratings has closed from about 40 percentage points to being even today. Continuing a trend noted in the previous survey, the majority of residents with children in the public school system (58%) are positive about the city's schools.

- ☐ More residents give positive ratings to the public elementary schools in the city (41%) than they do to the public high school (35%), but both of these ratings have grown in the past few years.
- ☐ Residents' opinions on overall change in the school system have grown more positive, with 30 percent now saying that the city's schools have improved in the past two years and 36 percent saying the schools are the same, compared with 9 percent saying they are worse.



### Evaluations of New Brunswick Institutions

- ☐ The vast majority (89%) of New Brunswick residents continue to believe that “culture” plays an important role in the revitalization of the city. Also, 3-in-5 residents report attending a New Brunswick arts or cultural activity in the past year.
- ☐ Approval of New Brunswick Tomorrow's efforts remains high (75% approval among those aware of NBT) and 2-in-3 residents believe that NBT is succeeding in its efforts to improve the city. Overall, awareness of NBT (49%) has decreased from past surveys, largely due to the more recent growth in the city's Latino population and the increasing number of home renters, who tend to have less knowledge of the organization.
- ☐ Resident opinion that both Johnson & Johnson (77%) and Rutgers University (81%) are good for the city has remained steady over the past twelve years.

### Summary

- ☐ While the current findings represent only modest changes since the 2000 survey results, they support the evident trend of improving resident attitudes toward New Brunswick. To put this in perspective, positive ratings from New Jersey residents on the state as a place to live have gone down during the same period (see figure). The fact that the growth in New Brunswick residents' positive opinion towards the city has continued during a time of economic downturn and uncertainty over security is important to note.

## A PLACE TO LIVE – CITY AND STATE COMPARISONS



\* *Percent rating each as an excellent or good place to live.*



# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

This report is the fourteenth in a series of biennial surveys of New Brunswick residents conducted by the Eagleton Institute's Center for Public Interest Polling (Eagleton) for New Brunswick Tomorrow (NBT). This regular survey of residents -- believed to be the longest running community survey in the nation -- serves to capture perceptions of the quality of life in New Brunswick, as well as reactions to the changes and developments that have occurred in the city as a result of revitalization over the past twenty-seven years. All questions asked in the survey were drafted by Eagleton after consultation with NBT.

### Methodology

The survey was conducted by telephone May 6 to 20, 2002 with a random sample of 800 adult New Brunswick permanent residents. Permanent residents are defined as all non-Rutgers students (with the exception of those students who have been living in the city for 10 or more years). Sampling error for the full sample of respondents is  $\pm 3.5$  percent. Interviews were conducted in both English and Spanish. Households were selected using a random digit dial telephone sample so that new and unlisted numbers would be included. A more detailed explanation of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix B of this report.

Demographically, the 2002 survey maintains the increased proportion of renters (63%) seen in the 2000 survey data. From 1980 to 1998 this number hovered between 48 and 57 percent.

Also, there continues to be a dramatic increase in the proportion of Hispanic residents and a consequent decline in white residents since the 1990 census was conducted (Figure 1.1). The proportion of African-American residents has increased very slightly over the past ten years.

Age distributions have remained fairly stable since 1978, although there has been a decrease in the age 60 and older cohort since 1996. The number of households with children under age 18 has increased to 40 percent in the current survey. The survey results also show that trends in education and employment have remained steady over the past decade.


### Overview of the Report

The substantive findings of the study are presented in the following chapters. Chapter 2 discusses resident perceptions of the overall quality of life in New Brunswick, evaluations of neighborhood life, mobility plans, and attitudes about crime and safety. Chapter 3 focuses on ratings of New Brunswick public schools. Chapter 4 explores residents' employment patterns. Chapter 5 examines residents' views on the role of culture in the city's revitalization and opinions towards some of the city's more prominent institutions -- New Brunswick Tomorrow, Johnson & Johnson and Rutgers University.

Each chapter in this report contains a narrative description of survey findings followed by tables and figures. An annotated copy of the questionnaire is appended to this report, which readers are encouraged to consult for the full text of question wording. A statistical profile which presents responses to all questions broken down by various demographic subgroups of the population accompanies this report in a separate volume.

**FIGURE 1.1:  
RACIAL COMPOSITION OF  
BIENNIAL SURVEY PARTICIPANTS**

(representing New Brunswick's adult permanent resident population)



## CHAPTER 2

### THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN NEW BRUNSWICK

This chapter explores New Brunswick permanent residents' perceptions of the city as a place to live. Specifically, it discusses how residents currently view the city as a place to live, whether it has changed for the better or worse both over the short and long term, and whether residents believe it will change for the better or worse in the near future. It then goes on to look more closely at residents' evaluations of their own neighborhoods.

The chapter then turns to a discussion of crime. This is followed by a discussion of the plans of permanent residents to stay in the city or move out. The final sections of this chapter explore residents' beliefs about what New Brunswick needs to do to improve the city, and the impact of revitalization on low-income families in the city.

#### New Brunswick as a Place to Live

Resident opinion of the city stands at an all-time high in the history of these biennial surveys, with 64 percent of New Brunswick's permanent residents giving the city positive marks as a place to live. While this result is only 2 percentage points above the previous high registered in 2000, it marks a steady continuing growth in positive ratings since 1992 (Figure 2.1).

Overall, 12 percent of residents rate the city as excellent and 52 percent say it is good, compared with 28 percent who rate it as only fair and 7 percent who say it is poor (Table 2.1). As in past surveys, there continue to be variations in the ratings given to the city by different racial groups. However, it is important to note that since 1988, majorities in all racial groups

have given New Brunswick positive ratings. These currently stand at 68 percent for white residents, 68 percent for Latinos, and 53 percent for African-Americans. From 1998 to 2000, positive ratings of white residents increased from 60 to 70 percent and the 2002 results continue to hold at that higher level (now 68%). African-American opinion has remained steady at 51-53 percent since 1998. Latino opinion, which stood at 60 percent in both 1998 and 2000 has increased to 68 percent in the current survey. An examination of recent trends shows that the growth of the Latino community along with its increasing positive regard toward the city has been a factor in the higher overall ratings in the survey.

#### Comparison of New Brunswick Today with Five Years Ago

Significant change has also occurred in residents' opinions about the city today as compared to the New Brunswick of five years ago. In 2002, more than half of city residents (52%) see New Brunswick as being a better place to live than it was five years ago (Figure 2.2). About one-third of residents (31%) believe the city is the same as it was 5 years ago, while 15 percent say the city is now a worse place to live. This represents a continued growing level of positive opinion since 1992.

Residents of all races seem to perceive improvement in the city. About half or more of whites (48%), Latinos (55%), and African-Americans (55%) say New Brunswick is better than it was five years ago (Table 2.2). The views of African-Americans concerning this issue represents the most substantial change among all groups since 1996 when only 26 percent of African-Americans said New Brunswick had improved as a place to live.

### Comparison of New Brunswick Today with Twenty-Five Years Ago

Residents who have lived in the city for 20 years or more were asked to compare present day New Brunswick to its condition “about 25 years ago before the rebuilding and revitalization efforts began.” This time frame asks residents to think back to a time when revitalization efforts were just beginning, before tangible results were seen. It also provides some perspective for the series of five year comparisons which have been included in each survey over the years.

As in past surveys, the majority of long-term residents feel that changes which have taken place in the city since revitalization efforts began have made New Brunswick a better place to live. Sixty-four percent of those living in the city for more than 20 years think the city is a better place to live than it was before revitalization, 21 percent say it is worse, and 7 percent say it is the same (Table 2.3).

### Expectations for New Brunswick Five Years from Now

Two-thirds of New Brunswick residents (66%) are optimistic about the city’s future (Table 2.4). This matches the 2000 survey results, which marked a return to 1980s levels in the number of permanent residents believing the city will be a better place to live in the near future. This finding is in contrast to the 1992 survey when only 50 percent of residents felt the city would improve. Complimenting this growing sense of optimism since the early 1990s is the corresponding decline in the number of residents who believe the city will be a worse place to live in five years time, with 15 percent now having this opinion -- a decrease of 13 percentage points from the 1992 results.

### Permanent Residents Assess their Neighborhoods

A majority of New Brunswick residents continue to be positive about their neighborhoods, with 2-in-3 rating their neighborhood as either an excellent (21%) or good (46%) place to live (Table 2.5). Again, these findings represent a reversal from the 1992 survey's dip in positive ratings of neighborhoods, and match the previous highs measured in 1978, 1986, and 1990 (Figure 2.3). In the current survey, 26 percent of city residents say their neighborhood is only fair and 7 percent say it is a poor place to live.

While positive evaluations of neighborhoods exist among majorities of all subgroups of residents. These positive ratings have held relatively stable since 2000 for white (71%) and Latino (66%) residents, while they have increased among African-Americans (63%, up from 52% in 2000).

As in the past, those with incomes under \$20,000 – although still a majority of 57 percent – are less likely than those with higher incomes from \$20,000 to \$50,000 (68%) or over \$50,000 (76%) to rate their neighborhood favorably.

By actual neighborhood, the highest ratings come from the Edgebrook area (86%), as well as Nichol Avenue (79%), Easton Avenue/Buccluch Park (78%), and Route 18/Dewey Heights (78%). Other high neighborhood ratings include Renaissance Station (71%), College Avenue (69%), Central New Brunswick (66%), and RiverWatch (63%), French Street (58%) and Harvey Park (50%). The Central New Brunswick and RiverWatch neighborhood evaluations have increased since the 2000 survey, when they were among the lowest rated neighborhoods. As in the past, the lowest positive neighborhood ratings come from residents in the southern portion of the city along Jersey Avenue (35%).

Although most residents (50%) continue to report that their neighborhood has not changed in the last few years, the 31 percent who say their neighborhood has gotten better is an

all-time high point for the survey (Table 2.6). As in 1998 and 2000, more residents say their neighborhood has gotten better (31%) than say it has gotten worse (14%). This 17 percentage point gap between “better” and “worse” is also the largest ever noted in the history of these surveys.

This reverses a negative 20 percentage point gap in these beliefs from the 1992 survey, when 32 percent said their neighborhood had gotten worse compared to 12 percent better. This finding provides further evidence that early 1990s’ trends in negative attitudes about the city continue to change for the better.

#### Perceptions of Crime in New Brunswick

More than half (55%) of the city's permanent residents say New Brunswick has either the same amount (37%) or less (18%) crime than other towns in the area (Table 2.7). Another 32 percent of residents feel that there is more crime in New Brunswick, which represents a 20 percentage point drop since 1992 in the number of residents who perceive that crime is higher in their city than in other towns.

Similar to previous findings, there are some variations among subgroups in perceptions of crime in New Brunswick. White residents (40%) are somewhat more likely than other residents to believe the city has more crime than other towns. However, for nearly every group of residents, the percentage who hold this view has decreased across the board since 1996.

The percentage of residents who say that dealing with crime in New Brunswick has gotten better compared to two years ago continues to grow dramatically from the early 1990s surveys. Nearly 4-in-10 residents (38%) now say that the problem of crime in the city is better than it was two years ago. This is up from 3-in-10 who said the same about the 1998-2000



period and from 1-in-10 residents who said the same in 1992 (Figure 2.4). Another 12 percent feel crime has gotten worse (down from 43% in 1992), while 40 percent have seen no change in crime over the past few years.

### Perceptions of Neighborhood Crime

New Brunswick residents continue to feel positively about the safety of their own neighborhoods. Most residents (85%) feel relatively safe in their own neighborhoods at night (Table 2.8). In the current survey, 33 percent of residents feel very safe in their own neighborhoods at night and 52 percent feel somewhat safe, while 12 percent do not feel safe at all in their own neighborhood at night.

### Commitment to New Brunswick

As has been the case since these surveys began, most New Brunswick residents (62%) would choose to stay in the city rather than move out of New Brunswick if presented with the option to move (Figure 2.5). In the current survey, nearly half of permanent residents (48%) say they would continue living where they are now and another 14 percent say they would move to some other location in the city (Table 2.9). In comparison, 36 percent would choose to move out of New Brunswick. This number has remained fairly steady over the past ten years.

There is some variation in mobility plans among subgroups of the population of permanent residents. Among those age 65 or older, only 28 percent say they want to move out of New Brunswick, although this is up from 20 percent in 2000. Residents age 50 to 64 are more likely to want to move out of New Brunswick than are residents age 65 and over, but in fewer numbers now (32%) than they were just six years ago (49%). Similarly, residents age 30 to 49

are somewhat less likely to want to leave New Brunswick (34%) now than they were just two years ago (42%). Residents under age 30 (41%) continue, by a small margin, to be most likely to want to move out of the city.

African-Americans (41%) and whites (37%) are somewhat more likely than Latino (31%) residents to want to move out of New Brunswick.

The most common reasons cited for wanting to move out of the city are crime (19%), the desire to live in a non-urban environment (13%), cost of living/rents (12%), and the school system (12%) (Table 2.10). However, the percentage who cite crime as a reason for wanting to move continues to remain low compared to the 1992 high point, when more than one-third (38%) said crime was their main reason for wanting to leave the city.

Other reasons for wanting to leave New Brunswick include the feeling that the city is dirty or run down (10%), new job opportunities elsewhere (8%), noise in New Brunswick (7%), wanting to live in a different city (6%), transportation issues (2%), and high taxes (2%).

### Suggestions to Improve the City

When asked what New Brunswick could do to improve the city, 36 percent of residents mention dealing with various safety and crime issues. This area of concern continues to remain low compared to the 1992 survey when 62 percent of residents cited crime as a major problem in the city (Table 2.11). Suggestions for reducing crime include generally making the city safer (14%), dealing with drug problems (10%), and increasing police foot patrols (5%).

Three-in-ten residents say the city should do something to improve housing conditions, such as building more housing (12%), building low-income housing in particular (8%),

renovating old housing (4%), replacing old housing projects (2%), and making landlords maintain properties (3%).

Another 1-in-4 feel that the city should encourage economic development, such as more job opportunities (9%), continued improvement of the downtown area (6%), lower taxes (4%), and encouraging new businesses in the city (5%).

Another 20 percent feel that the city should improve its schools. Other suggestions for improving New Brunswick include cleaner streets (11%), more youth activities (7%), more/improved parks and recreation (7%), as well as improving traffic and roads (6%), parking (8%), and other transportation issues (5%).

#### Impact of Revitalization on the Poor

On the whole, city residents are more likely to believe that revitalization will help low-income residents in New Brunswick as opposed to hurting them (Figure 2.6). This continues a trend from the 1996 survey in the belief that revitalization will help poorer residents and is similar to the opinions registered in the early 1980s when revitalization was first underway.

In the current survey, residents who believe that revitalization will help low income residents (39%) outnumber those who believe that it will hurt them (30%) by nine percentage points. Another 15 percent say these efforts will neither help nor hurt low income residents and 11 percent offer no opinion (Table 2.12). In 1992, only 28 percent of residents thought revitalization would help such families compared to 42 percent who thought it would hurt them.

Looking specifically at the opinions of low-income residents in the current survey, those earning under \$20,000 a year are more apt to feel that revitalization will help (38%) rather than

hurt (23%) people in their income bracket. By race, though, most African-Americans continue to feel that low-income families are more likely to be hurt (48%) rather than helped (31%) by revitalization. This contrasts with both white and Latino residents where 40 to 45 percent say revitalization will help and 21 to 30 percent say it will hurt.

Among those residents who say revitalization will help low income families, nearly half (46%) mention increased job opportunities as the reason they feel this way (Table 2.13). Other reasons why people feel revitalization will help include: better standard of living (21%), more affordable housing (12%), better housing conditions (12%), and more housing in general (9%).

The main reasons cited by those who feel revitalization will hurt low-income families is that it will worsen housing conditions (49%), will force out poor people (38%), will increase the cost of living (29%), and will worsen employment prospects (11%).

### Summary

The 64 percent “excellent/good” overall positive rating of New Brunswick is the highest that residents have given the city since these surveys began. Maintaining the upward trend in ratings that began after 1992, the current survey shows positive changes in residents’ attitudes about the quality of life in their city. While the current findings represent a modest two percentage point increase over the 2000 survey results, the fact that these ratings have continued to grow during a time of economic downturn and uncertainty over security is important to note.

In a significant increase since the early 1990s, more than half of permanent residents believe New Brunswick is a better place to live than it was five years ago. Moreover, the belief

among long-term residents that the city will be a better place five years from now shows a stable return to 1980s levels of confidence in the city's future.

Positive ratings of residents' own neighborhoods continue to be strong, again indicating that 1992 represented a "bottoming-out" of negative attitudes about the city and the higher trends seen in 2000 are continuing. Moreover, there is now a positive 17 percentage point difference between those who say their neighborhood has gotten better rather than worse.


Positive changes in the perceptions of permanent residents about crime that were first signaled in the 1996 survey have continued. Many more residents today think crime has gotten better (38%) than did ten years ago (10% in 1992). While about 1-in-3 city residents (32%) believe there is more crime in New Brunswick than there is in other areas, this continues to fall from the 52 percent who felt that way in 1992. Also, the issue of crime is less likely to be cited as a major reason for wanting to move out of New Brunswick than it was a few years ago.

The current findings support recent survey results for positive attitudes among permanent residents regarding the impact of revitalization on New Brunswick's poorer residents. In contrast to survey findings from 1984 to 1994, more city residents (with the exception of African-Americans) continue to believe that revitalization will help low-income residents rather than hurt them.


While the overall picture is extremely positive, there continue to be some differences to monitor for the future. Many of the increases in quality of life perceptions noted in this survey are due to substantial improvements in the opinions of white residents since 1998 and also to the growing presence of Latino residents -- who, as a group, tend to feel positively toward the city. There are still issues on which African-American residents' opinions remain unchanged and their

overall ratings and views of revitalization tend to be less positive than those of white and Latino residents.

**FIGURE 2.1 NEW BRUNSWICK IS A POSITIVE PLACE TO LIVE**



**NEW BRUNSWICK IS A POSITIVE PLACE TO LIVE  
by Race**




**Table 2.1:**  
**Overall Rating of New Brunswick [Q.2]**

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Only Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	12%	52%	28%	7%	1%	100%	(800)
<u>By Race</u>							
--White	13	55	22	8	1	99	(232)
--African-American	12	41	38	9	--	100	(180)
--Hispanic/Latino	11	57	26	6	1	101	(328)
<u>By Income</u>							
--Under \$20,000	10	52	29	9	--	100	(215)
--\$20,000 - \$50,000	10	49	33	6	1	99	(228)
--Over \$50,000	16	54	23	6	1	100	(171)
<u>PAST SURVEYS</u>							
--2000	11%	51%	28%	9%	1%	100%	(803)
--1998	11	46	32	9	2	100	(870)
--1996	6	45	35	12	1	99	(754)
--1994	6	42	39	11	1	99	(891)
--1992	4	44	39	12	1	100	(764)
--1990	7	47	37	8	2	101	(808)
--1988	9	48	34	9	1	101	(774)
--1986	9	48	35	7	1	100	(812)
--1984	9	47	37	7	1	101	(846)
--1982	6	38	40	14	2	100	(719)
--1980	6	37	40	15	2	100	(868)
--1978	5	29	44	20	2	100	(836)



**FIGURE 2.2**  
**Comparison of New Brunswick Today with Five Years Ago (Q.3)**



**Table 2.2:**  
**Comparison of New Brunswick Today with Five Years Ago [Q.3]**

	<u>Better</u>	<u>Same</u>	<u>Worse</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	52%	31%	15%	3%	101%	(800)
<u>By Length of Residence</u>						
--10 years or less	47	37	12	4	100	(403)
--11 years or more	57	24	17	1	99	(394)
<u>By Race</u>						
--White	48	36	15	1	100	(232)
--African-American	55	26	18	2	101	(180)
--Hispanic/Latino	55	26	14	4	99	(328)
<u>By Income</u>						
--Under \$20,000	48	31	16	4	99	(215)
--\$20,000 - \$50,000	53	29	16	1	99	(228)
--Over \$50,000	58	28	13	1	100	(171)

**Table 2.3:**  
**Comparison of New Brunswick Today With 25 Years Ago Before Revitalization Efforts**  
**[Q.4] (Includes only those having lived here since the mid-1970s)**

	<u>Better</u>	<u>Same</u>	<u>Worse</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
PERMANENT RESIDENTS, 2002	64%	7%	21%	7%	99%	(278)
<u>By Race, 2002</u>						
--White	69	5	22	5	101	(115)
--Non-white	62	8	22	8	100	(157)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS, 2000	66	9	18	7	100	(284)
<u>By Race, 2000</u>						
--White	72	8	12	7	99	(113)
--Non-white	61	9	23	7	100	(168)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS, 1998*	62	5	25	7	99	(400)
<u>By Race, 1998</u>						
--White	65	5	24	7	101	(180)
--Non-white	61	6	26	7	100	(199)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS, 1996*	62	9	27	4	102	(430)
<u>By Race, 1996</u>						
--White	62	10	25	3	100	(238)
--Non-white	60	8	28	3	99	(184)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS, 1994*	59	7	30	5	101	(437)
<u>By Race, 1994</u>						
--White	63	7	24	6	100	(258)
--Non-white	53	7	37	3	100	(167)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS, 1992*	52	6	36	7	101	(395)
<u>By Race, 1992</u>						
--White	52	6	36	7	101	(235)
--Non-white	54	2	38	5	99	(156)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS, 1990*	61	8	25	5	99	(422)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS, 1988*	53	18	25	3	99	(431)

\* The time period asked about in 1998 was 20 years prior; in 1996, 1994 and 1992 was 15 years prior; and in 1990 and 1988 was 10 years prior.


**Table 2.4:**  
**Comparison of New Brunswick Today**  
**With Expectations For Five Years From Now [Q.5]**

	PERMANENT RESIDENTS				
	<u>Better</u>	<u>Same</u>	<u>Worse</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>
2002	66%	6%	15%	14%	101%
2000	67	7	14	12	100
1998	56	8	17	17	98
1996	56	11	21	12	100
1994	53	9	24	13	99
1992	50	8	28	14	100
1990	58	8	18	16	100
1988	65	5	19	11	100
1986	68	5	12	14	99
1984	73	6	9	11	99
1982	70	5	11	14	100
1980	69	6	10	14	99

**Table 2.5:**  
**Neighborhood Evaluations of Permanent Residents [Q.7]**

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Only Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	21%	46%	26%	7%	--%	100%	(800)
<u>By Race</u>							
--White	28	43	21	7	1	100	(232)
--African-American	17	46	27	9	1	100	(180)
--Hispanic/Latino	19	47	28	5	--	99	(328)
<u>By Income</u>							
--Under \$20,000	14	43	34	8	1	100	(215)
--\$20,000 - \$50,000	21	47	26	7	--	101	(228)
--Over \$50,000	34	42	18	5	1	100	(171)
<u>By Neighborhood</u>							
--College Avenue	27	42	27	3	--	99	(33)
--Easton/Bucleuch	36	42	13	8	2	101	(68)
--Harvey Park	4	46	33	14	2	99	(43)
--French Street	23	35	33	9	--	100	(68)
--Jersey Avenue	15	20	49	17	--	101	(35)
--Renaissance Station	20	51	22	6	1	100	(106)
--Central New Brunswick	15	51	28	6	--	100	(183)
--River Watch	20	43	27	11	--	101	(63)
--Nichol Avenue	17	62	21	--	--	100	(42)
--Route 18/Dewey Heights	30	48	17	4	2	101	(60)
--Edgebrook	47	39	11	3	--	100	(28)

**FIGURE 2.3**  
**Positive Neighborhood Evaluations (Q.7)**



**Table 2.6:  
Permanent Residents' Perception of Recent  
Change in Quality of Neighborhood [Q.8]**


	<u>Better</u>	<u>Worse</u>	<u>No Change</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	31%	14%	50%	4%	99%	(800)
<u>By Length of Residence</u>						
--10 years or less	31	8	55	7	101	(403)
--More than 10 years	31	20	46	2	99	(394)
<u>By Race</u>						
--White	25	17	55	4	101	(232)
--African-American	33	15	50	2	100	(180)
--Hispanic/Latino	36	12	47	5	100	(328)
<u>By Neighborhood</u>						
--College Avenue	12	14	70	3	99	(33)
--Easton/Bucclench	29	9	57	4	99	(68)
--Harvey Park	33	22	37	9	101	(43)
--French Street	37	9	50	4	100	(68)
--Jersey Avenue	28	25	44	3	100	(35)
--Renaissance Station	34	13	47	6	100	(106)
--Central New Brunswick	33	15	48	4	100	(183)
--River Watch	46	8	44	2	100	(63)
--Nichol Avenue	19	17	62	3	101	(42)
--Route 18/Dewey Heights	20	12	66	2	100	(60)
--Edgebrook	29	22	49	--	100	(28)

**Table 2.7:**  
**Residents' Perceptions of Crime**  
**in New Brunswick Compared to Other Areas [Q.11]**

	<u>More Crime</u> <u>Than Elsewhere</u>	<u>Same Amount</u> <u>of Crime</u>	<u>Less</u> <u>Crime</u>	<u>Don't</u> <u>Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	32%	37%	18%	13%	100%	(800)
<u>By Length of Residence</u>						
--10 years or less	36	30	20	15	101	(403)
--More than 10 years	27	46	17	10	100	(394)
<u>By Age</u>						
--18 to 29	39	34	20	7	100	(286)
--30 to 49	35	33	18	13	99	(267)
--50 to 64	23	44	19	13	99	(117)
--65 or over	15	55	15	16	101	(102)
<u>By Race</u>						
--White	40	41	9	10	100	(232)
--African-American	29	47	15	9	100	(180)
--Hispanic/Latino	27	32	28	13	100	(328)
<u>By Gender</u>						
--Male	35	36	18	12	101	(383)
--Female	29	39	19	13	100	(417)
<u>PAST SURVEYS</u>						
--2000	33%	40%	15%	11%	99%	(803)
--1998	35	38	15	12	100	(870)
--1996	45	39	9	6	99	(754)
--1994	54	33	8	4	99	(891)
--1992	52	36	7	5	100	(764)
--1990	48	35	8	10	101	(808)
--1988	38	41	10	12	101	(774)
--1986	34	46	9	11	100	(812)
--1984	31	47	12	11	101	(846)
--1982	39	45	9	7	100	(719)
--1980	40	44	9	7	100	(868)
--1978	38	46	7	9	100	(836)




**FIGURE 2.4**  
**Crime in New Brunswick Compared to Two Years Ago (Q.12)**



**Table 2.8:**  
**How Safe Permanent Residents Feel in Own Neighborhood at Night [Q.13]**

	<u>Very Safe</u>	<u>Somewhat Safe</u>	<u>Not At All Safe</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>
2002	33%	52%	12%	3%	100%
2000	31	56	11	2	100
1998	31	55	12	2	100
1996	26	59	13	2	100
1994	27	58	14	1	100
1992	22	60	17	1	100
1990	30	53	12	4	99
1988	30	56	12	2	100
1986	30	56	13	2	101
1984	27	58	13	2	100
1982	na	na	na	na	na
1980	27	56	15	1	99
1978	31	52	14	3	100
<u>By Neighborhood, 2002</u>					
--College Avenue	49%	48%	--%	3%	100%
--Easton/Bucclench	47	44	9	--	100
--Harvey Park	13	67	17	2	99
--French Street	26	62	12	--	100
--Jersey Avenue	20	60	20	--	100
--Renaissance Station	31	51	13	5	100
--Central New Brunswick	32	50	16	3	101
--River Watch	37	47	11	5	100
--Nichol Avenue	12	70	19	--	101
--Route 18/Dewey Heights	42	44	13	2	101
--Edgebrook	58	39	3	--	100

**FIGURE 2.5**  
**Residents' Commitment to New Brunswick (Q.9)**



**Table 2.9:**  
**Residents' Commitment to New Brunswick [Q.9]**

	<u>Continue</u> <u>Where Now</u>	<u>Move</u> <u>Elsewhere In</u> <u>New Brunswick</u>	<u>Move Out Of</u> <u>New Brunswick</u>	<u>Don't</u> <u>Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	48%	14%	36%	2%	100%	(800)
<u>By Length of Residence</u>						
--10 years or less	45	17	37	1	100	(403)
--More than 10 years	52	10	36	2	100	(394)
<u>By Age</u>						
--18 to 29	42	14	41	2	99	(286)
--30 to 49	45	18	34	2	99	(267)
--50 to 64	54	12	32	2	100	(117)
--65 or over	64	6	28	2	100	(102)
<u>By Race</u>						
--White	55	6	37	1	99	(232)
--African-American	44	13	41	2	100	(180)
--Hispanic/Latino	46	21	31	2	100	(328)

**Table 2.10:**  
**Reasons for Wanting to Move Out of New Brunswick [Q.10]\***

(n)	<u>2002</u> (287)	<u>2000</u> (305)	<u>1998</u> (338)	<u>1996</u> (307)	<u>1994</u> (341)	<u>1992</u> (321)	<u>1990</u> (309)	<u>1988</u> (257)	<u>1986</u> (252)	<u>1984</u> (260)	<u>1982</u> (217)	<u>1980</u> (249)
High crime	19%	17%	23%	25%	36%	38%	28%	19%	12%	17%	24%	18%
Cost of living/rent	12	13	4	--	na	4	2	3	3	2	2	2
Want to live in a different city	6	13	7	5	na	5	3	6	4	1	2	9
Poor quality schools	12	10	16	12	17	14	11	15	9	11	8	11
New job opportunities	8	10	8	8	na	1	5	2	2	6	2	6
City is dirty/run down	10	9	8	20	16	19	9	13	16	19	15	21
Want non-urban environment	13	7	11	22	12	16	19	17	24	26	30	26
Noise	7	7	5	--	na	7	7	2	--	--	--	--
Transportation	2	3	3	4	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
High taxes	2	3	3	6	na	5	10	5	2	5	3	1
Leaving school	1	1	2	3	na	1	3	--	--	2	3	1
Parking	1	1	2	--	na	5	8	7	4	4	4	3
All other	28	26	27	19	47	28	57	55	49	41	43	44
Don't know	3	4	--	3	1	1	--	2	1	1	--	1

---


\*Percentages total to more than 100% because respondents could give more than one reason.

**Table 2.11: Residents' Suggestions for Improving the City\* [Q.6]**

	<u>2002</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1978</u>
<i>SAFETY/CRIME</i>	36%	33%	41%	45%	54%	62%	48%	31%	25%	23%	29%	25%	24%
Make safer	14	14	17	18	18	18	13	6	10	10	10	11	16
Deal with drug problem	10	8	9	13	17	23	21	14	5	3	3	1	na
More foot patrols	5	6	7	5	4	4	2	1	2	2	1	2	6
Better police protection	5	3	5	6	6	11	6	5	4	4	9	7	na
Better quality police	2	2	3	3	9	6	6	5	4	4	6	4	2
<i>HOUSING</i>	29	30	25	36	20	26	40	40	44	37	36	37	59
Build more housing	12	8	8	7	11	11	17	16	20	15	24	27	23
Build low-income housing	8	9	6	9	9	11	19	20	19	14	9	5	35
Renovate old housing	4	7	6	5	na	4	4	4	5	8	4	5	1
Replace old housing projects	2	4	3	10	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Landlords maintain property	3	2	2	5	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
<i>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</i>	24	21	23	22	na	28	29	27	30	38	38	37	54
More job opportunities	9	8	8	4	na	14	9	10	8	12	15	9	na
Downtown improvement	6	6	6	8	na	7	12	12	18	21	22	27	54
Lower taxes	4	2	5	4	na	7	8	5	4	5	1	1	na
Encourage new businesses	5	5	4	6	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Improve the Schools	20	21	19	16	24	18	18	14	13	14	14	17	na
More/better parks	7	4	11	4	na	4	4	8	5	8	8	9	na
Youth activities	7	9	na	6	na	10	6	8	6	5	3	3	2
Clean streets	11	12	10	4	na	11	12	9	9	14	11	12	13
More parking	8	6	4	5	na	3	6	8	5	4	5	5	na
Renovate other buildings	3	3	3	na	na	4	4	11	10	10	18	12	2
Race relations/immigration	3	2	2	na	na	7	5	3	5	3	3	2	1
Traffic/roads	6	9	2	na	na	4	4	7	5	5	6	5	na
Transportation	5	6	2	na	na	3	6	5	6	5	9	11	na
Reform politics	2	2	2	na	na	6	9	6	7	3	2	3	na
Clean water	1	1	1	na	na	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	na
RU student/town relations	2	3	1	na	na	3	3	3	1	1	2	1	na
Other	11	16	14	25	53	10	15	13	15	15	16	17	16
Nothing	4	3	4	3	--	1	2	1	1	4	2	2	2
Don't Know	8	10	10	8	9	6	6	8	10	7	7	7	na

\*Percentages total to more than 100% because respondents could give more than one answer.

**FIGURE 2.6**  
**Will Revitalization Help or Hurt Low-Income Families (Q.25)**



**Table 2.12:  
Will Revitalization Help or Hurt Low-Income Families [Q.25]**

	<u>Help</u>	<u>Hurt</u>	<u>Both</u>	<u>Neither</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	39%	30%	4%	15%	11%	99%	(800)
<u>By Length of Residence</u>							
--10 years or less	42	23	5	16	14	100	(403)
--More than 10 years	37	37	4	14	8	100	(394)
<u>By Race</u>							
--White	45	30	3	15	7	100	(232)
--African-American	31	48	6	11	4	100	(180)
--Hispanic/Latino	40	21	5	19	16	101	(328)
<u>By Income</u>							
--Under \$20,000	38	23	4	21	13	99	(215)
--\$20,000 - \$50,000	36	33	7	16	9	101	(228)
--Over \$50,000	42	37	2	12	6	99	(171)



**Table 2.13:**  
**Reasons Why Revitalization Will Help or Hurt Low-Income Families\* [Q.26]**

*AMONG THOSE WHO SAY IT WILL HELP:*

(n)	<u>2002</u> (313)	<u>2000</u> (316)	<u>1998</u> (339)	<u>1996</u> (316)	<u>1994</u> (308)	<u>1992</u> (217)	<u>1990</u> (265)	<u>1988</u> (234)	<u>1986</u> (194)	<u>1984</u> (210)	<u>1982</u> (227)	<u>1980</u> (297)
--Will provide jobs/opportunity	46%	40%	36%	52%	43%	35%	44%	51%	48%	51%	70%	44%
--Lead to more affordable housing	12	8	10	12	15	18	29	11	13	17	8	1
--Lead to better housing conditions	12	11	9	13	9	12	10	6	15	18	10	18
--Lead to more housing	9	8	9	10	8	5	7	7	9	--	--	--
--More public housing	2	2	2	4	4	2	1	3	1	2	6	8
--Lead to better standard of living	21	19	16	19	--	10	4	5	5	6	4	3
--Lower cost of living	2	3	3	3	2	--	2	--	1	2	--	--
--Better schools	4	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
--Less crime/drugs	4	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
--Other	7	22	21	14	33	55	46	41	40	33	29	51
--Don't know	15	18	18	10	12	7	8	7	9	6	9	16

*AMONG THOSE WHO SAY IT WILL HURT:*

(n)	<u>2002</u> (236)	<u>2000</u> (305)	<u>1998</u> (234)	<u>1996</u> (218)	<u>1994</u> (285)	<u>1992</u> (308)	<u>1990</u> (370)	<u>1988</u> (402)	<u>1986</u> (271)	<u>1984</u> (230)	<u>1982</u> (176)	<u>1980</u> (194)
--Will force out poor people	38%	40%	57%	55%	47%	37%	47%	45%	40%	48%	49%	52%
--Will increase the cost of living	29	29	17	36	27	26	33	30	9	13	14	12
--Worsen housing situation	49	35	12	14	6	39	46	47	56	45	57	38
--Worsen employment	11	3	3	3	1	7	7	5	8	10	10	7
--Other	8	11	20	13	31	22	30	16	34	22	24	37
--Don't know	3	4	4	5	4	3	2	2	3	4	2	3

---

\*Percentages total to more than 100% because respondents could give more than one answer.

## NEW BRUNSWICK PUBLIC SCHOOLS

This chapter assesses the city's school system by examining permanent residents' ratings of the public schools in New Brunswick in general, followed by more specific assessments of the high school and elementary schools.

### Public / Private School Enrollment

As noted in the demographic profile of survey participants, the city has experienced significant growth in the size of its Latino population, particularly in the past five years. Because of differences in family size, there has been an even greater growth trend among the number of Latino children in the city, to the point where a majority of New Brunswick children are Hispanic/Latino.

Among those households with children in school, 79 percent send their children to New Brunswick public schools, 13 percent send their children to private or parochial schools, and 8 percent do both (Table 3.1). White parents (55%) are more likely than African-American (23%) or Latino (12%) parents to send at least one of their children to a private school. There are also income differences, with 49 percent of those households earning over \$50,000 a year sending their children to private school, compared to 24 percent of those between \$20,000 and \$50,000 and 8 percent of those below \$20,000.

### Ratings of Public Schools

New Brunswick's public schools receive positive ratings from 4-in-10 city residents, with 10 percent rating them excellent and 30 percent good (Table 3.2). This represents a 16 percentage point increase since 1994 and is the highest positive rating recorded in the history of the survey (Figure 3.1). About 2-in-5 permanent residents rate the city's schools as only fair (25%) or poor (15%), which is a 23 percentage point decline in these responses since 1994. This also marks the first time when the gap between negative (40%) and positive (40%) ratings of city schools has closed.

Similar to findings in previous studies, residents with children in the New Brunswick public school system (58%) are more likely to be positive than other parents (29%) and non-parents (33%) about the schools. These ratings have improved among all groups and support the evidence that a trend was established in 2000 where a majority of public school parents now give the city school system positive marks.

Opinions of the schools in the city vary by race. A majority of Latinos (55%) give the schools positive ratings, a 20 percentage point increase from the 1996 results. African-Americans (36%) are not as favorable about the schools as Latinos, but are more likely than white residents (22%) to rate the city's schools positively.

Three-in-ten residents (30%) say the city's public schools are better than they were two years ago, 1-in-10 say they are worse (9%), and 36 percent say they are the same as two years ago (Table 3.3). The 30 percent who say that the schools have improved is the highest level recorded since these surveys began.

### Ratings of New Brunswick High School

When asked specifically about New Brunswick High School, more than 1-in-3 residents give it a positive rating of excellent (8%) or good (27%) -- a 12 percentage point increase since 1994 when the high school was first evaluated in these surveys (Table 3.4). Another 20 percent rate the high school as only fair, and 9 percent say it is poor. Thirty-six percent offer no opinion. The 29 percent negative rating marks a continued decline from 56 percent in 1994.

Like the ratings for the city's schools in general, those residents with children in the public school system (42%) are most positive about the high school.

### Ratings of New Brunswick Elementary Schools

City residents are somewhat more positive about New Brunswick's public elementary schools than they are about the high school. Over 2-in-5 permanent residents rate the elementary schools as either excellent (9%) or good (32%) compared to 3-in-10 who rate them as only fair (22%) or poor (9%) (Table 3.5). Twenty-eight percent offer no opinion. The current 31 percent negative rating for New Brunswick's elementary schools has dropped 20 percentage points since 1994.

Residents with children in the public school system in the city are most positive about the elementary schools, with a majority (57%) having favorable opinions of the elementary schools.

### Summary

The New Brunswick school system has been undergoing significant demographic changes, with the vast majority of students now being of Latino origin. At the same time,

positive ratings of the New Brunswick public schools are the highest they have been since these surveys have been conducted. Two-fifths of city residents rate the public schools as excellent (10%) or good (30%). This marks the first time where negative evaluations of the schools (40%) have not outnumbered positive evaluations (40%).

New Brunswick High School receives a positive rating from about one-third of residents (35% -- a 12 percentage point increase from 1994), and 2-in-5 residents view the public elementary schools in the city favorably (41% -- a 9 percentage point increase from 1994).


**Table 3.1:**  
**Type of School Attending**  
**(among Households with School-Age Children) [Q.D4/5]**

	<u>Public</u>	<u>Both</u>	<u>Private</u>	<u>Total</u>
TOTAL	79%	8%	13%	100%
<u>By Race</u>				
--White	45	7	48	100
--African-American	77	10	13	100
--Hispanic/Latino	88	8	4	100
<u>By Income</u>				
--Under \$20,000	92	7	1	100
--\$20,000 - \$50,000	77	9	15	101
--Over \$50,000	51	13	36	100
<u>PAST SURVEYS</u>				
--2000	79%	6%	16%	101%
<u>By Race</u>				
--White	39	9	52	100
--African-American	84	3	12	99
--Hispanic/Latino	86	6	9	101


**Table 3.2:  
Rating of New Brunswick Public Schools [Q.14]**

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Only Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	10%	30%	25%	15%	21%	101%	(800)
<u>By Race</u>							
--White	2	20	27	21	30	100	(232)
--African-American	10	26	30	22	12	100	(180)
--Hispanic/Latino	16	39	21	9	15	100	(328)
<u>By Presence of Children in Household</u>							
--Yes	15	33	25	15	11	99	(323)
--No	6	27	24	15	27	99	(472)
<u>Does Any Child in Household Attend Public School</u>							
--Yes	19	39	24	15	4	101	(218)
--No	8	21	30	15	27	101	(105)
<u>PAST SURVEYS</u>							
--2000	8%	28%	28%	15%	20%	99%	(803)
<u>By Race</u>							
--White	3	24	24	19	31	101	(283)
--African-American	6	28	39	19	9	101	(215)
--Hispanic/Latino	17	38	25	8	12	100	(239)

**FIGURE 3.1  
NEW BRUNSWICK SCHOOLS POSITIVE RATINGS**



**by Race  
Among Those Familiar with the Schools**





**Table 3.3:**  
**Comparison of New Brunswick Public**  
**Schools with Two Years Ago [Q.15]**

	<u>Better</u>	<u>Worse</u>	<u>Same</u>	<u>Not Here</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>
2002	30%	9%	36%	4%	21%	100%
2000	24	9	44	5	18	100
1998	19	11	45	3	21	99
1996	15	11	48	6	20	100
1994	9	20	54	3	14	100
1992	15	17	49	4	15	100
1990	15	14	41	8	22	100
1988	15	13	48	3	21	100
1986	19	12	44	4	21	100
1984	25	10	32	8	25	100
1982	14	15	34	14	22	99
1980	14	24	37	8	17	100

**Table 3.4:**  
**Residents' Ratings of New Brunswick High School [Q.16]**

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Only Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	8%	27%	20%	9%	36%	100%	(800)
<u>By Race</u>							
--White	2	20	19	14	45	100	(232)
--African-American	7	28	29	12	25	101	(180)
--Hispanic/Latino	14	33	16	5	31	99	(328)
<u>By Presence of Children in Household</u>							
--Yes	11	27	22	10	29	99	(323)
--No	6	26	19	9	40	100	(472)
<u>Does Any Child in Household Attend Public School</u>							
--Yes	11	31	22	9	27	100	(218)
--No	11	19	23	12	34	99	(105)
<u>PAST SURVEYS</u>							
--2000	6%	27%	24%	11%	32%	100%	(803)
--1998	3	23	27	17	30	100	(870)
--1996	2	19	32	16	31	100	(755)
--1994	3	20	35	21	21	100	(891)

**Table 3.5:**  
**Residents' Ratings of New Brunswick**  
**Elementary Schools [Q.17]**

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Only Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	9%	32%	22%	9%	28%	100%	(800)
<u>By Race</u>							
--White	4	26	23	11	36	100	(232)
--African-American	9	33	26	12	19	99	(180)
--Hispanic/Latino	12	38	22	7	21	100	(328)
<u>By Presence of Children in Household</u>							
--Yes	13	38	24	12	13	100	(323)
--No	6	28	22	7	37	100	(472)
<u>Does Any Child in Household Attend Public School</u>							
--Yes	15	42	24	12	7	100	(218)
--No	10	28	24	11	28	101	(105)
<u>PAST SURVEYS</u>							
--2000	7%	34%	26%	8%	25%	100%	(803)
--1998	6	28	31	8	26	99	(870)
--1996	4	27	31	10	28	100	(755)
--1994	6	26	35	16	17	100	(891)

## CHAPTER 4

### EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS

This chapter presents an overview of employment patterns among adults in New Brunswick.

#### Employment Patterns Among New Brunswick Adults

Seven-in-ten New Brunswick residents are currently employed in either a full-time (60%) or part-time (10%) position (Table 4.1). Another 12 percent are retired, 3 percent are laid off, and 13 percent are not working. This represents no significant change in employment status over the past four years.

Those currently working include 79 percent of 18 to 29 year olds, 83 percent of 30 to 49 year olds, 72 percent of 50 to 64 years olds, and 15 percent of those 65 and over. Residents under age 30 (14%) are most likely to have a part-time job.

Nearly 4-in-10 working residents (37%) have their job located in the city of New Brunswick. Another 29 percent work in neighboring towns.

Examining employment information for the person identified as the “chief wage earner” in New Brunswick households, survey results indicate that 78 percent of chief wage earners are employed, 13 percent are retired, and 7 percent are laid off or not employed (Table 4.2). Among those households with children under age 18, about 1-in-12 households are led by a chief wage earner who is laid off (2%) or otherwise not working (6%). Also, 13 percent of households earning less than \$20,000 a year report that the chief wage earner is not working.

Among all permanent resident households, 51 percent identify the chief wage earner as a man, 38 percent say it is a woman, and 8 percent say they have no single chief wage earner (Table 4.3). These results are similar to findings in the 2000 survey, when this question was first asked. African-American households (48%) are somewhat more likely than white (39%) or Latino (35%) households to have a female head. Also, in households where the chief wage earner is either laid off or otherwise not working, the head of household is more likely to be a woman (52%) than in households where the chief wage earner is employed (40%).

### Summary

Seven-in-ten New Brunswick residents are currently employed. Another 13 percent are retired, 3 percent are laid off, and 13 percent are not working. Nearly 4-in-10 working residents (37%) have their job located in the city of New Brunswick.

Among all permanent resident households, 51 percent identify their chief wage earner as a man and 38 percent say it is a woman. Households where the chief wage earner is not working are somewhat more likely to have a female head of household.

**Table 4.1:**  
**Permanent Resident Employment Profile [Q.D7]**

	<u>Full</u> <u>Time</u>	<u>Part</u> <u>Time</u>	<u>Temp.</u> <u>Lay-off</u>	<u>Retired</u>	<u>Not Emp-</u> <u>loyed</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>No</u> <u>Answer</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	60%	10%	3%	12%	13%	1%	1%	100%	(800)
<u>By Gender</u>									
--Male	67	10	3	9	10	1	2	102	(383)
--Female	54	10	3	15	15	2	1	100	(417)
<u>By Age</u>									
--18 to 29	65	14	3	--	17	1	--	100	(286)
--30 to 49	73	10	2	--	12	2	--	99	(267)
--50 to 64	66	6	4	13	9	2	--	100	(117)
--65 or over	9	6	1	75	8	1	--	100	(102)
<u>By Race</u>									
--White	56	7	2	24	8	2	--	99	(232)
--African-American	62	8	4	15	9	1	1	100	(180)
--Hispanic/Latino	63	13	2	2	18	1	--	99	(328)
<u>By Education</u>									
--Less than high school	51	12	2	11	20	2	1	99	(201)
--High school graduate	57	10	3	16	13	2	--	101	(255)
--Some college	69	8	1	11	10	2	--	101	(145)
--College graduate	70	10	4	9	7	--	1	101	(184)
<u>By Income</u>									
--Under \$20,000	53	11	4	11	17	4	--	100	(215)
--\$20,000 - \$50,000	67	11	3	11	7	--	--	99	(228)
--Over \$50,000	79	6	2	9	4	1	--	101	(171)

**Table 4.2:**  
**Chief Wage Earner Employment Status [Q.D10]**

	<u>Employed</u>	<u>Laid Off</u>	<u>Retired</u>	<u>Not Employed</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>No Answer</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	78%	2%	13%	5%	1%	1%	100%	(718)
<u>By Race</u>								
--White	66	2	27	3	1	1	100	(197)
--African-American	76	2	16	5	1	1	101	(167)
--Hispanic/Latino	87	2	3	6	1	1	100	(303)
<u>By Income</u>								
--Under \$20,000	72	4	11	9	4	1	101	(193)
--\$20,000 - \$50,000	84	2	12	3	--	--	101	(212)
--Over \$50,000	87	2	10	1	--	--	100	(157)
<u>By Children in Household</u>								
--Yes	88	2	2	6	1	1	100	(299)
--No	72	2	21	4	1	1	101	(419)
<u>PAST SURVEYS</u>								
--2000	76%	2%	16%	4%	1%	1%	100%	(726)

**Table 4.3:**  
**Chief Wage Earner's Gender [Q.D11]**

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>No CWE</u>	<u>No Answer</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	51%	38%	8%	3%	100%	(800)
<u>By Race</u>						
--White	46	39	13	2	100	(232)
--African-American	45	48	5	3	101	(180)
--Hispanic/Latino	56	35	6	2	99	(328)
<u>By Income</u>						
--Under \$20,000	45	43	10	2	100	(215)
--\$20,000 - \$50,000	54	39	5	2	100	(228)
--Over \$50,000	59	32	7	1	99	(328)
<u>By Children in Household</u>						
--Yes	52	40	5	3	100	(323)
--No	51	37	10	2	100	(472)
<u>By Chief Wage Earner Status</u>						
--Employed	59	40	--	1	100	(559)
--Retired	47	53	--	--	100	(95)
--Not working/laid off	48	52	--	--	100	(50)
<u>PAST SURVEYS</u>						
--2000	53%	36%	7%	4%	100%	(803)



## CHAPTER 5

### EVALUATIONS OF NEW BRUNSWICK INSTITUTIONS

As in past years, the 2002 survey includes questions to gauge residents' opinions on the contribution of cultural offerings in the city as well as some of the major institutions in New Brunswick. These include New Brunswick Tomorrow, Johnson & Johnson, and Rutgers University.

#### Importance of Culture to Revitalization

The importance of culture in New Brunswick's revitalization continues to be expressed by a large majority of the city's residents. Nearly 9-in-10 residents believe culture plays a very (61%) or somewhat (28%) important role in revitalization (Table 5.1).

In fact, 3-in-5 residents report that they have attended a cultural event in the city during the past year (Table 5.2). This includes 12 percent who report having attended such an event or activity more than five times in the past year, 18 percent who have done this three to five times, and 31 percent who have done this once or twice.

African-American (71%) and white (69%) residents are somewhat more likely than Latino residents (50%) to have attended New Brunswick cultural activities in the past year. Attendance at New Brunswick cultural events has increased by 6-7 percentage points among African-American and white residents since the 2000 survey, while it has decreased 5 percentage points among Latinos. Also, residents in higher income brackets are more likely to take advantage of the cultural opportunities available in the city.

#### New Brunswick Tomorrow

About half of the city's residents (49%) are aware of New Brunswick Tomorrow (Table 5.3). This represents a decline over the past six years. From 1978 to 1996, awareness of NBT remained fairly stable (from 65% to 80%). The decline in awareness correlates with the growth of both Latinos and home renters in the city. Both groups tend to have lower overall awareness of New Brunswick Tomorrow. While two-thirds of African-American (67%) and white (66%) residents know of NBT, only 3-in-10 Latinos (29%) say the same (Table 5.6). Moreover, awareness of NBT among Latinos has decreased by 9 percentage points since 2000.

Despite the decrease in awareness, public approval of NBT's efforts remains high with 3-in-4 permanent residents (75%) who know of NBT saying they approve of NBT's efforts to revitalize the city (Table 5.4). Twelve percent of residents say they disapprove of NBT's work and 13 percent don't offer an opinion. Approval of NBT's efforts is high among all groups of residents (Table 5.7).

Two-thirds of permanent residents who are aware of NBT (65%) believe it is succeeding in improving New Brunswick (Table 5.5). This represents a continued high level of confidence over the past eight years.

### Johnson & Johnson

The belief that Johnson & Johnson is good for the city has remained steady over the past 25 years, with 77 percent of permanent residents in the current survey having this opinion (Table 5.8). Just 5 percent believe the company is bad for the city and 13 percent say the presence of the company makes no difference.

### Rutgers University

A large majority of permanent residents continue to believe Rutgers University is good for the city (Table 5.9). In the current survey, 81 percent of permanent residents say Rutgers is good for New Brunswick. Just 3 percent believe the university is bad for the city and 14 percent say the presence of Rutgers makes no difference to the quality of life in New Brunswick.

### Summary

A large majority of New Brunswick residents continue to believe cultural activities are an important aspect of revitalizing their city, with many residents reporting that they take advantage of the cultural opportunities available in their home city.

Approval of New Brunswick Tomorrow's efforts remains high -- with 3-in-4 approving of what NBT is trying to do. However, overall awareness of NBT has decreased during the past six years. At the same time, about two-thirds of residents continue to believe that NBT is succeeding in its efforts to improve the city.

Resident opinion that Johnson & Johnson is good for the city has remained fairly steady over the past twenty-five years and currently stands at 77 percent. Similarly, positive evaluations of the impact Rutgers University has on the city also continue to be high, with 81 percent of city residents saying that the university's presence is good for New Brunswick.

**Table 5.1:**  
**Importance of Culture in Revitalization of New Brunswick [Q.18]**

	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Somewhat Important</u>	<u>Not Very Important</u>	<u>Not At All Important</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>PERMANENT RESIDENTS</u>						
2002	61%	28%	4%	2%	6%	101%
2000	65	23	4	2	5	99
1998	62	25	5	2	6	100
1996	65	25	4	4	2	100
1994	62	27	5	4	2	100
1992	62	29	3	4	2	100
1990	55	31	6	5	3	100
1988	49	35	8	4	4	100
1986	50	35	7	4	4	100
1984	50	36	7	3	4	100
1982	49	37	7	3	5	101

**Table 5.2:  
Resident Attendance at New Brunswick Cultural and  
Arts Events in the Past Year [Q.19]**

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once or Twice</u>	<u>3 to 5 Times</u>	<u>Over 5 Times</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	38%	31%	18%	12%	1%	100%	(800)
<u>By Race</u>							
--White	30	30	23	16	--	99	(232)
--African-American	29	34	26	11	--	100	(180)
--Hispanic/Latino	48	31	11	8	2	100	(328)
<u>By Income</u>							
--Under \$20,000	55	29	9	5	1	99	(215)
--\$20,000 - \$50,000	30	38	23	9	1	101	(228)
--Over \$50,000	20	29	28	23	--	100	(171)
<u>PAST SURVEYS</u>							
--2000	39%	28%	19%	13%	1%	100%	(803)

**Table 5.3: Awareness of New Brunswick Tomorrow (NBT) [Q.22]**

	<u>2002</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1978</u>
--Aware of NBT	49%	57%	60%	72%	70%	65%	69%	75%	77%	76%	80%	79%	70%

**Table 5.4: Approval of What NBT Is Trying To Do\* [Q.23]**

## PERMANENT RESIDENTS WHO ARE AWARE OF NBT

	<u>2002</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1978</u>
--Approve	75%	80%	75%	81%	75%	70%	65%	64%	63%	74%	75%	75%	73%
--Disapprove	12	9	8	6	8	12	13	16	15	11	9	7	6
--Don't Know	13	11	17	13	16	18	23	20	23	15	16	18	21

**Table 5.5: Is NBT Succeeding in Improving New Brunswick?\* [Q.24]**

## PERMANENT RESIDENTS WHO ARE AWARE OF NBT

	<u>2002</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1978</u>
--Yes	65%	68%	68%	66%	66%	55%	59%	62%	67%	74%	67%	58%	53%
--No	15	15	14	16	20	26	21	21	17	12	14	21	23
--Don't Know	20	17	18	18	14	19	19	17	16	14	19	20	25

---

\* Based on those permanent residents who are aware of NBT.

**Table 5.6: Awareness of New Brunswick Tomorrow [Q.22]**

	<u>Aware</u>	<u>(n)</u>
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	49%	(800)
<u>By Length of Residence</u>		
--10 years or less	22	(403)
--More than 10 years	76	(394)
<u>By Residence Type</u>		
--Own	74	(252)
--Rent	36	(504)
<u>By Race</u>		
--White	66	(232)
--African-American	67	(180)
--Hispanic/Latino	29	(328)
<u>By Age</u>		
--18 to 29	30	(286)
--30 to 49	46	(267)
--50 to 64	73	(117)
--65 or over	75	(102)
<u>PAST SURVEYS</u>		
--2000	57%	(803)
<u>By Length of Residence</u>		
--10 years or less	33	(427)
--More than 10 years	82	(374)
<u>By Race</u>		
--White	67	(283)
--African-American	70	(215)
--Hispanic/Latino	38	(239)

**Table 5.7: Approval Of What New Brunswick Tomorrow Is Trying To Do [Q.23] \***

	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	73%	9%	18%	100%	(800)
<u>By Race</u>					
--White	78	6	16	100	(232)
--African-American	70	13	17	100	(180)
--Hispanic/Latino	71	10	19	100	(328)
<u>By Income</u>					
--Under \$20,000	66	10	24	100	(215)
--\$20,000 - \$50,000	80	10	10	100	(228)
--Over \$50,000	81	8	11	100	(171)
<u>PAST SURVEYS</u>					
--2000	77%	9%	14%	100%	(803)
<u>By Race</u>					
--White	83	5	12	100	(283)
--African-American	78	11	11	100	(215)
--Hispanic/Latino	72	13	15	100	(239)

---

\* The wording of this question was changed in 2000. In order to distinguish NBT from other organizations in the city, a brief description was read and the question was asked of all study participants. In the past the question was read with no description and only asked of those who said they had heard of NBT.



**Table 5.8:**  
**Perception of Johnson & Johnson as Good or Bad for New Brunswick [Q.21]**

	<u>Good</u>	<u>Bad</u>	<u>No Difference</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	77%	5%	13%	4%	99%	(800)
<u>By Race</u>						
--White	84	3	10	3	100	(232)
--African-American	79	2	16	3	100	(180)
--Hispanic/Latino	71	8	15	7	101	(328)
<u>By Income</u>						
--Under \$20,000	74	9	12	6	101	(215)
--\$20,000 - \$50,000	78	4	17	1	100	(228)
--Over \$50,000	84	4	9	4	101	(171)
<u>PAST SURVEYS</u>						
--2000	80%	2%	13%	4%	99%	(803)
--1998	79	3	13	6	101	(870)
--1996	79	3	16	1	99	(754)
--1994	82	3	13	1	99	(891)
--1992	77	5	16	2	100	(764)
--1990	78	4	14	4	100	(808)
--1988	75	8	12	5	100	(774)
--1986	74	8	13	5	100	(812)
--1984	84	5	8	3	100	(846)
--1982	85	3	8	3	99	(719)
--1980	85	5	7	3	100	(868)
--1978	83	3	9	5	100	(836)

**Table 5.9:**  
**Perception of Rutgers As Good or Bad for New Brunswick [Q.20]**

	<u>2002</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1978</u>
--Good	81%	85%	82%	80%	84%	79%	81%	77%	78%	83%	84%	83%	77%
--Bad	3	2	4	5	3	4	3	8	4	3	3	3	6
--No Difference	14	11	12	14	12	15	14	13	14	13	10	11	14
--Don't Know	3	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	4	2	2	3	3

**APPENDIX A:**  
**SURVEY INSTRUMENT**

**NEW BRUNSWICK TOMORROW 2002**  
 May 6-20, 2002  
 ANNOTATED QUESTIONNAIRE

RESPONDENT SEX:

Responses	Total (n=800)
Male	48%
Female	52

1. How long have you lived in New Brunswick, or have you lived here all of your life?

Responses	Total (n=800)
Less than one year	8%
1 or 2 years	12
3 - 5 years	15
6 - 10 years	15
11 - 20 years	15
21 - 30 years	6
More than 30 years	9
All my life	19
Don=t know	--

1A. Do you attend Rutgers University? **(IF YES:** Is that full-time or part-time?)

Responses	Total (n=800)
Yes, Full-time	1%
Yes, Part-time	2
No	97
Don=t know	--

2. How would you rate New Brunswick as a place to live-- excellent, good, only fair, or poor?

Responses	Total (n=800)
Excellent	12%
Good	52
Only fair	28
Poor	7
Don=t know	1

3. All things considered, do you think New Brunswick has gotten better or worse than it was (5 years ago/when you first moved in), or has it stayed about the same as a place to live? **(IF "BETTER" OR "WORSE," PROBE: Would you say it's gotten much (better/worse) or only somewhat (better/worse)?**

Responses	Total (n=800)
Much better	25%
Somewhat better	27
About the same	31
Somewhat worse	8
Much worse	7
Don=t know	3

**[NOTE: ASK Q.4 ONLY IF RESPONDENT HAS LIVED IN NEW BRUNSWICK 21 YEARS OR MORE]**

4. Now I'd like you to think back to what New Brunswick was like about 25 years ago before the rebuilding and revitalization efforts began. All things considered, do you think New Brunswick is better or worse **(IF "BETTER" OR "WORSE," PROBE: Would you say it is much (better/worse) or only somewhat better/worse?)**

Responses	Total (n=278)
Much better	40%
Somewhat better	24
About the same	7
Somewhat worse	9
Much worse	12
Don=t know	7

5. Thinking of the future, do you think New Brunswick will be better or worse as a place to live 5 years from now? **(IF "BETTER" OR "WORSE," PROBE: Would you say it will be much or only somewhat (better/worse)?**

Responses	Total (n=800)
Much better	32%
Somewhat better	34
About the same	6
Somewhat worse	9
Much worse	6
Don=t know how much better/worse	5
Don=t know better/worse	10

6. What do you think are the two or three most important things that should be done to make New Brunswick a better place to live? **(PROBE: Is there anything New Brunswick needs that would make living here easier or better?) (OPEN END - DO NOT READ LIST - PROBE FOR UP TO THREE)**

Responses	Total (n=800)
Make safer/reduce crime	14%
Deal with drug problems	10
Improve police protection	5
More police/foot patrols	5
Improve quality of police force	2
Improve education/schools	20
Build more housing	12
Build Low-Income housing	8
Renovate old housing	4
Replace old housing projects	2
Make landlords keep up property	3
Renovate buildings (NOT housing)	3
Improve Downtown area	6
Clean streets	11
Encourage New Businesses	5
More jobs	9
More/better parking	8
More/better parks/recreation	7
Lower taxes	4
Better transportation	5
Improve Government/Politics	2
Race relations/immigration	3
Roads and Traffic	6
Clean water	1
RU students relations	2
More activities for youth	7
More nightlife/entertainment	3
Lower rents/rent control	2
More services for seniors	<1
Over-development/overcrowding	2
Other	4
Nothing	4
DK/refused	8

7. How would you rate your neighborhood as a place to live--excellent, good, only fair or poor?

Responses	Total (n=800)
Excellent	21%
Good	46
Only fair	26
Poor	7
Don't know	--

8. In the last few years, has your neighborhood gotten better or worse as a place to live, or hasn't there been any change?

Responses	Total (n=800)
Better	31%
Worse	14
No change	50
Don=t know	4

9. If you had the opportunity, would you like to move out of your neighborhood or would you continue to live where you are now? **(IF "MOVE" ASK: Would you like to move to another part of New Brunswick or would you prefer to move out of the city?)**

Responses	Total (n=800)
Move out of New Brunswick	32%
In process of moving out of New Brunswick	4
Move to another part of New Brunswick	14
Continue where now	48
Don=t know	2

**(IF "MOVE OUT OF NEW BRUNSWICK" OR "IN PROCESS" TO Q.9, ASK Q.10:)**

10. Why do you want to move out of New Brunswick?  
**(DO NOT READ LIST - PROBE FOR UP TO TWO RESPONSES)**

Responses	Total (n=287)
Crime rate/Safety	19%
School/education quality	12
Want to live in suburban area/better environment	13
Want to live in a different city	6
New Brunswick is dirty/run-down/don't like it	10
Job/employment opportunities	8
Transportation	2
Leaving college/school	1
Taxes	2
Noise	7
Cost of Living/Cost of Housing/expensive	12
Parking	1
Too crowded	12
Been here too long/all my life	4
Want to live in a house/different house	5
Other	7
DK/ref	3

11. Compared to other towns in this area, do you think New Brunswick has more crime, less crime, or about the same amount?

Responses	Total (n=800)
More crime	32%
Less crime	18
Same amount	37
Don=t know	13

12. Compared to two years ago, do you think crime in New Brunswick has gotten better, gotten worse, or stayed about the same? **(IF LIVED IN NEW BRUNSWICK LESS THAN 2 YEARS, SAY: Then compared with when you first moved in.)**

Responses	Total (n=800)
Better	38%
Worse	12
Same	40
Don=t know	11

13. How safe is your neighborhood at night--very safe, somewhat safe, or not at all safe?

Responses	Total (n=800)
Very safe	33%
Somewhat safe	52
Not at all safe	12
Don=t know	3

14. How good a job do you think New Brunswick's public schools are doing--excellent, good, only fair or poor? **(PROBE: Based on what you've heard.)**

Responses	Total (n=800)
Excellent	10%
Good	30
Only fair	25
Poor	15
Don=t know	21



15. Compared to two years ago, do you think the quality of the public schools has gotten better, gotten worse, or stayed about the same? **(IF LIVED IN NEW BRUNSWICK LESS THAN 2 YEARS, SAY: Then compared with when you first moved in.)**

Responses	Total (n=800)
Better	30%
Worse	9
Same	36
Was not here/no children in schools	4
Don=t know	21

16. How good a job do you think New Brunswick High School is doing--excellent, good, only fair, or poor?

Responses	Total (n=800)
Excellent	8%
Good	27
Only Fair	20
Poor	9
Don=t know	36

17. And, how would you rate the job the New Brunswick grammar or elementary schools are doing--excellent, good, only fair, or poor?

Responses	Total (n=800)
Excellent	9%
Good	32
Only fair	22
Poor	9
Don=t know	28

18. Thinking of things like the arts, theater, and concerts, how important a role do you think culture plays in revitalizing New Brunswick--is it very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not at all important?

Responses	Total (n=800)
Very important	61%
Somewhat important	28
Not very important	4
Not at all important	2
Don=t know	6

19. In the past year, how often have you attended concerts, shows, or plays in New Brunswick -- [READ LIST]

Responses	Total (n=800)
Never,	38%
Once or twice,	31
3 to 5 times, or	18
More than 5 times in the past year	12
Don=t know	1

On another topic,

20. Rutgers University is located in New Brunswick. Do you think this is good for the city, bad, or doesn't it make any difference?

Responses	Total (n=800)
Good	81%
Bad	3
Doesn=t make any difference	14
Don=t know	3

21. How about Johnson & Johnson--is it good for the city that J&J is located in New Brunswick, is it bad, or doesn't it make any difference?

Responses	Total (n=800)
Good	77%
Bad	5
Doesn=t make any difference	13
Both--refuses to choose	1
Don=t know	3

22. Have you heard of New Brunswick Tomorrow?

Responses	Total (n=800)
Yes	49%
No	50
Don=t know	2

23. New Brunswick Tomorrow is a private, non-profit organization that works to coordinate services for city residents to assure that human and social issues are addressed. They do NOT renovate buildings or property. Do you approve or disapprove of what New Brunswick Tomorrow is trying to do?

Responses	Total (n=800)
Approve	73%
Disapprove	9
Don=t know	18

24. Do you think it is succeeding in improving New Brunswick, or not?

Responses	Total (n=800)
Yes--is Succeeding	62%
No--not succeeding	11
Both--refuses to choose	3
Don=t know	23

25. All things considered, do you think the revitalization and redevelopment that has taken place in the city in recent years will help or hurt low-income families in New Brunswick or will it have no effect?

Responses	Total (n=800)
Help	39%
Hurt	30
Both help and hurt	4
Neither/no effect	15
Don=t know	11

(IF "HELP, HURT, OR BOTH" TO Q.25, ASK:)

- 26A. How will it help?) (OPEN-END  
- DO NOT READ LIST - PROBE  
FOR UP TO TWO RESPONSES)

Less crime/safer	4
Other	7
DK/ref	15

Responses	Total (n=313)
Create/Provide jobs	35%
Create opportunities for poor	11
More housing	9
More affordable housing	12
Better housing conditions	12
Lower cost of living	2
Improve standard of living	21
Better schools	4

- 26B. How will it hurt?) (OPEN-END  
- DO NOT READ LIST - PROBE  
FOR UP TO TWO RESPONSES)

Responses	Total (n=236)
Fewer jobs	11%
Clear out poor/forced to re-	38
Less housing	11
Less affordable housing	34
Worse housing conditions	4

Increase cost of living	27
Worsen standard of living	2
Worsen/fewer services	4
Other	4
DK/ref	3

Now just a few questions so that we can classify your answers.

D1. What was the last grade in school you completed?

Responses	Total (n=800)
8TH GRADE OR LESS	14%
HIGH SCHOOL INCOMPLETE (GRADES 9, 10 AND 11)	11
HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETE (GRADE 12)	29
VOCATIONAL/TECHNICAL SCHOOL	2
SOME COLLEGE	13
JUNIOR COLLEGE GRADUATE (2 YEAR, ASSOCIATES DEGREE)	5
4 YEAR COLLEGE GRADUATE (BACHELOR=S DEGREE)	14
GRADUATE WORK (MASTERS, LAW/MEDICAL SCHOOL, ETC.)	9
DK/REF	2

D2. Do you own or rent your home?

Responses	Total (n=800)
OWN	32%
RENT	63
LIVE RENT FREE WITH PARENTS/RELATIVES	4
DON'T KNOW	1

D3. Are there any children under 18 now living in your household?

Responses	Total (n=800)
Yes	40%
No	59
Don=t know	1

D4. Is there a child in your household that attends public school?

Responses	Total (n=323)
Yes	67%
No	32
Don=t know	--

D5. Is there a child in your household that attends private or parochial school?

Responses	Total (n=323)
Yes	16%
No	83

Don't know	--
------------	----

D6. How many people age 18 or over are now living in your household **other than yourself?**

Responses	Total (n=800)
None	16%
1	33
2 - 3	35
4 or more	13
Refused	2

D7. Are you currently employed full-time--that is, more than 20 hours a week--employed part-time, laid off, retired or not employed?

Responses	Total (n=800)
EMPLOYED FULL-TIME	60%
EMPLOYED PART-TIME	10
LAID OFF	3
RETIRED	12
NOT EMPLOYED	13
OTHER	1
DK/ref	1

D8. In which town or city do you work?

Responses	Total (n=578)
New Brunswick	37%
Somerset/Franklin	6
Piscataway/Highland Park	8
North Brunswick	5
East Brunswick	3
Edison/Metuchen	7
New York City	3
Princeton	2
Trenton	1
South Brunswick/ Dayton/Cranbury/Plainsboro	4
Iselin/Woodbridge	2
South Plainfield	2
Other Middlesex County	5
Other	13
DK/ref	4

D9. Are you the chief wage earner in your household?

Responses	Total (n=800)
Yes	57%
No	32
There is no chief wage earner in household	8
DK/ref	3

D10. Is the chief wage earner in your household currently employed, temporarily laid off, retired or not employed?

Responses	Total (n=718)
Employed	78%
Laid off	2
Retired	13
Not employed	5
Other	1
DK/ref	1

D11. Is the chief wage earner male or female?

Responses	Total (n=800)
Male	51%
Female	38
No Chief Wage Earner	8
DK/ref	3

D12. What was your age on your last birthday?

D13. [IF REFUSED AGE ASK:] Is it between --

Responses	Total (n=800)
18-20	7%
21-24	14
25-29	13
THIRTIES (30-39)	19
FORTIES (40-49)	16
FIFTIES (50-59)	11
60 - 64	4
65 OR OLDER	12
NO ANSWER/REFUSED	3

D14. **IF RESPONDENT IS LESS THAN 65 YEARS OLD OR REFUSED AGE, ASK:** Is anyone in your household 65 years of age or older?

Responses	Total (n=800)
Yes	8%
No	77
Respondent is 65 or older	12
DK/ref	4

D15. Are you married, living as married, widowed, divorced, separated, or have you never been married?

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total (n=800)</b>
Married	35%
Living as married	6
Widowed	8
Divorced	9
Separated	5
Never married	35
Don=t know	3

D16. Do you consider yourself to be of Hispanic or Latino origin?

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total (n=800)</b>
Yes--Hispanic/Latino	37%
No	61
Don=t know	2

D17. What country is your family from?

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total (n=800)</b>
Columbia	1%
Dominican Republic	6
Ecuador	1
Guatemala	1
Honduras	4
Mexico	15
Nicaragua	1
Puerto Rico	7
Peru	1
Other	2
Not Hispanic/Latino	63

D18. Are you white, black or of Asian origin?

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Total (n=800)</b>
White	39%
Black	28
Asian	5
Hispanic/Latino	23
Other	<1
DK/ref	5



D19. What languages are spoken in your home? [MULTIPLE RESPONSE]

Responses	Total (n=800)
English	77%
Spanish	39
Hindi/Indian dialects	2
Chinese/Mandarin/Cantonese	<1
Arabic	1
Hungarian	2
Russian/Polish/Slovak/Ukranian (Eastern Europe)	1
Other Western Europe (Italian, French, etc.)	2
Other	1
DK	1

D20. And so that we can make sure that all parts of New Brunswick are represented, what are the nearest cross streets to your home? [PROBE FOR TWO STREET NAMES]

Responses (Grouped into Neighborhoods)	Total (n=800)
College Avenue	4%
Easton Avenue/Buccleuch Park	8
Harvey Park	5
French Street	8
Jersey Avenue	4
Renaissance Station	13
Central New Brunswick	23
River Watch	8
Nichol Avenue	5
Route 18/Dewey Heights	8
Edgebrook	4
Not determined	9

D21. So that we can group all answers, what is your total annual family income before taxes: Under \$10,000; \$10,000 to under \$20,000; \$20,000 to under \$30,000; \$30,000 to under \$50,000; \$50,000 to under \$75,000; or over \$75,000?

Responses	Total (n=800)
UNDER \$10,000	10%
\$10,000 - \$19,999	17
\$20,000 - \$29,999	13
\$30,000 - \$49,999	16
\$50,000 - \$74,999	11
\$75,000 OR MORE	11
REFUSED/DON'T KNOW	23

**APPENDIX B:**  
**SURVEY METHODOLOGY**

## **APPENDIX B:**

### **SURVEY METHODOLOGY**

2000 marked a transition year in the sampling methodology employed for the New Brunswick Biennial Survey, moving from an outmoded reverse-directory approach to a random-digit dialing telephone sample. The 1998 report includes an extensive discussion of the rationale behind this transition. In the past, the survey included both permanent residents and Rutgers student residents in the sample, although the results were usually reported only for the permanent resident sample. In light of escalating survey costs, the 2002 survey interviewed permanent residents only.

#### Sample Selection

This random-digit dial approach takes all telephone exchanges which serve the city of New Brunswick and distributes them in the sample according to proportion of phone service (e.g. if exchange “246” makes up 15 percent of all telephone numbers in the city, the chances of a “246” number being selected for the sample are about 15 percent). After the exchanges are set, a computer program randomly selects the last four digits in the phone number. This process ensures that unlisted numbers as well as new listed telephone numbers are included in the sampling frame.

However, because the telephone company does not assign exchanges based on municipal boundaries there is overlap in the exchanges which serve New Brunswick and surrounding towns. Of the 20 or so telephone exchanges which serve New Brunswick and the surrounding area, 40 percent of the total telephone numbers included in those exchanges are assigned to New Brunswick locations and the remaining 60 percent are outside the city. A tele-match was conducted for listed numbers to eliminate households known to be outside the city, leaving those numbers attached to New Brunswick addresses as well as those numbers for which no listed address was found.

The survey includes a screening question for city/town of residence. In addition, the survey includes questions asking respondents to identify their general location in the city (by nearest cross-streets).

A set of screening questions were used to screen out full-time Rutgers students who had lived in the city for less than 10 years, so that the sample would include only permanent city residents.

### Data Collection

A sample of 800 New Brunswick residents 18 years of age and older were interviewed by telephone from May 6 to 20, 2002. Interviewing was conducted during the evening on week days, and on weekends during both daytime and evening hours. These hours maximize the chances of contacting residents who work full-time, providing a representative sample of New Brunswick's population. A minimum of four attempts to contact and interview a respondent were made with each number randomly chosen for the sample. Interviews were conducted in both English (n=596) and Spanish (n=204).

Using these methods, an overall completion rate of 81 percent was achieved. Completion rate is calculated by dividing the total number of calls made in which an eligible person was contacted (i.e., not a busy signal or no answer) by the number of interviews completed.

### Sampling Error

The percentages obtained in any sample survey are estimates of what the percentages would be were the entire population interviewed. "Sampling error" is the possible difference between interviewing everyone 18 years and older in New Brunswick as opposed to a sample of the population. The sampling error associated with the total sample of 800 respondents is about  $\pm 3.5$  percent at a 95 percent confidence interval. For example, if 47 percent of those in the sample are found to agree with a particular statement, the percentage of agreement in the entire population would be between 43.5 and 50.5 percent 95 times out of 100. Sampling error increases as the size of the sample decreases. Therefore, statements about specific sub-groups of the population -- e.g. men and women -- have a greater sampling error than for the full sample. This should be kept in mind whenever percentages for population sub-groups are discussed.

### Weighting

Table B.1 shows the weighted composition of the 2002 sample for all 800 participants, as well as comparable figures for the past surveys. As in the past, not all attributes of the population are proportionally represented in the sample. To correct for such differences and to more accurately reflect the responses of a cross-section of the population, the sample has been "weighted," a statistical technique used to bring samples into line with known populations.

As a hypothetical example of how weighting works, assume that a specific population was known to have an equal number of men and women, but a sample of that population was divided 75 percent male to 25 percent female. To make the sample accurately reflect the population the responses of men would be counted as "2" each, while the responses of women would only be counted as ".67" each, thus equalizing the sample division to 50/50.

For the New Brunswick Biennial Survey, no weighting procedure was used from 1976 to 1982. In 1984, it was noted that the African-American population in New Brunswick had grown between the 1970 and 1980 U.S. Censuses and that the white population had dropped. From 1984 to 1990, the Census population count for racial distribution among adults in the city was used to keep the data in line with those Census figures. When the 1990 Census was published, the Hispanic/Latino population of the city had more than doubled, from 8 percent to 18 percent. There was also a slight increase in the proportion of black adult residents, from 21 percent to 24 percent. Conversely, the proportion of white residents aged 18 and over decreased from 66 percent to 55 percent. For 1992 through 1996, these new census figures for race were used to weight the survey data. A comparison of the results from past surveys using the weights derived from the 1980 versus 1990 census figures (as well as with unweighted data ) reveal only minimal and not statistically significant differences.

Since 1998, a different weighting approach has been utilized for the random digit dial sample. The growth of the Hispanic community which was shown in the 1990 Census has continued. In comparison with the counts by race, the Census results for age categories have remained fairly stable from 1970 to 2000. As such, this variable is used as the weighting factor for the current sample. Also, the use of age categories allows Eagleton to account for the exclusion of students from the sample. While students are included in the Census count, they were not included in the survey (for reasons described earlier in this section). Therefore, the weighting approach needs to be able to take into account the number of students who are excluded. While Rutgers University tracks the number of students living in New Brunswick, it does not provide demographic information on them. While it would be impossible to assign racial categories to these students, it is much safer to assume that nearly all fall into the 18 to 29 year old age category. According to Rutgers figures, approximately 6,000 students live in New Brunswick dorms and about 6-7,000 live in off-campus apartments in the city. As such, the 2000 census results for the 18-29 year old category was reduced by 13,000 people to create the weighting calculations for this survey sample.

### Trends in the New Brunswick Permanent Resident Profile

Table B.1 examines survey findings for different demographic and economic groupings for permanent residents from 1978 to the present. Overall, trends in education and employment have remained steady for the past decade, although there is a slight decline in those holding a college degree.

The 2000 and 2002 surveys show a marked increase in the number of renters (63%). From 1980 to 1998 this number hovered between 48 and 57 percent.

Table B.2 presents an unweighted profile of permanent residents who have participated in these surveys since 1978 and allows for a better examination of changes in age and race over two-year periods.

According to these results, there has been a dramatic increase in the proportion of Hispanic residents (especially in the past few years) and a consequent decline in white residents since the 1990 census was conducted.

The proportion of African-American residents has remained fairly steady over the past ten years.

Also, age distributions have remained fairly stable since 1978, although there has been a decrease in the age 60 and older cohort since 1996.

**Table B.1: Profile of Permanent Residents [Weighted]**

(n)	<u>2002</u> (800)	<u>2000</u> (803)	<u>1998</u> (870)	<u>1996</u> (755)	<u>1994</u> (891)	<u>1992</u> (764)	<u>1990</u> (808)	<u>1988</u> (774)	<u>1986</u> (812)	<u>1984</u> (846)	<u>1982</u> (719)	<u>1980</u> (868)	<u>1978</u> (836)
<u>Gender</u>													
--Male	48%	49%	48%	50%	46%	49%	45%	47%	44%	46%	48%	48%	50%
--Female	52	51	52	50	54	51	55	53	56	54	52	52	50
<u>Education</u>													
--8th grade or less	14	8	8	6	6	5	5	5	6	7	9	10	10
--Some high school	11	10	10	10	8	10	9	11	11	11	10	12	14
--High school grad	29	28	29	24	27	29	28	26	32	35	32	30	32
--Vo-Tech school	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	na	na	na	na
--Some college	18	18	17	18	18	22	18	19	16	17	16	16	15
--College grad	14	20	19	21	24	20	24	24	21	19	17	17	16
--Graduate school	9	12	13	15	14	10	12	11	11	10	16	14	12
<u>Children in home</u>													
--Child under 18	40	35	36	30	30	31	27	31	31	na	na	na	na
<u>Child in school</u>													
--NB Public school	27	22	22	15	15	17	14	15	16	14	11	12	14
--Private school	7	6	6	9	8	7	6	8	8	9	8	9	11
<u>Senior Citizen</u>													
--in household	20	24	24	29	25	23	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
<u>Age</u>													
--18 to 29	34	29	27	27	25	34	28	31	30	34	34	29	28
--30 to 39	19	24	21	21	27	21	25	24	22	17	19	21	16
--40 to 49	16	13	15	15	14	14	12	10	10	9	8	8	10
--50 to 59	11	11	12	10	9	9	10	10	9	11	13	15	18
--60 and over	16	20	21	26	22	20	23	25	25	26	24	24	28
<u>Home Ownership</u>													
--Own	32	33	46	45	46	41	44	46	49	46	43	44	na
--Rent	63	63	49	51	51	57	54	53	48	51	55	53	na
--Lives with family	4	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	na

**Table B.1: Profile of Permanent Residents [Weighted] (continued)**

(n)	<u>2002</u> (800)	<u>2000</u> (803)	<u>1998</u> (870)	<u>1996</u> (755)	<u>1994</u> (891)	<u>1992</u> (764)	<u>1990</u> (808)	<u>1988</u> (774)	<u>1986</u> (812)	<u>1984</u> (846)	<u>1982</u> (719)	<u>1980</u> (868)	<u>1978</u> (836)
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>													
--White	29%	38%	39%	51%	52%	52%	63%	62%	62%	64%	66%	68%	75%
--African-American	23	26	27	27	26	28	25	25	25	24	22	21	19
--Hispanic/Latino	41	28	23	17	16	16	8	9	9	9	7	8	na
--Asian	4	4	4	2	na	na	2	1	na	na	na	na	na
--Other	1	1	2	--	4	2	1	2	2	2	3	2	3
<u>Speaks Spanish</u>													
--in home	39	26	24	13	13	12	7	6	7	5	6	5	na
<u>Years in New Brunswick</u>													
--Less than one	8	8	5	4	5	4	5	5	4	5	7	4	2
--1 to 2	12	11	8	7	8	11	12	10	10	9	10	9	7
--3 to 5	15	15	15	15	17	21	17	16	12	14	16	15	12
--6 to 10	15	17	17	14	14	12	13	13	12	11	11	11	13
--11 to 20	15	11	13	13	14	13	10	9	12	12	10	10	11
--21 to 30	6	5	8	9	7	9	8	8	8	7	8	7	9
--Over 30	9	12	14	14	16	15	12	11	15	15	12	15	15
--Entire life	19	21	20	23	18	16	22	28	28	27	25	28	31
<u>Marital Status</u>													
--Married/living as	41	32	40	37	40	35	39	43	43	na	na	na	na
--Widowed	8	10	9	12	11	10	11	11	12	na	na	na	na
--Divorced	9	10	10	8	7	10	9	8	7	na	na	na	na
--Separated	5	6	4	3	4	5	4	5	3	na	na	na	na
--Never married	35	41	34	38	36	39	35	33	33	na	na	na	na
<u>Employment</u>													
--Full-time	60	65	61	58	59	58	64	65	60	na	na	na	na
--Part-time	10	6	9	7	7	9	5	6	6	na	na	na	na
--Laid off	3	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	na	na	na	na
--Retired	12	17	18	21	19	17	19	18	19	na	na	na	na
--Not working	13	10	8	10	12	12	10	9	12	na	na	na	na
--Other	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	na	na	na	na
<u>Annual Household Income</u>													
--Under \$10,000	10	10	9	11	11	14	11	11	12	18	21	25	27
--\$10 - 20,000	17	15	14	15	18	17	16	17	24	24	29	31	38
--\$20 - 30,000	13	14	16	14	14	18	16	18	19	18	18	16	19
--\$30 - 50,000	16	20	18	22	20	21	24	26	18	21	18	13	↓
--Over \$50,000	22	22	21	21	23	17	17	13	9	↓	↓	↓	↓
--No answer	23	19	23	16	14	14	15	15	19	19	15	14	16



**Table B.2: Unweighted Profile of Permanent Residents**

(n)	<u>2002</u> (800)	<u>2000</u> 803)	<u>1998</u> (870)	<u>1996</u> (755)	<u>1994</u> (891)	<u>1992</u> (764)	<u>1990</u> (808)	<u>1988</u> (774)	<u>1986</u> (812)	<u>1984</u> (846)	<u>1982</u> (719)	<u>1980</u> (868)	<u>1978</u> (836)
<u>Gender</u>													
--Male	48%	50%	46%	51%	46%	50%	45%	48%	45%	46%	48%	48%	50%
--Female	52	50	54	49	54	50	55	52	55	54	52	52	50
<u>Age</u>													
--18 to 29	36	32	28	28	25	34	28	31	30	34	34	29	28
--30 to 39	19	25	23	22	27	21	26	24	22	17	19	21	16
--40 to 49	15	16	16	15	14	13	12	10	9	9	8	8	10
--50 to 59	10	10	12	9	9	9	10	9	9	10	13	15	18
--60 and over	17	14	18	25	23	20	23	25	26	27	24	24	28
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>													
--White	29	35	39	49	55	61	64	66	69	71	66	68	75
--African-American	22	27	24	21	21	20	22	19	18	19	22	21	19
--Hispanic/Latino	41	30	26	24	19	15	10	10	9	8	7	8	na
--Asian	4	4	4	3	na	na	2	1	na	na	na	na	na
--Other	1	1	2	1	4	3	1	2	2	2	3	2	3

**Table B.3: Description of Neighborhood Areas in New Brunswick**

*Edgebrook:* This is an area of single family homes in the section of the city east of Route 1. It encompasses Districts 4 and 5 in the 1st Ward.

*Route 18/Dewey Heights:* This includes the area along Route 18 from west of Route 1 to just before the George Street ramp. It has a mix of single family homes and garden apartments. It includes most of Districts 1 and 6 in the 1st Ward.

*Nichol Avenue:* This areas is bounded by the Douglass/Cook campus on the west, Commercial Avenue/Georges Road on the east, and Redmond Street on the north. It is mainly older single family homes, some of which are used as rental properties for college students. It is in the eastern part of the 2nd Ward.

*River Watch:* This is the area from Bishop Street to the Railroad tracks, between Redmond Street and the Raritan River. It currently contains, older housing along and around George Street, apartment buildings along the northern end of Commercial Avenue, the Memorial Homes housing project, and newer owner/renter properties around Hiram Square. This area is slated to see many changes in coming years. It includes the far western part of District 1 and all of District 2 and 3 in the 1st Ward, the southern half of the 3rd Ward, District 1 in the 4th Ward, and part of District 1 in the 5th Ward.

*Central New Brunswick:* The largest area of the city defined in the survey, it is bounded by Commercial Avenue to the west, the Railroad tracks to the east, Redmond Street to the north, and Delavan Street to the south. It has mainly older housing stock, many multi-family properties, and many rental properties. It includes the northwestern portions of the 2nd Ward, and District 2 and part of District 3 in the 4th Ward.

*Renaissance Station:* Taking its name from the townhouse complex built here in the past decade, this includes the area of the city south of Delavan Street and east of the Railroad tracks, including the entire southern end of Livingston Avenue. In addition to the townhouse complex, this area has larger single family and multi-family housing, mostly of older stock. It includes most of Districts 5, 6, and 7 in the 2nd Ward, and most of District 3 and all of District 4 in the 4th Ward.

*Jersey Avenue:* This area comprises the southwestern portion of the city from Sandford Street along the Railroad tracks to the North Brunswick and Franklin borders. It includes a mix of older apartment units, Robeson Village and Schwartz-Robeson HUD apartments, single family homes in Lincoln Gardens, and the relatively new Hampton Club townhouse complex. It includes Districts 6 and 7 in the 4th Ward.

*French Street:* This comprises the area along French Street between Somerset Street and the Railroad tracks. It supports a growing Latino population in mostly older rental housing stock. It includes District 5 in the 4th Ward, and part of District 1 and all of District 2 in the 5th Ward.

*Harvey Park:* This area is bounded by Hamilton Street and Somerset Street from Easton Avenue to Sandford Street. It is mostly residential with many homes being used as rental properties. It includes Districts 3 and 4 in the 5th Ward.

*Easton Avenue/Bucleuch Park:* This is the area surrounding St. Peters Medical Center, from Hamilton Street to Easton Avenue and runs northwest to include Landing Lane. It includes apartment buildings, single family homes, and rental units populated by many students. It includes Districts 2, 5, and 6 in the 6th Ward.

*College Avenue:* This area is bounded by Easton Avenue, Bucleuch Park, the Raritan River, and the Railroad tracks. It is comprised of mostly older housing which has been converted to rental units for students, although a number of long-term residents still live here. It includes Districts 1, 3, and 4 in the 6th Ward.