

**1996 SURVEY OF
NEW BRUNSWICK RESIDENTS**

Prepared for:

New Brunswick Tomorrow

Prepared by:

The Center for Public Interest Polling
The Eagleton Institute of Politics

Data collection:

May 2-16, 1996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	I-vi
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
OVERVIEW OF THE REPORT	1
SAMPLE SELECTION	2
SAMPLING ERROR	3
WEIGHTING	4
II. THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN NEW BRUNSWICK.....	9
NEW BRUNSWICK AS A PLACE TO LIVE	9
COMPARISON OF NEW BRUNSWICK TODAY WITH FIVE YEARS AGO.....	10
COMPARISON OF NEW BRUNSWICK TODAY WITH FIFTEEN YEARS AGO	12
COMPARISON OF NEW BRUNSWICK TODAY WITH FIVE YEARS FROM NOW	13
PERMANENT RESIDENTS ASSESS THEIR NEIGHBORHOODS	13
PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME IN NEW BRUNSWICK	15
PERCEPTIONS OF NEIGHBORHOOD CRIME.....	15
MOBILITY PLANS	16
SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE THE CITY	17
IMPACT OF REVITALIZATION ON THE POOR	18
SUMMARY	19
III. DOWNTOWN NEW BRUNSWICK	44
SHOPPING PATTERNS OF NEW BRUNSWICK RESIDENTS	44
IMPORTANCE OF CULTURE TO REVITALIZATION	46
SUMMARY	46
IV. SCHOOLS AND RENOVATION PROGRAMS.....	51
RATINGS OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS	51
RATINGS OF NEW BRUNSWICK HIGH SCHOOL	52
RATINGS OF NEW BRUNSWICK ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.....	53
RENOVATION PROGRAMS	53
SUMMARY	55
V. SOCIAL SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS AND CHILD CARE.....	65
SOCIAL SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS	65
UTILIZATION OF ORGANIZATIONS	66
THE A-STEP PROGRAM.....	67
THE INFO-LINE SERVICE	67
USE OF CHILD CARE	68
SUMMARY	68

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

PAGE

VI. EVALUATIONS OF NEW BRUNSWICK TOMORROW, JOHNSON & JOHNSON, AND RUTGERS.....	76
NEW BRUNSWICK TOMORROW	76
JOHNSON & JOHNSON	77
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY	78
SUMMARY	78
VII. RUTGERS STUDENTS' EVALUATIONS OF NEW BRUNSWICK	89
PROFILE OF RUTGERS STUDENTS	89
THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN NEW BRUNSWICK	90
COMMITMENT TO NEW BRUNSWICK	91
SHOPPING IN DOWNTOWN NEW BRUNSWICK	92
AWARENESS AND APPROVAL OF RENOVATION/SERVICE PROJECTS	92
AWARENESS OF SOCIAL SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS	93
SUMMARY	94
APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT	
APPENDIX B: SAMPLING METHODOLOGY	

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

CHAPTER II

Table 2.1:	Overall Rating of New Brunswick.....	21
Table 2.2:	Comparison of New Brunswick Today with Five Years Ago	22
Table 2.3:	Comparison of New Brunswick Today with 15 Years Ago Before Revitalization Efforts	25
Table 2.4:	Comparison of New Brunswick Today with 5 Years From Now.....	26
Table 2.5:	Neighborhood Evaluations of Permanent Residents.....	28
Table 2.6:	Permanent Residents' Perception of Recent Change in Quality of Neighborhood	30
Table 2.7:	New Brunswick Residents' Perceptions of Crime Compared to Other Areas	33
Table 2.8:	Perceptions of Crime in Own Neighborhood Compared to Other New Brunswick Neighborhoods	34
Table 2.9:	How Safe Permanent Residents Feel in Own Neighborhood at Night	35
Table 2.10:	Residents' Commitment to New Brunswick	37
Table 2.11:	Reason for Wanting to Move Out of New Brunswick	38
Table 2.12:	Reason Still Living in New Brunswick	39
Table 2.13:	What New Brunswick Needs To Do To Improve City	40
Table 2.14:	Will Revitalization Help or Hurt Low-Income Families	42
Table 2.15:	Reasons Why Revitalization Will Help or Hurt Low-Income Families	43

CHAPTER III

Table 3.1:	How Often New Brunswick Residents Shop Downtown	47
Table 3.2:	What Residents Shop For Downtown.....	48
Table 3.3:	What Would Increase Residents' Frequency of Shopping Downtown	49
Table 3.4:	Importance of Culture in Revitalization of New Brunswick	50

CHAPTER IV

Table 4.1:	Rating of New Brunswick Schools.....	58
Table 4.2:	Comparison of New Brunswick Public Schools With Two Years Ago.....	59
Table 4.3:	Resident's Ratings of New Brunswick High School.....	60
Table 4.4:	Resident's Ratings of New Brunswick Elementary Schools.....	61
Table 4.5:	Permanent Residents' Awareness of Renovation Projects	62
Table 4.6:	Approval of Renovation Projects.....	63
Table 4.7:	Those Who Approve of Renovation Projects.....	64

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

PAGE

CHAPTER V

Table 5.1:	Awareness of Social Service Organizations.....	70
Table 5.2:	Use of Social Service Organizations in the Past Year.....	71
Table 5.3:	Evaluation of A-STEP Program.....	72
Table 5.4:	Evaluation of INFO-LINE Service.....	73
Table 5.5:	Use of Child Care.....	74
Table 5.6:	Satisfaction with Child Care.....	75

CHAPTER VI

Table 6.1:	Awareness of NBT.....	81
Table 6.2:	Approval of What NBT Is Trying To Do.....	82
Table 6.3:	Approval of What NBT Is Trying To Do.....	83
Table 6.4:	Is NBT Succeeding in Improving New Brunswick.....	83
Table 6.5:	Perception of Johnson & Johnson as Good or Bad for New Brunswick.....	85
Table 6.6:	How Much Influence Does Johnson & Johnson Have in What Happens in New Brunswick.....	86
Table 6.7:	Is Rutgers Good or Bad for New Brunswick.....	87
Table 6.8:	Perception of Rutgers as Good or Bad for New Brunswick.....	88

CHAPTER VII

Table 7.1:	Rutgers Student Profile.....	96
Table 7.2:	Rutgers Students' Rating of New Brunswick.....	97
Table 7.3:	Rutgers Students' Expectations For Five Years From Now.....	98
Table 7.4:	Neighborhood Evaluations of Rutgers Students.....	99
Table 7.5:	Rutgers Students' Perceptions of Crime Compared to Other Areas.....	100
Table 7.6:	Rutgers Students' Perceptions of Crime in Neighborhood Compared to Other New Brunswick Neighborhoods.....	101
Table 7.7:	How Safe Rutgers Students Feel in Own Neighborhood at Night.....	102
Table 7.8:	Rutgers Students' Commitment to New Brunswick.....	103
Table 7.9:	Rutgers Students' Opinions on How to Improve City.....	104
Table 7.10:	Rutgers Students' Awareness and Approval of Renovation Projects.....	105
Table 7.11:	Rutgers Students' Awareness of Social Service Organizations.....	106

APPENDIX

Table 1.1:	Comparison of 1996 Sample with Past Samples
Table 1.2:	Description of Twelve Neighborhood Areas in New Brunswick

LIST OF FIGURES

PAGE

CHAPTER II

Figure 2.1:	Overall Rating of New Brunswick.....	23
Figure 2.2:	Comparison of New Brunswick Today with Five Years Ago	24
Figure 2.3:	Neighborhood Evaluations of Permanent Residents.....	27
Figure 2.4:	Permanent Residents' Perception of Change in Quality of Neighborhood	29
Figure 2.5:	Permanent Residents' Perception of Crime in New Brunswick Compared to Other Areas.....	31
Figure 2.6:	Permanent Residents' Perceptions of Crime Compared to Two Years Ago	32
Figure 2.7:	Permanent Residents' Commitment to New Brunswick.....	36
Figure 2.8:	Will Revitalization Help or Hurt Low Income Families.....	41

CHAPTER IV

Figure 4.1:	Rating of New Brunswick Schools	57
-------------	---------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER VI

Figure 6.1:	Perception of Johnson & Johnson as Good or Bad for New Brunswick	80
Figure 6.2:	How Much Influence Johnson & Johnson Has in What Happens in New Brunswick.....	84

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is the eleventh in a series of bi-annual 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 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 years. The survey was conducted by telephone May 2-16, 1996 with a random sample of 1,000 New Brunswick residents.

The 1996 survey shows a number of improvements in New Brunswick residents' opinions about the city. These findings are particularly striking when taking into account low positive attitudes about the city found in the 1992 survey. Thus, the current survey continues a reversal of the trend toward negative attitudes about the city first signaled in the 1994 survey. Responses to many of the "quality of life" questions in this year's survey represent positive high points, specifically with regard to perceptions of crime in the city.

The 1996 survey addressed the following topics: perceptions of quality of life in New Brunswick, use of the downtown area, opinions of schools, awareness and approval of renovation projects, awareness and use of social service organizations, and evaluations of the city's prominent institutions. The current report also includes a detailed comparison of the opinions of both the student and permanent resident populations.

Perceptions of Quality of Life

- Half of the city's permanent residents give the city an overall rating of "excellent" (6%) or "good" (45%) as a place to live. Another 35 percent rate it as "only fair" and 12 percent say it is "poor." In 1978 before revitalization and redevelopment efforts began, one-third of the residents said that the city was an "excellent" or "good" place to live.
- One-in-three residents believe New Brunswick is a better place to live than it was 5 years ago, 1-in-4 say it is the same, and one-in-five say it has become worse.
- There have also been further increases among long-term residents in the belief that the city has become a better place to live than it was 15 years ago (62%--up 9 points since 1992), and there continues to be an increase in the number of residents believing that the city will be a better place to live five years from now (56%--up 6 points since 1992).
- Positive ratings of residents' own neighborhoods are similar to the increased ratings found in the 1994 survey, 6-in-10 saying their neighborhood is an excellent (17%) or good (45%) place to live. As in previous studies, a majority of residents (60%) believe that there has been no change in the quality of their neighborhood in the past few years. Also, the gap between those saying their neighborhood has gotten worse (22%) and those saying it has gotten better (14%) continues to narrow.

Perceptions of Crime

■ For the first time since 1990, less than half of city residents (45%) believe there is more crime in New Brunswick than there is in other areas. There has also been an increase in the number of residents who feel that the problem of crime has improved over the past two years (22%--up 7 points since 1994). The number of residents who feel crime has become worse (17%) is at its lowest level since 1984. Moreover, crime is no longer the top reason for leaving New Brunswick mentioned by residents who say they want to move out of the city.

■ New Brunswick residents continue to be more positive about the extent of crime in their own neighborhoods compared to other areas of the city, with 64 percent saying there is less crime where they live. A total of 85 percent say they feel very (26%) or somewhat (59%) safe in their own neighborhood at night, while 13 percent do not feel safe at all.

Commitment to New Brunswick

■ As in past surveys, a majority of residents (57%) say they would prefer to continue to live in New Brunswick. As in the past, the most common reason for wanting to remain in the city are financial concerns (36%). However, for the first time, the desire for a non-urban environment (21%) rather than concerns about crime (14%) is the top reason for wanting to move out of the city.

■ When asked about what should be done to improve the New Brunswick, addressing crime issues such as safety and police protection are mentioned by 45 percent of permanent residents (down from 54% in 1994). Other suggestions include improving housing (36%), continuing economic development efforts (22%), and improving the city's schools (16%).

■ For the first time since the 1982 survey, city residents are more likely to believe that revitalization will help low-income residents (42%) as opposed to hurt them (30%).

Downtown New Brunswick

- Eight-in-ten permanent residents shop in downtown New Brunswick at least occasionally, with 29 percent doing so at least once a week. Those who live in neighborhoods near the downtown area are more likely to be frequent shoppers there. Permanent residents tend to use downtown stores to shop for clothing (25%), shoes (20%), food/groceries (19%), and eat in restaurants (19%).
- Among suggestions given by residents on what would increase their frequency of shopping downtown, nearly 2-in-3 say that having more and/or a better variety of stores would increase their visits downtown, 25 percent mention free or better parking, and 9 percent mention safety and appearance.

Public Schools

- New Brunswick's public schools continue to be rated positively by about one-in-four city residents (26%), while 51 percent give negative ratings (a 12 percentage point decline in negative ratings since 1994). As in past surveys, those residents with children in the public school system (45%) are more likely to be positive about the schools than are those without children in the schools (25%). Also, positive ratings among public school parents are 10 percentage points higher than they were two years ago.
- Residents give higher positive ratings to the public elementary schools in the city (31%) than they do to the public high school (21%).
- Residents opinions on change in the school system have improved in the past two years, with 15 percent saying that the city's schools have improved over the past few years (up from 9% in 1994) and 11% saying the schools have become worse (down from 19% in 1994). This is the first time since 1988 when those who say the city's schools have improved outnumbered those who believe they have become worse. In addition, 48 percent say the schools are the same. The percentage to residents who report they don't know how to assess improvement in the schools has increased 5 percentage points since 1994 to 20 percent. this suggests that residents may be in the process of re-assessing the public schools.

Renovation Projects

- While awareness of five specific construction and renovations project taking place or planned for the city is varied, support for four of the five projects asked about is high. A majority of the city's residents are aware of the Route 1 cinema project (87%), the project to renovate and beautify Boyd Park (65%), and "Renaissance 2000," the project to revitalize the Route 27 corridor adjacent to Franklin Township (59%). Half are aware of the projects to renovate the Livingston Manor Senior Citizen housing project (52%) and the upscale housing planned for "River Watch" (49%).

- Almost all of the those aware of the Livingston Manor project approve of it, and more than 7-in-10 of those aware of the “Renaissance 2000”, Boyd Park, and “River Watch” projects approved of those. Only for Route 1 cinema complex were opinions more divided, with 54 percent of those aware of the project approving of it, compared to 40 percent who disapprove.

Social Services and Child Care

- Nine-in-ten residents are familiar with the Salvation Army (96%) and the American Red Cross (90%). About half are familiar with the Puerto Rican Action Board (54%), and the Hungarian Civic Association (53%), while slightly fewer are aware of Elijah’s Promise (49%) and the Civic League of greater New Brunswick (48%), and the Eric B. Chandler Health Center (48%). Residents are less likely to be familiar with the First Baptist Community Corporation (41%), and St. Johns Community Health Center (34%). Among the organizations listed above, residents are most likely to have used the services of the Salvation Army in the past year (18%). Less than one-in-ten residents report using in the past year any of the other organizations asked about.

- While few permanent residents have read or heard about either the A-STEP teen employment program (32%) or the proposed INFO-LINE social services referral service (12%), about 9-in-10 approve of these based upon their description. Four percent report that someone in their household already participates in A-STEP and a majority of city resident report that they are very (22%) or somewhat (32%) likely to use INFO-LINE once it becomes available.

- Currently one-in-five New Brunswick households with children use some type of child care. Another 63 percent say they do not need it, while another one-in-ten say they do not use child care because they cannot find it. Among those who use child care services, large majorities say they are at least somewhat satisfied with the convenience (94%), quality (88%) and cost (79%) of child care available.

Evaluations of New Brunswick Institutions

- Awareness and approval of the efforts of New Brunswick Tomorrow have increased to their highest levels since first asked about in 1978. In the current survey, 72 percent of permanent residents are aware of NBT, and among them 81 percent approve of what the organization is trying to do. Also 66 percent of those aware of NBT believe that it is succeeding in its efforts to improve the city.

- The belief that Johnson & Johnson is good for the city has remained steady over the past 6 years and currently stands at 79 percent. Moreover, the gap between residents believing that the company has "the right amount" of influence in the city (54%) and those feeling that the company has "too much" influence (29%) is the widest recorded in these surveys.

- Positive evaluations of the effect of Rutgers University on the city also continue

to be high, with 80 percent of the city's permanent residents believing that the university is "good" for the city.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This report is the eleventh in a series of bi-annual 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 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 years. All questions asked in the survey were drafted by Eagleton after consultation with NBT. The survey was conducted by telephone May 2-16, 1996 with a random sample of 1,000 New Brunswick residents. Sampling error for the full sample of respondents is $\pm 3\%$. Sampling error for the sub-sample of 745 permanent residents is $\pm 3.5\%$, and for the sub-sample of 245 student residents is $\pm 6.5\%$.

Overview of the Report

The remainder of this introductory chapter is devoted to providing a summary of the study's methodology, while the substantive findings of the study are discussed in the following five chapters. Chapter II discusses citizen perceptions of the overall quality of life in New Brunswick, evaluations of neighborhood life, mobility plans, and attitudes about crime. Chapter III presents findings regarding participation in activities in the downtown area. Specifically, residents were questioned about their shopping habits in the downtown area. Chapter IV focuses on ratings of New Brunswick public schools, and awareness and support for various construction and renovation projects in the city. The next chapter explores residents awareness and use of various health care and social service organizations in the community. Chapter VI discusses how

citizens see some of the city's more prominent institutions -- Rutgers University, Johnson & Johnson, and New Brunswick Tomorrow. Finally, Chapter VII examines the attitudes and behaviors of Rutgers students, a sometimes overlooked but important part of the city's population. Each chapter in this report contains a narrative description of survey findings followed by supporting tables and figures for that narrative. The full questionnaire is appended, which readers are urged 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, and is bound in a separate volume.

CHAPTER II

THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN NEW BRUNSWICK

This chapter explores New Brunswick 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, both how they feel about their neighborhoods as they are today, and how they assess recent changes in their neighborhoods. The chapter then turns to a discussion of crime, first in the city, then more specifically in the residents' own neighborhoods. 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

As in the 1994 study, about half (51%) of New Brunswick's permanent residents give the city a positive rating as a place to live (Table 2.1). Another 35 percent rate the city as "only fair," while 12 percent say it is a "poor" place to live. While the positive ratings are not as high as they were in the 1984 through 1990 surveys, they are still significantly higher than in 1978 before revitalization and redevelopment efforts began, when one-third residents said the city was an "excellent" or "good" place to live (Figure 2.1). The positive ratings in the past three surveys, seem to signify a leveling off of such ratings since 1990.

There are variations in changes in the ratings given the city by different racial groups since 1992 (Table 2.1). While the positive ratings given the city by whites have remained fairly

consistent, positive ratings given by Hispanics/Latinos have increased from 48 percent in 1992 to 53 percent in 1994 and 57 percent in the current study. Positive ratings by African-American residents which slipped to 38 percent in 1994 have returned to their 1992 level of 46 percent.

Positive evaluations of the city as a place to live also vary by income and education. In both cases, as the amount of education and income increases, so does the likelihood of having a favorable opinion of New Brunswick as a place to live. Thus, those with higher incomes or more education are most likely to give a positive rating to the city. However, those with less than a high school education are more likely to give the city positive ratings now than they were two years ago (52% in 1996 versus 40% in 1994).

Comparison of New Brunswick Today with Five Years Ago

The increase in the proportion of permanent residents who say the city is a better place to live now than it was five years ago in the 1994 survey is maintained in the current survey (Figure 2.2). Whereas in the 1992 study residents were more likely to believe the city had gotten worse (32%) than to believe it had gotten better (27%), in the current study the reverse is true. About one-third of residents (33%) believe the city is better than 5 years ago, while 21 percent say the city is a worse place to live. This latter figure, therefore, represents an 11 percentage drop over four years in the proportion of residents having this opinion. In the current study 44 percent say New Brunswick is the same as it was 5 years ago.

The increase in the proportion of residents believing the city has gotten "better" in the past 5 years continues to reverse a trend in the decline of such beliefs beginning in 1984, when 64 percent of permanent resident thought the city had gotten better. Similarly, the decline in the proportion of residents believing the city has become a "worse" place to live continues to reverse a trend in the continued increase of such beliefs beginning in 1984, when 17 percent held this

opinion.

In the current study whites and Hispanics are more favorable than African-Americans about the changes in the city in the past 5 years. Thirty-six percent of the whites, and 40 percent of Hispanics say the city has become a better place to live, compared to 26 percent of African-Americans (Table 2.2).

Those who have lived in the city for more than 5 years are also more positive about the changes during that time frame than are more recent residents of the changes that have occurred in the city since their arrival. Thirty-five percent of those living in the city for more than 5 years say the city has gotten better in the past 5 years. Those who have lived in the city for 3 to 5 years are more likely than their counterparts two years ago to feel that the city has gotten better (38% in 1996 versus 30% in 1994). Residents of two years or less are most likely to say the city has not changed since their arrival.

Residents earning more than \$30,000 a year are much more likely than those with lower incomes to say the city has become a better place to live in the past 5 years. Thirty-nine percent of those with incomes over \$30,000 a year believe the city has gotten better, compared to about three-in-ten of those with lower incomes. Another one-fourth of those with low incomes believe the city has gotten worse, compared to 15 percent of those with incomes over \$30,000.

Comparison of New Brunswick Today with Fifteen Years Ago

Residents who have lived in the city for 15 years or more were asked to compare present day New Brunswick to its condition "about 15 years ago," or 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 last year's study, the results demonstrate that the majority of long-term permanent 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-two percent of those living in the city for more than 10 years think the city is a better place to live than it was 15 years ago, 27 percent say it is worse, and 9 percent say it is the same. These findings represent a 3 percentage point increase from the 1994 study and a 9 percentage point increase from the 1992 study in positive evaluations of long-term change in the city. These results also reveal that attitudes about change among long-term residents are more positive than when they are asked to think back only five years, with only 35 percent of those living in the city 10 or more years saying New Brunswick has gotten better over the last five years. Again, as in previous surveys, these differences in evaluations clearly reflect a different basis of comparison over different time periods.

Unlike in the 1994 survey, whites (62%) and non-whites (60%) are similar in their beliefs about long-term change in the city, as they were in the 1992 survey, (Table 2.3). Positive evaluations of long-term changes in the city among non-whites, however, has increased in the past four years (from 54% in 1992 to 60% in the current study).

Comparison of New Brunswick Today with Five Years from Now

The majority of New Brunswick's residents remain optimistic about the city's future (56%) (Table 2.4). The increase since the 1992 survey in the number of residents believing the city will be a better place to live five years from now (when 50% held this opinion) continues a reversal in the steady decline that occurred from 1984 to 1992 in the percentage of residents believing the city will get better. Strengthening this argument is the corresponding decline in the number of residents who believe the city will be a worse place to live in five years, with 21 percent now having this opinion.

Permanent Residents Assess their Neighborhoods

A majority of New Brunswick residents continue to be positive about their neighborhoods, with 62 percent rating their neighborhood as either an "excellent" (17%) or "good" (45%) place to live (Table 2.5). Again, these findings represent a reversal from the 1992 survey's dip in favorable ratings of neighborhoods (58%), and are more in keeping with the 1994 and pre-1992 surveys, when between 62 percent and 67 percent of residents consistently gave favorable ratings to their neighborhoods (see Figure 2.3). The remaining 37 percent in the current survey are less positive about their neighborhoods, with about three-in-ten saying their neighborhood is "only fair," and 7 percent saying their neighborhood is a "poor" place to live.

However, while positive evaluations of neighborhoods exist among majorities of all subgroups of residents, African-Americans (57%) and Hispanics/Latinos (60%) are less likely than whites (66%) to rate their neighborhood favorably, and those with incomes under \$30,000 are less likely than those with higher incomes to rate their neighborhood favorably (Table 2.5). However, fewer people with incomes of \$30,000 or less give their neighborhood the lowest rating of poor than they did two years ago (8% in 1996 versus 18% in 1994).

While most residents (60%) continue to report their neighborhood has not changed in the

last few years, fewer report that their neighborhood has become worse (22%) than did so in 1994 (27%) (Figure 2.4). With 14 percent who say their neighborhood has gotten better in the current survey, the gap between those saying their neighborhoods have gotten worse and those saying they have gotten better continues to narrow. In the current study 14 percent say their neighborhoods have gotten better and a 22 percent say they have gotten worse -- an 8 percentage point gap. In the 1992 survey there was a 20 percentage point gap between these beliefs. Thus, again there is further evidence that previously observed trends in negative attitudes about the city have been changing for the better.

Similar to the past several studies, residents age of 50 or older are more likely than those under 50 to say their neighborhoods have gotten worse (Table 2.6). However, compared to the 1992 survey there has been a marked decline in the number of residents aged 65 and over believing their neighborhoods have gotten worse, and since the 1994 survey those age 30 to 49 are less likely to say their neighborhood is worse (21% in 1996 versus 31% in 1994).

Residents living in the city for more than 5 years (26%) are more than twice as likely as those living here for shorter lengths of time (10%) to say their neighborhoods have gotten worse in the past few years. And in a reversal since 1994, non-whites (17%) are now less likely than whites (25%) to believe their neighborhoods have gotten worse. Finally, residents with incomes between \$15,000 and \$30,000 (19%) or less than \$15,000 (24%) are less likely to feel their neighborhood has gotten worse than they did two years ago (31% and 32% respectively).

Perceptions of Crime in New Brunswick

For the first time since 1990, less than half of the city's permanent residents (45%) believe there is more crime in New Brunswick than in other areas (Figure 2.5). Almost four-in-ten believe New Brunswick has the same amount of crime as other areas, while 9 percent say there is

less crime in New Brunswick and 7 percent do not have an opinion.

Similar to previous findings, wide variations between subgroups of residents exist in perceptions of the amount of crime in New Brunswick compared to other areas (Table 2.7). Residents who are younger, whites, those with higher incomes, those with more education, and males are more likely than their respective counterparts to believe the city has more crime than other areas. Moreover, compared to the 1994 survey, fewer women, African-Americans, whites, and residents earning over \$15,000 feel New Brunswick has more crime than felt that way two years ago.

There has been a notable increase in the number of residents saying that the problem of crime in the city is "better" compared to two years ago, up from 15 percent in 1994, to 22 percent in the current survey. Also, the number of permanent residents who feel crime has gotten worse (17%) is at its lowest level since 1984. About half of the residents (54%) now believe there is the same amount of crime, compared to 42 percent in the 1992 survey.

Perceptions of Neighborhood Crime

New Brunswick residents continue to be more positive about the extent of crime in their own neighborhoods compared to that of other neighborhoods in the city. In the current study 64 percent of permanent residents say there is less crime in their own neighborhood than in other neighborhoods (Table 2.8). Twenty-three percent of residents believe their neighborhood has the same amount of crime as other neighborhoods in the city, and 9 percent believe their neighborhood now has more. These results are similar to the 1994 survey.

There are few differences in perceptions of crime in one's own neighborhood among various subgroups of the population. Whites, home-owners, and residents with incomes over \$15,000 are more likely than others to believe their neighborhood has less crime.

Most residents (85%) continue to feel relatively safe in their own neighborhoods at night. In the current survey 26 percent of residents say they feel "very" safe in their own neighborhoods at night and 59 percent feel somewhat safe. Thirteen percent do not feel safe at all in their own neighborhood at night (Table 2.9).

Mobility Plans

As has been the case since 1978, most New Brunswick residents (57%) would choose to stay in the city rather than move out of New Brunswick (Figure 2.7). In the current survey almost half of permanent residents (47%) say they would continue living where they are now, and another 10 percent say they would move to some other location in the city. In comparison, 40 percent would choose to move out of New Brunswick. This number has remained fairly steady over the past six years.

There is some variation in the mobility plans among subgroups of the population of permanent residents. Among the residents who are aged 65 or older, 18 percent say they want to move out of New Brunswick. In comparison, larger percentages of younger residents say they want to leave the city. Residents who are 50 to 64 are more likely to want to move out of New Brunswick now (49%) than they were two years ago (28%). Short-term residents (46%) and those with incomes over \$15,000 (45%) are also more likely than others to want to move out.

The most common reason cited for wanting to move out of the city is the desire to live in a non-urban environment (21%) (Table 2.11). Another 14 percent of those wanting to move out of the city say it is because of high crime, and another 12 percent say it is because of the poor quality of schools. Another reason cited by 11 percent of those wanting to leave the city is because of unsafe streets. This is a change from 1994 when the crime was the reason most often mentioned (22%).

This same group of residents wanting to move out of New Brunswick but still living in the city were asked why they had not yet moved. As in all previous surveys, financial constraints are the primary reason given by a plurality of residents in this situation (36%) (Table 2.12). The next most common reasons given are that the person's job is here (19%) and wanting to be near friends and/or relatives (11%).

Suggestions to Improve the City

When asked what New Brunswick could do to improve the city, 45 percent of residents mention dealing with various crime problems, down from 54 percent in 1994 (Table 2.13). Suggestions for reducing crime include generally making the city safer (18%), dealing with drug problems (13%), and increasing and/or improving police protection (7%). About one-fourth of residents say the city could do something to improve the housing conditions (26%), such as building more housing (7%), building low-income housing in particular (9%), making landlords maintain properties (5%), and replacing old housing projects (5%). Another one-in-five feel that the city should encourage economic development (22%), such as continued improvement of the downtown area (8%), encourage new businesses in the city (6%), lower taxes (4%), and more job opportunities (4%). Another 16 percent feel that the city could improve its schools. Other suggestions for improving New Brunswick include more youth recreation programs (6%) and parks (4%), and more parking spaces (5%) and cleaner streets (4%).

Impact of Revitalization on the Poor

For the first time since the 1982 survey, residents are more likely to believe that revitalization will help low-income residents as opposed to hurting them (Figure 2.8). In the current survey, residents who believe that revitalization will "help" low income residents (42%), outnumber those who believe that it will "hurt" them (30%). Another 17 percent say these

efforts will neither help nor hurt low income residents. In 1992, by comparison, 28 percent of residents thought revitalization would "help" such families, while 42 percent thought it would "hurt" them, and 28 percent said it would do neither. There are some group differences in opinion as to whether revitalization will help or hurt low income families (Table 2.14).

Among those who say revitalization will help low income families, half mention increased job opportunities as the reason they feel this way (Table 2.15). Other reasons why people feel revitalization will help include: better standard of living (19%), better housing conditions (13%) and more affordable housing (12%). The main reason cited by those who feel revitalization will hurt low-income families is that it will force out poor people (55%). Other reasons why people feel revitalization will hurt is that they believe it will increase the cost of living (34%) and lead to worse housing conditions (13%). Those who have lived in the city for 10 years or less (48%) are more likely than others to feel that revitalization will help low income families, whereas African-American residents (40%) are more likely than others to feel it will hurt this group.

Summary

The current survey continues to show results of the positive changes from the 1994 survey in residents' assessments of the quality of life in New Brunswick. These findings are particularly striking when taking into account the low percentages of positive attitudes about the city found in the 1992 survey. Thus, the current survey supports a reversal of the trend toward negative attitudes about the city. Similar to the 1994 survey, about half of the city's permanent residents give the city an overall rating of "excellent" or "good" as a place to live, and continue to be slightly more likely to believe New Brunswick is "better" than it was 5 years ago, and less likely to believe the city is a "worse" place to live. Moreover, there have been further increases among long-term residents in the belief that the city has become a better place to live than it was 15 years ago before revitalization, and there continues to be an increase in the number of residents believing that the city will be a better place to live five years from now.

Positive ratings of residents' own neighborhoods are similar to the increased ratings found in the 1994 survey, again indicating that 1992 may have represented a "bottoming-out" of negative attitudes about the city. Most residents are still likely to believe there has been no change in their neighborhood over the past few years. However, while those saying their neighborhood has gotten worse still outnumber those who say it has gotten better, the gap between those saying their neighborhoods have gotten worse and those saying it has gotten better continues to narrow.

In one of the most notable changes since the 1994 survey, crime in the city is perceived to be less of a problem than it was two years ago. For the first time since 1990, less than half of city residents believe there is more crime in New Brunswick than there is in other areas. There has also been an increase in the number of residents who feel that the problem of crime has

improved over the past two years. Moreover, crime is no longer the top reason for leaving New Brunswick that is mentioned by residents who say they want to move out of the city.

Finally, the current survey also reveals more generally positive attitudes among residents regarding the impact of revitalization on New Brunswick's poorer residents. For the first time since the 1982 survey, residents are more likely to believe that revitalization will help low-income residents as opposed to hurting them.

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>
TOTAL SAMPLE	6%	46%	38%	11%	1%	102%	(1000)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	6	45	35	12	1	99	(755)
<u>By Income</u>							
--Under \$15,000	6	39	38	16	1	100	(135)
--\$15,000 - \$30,000	8	44	34	14	1	101	(177)
--Over \$30,000	4	50	36	9	1	100	(322)
<u>By Race</u>							
--White	7	47	34	11	1	100	(369)
--African-American	4	42	38	15	--	99	(162)
--Hispanic/Latino	10	47	31	10	1	99	(182)
<u>By Education</u>							
--Less than high school	10	42	28	20	1	101	(144)
--High school graduate	7	36	42	14	1	100	(204)
--More than high school	5	51	34	9	1	100	(407)

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>
TOTAL SAMPLE	30%	52%	17%	2%	101%	(1000)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	33	44	21	2	100	(755)
<u>By Length of Residence</u>						
--2 years or less	14	73	9	4	100	(93)
--3 - 5 years	38	51	10	1	100	(119)
--6 years or more	35	38	25	2	100	(543)
<u>By Race</u>						
--White	36	47	16	1	100	(369)
--African-American	26	39	35	1	101	(162)
--Hispanic/Latino	40	41	14	4	99	(182)
<u>By Income</u>						
--Under \$15,000	30	41	24	5	100	(135)
--\$15,000 - \$30,000	28	44	27	1	100	(177)
--Over \$30,000	39	45	15	1	100	(322)

figure 2.1

Figure 2.2

Table 2.3: Comparison of New Brunswick Today With
15 Years Ago Before Revitalization Efforts [Q.4]

(Includes only permanent residents having
lived here for more than 10 years)

		Better	Same	Worse	Don't Know	Total	(n)
TOTAL, 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)
TOTAL, 1994	59	7	30	5	99	(437)	
<u>By Race, 1994</u>							
--White		63	7	24	6	99	(258)
--Non-white		53	7	37	3	99	(167)
TOTAL, 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)

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

	<u>Better</u>	<u>Same</u>	<u>Worse</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>
TOTAL SAMPLE					
1996	56%	12%	21%	11%	100%
1994	55	10	23	12	100
1992	51	8	29	13	101
1990	60	8	18	14	100
1988	67	6	18	10	101
1986	70	5	11	13	99
1984	75	7	8	9	99
1982	73	4	11	12	100
1980	70	6	12	13	101
PERMANENT RESIDENTS					
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

figure 2.3

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	17%	45%	30%	7%	--	99%	(755)
<u>By Race</u>							
--White 19	47	27	7	--	100	(369)	
--African-American	16	41	35	8	--	100	(162)
--Hispanic/Latino	19	41	31	9	--	100	(182)
<u>By Income</u>							
--Under \$15,000	15	35	42	8	--	100	(135)
--\$15,000 - \$30,000	16	46	30	8	--	100	(177)
--Over \$30,000	20	49	24	8	--	101	(322)

figure 2.4

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		14%	22%	60%	4%	100%	(755)
<u>By Length of Residence</u>							
--5 years or less		10	10	70	10	100	(212)
--More than 5 years		16	26	56	2	100	(543)
<u>By Age</u>							
--18 - 29 years	14	12	66	8	100	(212)	
--30 - 49 years	14	21	61	3	99	(276)	
--50 - 64 years	16	33	49	2	100	(105)	
--65 or over		14	25	59	3	101	(148)
<u>By Race</u>							
--White		7	25	66	3	101	(369)
--Non-white		23	17	54	6	100	(371)
<u>By Income</u>							
--Under \$15,000		14	24	56	6	100	(135)
--\$15,000 - \$30,000		21	19	56	5	101	(177)
--Over \$30,000		10	22	65	3	100	(322)

figure 2.5

Figure 2.6

Table 2.7: New Brunswick Residents' Perceptions
of Crime Compared to Other Areas [Q.12]

	<u>More Crime Than Elsewhere</u>	<u>Same Amount of Crime</u>	<u>Less Crime</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>	
TOTAL SAMPLE	46%	37%	8%	8%	99%	(1000)	
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	45	39	9	7	100	(755)	
<u>By Length of Residence</u>							
--10 years or less	46	34	12	9	101	(325)	
--More than 10 years	44	8	6	100	(430)		
<u>By Age</u>							
--18 - 29 years	48	34	10	9	101	(212)	
--30 - 49 years	54	32	9	4	99	(276)	
--50 or over	33	48	9	10	100	(253)	
<u>By Race</u>							
--White	54	36	4	6	100	(369)	
--African-American	35	47	11	7	100	(162)	
--Hispanic/Latino	36	35	20	9	100	(182)	
<u>By Gender</u>							
--Male	52	31	9	7	99	(382)	
--Female		37	46	10	7	100	(373)
<u>By Income</u>							
--Under \$15,000	32	47	17	4	100	(135)	
--\$15,000 - \$30,000	44	36	12	8	100	(177)	
--Over \$30,000	56	34	4	6	100	(322)	
<u>By Education</u>							
--Less than high school	23	52	18	7	100	(144)	
--High school graduate	41	42	11	7	101	(204)	
--More than high school	54	32	6	8	100	(407)	

Table 2.8: Perceptions of Crime in Own Neighborhood Compared to Other New Brunswick Neighborhoods [Q.15]

		<u>More</u>	<u>Less</u>	<u>Same</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
TOTAL SAMPLE		9%	65%	22%	4%	100%	(1000)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS		9	64	23	5	101	(755)
<u>By Income</u>							
--Under \$15,000		14	54	27	5	100	(135)
--\$15,000 - \$30,000		8	65	24	3	100	(177)
--Over \$30,000		8	72	17	3	100	(322)
<u>Own or Rent</u>							
--Own	6	68	21	4	99	(330)	
--Rent	11	62	23	5	101	(395)	
<u>Race</u>							
--White		6	69	20	5	100	(369)
--African-American		10	60	27	3	100	(162)
--Hispanic/Latino		14	58	24	4	100	(182)

Table 2.9: How Safe Permanent Residents Feel in Own Neighborhood at Night [Q.14]

	<u>Very Safe</u>	<u>Somewhat Safe</u>	<u>Not At All Safe</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>
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
1978	31	52	14	3	100

figure 2.7

Table 2.10: Residents' Commitment to New Brunswick [Q.9]

	<u>Continue Where Now</u>	<u>Move Elsewhere In New Brunswick</u>	<u>Move Out Of New Brunswick</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
TOTAL SAMPLE	46%	9%	43%	2%	100%	(1000)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	47	10	40	2	99	(755)
<u>By Length of Residence</u>						
--10 years or less	39	12	46	3	100	(325)
--More than 10 years	52	8	37	2	99	(430)
<u>By Age</u>						
--18 - 29 years	37	14	45	4	100	(212)
--30 - 49 years	40	11	48	1	100	(276)
--50 - 64 years	45	6	49	--	100	(105)
--65 or over	74	4	18	3	99	(148)
<u>By Race</u>						
--White	50	6	43	2	101	(369)
--African-American	44	13	39	3	99	(162)
--Hispanic/Latino	48	14	37	2	101	(182)
<u>By Income</u>						
--Under \$15,000	58	14	26	1	99	(135)
--\$15,000 - \$30,000	44	9	45	2	100	(177)
--Over \$30,000	41	9	49	1	100	(322)

Table 2.11: Reason for Wanting to Move Out of New Brunswick [Q.10]*
(n = 308)

Want non-urban environment	21%
High crime	14
Poor quality schools	12
Unsafe streets	11
New job opportunities	8
City is run down	8
Tired of living in New Brunswick	7
Higher taxes	6
City is dirty	5
Want to live in another city	5
Transportation	4
Leaving school	3
All other	19
Don't know	2

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

Table 2.12: Reason Still Living in New Brunswick [Q.11]

		<u>PERMANENT RESIDENTS</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>
Financial		36%	43%	37%	43%	46%	36%	37%	39%	30%	29%
Job here	19	15	17	21	22	23	24	20	29	23	
Live near transportation		2	2	2	3	1	2	1	2	2	1
Schools		3	2	4	1	2	3	4	3	2	3
College		3	4	8	6	4	5	6	6	4	11
Near friends, relatives		11	10	9	6	8	10	8	9	9	2
Grew up here		4	2	3	7	3	1	5	1	3	1
Haven't found a place yet		5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Own a house/property		5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other		9	19	18	15	12	16	11	18	20	27
Don't know		2	3	2	2	1	3	5	1	2	3
TOTAL		99%	100%	100%	104%	99%	99%	101%	99%	101%	100%

Table 2.13: What New Brunswick Needs To Do To Improve City* [Q.6]

(n = 755)

SAFETY	45%
--Make safer (18%)	
--Deal with drug problem (13%)	
--Increase police force (1%)	
--Better police protection (6%)	
--More foot patrols (4%)	
--Better quality police (3%)	
SCHOOLS	16%
HOUSING	36%
--Build more housing (7%)	
--Renovate old buildings (10%)	
--Build low-income housing (9%)	
--Make landlords maintain property (5%)	
--Replace old housing projects (5%)	
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	22%
--Continue downtown improvement (8%)	
--Encourage new businesses (6%)	
--Lower taxes (4%)	
--More job opportunities (4%)	
--More youth recreation	6%
--More parking	5
--More/ better parks	4
--Clean streets	4
--Other	25
--Don't know	7
--Nothing	3

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

Figure 2.8

Table 2.14: Will Revitalization Help or Hurt Low-Income Families [Q.33]

	<u>Help</u>	<u>Hurt</u>	<u>Both</u>	<u>Neither</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
TOTAL SAMPLE	41%	30%	4%	17%	9%	101%	(1000)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	42	30	3	17	8	100	(755)
<u>By Length of Residence</u>							
--10 years or less	48	26	3	15	8	100	(325)
--More than 10 years	38	32	3	18	8	99	(430)
<u>By Income</u>							
--Under \$15,000	40	28	3	18	11	100	(135)
--\$15,000 - \$30,000	43	29	3	15	10	100	(177)
--Over \$30,000	42	33	3	16	6	100	(322)
<u>By Race</u>							
--White	44	25	4	18	9	100	(369)
--African-American	40	40	3	15	2	100	(162)
--Hispanic/Latino	41	27	3	16	12	99	(182)

Table 2.15: Reasons Why Revitalization Will Help or Hurt Low-Income Families [Q.34]

AMONG THOSE WHO SAY IT WILL HELP (n=314)

--Will provide jobs	52%
--Lead to a better standard of living	19
--Lead to better housing conditions	13
--Lead to more affordable housing	12
--Lead to more public housing	4
--Other	12
--Don't know	10

AMONG THOSE WHO SAY IT WILL HURT (n=222)

--Will force out poor people	55%
--Will increase the cost of living	34
--Worsen housing conditions	13
--Other	13
--Don't know	5

CHAPTER III

DOWNTOWN NEW BRUNSWICK

This chapter examines resident's awareness of and participation in activities in downtown New Brunswick. First, shopping habits are reviewed, both in terms of the frequency with which residents shop in the downtown area, and what they shop for. The chapter also includes a discussion of what residents say would bring them downtown to shop more frequently.

Shopping Patterns of New Brunswick Residents

The frequency with which residents shop downtown has remained at levels fairly consistent with those found in the past several studies with 80 percent doing so at least occasionally (Table 3.1). Twenty-nine percent of permanent residents shop in the downtown areas at least once a week, 21 percent shop there once a month, 30 percent shop there less often and 19 percent never shop in downtown New Brunswick. As may be expected those who live in neighborhoods near the downtown area are more likely than other residents to shop there. Those who are more likely to shop in the downtown area at least once a week include: 40 percent of Downtown residents, 44 percent of West Central residents, 35 percent of East Central residents, and 34 percent of Buccleuch Park area residents. Among those who are less likely to shop downtown once a week includes residents of the Remsen Park area (18%), the Route 1 area (23%), and the Douglass/Cook College area (23%).

Rutgers students in particular continue to be an important source of patronage for downtown merchants. Almost all students (96%) shop downtown at least occasionally, with 41 percent who do so at least once a week.

When asked what they shop for in downtown New Brunswick, residents who do so at

least occasionally are most likely to say they do so to get clothing (25%), shoes (20%), or food and groceries (19%) (Table 3.2). Another 19 percent say they go to restaurants in the downtown area, and 14 percent shop for books or music albums/CDS. Slightly fewer residents purchase pharmaceutical (i.e., medicine, drugs, cosmetics) (13%), or household items (8%). When compared to permanent residents, Students are more likely to shop downtown for food and groceries (29%), books and music (31%), and pharmaceuticals (23%).

Residents were asked what changes or improvements could be made in the downtown area to bring them shopping there more often. A majority (64%) responded that bringing in new or different types of stores would increase their downtown shopping (Table 3.3). While many residents cite the need for "more stores" (28%), others want better quality stores (14%), more/better clothing or shoe stores (4%), a department store (4%), or a discount store (6%). In addition to improving the selection of stores, a number of residents would like to see improvements in the parking situation downtown. Twenty-five percent of residents say they would shop downtown more often if parking were improved (including more parking (11%), and/or free parking (5%)).

One-in-four residents do not mention anything that could be done to get them to shop downtown more often. Also, Rutgers students (19%) are more likely than permanent residents (9%) to mention improving safety and cleanliness as ways to get them to shop downtown more often.

Importance of Culture to Revitalization

The importance of culture in New Brunswick's revitalization continues to be felt by a

majority of the city's residents. Similar to the 1992 and 1994 surveys, a total of 90 percent of residents believe culture plays a "very" (65%) or "somewhat" (25%) role in revitalization. As in the past, those with higher incomes, and more education are especially likely to believe culture is "very important" to the revitalization of New Brunswick.

Summary

The frequency with which residents shop downtown has remained at levels fairly consistent with those found over the past several years, with 81 percent of permanent residents doing so at least occasionally. Those who live in neighborhoods near the downtown area are more likely to be frequent shoppers there. Also as indicated in past surveys, Rutgers students continue to be important patrons of the downtown area, with 96 percent of them saying they shop downtown at least occasionally. Students and permanent residents also have different shopping patterns, with students more likely to purchase food and groceries, books and music, and pharmaceuticals in downtown New Brunswick. Students are also more likely to say that improving cleanliness and safety will get them to shop downtown more often.

Table 3.1: How Often New Brunswick Residents Shop Downtown [Q.20]

	<u>More Than Once a Week</u>	<u>Once A Week</u>	<u>Once A Month</u>	<u>Less Than Once a Month</u>	<u>Not At All</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>TOTAL SAMPLE</u>						
1996	13%	19%	24%	28%	16%	100%
1994	13	20	21	28	17	99
1992	14	19	24	29	13	99
1990	14	22	22	23	19	100
1988	16	23	23	20	18	100
1986	13	19	25	25	18	100
1984	17	21	26	18	16	99
1978	16	20	21	21	21	99
<u>PERMANENT RESIDENTS</u>						
1996	13	16	21	30	19	99
1994	12	18	20	30	20	100
1992	14	16	22	33	16	101
1990	13	19	21	25	22	100
1988	16	19	20	23	22	100
1986	13	15	23	27	21	99
1984	16	18	24	21	29	100
1978	16	18	20	22	24	100
<u>STUDENTS</u>						
1996	11	30	32	23	4	100
1994	19	36	28	14	3	100
1992	16	32	33	16	2	99
1990	16	36	26	18	4	100
1988	17	35	32	10	5	99
1986	12	34	34	14	5	99
1984	23	34	32	7	4	100
1978	15	35	29	18	4	101

Table 3.2: What Residents Shop For Downtown* [Q.21]

	Permanent Residents (<i>n</i> =755)	Students (<i>n</i> =245)
Clothing	25%	28%
Shoes	20	9
Food/groceries	19	29
Restaurants	19	17
Books/music/CDS	14	31
Medicine/cosmetics/drugs	13	23
Household items	8	8
Banking	5	5
Theater/Entertainment	4	3
Gifts	3	10
Jewelry	3	1
Office supplies	3	2
Medical care	2	1
Appliances	1	1
Furniture	1	--
Other	11	4

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

Table 3.3: What Would Increase Residents' Frequency [Q.22]
of Shopping Downtown

	<u>Permanent Residents</u> (n=755)	<u>Students</u> (n=245)
STORES	64%	53%
--More stores	28	29
--Better quality stores	14	12
--Clothing/shoe store	4	3
--Department store	4	1
--Discount stores	6	3
--Restaurants	2	1
--Movie Theater	1	1
--Other store mentions	5	3
PARKING	25	13
--More parking	11	7
--Free parking	5	2
--Other parking mentions	9	4
SAFETY AND APPEARANCE	9	19
--Clean up area	3	8
--Make safer at night	2	1
--Make safer-general	4	10
OTHER	8	12
NOTHING/DON'T KNOW	23	31

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

Table 3.4: Importance of Culture in Revitalization of New Brunswick [Q.23]
(n=755)

	<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>						
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

CHAPTER IV SCHOOLS AND RENOVATION PROGRAMS

This chapter focuses on an assessment of the city's public schools, as well as on renovation programs going on in the city. The first part of the chapter examines residents ratings of the public schools in New Brunswick in general, followed by more specific assessments of the high school and elementary schools. It then turns to awareness and evaluations of several different renovation programs. These programs include "Renaissance 2000," the beautification of Boyd Park, the "River Watch" project, renovation of Livingston Manor Senior Citizens housing, and the new Route 1 cinema complex.

Ratings of Public Schools

New Brunswick's public schools continue to be rated positively by about one-fourth of the city's permanent residents (26%), a figure that has remained fairly constant since about 1984 (Figure 4.1). Thirty percent rate the public schools as "only fair," while 21 percent rate them as "poor". This represents a 12 percentage point decline in negative responses from 1994. Twenty-three percent of residents do not offer an opinion as to the ratings of the public schools in the city (up from 13 percent in 1994).

Similar to findings in previous studies, residents with children in the New Brunswick public school system (45%) are much more positive than other parents (25%) and non-parents (22%) about the schools (Table 4.1). Also the positive ratings among parents of public school children are higher than two years ago. In the current survey, 45 percent of this group rates New Brunswick's schools as excellent (10%) or good (35%) compared with 35 percent who said the same in 1994. In the current survey 33 percent of these parents rate the schools as "only fair" and 17 percent rate them as "poor".

Opinions of the schools in the city also vary by race. Hispanic/Latinos (38%) and African-Americans (33%) are more likely than white residents (18%) to give the city's schools positive ratings. Also, more African-Americans give the schools positive ratings than did so two years ago (23%).

There has been an 8 percentage point decrease in the proportion of permanent residents (11%) who say the city's public schools are "worse" than they were two years ago (Table 4.2). This figure reflects a return to pre-1990 levels in negative assessments of change in the schools, when 12 percent of the residents felt this way. In addition, the proportion of residents saying that the schools have gotten better in the past two years increased somewhat to 15 percent, also a return to pre-1994 levels. Almost half say there has been "no change" in the public schools in the recent past (48%).

Ratings of New Brunswick High School

When asked specifically about New Brunswick High School, about one-in-five permanent residents give it a positive rating of either "excellent" (2%) or "good" (19%) (Table 4.3). Thirty-two percent rate the high school as "only fair," and 16 percent say it is "poor." In the past two years the poor rating have declined 5 percentage points. Another 31 percent of residents, however, do not have an opinion on the question. Since 1994 there has been a 10 percentage point increase in those who say they don't know.

Like the ratings for the city's schools in general, those residents with children in the public school system (31%) are more positive about the high school than are other parents (23%) and the general public (18%). However, those residents who have children between the ages of 13 and 17 in the household (24%) are more likely than other parents (12%) and the general public (16%) to rate the high school as "poor".

Ratings of New Brunswick Elementary Schools

Permanent residents are more positive about the public elementary schools in the city than they are about the high school. Three-in-ten permanent residents rate the elementary schools as either "excellent" (4%) or "good" (27%) (Table 4.4). Thirty-one percent rate them as "only fair," 10 percent as "poor," and 28 percent offer no opinion. Similar to the high school, poor ratings have declined 6 percentage points since 1994.

Those residents with children in the public school system in the city are even more positive about the elementary schools, but this is primarily due to a decrease among this group in the numbers having no opinion on the schools. However, among residents with children in the school system, 11 percent rate the elementary schools as "excellent," and 36 percent rate them as "good."

Renovation Programs

Residents were asked about their awareness and approval of five different renovation programs in the city. Residents are most likely to be aware of the new cinema complex at the old Route 1 Flea Market site (87%) project (Table 4.5). This is followed by awareness of the project to renovate and beautify Boyd Park (65%); "Renaissance 2000," the project to revitalize the Route 27 corridor adjacent to Franklin township (59%); the Livingston Manor Senior Citizen housing renovation (52%); and the proposal to build upscale rental housing in the area designated as "River Watch" (49%).

There are some consistent sub-group differences in awareness of these various construction/renovation projects. Awareness of each of the projects increases with length of residency, age and income. For example, the longer one has been living in the city or the older

one is, the more likely he or she is to be aware of the project. In addition, there are some racial differences in awareness of some of the projects. Specifically, white residents are more likely than non-whites to be aware of the Boyd Park project and the “River Watch” project, and whites along with African-Americans are more likely than Hispanics/Latinos to be aware of "Renaissance 2000" and the Route 1 cinema complex. African-Americans are more likely than either whites or Hispanics/Latinos, on the other hand, to be aware of the Livingston Manor project.

There is relatively high support for four of the five renovation projects among those who are aware of them. Ninety-four percent of those aware of the Livingston Manor renovation approve of it, 79 percent of those aware of “Renaissance 2000” approve of the project, 76 percent of those aware of the Boyd Park renovation project approve of it, and 71 percent of those aware of the upscale housing proposal for “River Watch” approve of it. In comparison, 54 percent of permanent city residents who are aware of the Route 1 cinema project approve of it and 40 percent disapprove.

Among those aware of these five renovation projects those who have lived in New Brunswick for 10 years or less are more likely than longer term residents to support the Boyd Park, “River Watch”, and Route 1 cinema projects, while older term residents are more likely to support Livingston Manor and “Renaissance 2000”. White residents are somewhat less likely to approve of the Boyd Park renovation and African-American residents are somewhat less likely to approve of the “River Watch” and Route 1 cinema projects.

Summary

Overall, there has an increase of 6 percentage points from 9 to 15 percent in those who say the New Brunswick public schools are better than 2 years ago. When it comes to specific

ratings, a majority of the city's residents continue to give the public schools in the city a negative rating, although, as in past surveys, those with children in the public school system are slightly more positive about the schools than are those without children in the schools. New Brunswick High School receives a positive rating by about one-fourth of residents (21%). Residents are slightly more positive about the public elementary schools in the city (31%). Also, since 1992 there is a decline in the percentage of residents giving poor ratings. Overall, those with higher incomes, with more education, and whites are less likely than others to give positive ratings to either the high school, the elementary schools, or the school system in general.

While awareness of five specific construction and renovations project taking place or planned for the city is varied, support for four of the five projects asked about is high. A majority of the city's residents are aware of the Route 1 cinema project (87%), the project to renovate and beautify Boyd Park (65%), and "Renaissance 2000," the project to revitalize the Route 27 corridor adjacent to Franklin Township (59%). Less likely to be widely known about are the projects to renovate the Livingston Manor Senior Citizen housing project (52%) and the upscale housing planned for "River Watch" (49%). Almost all of those aware of the Livingston Manor project approve of it, and more than 7-in-10 of those aware of the "Renaissance 2000", Boyd Park, and "River Watch" projects approved of those. Only for Route 1 cinema complex are opinions more divided, with 54 percent of those aware of the project approving it, compared to 40 percent who disapprove.

Figure 4.1

Table 4.1: Rating of New Brunswick Public Schools [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	4%	22%	30%	21%	23%	100%	(755)
<u>By Income</u>							
--Under \$15,000	6	23	32	8	32	101	(135)
--\$15,000 - \$30,000	4	24	29	21	21	99	(177)
--Over \$30,000	4	20	30	28	18	100	(322)
<u>By Race</u>							
--White	1	17	32	24	26	100	(369)
--African-American	5	28	33	21	14	101	(162)
--Hispanic/Latino	9	29	21	15	26	100	(182)
<u>By Education</u>							
--Less than high school	5	26	32	12	24	99	(144)
--High school graduate	6	29	26	20	19	100	(204)
--More than high school	2	17	32	25	24	100	(407)
<u>By Presence of Children in Household</u>							
--Yes	8	27	33	24	8	100	(231)
--No	2	20	29	21	29	101	(514)
<u>Does Any Child in Household Attend Public School</u>							
--Yes	10	35	33	17	5	100	(116)
--No	6	19	33	30	11	99	(119)

Table 4.2: Comparison of New Brunswick Public

Schools with Two Years Ago [Q.17]

	Better	Worse	Same	Not Here	Don't Know	Total
<u>TOTAL SAMPLE</u>						
1996	15%	11%	48%	6%	20%	100%
1994	9	19	54	3	15	100
1992	13	15	51	4	18	101
1990	13	12	41	8	27	101
1988	14	11	48	2	24	99
1986	16	11	43	4	26	100
1984	23	8	32	9	28	100
1982	12	12	31	13	32	100
1980	12	22	38	8	20	100
<u>PERMANENT RESIDENTS</u>						
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 4.3: Resident's Ratings of New Brunswick High School [Q.18]
(n=755)

	<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	2%	19%	32%	16%	31%	100%	(755)
<u>By Age</u>							
--18 - 29 years	3	20	37	10	30	100	(212)
--30 - 49 years	1	18	34	22	25	100	(276)
--50 or over	3	19	27	15	36	100	(253)
<u>By Income</u>							
--Under \$15,000	3	20	33	7	37	100	(135)
--\$15,000 - \$30,000	3	18	35	14	30	100	(177)
--Over \$30,000	2	19	29	23	27	100	(322)
<u>By Race</u>							
--White	1	14	33	19	33	100	(369)
--African-American	3	25	37	14	21	100	(162)
--Hispanic/Latino	5	25	21	13	35	99	(182)
<u>By Education</u>							
--Less than high school	3	20	30	9	39	101	(144)
--High school graduate	5	25	30	16	24	100	(204)
--More than high school	1	16	34	18	31	100	(407)
<u>By Presence of Children in Household</u>							
--Yes	4	24	36	17	19	100	(231)
--No	2	16	31	16	35	100	(514)
<u>Does Any Child in Household Attend Public School</u>							
--Yes	5	26	38	12	19	100	(116)
--No	2	21	35	23	18	99	(119)
<u>Children in Household Ages 13 - 17</u>							
--Yes	4	28	37	24	8	101	(81)
--No	3	20	35	12	29	99	(214)

Table 4.4: Resident's Ratings of New Brunswick
Elementary Schools [Q.19]
(n=755)

	Excellent	Good	Only Fair	Poor	Don't Know	Total	(n)
Permanent Residents	4%	27%	31%	10%	28%	100%	(755)
<u>By Age</u>							
--18 - 29 years	6	25	28	8	34	101	(212)
--30 - 49 years	6	28	33	15	18	100	(276)
--50 or over	2	27	30	8	33	100	(253)
<u>By Income</u>							
--Under \$15,000	8	32	25	6	30	100	(135)
--\$15,000 - \$30,000	4	26	30	12	27	99	(177)
--Over \$30,000	3	26	33	14	24	100	(322)
<u>By Race</u>							
--White	2	21	34	11	31	99	(369)
--African-American	6	36	28	10	19	99	(162)
--Hispanic/Latino	9	29	25	9	27	99	(182)
<u>By Education</u>							
--Less than high school	6	32	27	5	30	100	(144)
--High school graduate	6	29	32	9	24	100	(204)
--More than high school	3	24	32	13	29	101	(407)
<u>By Presence of Children in Household</u>							
--Yes	7	33	34	13	12	99	(231)
--No	3	23	30	9	34	99	(514)
<u>Does Any Child in Household Attend Public School</u>							
--Yes	11	36	32	11	9	99	(116)
--No	4	30	37	15	15	101	(119)
<u>Children in Household Ages 6 - 12</u>							
--Yes	9	33	32	18	9	101	(117)
--No	4	28	36	8	24	100	(178)

Table 4.5: Permanent Residents' Awareness of Renovation Projects [Q.24]

	Cinema Complex At Route 1 Flea Market Site	Boyd Park Renovation	"Renaissance 2000"	Livingston Manor	"River Watch" Upscale Housing	(n)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	87%	65%	59%	52%	49%	(755)
<u>By Length of Residence</u>						
--10 years or less	81	48	43	42	37	(325)
--More than 10 years	91	77	70	59	58	(430)
<u>By Age</u>						
--18 - 29	82	50	40	37	26	(212)
--30 - 49	90	72	64	52	55	(276)
--50 and older	88	71	68	64	61	(253)
<u>By Race</u>						
--White	90	73	64	51	58	(369)
--African-American	90	62	62	61	48	(162)
--Hispanic/Latino	75	54	44	43	30	(182)
<u>By Income</u>						
--Under \$15,000	76	52	47	47	38	(135)
--\$15,000 - \$30,000	91	66	56	52	52	(177)
--Over \$30,000	90	74	68	56	58	(322)

Table 4.6: Approval of Renovation Projects [Q.24]

(Among Permanent Residents Aware of Projects.)

	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
Livingston Manor Senior Housing Renovation	94%	3%	3%	100%	(381)
'Renaissance 2000'	79	10	10	99	(431)
Boyd Park renovation	76	18	6	100	(483)
“River Watch” upscale housing	71	18	10	99	(359)
Cinema Complex at Route 1 Flea Market site	54	40	6	100	(645)

Table 4.7: Those Who Approve of Renovation Projects [Q.24]
(Among those Aware of Project)

	Livingston Manor (n=381)	"Renaissance 2000" (n=431)	Boyd Park Renovation (n=483)	"River Watch" Upscale Housing (n=359)	Cinema Complex At Route 1 Flea Market Site (n=645)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	94%	79%	76%	71%	54%
<u>By Length of Residence</u>					
--10 years or less	90	76	86	79	60
--More than 10 years	95	81	72	68	51
<u>By Age</u>					
--18 - 29	91	70	88	78	56
--30 - 49	94	82	77	72	55
--50 and older	94	82	69	69	52
<u>By Race</u>					
--White	92	81	72	74	56
--African-American	97	76	81	67	48
--Hispanic/Latino	92	81	83	74	61
<u>By Income</u>					
--Under \$15,000	97	77	78	68	51
--\$15,000 - \$30,000	94	82	77	77	52
--Over \$30,000	94	82	78	71	56

CHAPTER V

SOCIAL SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS AND CHILD CARE

The 1994 survey included a series of questions about residents' awareness and use of various social service agencies. This chapter, examines whether there has been any change in use and awareness of these agencies over the past two years, and also looks at some agencies new to the 1996 survey. Finally, this chapter looks at use of child care services by city residents.

Social Service Organizations

There are a number of different organizations in New Brunswick to which the city's residents can turn for various types of assistance, such as social services and health care. In the current survey, residents were asked about both their awareness and use of nine of these organizations. Of the organizations asked about, residents are most likely to be familiar with the local chapters of large, national organizations, specifically, the Salvation Army (96%), and the American Red Cross (90%). A majority of residents are also aware of the Puerto Rican Action Board (54%) and the Hungarian Civic Association (53%). Slightly fewer residents are familiar with, the Civic League of greater New Brunswick (48%), the Eric B. Chandler Health Center (48%) and Elijah's Promise (47%). Residents are less likely to be familiar with the First Baptist Community Corporation of Renaissance 2000 (41%) and St. Johns Community Health Center (34%). Awareness levels for these organizations are similar to the results from the 1994 survey.

There are large differences in awareness of these organizations among sub-groups of residents. Length of residency in the city, age, income, race, and gender all relate to how likely one is to know about these social service and health care agencies. Long-term residents are more likely than more recent arrivals to the city to be aware of each of the organizations asked about.

Older residents, women, and those with higher incomes are also more likely than others to be aware of each of the organizations.

Race is related to awareness of the various organizations in a number of different ways. White residents are more likely than either African-Americans or Hispanics/Latinos to be aware of the American Red Cross, the Hungarian Civic Association and Elijah's Promise. African-Americans and Hispanics/Latinos are more likely than white residents to be aware of the Puerto Rican Action Board. African-Americans are more familiar than either Hispanics/Latinos or whites with the Civic League of Greater New Brunswick, the Eric B. Chandler Health Center, and the First Baptist Community Corporation.

Utilization of Organizations

Those residents saying they were familiar with an organization were asked if they had gone to the organization for assistance with social services or health care in the past year. Table 5.2 presents use of each of these organizations based upon the entire sample of permanent residents. The organization residents were most likely to have used in the past year was the Salvation Army (18%).

Used in the past year by less than one-in-ten permanent residents were the Eric B. Chandler Health Center (9%), the American Red Cross (6%), the Puerto Rican Action Board (5%), the Hungarian Civic Association (5%), and the Civic League of New Brunswick (4%). Also used by a small percentage of city residents in the past year were Elijah's Promise (3%), the First Baptist Community Corporation (3%) and St. John's Community Health Center (2%). These findings are similar to the results from the 1994 survey.

The A-Step Program

Residents were asked about A-STEP — the Alliance for Successful Teen Employment

Program. This is a cooperative program to provide skills training and job placement for young people in New Brunswick. While only one-third of city residents (32%) have read or heard anything about this program, 93 percent say they approve of it based upon the description given (Table 5.3). African-American (40%) and Hispanic/Latino (34%) residents are more likely than white residents (27%) to be aware of this program. Furthermore, 4 percent of residents report that someone in their household has participated in A-STEP.

The INFO-LINE Service

Residents were also asked their opinion about a plan to develop a computerized social service information and referral service called INFO-LINE. People who need information about housing, health, or other social services can make one phone call to find out which services are available. While only 12 percent say they have read or heard anything about this proposed service, 87 percent of residents say they approve of it based upon the description given (Table 5.4).

Just over half of city residents (54%) say they are very (22%) or somewhat (32%) likely to use INFO-LINE when it becomes available, while 19 percent say they are not very likely to use it and 23 percent say they are not at all likely to use it. Residents who are more apt to say they are at least somewhat likely to use INFO-LINE include: those with children in the household (70%), those who have lived in the city for 10 years or less (59%), and those who earn \$15,000 a year or less (63%). Residents age 65 or older (42%) and white residents (40%) are least likely to use INFO-LINE. However, 7-in-10 of those residents who said they would not be likely to use INFO-LINE said it was because they did not need the social services referenced, while 26 percent said there were other reasons why they would not use it.

Use of Child Care

Residents with children in their household were asked about their use of child care services. About one-in-five households with children use some type of child care (22%) (Table 5.5). Of the remainder, 63 percent do not use child care because they do not need it and 11 percent do not use child care because they cannot find it.

Among those who do use child care, about 8-in-10 or more say they are either very or somewhat satisfied with the quality (88%), convenience (94%), and cost (79%) of the child care services they use (Table 5.6). Moreover, 67 percent of those who use child care say they are very satisfied with the quality of that care, 55 percent are very satisfied with the convenience of their child care services, and 50 percent are very satisfied with the cost of child care.

Summary

This survey included a series of questions about resident's awareness and use of various social service and health care organizations. As well as a proposed service (INFO-LINE) and child care issues.

Of the number of different social service and health care organizations asked about, residents are most likely to be familiar with the local chapters of large, national organizations. About 9-in-10 residents are familiar with the Salvation Army, and the American Red Cross. A majority of residents are familiar with the Puerto Rican Action Board (54%), and the Hungarian Civic Association (53%), while slightly fewer are aware of the Civic League of Greater New Brunswick (48%), the Eric B. Chandler Health Center (48%), and Elijah's Promise (47%). Residents are less likely to be familiar with — the First Baptist Community Corporation (41%), and St. Johns Community Health Center (34%).

Looking at all residents, regardless of their awareness of each of the organizations asked about, the survey finds that residents are most likely to have used is the Salvation Army (18%).

Less than one-in-ten residents report using any of the other organizations asked about in the past year.

While few permanent residents have read or heard about either the A-STEP teen employment program (32%) or the proposed INFO-LINE social services referral service (12%), about 9-in-10 approve of these based upon their description.

Four percent report that someone in their household already participates in A-STEP and a majority of city resident report that they are very (22%) or somewhat (32%) likely to use INFO-LINE once it becomes available.

On another service issue, currently one-in-five New Brunswick households with children use some type of child care. Sixty-three percent say they do not need it, while another one-in-ten say they do not use child care because they cannot find it. Among those who do use child care, large majorities say they are at least somewhat satisfied with the convenience (94%), quality (88%) and cost (79%) of child care available.

Table 5.1: Awareness of Social Service Organizations [Q.35]
(For All Permanent Residents)

	Salvation Army	American Red Cross	Puerto Rican Action Board	Hungarian Civic Assoc.	Civic League Of Greater New Brunswick	Eric B. Chandler Health Center	Elijah's Promise	First Baptist Community Corporation	St. John's Community Health Center	(n)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	96%	90%	54%	53%	48%	48%	47%	41%	34%	(755)
<u>By Length of Residence</u>										
--10 years or less	94	88	38	36	26	35	37	31	27	(325)
--More than 10 years	97	92	65	64	62	56	54	48	39	(430)
<u>Gender</u>										
--Male	95	89	47	49	41	40	41	39	31	(382)
--Female	96	92	61	56	55	58	54	44	37	(373)
<u>By Age</u>										
--18 - 29	95	86	38	34	33	41	34	24	26	(212)
--30 - 49	95	91	60	52	51	50	48	50	33	(276)
--50 and older	97	93	60	67	57	52	57	46	41	(253)
<u>By Race</u>										
--White	98	95	49	63	44	43	57	37	37	(369)
--African-American	97	89	61	43	64	63	43	58	31	(162)
--Hispanic/Latino	89	82	64	41	37	46	27	32	33	(182)
<u>By Income</u>										
--Under \$15,000	91	84	52	40	42	48	35	35	31	(135)
--\$15,000 - \$30,000	97	91	60	54	50	53	47	39	37	(177)
--Over \$30,000	97	93	56	59	50	47	54	49	34	(322)
<u>Past Surveys</u>										
Permanent Residents, 1994	94	89	54	59	48	44	n/a	n/a	34	(885)

Table 5.2: Use of Social Service Organizations In The Past Year [Q.36]

(For All Permanent Residents)

	<i>USED IN PAST YEAR</i>	
	<u>1996</u> (n=755)	<u>1994</u> (n=885)
Salvation Army	18%	17%
Eric B. Chandler Health Center	9	8
American Red Cross	6	6
Puerto Rican Action Board	5	5
Hungarian Civic Association	5	6
Civic League of Greater New Brunswick	4	4
Elijah's Promise	3	n/a*
First Baptist Community Corporation	3	n/a*
St. John's Community Health Center	2	3

* Not asked.

Table 5.3: Evaluation of A-STEP Program [Q.25]

(n=755)

Are Aware of Program	32%
Approve of Program	93
Someone in household has participated in the program	4

Table 5.4: Evaluation of INFO-LINE Service [Q.26]

(n=755)

Are Aware of Service 12%

Approve of Service 87

Likelihood of Using INFO-LINE:

	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Not Very Likely	Not At All Likely	Don't Know	Total	(n)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	22%	32%	19%	23%	4%	100%	(755)
<u>Length of Residence</u>							
--10 years or less	25	34	21	17	3	100	(325)
--More than 10 years	21	30	17	28	4	100	(430)
<u>Any Children in Household</u>							
--Yes	35	35	13	14	3	100	(231)
--No	17	31	21	28	4	101	(514)
<u>Anyone age 65 or Over in Household</u>							
--Yes	21	26	16	31	6	100	(212)
--No	23	34	20	20	2	99	(531)
<u>Age</u>							
--18 - 29	27	32	22	17	3	101	(212)
--30 -49	23	34	19	22	2	100	(276)
--50 - 64	23	34	16	27	1	101	(105)
--65 and older	16	26	17	32	8	99	(148)
<u>Income</u>							
--\$15,000 or less	31	32	14	18	5	100	(135)
--\$15,000 - \$30,000	22	32	18	23	5	100	(177)
--Over \$30,000	19	35	21	24	1	100	(322)
<u>Race</u>							
--White	8	32	28	29	3	100	(369)
--African-American	40	31	9	15	4	99	(162)
--Hispanic/Latino	36	30	8	20	5	99	(182)

Table 5.5: Use of Child Care [Q.42]

(Among Those Who Have Children in the Household)

(n=231)

Yes, currently use child care	22%
Do not use child care because they do not need it	63
Do not use child care because they cannot find it	11
Don't know	3
TOTAL	99%

Table 5.6: Satisfaction with Child Care [Q.42]

(Among Those Using Child Care Now)

	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Satisfied	Don't Know	Total	(n)
Quality	67%	21%	11%	2%	101%	(54)
Convenience	55	39	5	2	101	(54)
Cost	50	29	19	2	100	(54)

CHAPTER VI
EVALUATIONS OF NEW BRUNSWICK TOMORROW,
JOHNSON & JOHNSON, AND RUTGERS

As in past years, the 1996 survey includes questions intended to gauge residents' opinions of some of the major institutions in New Brunswick. The first section of this chapter presents the findings regarding awareness and attitudes towards New Brunswick Tomorrow, and the next two discuss Johnson & Johnson and Rutgers University, respectively.

New Brunswick Tomorrow

A growing majority of permanent residents (72%) are aware of New Brunswick Tomorrow. Long-term residents, older residents, those with higher incomes, those with more education, whites, and women are more likely than their respective counterparts to say they have heard or read about NBT (Table 6.1). Over the past two years, NBT has made gain in awareness among Hispanic/Latinos (59% up 8 points from 1994), those with incomes between \$15,000 - \$30,000 (73% up 9 points), and those with less than a high school education (66% up 8 points).

Public approval of NBT's efforts increased 6 points since the 1994 survey, and at 81 percent among permanent residents, is now at its highest level since first asked in 1978 (Table 6.3). Eight-in-ten permanent residents approve of what the organization is trying to do, 6 percent disapprove, and 13 percent do not have an opinion (Table 6.2). Approval ratings have improved among virtually every population group and are now similar for all levels of education, age groups and race.

Notable increases are seen among approval ratings of African-Americans (81% up 13 points from 1994) and residents with less than a high school education (83% up 20 points from 1994). Most of these increases were due to the fact that less members of these groups said they had no opinion about NBT than they did in 1994.

Two-thirds of permanent residents in the current survey believe NBT is succeeding in improving New Brunswick. While there has been no increase since 1994 in the proportion of residents who believe NBT is succeeding in its efforts to improve the city, the current results maintain the 11 point increase which occurred from 1992 to 1994 (Table 6.4).

Johnson & Johnson

The belief that Johnson & Johnson is good for the city has remained steady over the past six years, with 79 percent of permanent residents in the current survey having this opinion (Figure 6.1). Just 3 percent believe the company is "bad" for the city, while 16 percent say the presence of the company makes no difference in the city.

Beliefs about whether Johnson & Johnson is good for the city vary by income, education, and race (Table 6.5). As income and education increase, so does the likelihood that one believes the company is good for the city. Also, as in the 1994 survey, whites (83%) and Hispanics/Latinos (81%) are more likely than African-Americans (68%) to say Johnson & Johnson is good for New Brunswick.

Although there has not been a lot of variation in past surveys in the proportion of residents believing that Johnson & Johnson has "the right amount" of influence in the city, the findings for the current survey represent the largest proportion of residents ever expressing this opinion (54%)(Figure 6.2). And, the proportion of residents believing the company has "too much" influence in the city continues to be at an all-time low since the question was first asked in 1978, with 29 percent in the current survey and in 1994 having this opinion. Thus, the gap between those believing the company has "the right amount" versus "too much" of influence is now the widest recorded in these surveys. Again, as in past surveys, few permanent residents believe the company has "too little" influence (6%).

Rutgers University

An overwhelming majority of permanent residents continue to believe Rutgers University is

"good" for the city (Table 6.7). In the current survey, 80 percent of permanent residents say Rutgers is good for New Brunswick. In comparison, 93 percent of Rutgers Students feel the University is good for the city.

Summary

Awareness and approval of the efforts of NBT has increased to the highest levels since first asked about in 1978. In the current survey 72 percent of permanent residents are aware of NBT, and among them 81 percent approve of what the organization is trying to do. At 66 percent, there continues to be a large proportion of residents who believe NBT is succeeding in its efforts to improve the city. The belief that Johnson & Johnson is good for the city has remained steady over the past 6 years and currently stands at 79 percent. Moreover, the gap between residents believing that the company has "the right amount" of influence in the city (54%) and those feeling that the company has "too much" influence (29%) is the widest recorded in these surveys.

Finally, positive evaluations of the effect of Rutgers University on the city also continue to be high, with 80 percent of the city's permanent residents believing that the university is "good" for the city.

figure 6.1

Table 6.1: Awareness of NBT [Q.30]

	<u>Heard Of</u>	<u>Not Heard Of</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
TOTAL SAMPLE	60%	39%	1%	100%	(1000)
RUTGERS STUDENTS	22	78	1	101	(245)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	72	27	1	100	(755)
<u>By Length of Residence</u>					
--10 years or less	47	53	1	101	(325)
--More than 10 years	89	10	1	100	(430)
<u>By Residence Type</u>					
--Own	85	14	1	100	(330)
--Rent	61	38	1	100	(395)
<u>By Age</u>					
--18 - 29 years	46	53	1	100	(212)
--30 - 49 years	77	23	1	101	(276)
--50 or over	87	12	1	100	(253)
<u>By Education</u>					
--Less than high school	66	32	3	101	(144)
--High school graduate	79	21	--	100	(204)
--More than high school	71	29	1	101	(407)
<u>By Income</u>					
--Under \$15,000	63	35	2	100	(135)
--\$15,000 - \$30,000	73	27	--	100	(177)
--Over \$30,000	76	23	1	100	(322)
<u>By Race</u>					
--White	79	20	1	100	(369)
--African-American	71	28	1	100	(162)
--Hispanic/Latino	59	40	1	100	(182)
<u>By Gender</u>					
--Male	68	32	--	100	(382)
--Female	76	22	2	100	(373)

Table 6.2: Approval Of What NBT Is Trying To Do [Q.31]

(Among those permanent residents aware of NBT)

	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	81%	6%	13%	100%	(531)
<u>By Age</u>					
--18 - 29 years	82	4	14	100	(96)
--30 - 49 years	82	7	11	100	(207)
--50 or over	80	6	14	100	(220)
<u>By Education</u>					
--Less than high school	83	7	10	100	(91)
--High school graduate	81	5	15	101	(158)
--More than high school	80	7	13	100	(282)
<u>By Income</u>					
--Under \$15,000	75	7	19	101	(83)
--\$15,000 - \$30,000	88	2	11	101	(127)
--Over \$30,000	82	8	10	100	(239)
<u>By Race</u>					
--White	80	8	13	101	(293)
--African-American	81	5	14	100	(115)
--Hispanic/Latino	87	2	11	100	(107)
RUTGERS STUDENTS	74	5	21	100	(51)

Table 6.3: Approval of What NBT Is Trying To Do* [Q.31]

	TOTAL RESIDENTS										PERMANENT RESIDENTS									
	<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>	<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	80%	75%	70%	64%	64%	62%	73%	75%	75%	4%	81%	75%	70%	65%	64%	63%	74%	75%	75%	73%
--Disapprove	6	8	12	13	16	14	11	8	7	6	6	8	12	13	16	15	11	9	7	6
--Don't Know	14	17	18	23	20	24	16	17	17	20	13	16	18	23	20	23	15	16	18	21
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 6.4: Is NBT Succeeding in Improving New Brunswick?*

	TOTAL RESIDENTS										PERMANENT RESIDENTS									
	<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>	<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%	65%	54%	58%	62%	67%	73%	66%	59%	54%	66%	66%	55%	59%	62%	67%	74%	67%	58%	53%
--No	16	21	26	21	22	17	12	14	21	22	16	20	26	21	21	17	12	14	21	23
--Don't Know/Both	19	14	20	20	17	17	15	20	20	24	18	14	19	19	17	16	14	19	20	25
Total	100%	100%	100%	99%	101%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	101%

*Based only on the 60% of all residents and 72% of permanent residents having heard of NBT.

Figure 6.2

Table 6.5: Perception of Johnson & Johnson as Good or Bad for New Brunswick [Q.28]

	Good	Bad	No Difference	Don't Know	Total	(n)
TOTAL SAMPLE	79%	4%	15%	1%	99%	(1000)
RUTGERS STUDENTS	82	4	11	2	99	(245)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	79	3	16	1	99	(775)
<u>By Race</u>						
--White	83	3	13	1	100	(369)
--African-American	68	5	24	2	99	(162)
--Hispanic/Latino	81	1	15	3	100	(182)
<u>By Income</u>						
--Under \$15,000	70	5	23	2	100	(135)
--\$15,000 - \$30,000	78	2	19	1	100	(177)
--Over \$30,000	84	3	12	1	100	(322)
<u>By Education</u>						
--Less than high school	76	2	20	2	100	(144)
--High school graduate	73	4	22	1	100	(204)
--More than high school	82	4	12	1	99	(407)

Table 6.6: How Much Influence Does Johnson & Johnson Have in [Q.29]

	What Happens in New Brunswick					
	Too Much	Right Amount	Too Little	Don't Know	Total	(n)
TOTAL SAMPLE	27%	54%	6%	12%	99%	(1000)
RUTGERS STUDENTS	24	53	7	16	100	(245)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	29	54	6	11	100	(755)
<u>By Age</u>						
--18 - 29	31	50	9	10	100	(212)
--30 - 49	34	49	6	11	100	(276)
--50 - 64	25	61	5	9	100	(105)
--65 or over	18	64	4	14	100	(148)
<u>By Race</u>						
--White	24	61	5	10	100	(369)
--African-American	36	46	6	11	99	(162)
--Hispanic/Latino	31	46	11	13	101	(182)
<u>By Length of Residence</u>						
--10 years or less	27	52	7	13	99	(325)
--More than 10 years	30	56	6	10	102	(430)

Table 6.8: Perception of Rutgers as Good or Bad for New Brunswick [Q.27]

	Good	Bad	No Difference	Don't Know	Total	(n)
TOTAL SAMPLE	84%	4%	12%	1%	101%	(1000)
RUTGERS STUDENTS	93	1	4	1	99	(245)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	80	5	14	1	100	(755)
<u>By Age</u>						
--18 - 29	86	2	11	1	100	(212)
--30 - 49	83	5	11	1	100	(276)
--50 and older	74	6	19	1	100	(253)
<u>By Income</u>						
--Less than \$15,000	77	5	17	1	100	(135)
--\$15,000 - \$30,000	81	5	13	1	100	(177)
--More than \$30,000	85	4	10	1	100	(322)
<u>By Education</u>						
--Less than high school	71	5	23	1	100	(144)
--High school graduate	76	5	19	--	100	(204)
--More than high school	86	5	8	1	100	(407)
<u>By Race</u>						
--White	83	7	9	1	100	(369)
--African-American	73	3	23	1	100	(162)
--Hispanic/Latino	85	1	12	2	100	(182)
<u>By Length of Residence</u>						
--10 years or less	87	2	9	1	99	(325)
--More than 10 years	76	6	17	1	100	(430)

CHAPTER VII

RUTGERS STUDENTS' EVALUATIONS OF NEW BRUNSWICK

As at least part-time residents of the city, Rutgers University students are a significant presence in the day-to-day activities of New Brunswick -- through both their direct economic impact (i.e. housing and shopping) and other elements of “town/gown” relations, such as neighborliness and community service. Also, a number of students choose to live in New Brunswick year round and others continue to live in the city after they graduate.

In past survey reports, the attitudes and behaviors of this group was rarely discussed. Previous chapters of the current report have included students in the discussion of downtown New Brunswick and evaluations of some New Brunswick institutions. These results indicate that Rutgers students are generally as likely as permanent residents to have positive opinions of how Johnson & Johnson, Rutgers University, and New Brunswick Tomorrow benefit the city (although fewer students are actually aware of NBT).

This chapter further explores Rutgers students' opinions of life in New Brunswick, while noting similarities and differences with permanent residents' opinions. These results can be utilized to help determine potential resources among the student population for furthering the New Brunswick revitalization effort.

Profile of Rutgers Students

The current survey included interviews with 245 Rutgers University students who reside within the New Brunswick city limits. Table 7.1 presents a profile of these students. Two-thirds are undergraduates with the remainder pursuing graduate study. More than half are female (58%--due mainly to the student population of Douglass College). About 2-in-3 are white, 14 percent are of

Hispanic/Latino origin, 9 percent are African-American, and 10 percent are Asian. Twelve percent of students report that they are employed in a full-time job, 46 percent work part-time, and 41 percent are not employed.

Students tend to reside in areas immediately surrounding one of the two New Brunswick campuses. Just under half of Rutgers students included in the survey who reside in the city live on or near the College Avenue campus (46%) and 4-in-10 live on or near the Douglass/Cook campus (39%). However, 15 percent of Rutgers students living in New Brunswick reside in other city neighborhoods. While most students live near campus, only one-in-four included in the survey report that they live in a dorm or fraternity/sorority (24%), while 71 percent rent an apartment and 4 percent own a home or live with their family.

The Quality of Life in New Brunswick

With nearly half rating New Brunswick as excellent (2%) or good (46%), about as many students (48%) as permanent residents (51%) give the city positive ratings as a place to live (Table 7.2). African-American and Hispanic/Latino students (58%) and those living in dorms (56%) are most likely to rate New Brunswick positively. Students are also as optimistic as permanent residents about New Brunswick, with 56 percent of students expecting that the city will be a better place to live in five years time, 16 percent saying it will be the same, and 19 percent expecting it to get worse (Table 7.3). Moreover, two-thirds of students rate their own neighborhoods as excellent (16%) or good (51%) places to live (Table 7.4). However, more Douglass area (73%) and College Avenue area (70%) student residents give their neighborhoods positive ratings when compared with students who live in other areas of the city (44%).

When asked about crime in New Brunswick, Rutgers students -- almost all of whom are not New Brunswick natives -- are only somewhat more likely than permanent residents to say that there is more

crime in New Brunswick than in other areas (52% students and 45% permanent residents). One-in-three students say that crime in New Brunswick is the same as elsewhere and 5 percent say that it is less (Table 7.5). Like permanent residents, nearly 7-in-10 student residents feel that there is less crime (68%) in their own New Brunswick neighborhood (Table 7.6). College Avenue area residents (74%) are more likely than those who reside in the Douglass area (64%) or others areas of the city (60%) to feel this way.

Student residents are also as likely as permanent residents to feel safe in their neighborhood at night (Table 7.7). About one-in-four students say they feel very safe in their own neighborhood at night (23%), 64 percent feel somewhat safe, and 11 percent do not feel safe at all. More men (31%) than women (18%) feel very safe at night, and more Asian (36%) and white (26%) students than African-American and Hispanic/Latino (13%) students feel very safe. Also, more student residents of the College Avenue (27%) and Douglass (24%) areas say they feel very safe in their neighborhood at night when compared with students living in other areas of the city (10%).

Commitment to New Brunswick

While the vast majority of current Rutgers students residing in New Brunswick are not native to the city, almost half of those students say they would choose to remain in the city given the choice (48%, compared to 57% of permanent residents). This includes 41 percent who would remain where they are now and 7 percent who would move to another part of New Brunswick (Table 7.8). Fifty-one percent of Rutgers students say they would choose to move out of the city. African-American and Hispanic-Latino students (59%) are more likely than white (48%) or Asian (44%) students to want to move out of the city.

When asked for suggestions on improving the city, Rutgers students are more likely than permanent residents to emphasize economic development (34%), especially continuation of the

downtown revitalization (21%) (Table 7.9). While student residents (17%) are as likely as permanent residents to suggest that the city generally be made safer, students are less likely to mention other crime issues, such as drugs and police protection (27% total crime issue mentions). Students are also less likely to mention housing concerns (30%) and improvement of schools (6%) as ways to improve the city.

Shopping in Downtown New Brunswick

Comparisons of students' and permanent residents' downtown shopping patterns have already been discussed in Chapter 3 of this report. However, it is worth repeating some of the notable differences. Students (41%) are more likely than permanent residents (29%) to be weekly downtown shoppers. When downtown, students tend to make book and music purchases (31%), buy food and groceries (29%), shop for clothing (28%), buy medicine and cosmetics (23%), eat in restaurants (17%), and purchase gifts (10%). With the exception of shopping for clothing and eating in restaurants, student residents are more likely to shop for these types of items in downtown New Brunswick than permanent residents are.

Students are also more likely than permanent residents to mention safety and appearance issues (19%) as ways to get them to increase the frequency of their downtown shopping. Readers are encouraged to refer to Chapter 3 for a fuller discussion of downtown shopping.

Awareness and Approval of Renovation/Service Projects

For the most part, about half as many or fewer student residents are aware as permanent residents of seven ongoing or proposed renovation/service projects (Table 7.10). These include the Route 1 cinema complex (79%), the Boyd Park renovation (34%), "Renaissance 2000" (20%), upscale housing at "River Watch" (18%), Livingston Manor senior citizen housing (14%), A-STEP teen employment program (10%), and the INFO-LINE service (9%). Only for the Route 1 cinema complex and INFO-

LINE are student awareness levels similar to permanent resident awareness.

Among those aware of these projects, student residents are more likely than permanent residents to approve of the Boyd Park renovation (92% student/76% permanent resident), INFO-LINE (95% student/87% permanent resident), and the Route 1 cinema complex (60% student/54% permanent resident). Students are less likely than permanent residents to approve of Livingston Manor (81% student/94% permanent resident) and "River Watch" (56% student/71% permanent resident). Students are about as likely as permanent residents to approve of A-STEP (94% student/93% permanent resident) and "Renaissance 2000" (83% student/79% permanent resident).

Awareness of Social Service Organizations

Of nine social service organizations asked about, student residents are about as likely as permanent residents to be aware of Salvation Army (96%), American Red Cross (94%), Elijah's Promise (52%), and St. John's Community Health Center (28%) (Table 7.11). Students are less likely to be aware of the Hungarian Civic Association (28%), Civic League of Greater New Brunswick (22%), Eric B. Chandler Health Center (18%), First Baptist Community Corporation (15%), and Puerto Rican Action Board (11%).

A number of student residents report that they "use" these social service organizations, including: the Salvation Army (16%), Elijah's Promise (10%), and the American Red Cross (7%). The survey did not ask for a description of what "use" of these organizations entails, but it seems unlikely that Rutgers students would need the services provided by these organizations. It may be that "use" of these organizations among Rutgers students is an indicator of community service among the student resident population. At this time, this interpretation of Social Service use is speculation.

Summary

As at least part-time residents of the city, Rutgers University students are a significant presence

in the day-to-day activities of New Brunswick, with a number of Rutgers students choosing to live in the city year-round. Students' overall opinions about New Brunswick tend to be similar to permanent residents' with nearly half saying it is an excellent or good place to live and 56 percent expecting that the city will become a better place to live over the next five years. Given the choice, nearly half of the student resident population would continue to live in New Brunswick (48%, compared to 57% of permanent residents).

Half of Rutgers students residing in New Brunswick feel that there is more crime in the city than there is in other areas. However, this is an only slightly higher percentage than permanent residents who hold the same opinion (52% students and 45% permanent residents).

Students are also somewhat more likely than permanent residents to mention improving the safety and appearance of downtown New Brunswick as ways to get them to shop there more frequently. As it stands now, students tend to be more frequent downtown shoppers, with more student residents (41%) than permanent residents (29%) saying that they shop in the downtown area at least once a week. Student reports of their downtown shopping habits also indicate that they purchase a wider variety of goods than permanent residents do.

With the exception of the Route 1 cinema complex, Rutgers students are less aware of five ongoing or proposed renovation projects in the city. Among those aware of these projects, 9-in-10 approve of the Boyd Park renovation, 8-in-10 approve of "Renaissance 2000" and Livingston Manor, and 6-in-10 approve of the Route 1 cinema and "River Watch" housing. When compared to permanent residents, support for Boyd Park and the Route 1 cinema is higher among students, whereas student support for Livingston Manor and "River Watch" is lower.

Like permanent residents, students give high marks to the presence of Rutgers University, Johnson & Johnson, and New Brunswick Tomorrow in the city. However, students tend to be less aware

than permanent residents of the various social service organizations in the city, with the exception of the Salvation Army (96%), American Red Cross (94%), Elijah's Promise (52%), and St. John's Community Health Center (28%). Also, a number of Rutgers students report that they "use" these organizations, possibly indicating a level of voluntary community service among the resident student population.

Table 7.1: Rutgers Student Profile

<u>Gender</u>		<u>Type of Residence</u>	
--Male	42%	--Own/live with family	4%
--Female	58	--Rent apartment	24
		--Live in dorm/fraternity/sorority	24
<u>Race</u>		<u>Neighborhood of Residence</u>	
--White	65%	--COLLEGE AVE. AREA	46%
--African-American	9	--Rutgers/College Ave. Campus (28%)	
--Hispanic/Latino	14	--Buccleuch Park (10%)	
--Asian	10	--Harvey Park (8%)	
--Other	2		
<u>Employment Status</u>		--DOUGLASS AREA	39
--Full-time	12%	--Douglass-Cook Campus (30%)	
--Part-time	46	--Commercial-Nichol Aves (8%)	
--Not employed	41	--Route 1 area (1%)	
<u>Level of School</u>		--OTHER AREAS	15
--Undergraduate	65%		
--Graduate school	35		

Table 7.2: Rutgers Students' Rating of New Brunswick [Q.2]

	Excellent	Good	Only Fair	Poor	Don't Know	Total	(n)
STUDENTS	2%	46%	45%	7%	--	100%	(245)
<u>Race</u>							
--White	1	44	48	7	--	100	(144)
--African-American/ Hispanic/Latino	4	54	35	7	--	100	(61)
--Asian	6	42	50	3	--	101	(36)
<u>Area</u>							
--College Ave	2	45	47	6	--	100	(115)
--Douglass	3	47	42	7	--	99	(96)
--Other	2	42	50	6	--	100	(34)
<u>Housing</u>							
--Apartment	2	44	47	7	--	100	(175)
--Dorm	2	54	38	6	--	100	(59)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	6	45	35	12	1	99	(755)

Table 7.3: Rutgers Students' Expectations For Five Years From Now [Q.5]

	Better	Same	Worse	Don't Know	Total	(n)
STUDENTS	56%	16%	19%	9%	100%	(245)
<u>Race</u>						
--White	57	18	17	9	101	(144)
--African-American/ Hispanic/Latino	59	13	23	5	100	(61)
--Asian	52	8	19	19	98	(36)
<u>Area</u>						
--College Ave	56	21	18	5	100	(115)
--Douglass	57	12	21	10	100	(96)
--Other	54	8	16	23	101	(34)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	56	11	21	12	100	(755)

Table 7.4: Neighborhood Evaluations of Rutgers Students [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>
STUDENTS	16%	51%	28%	4%	--	99%	(245)
<u>Area</u>							
--College Ave	16	54	27	4	--	101	(115)
--Douglass	21	52	26	1	--	100	(96)
--Other	2	42	41	15	--	100	(34)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	17	45	30	7	--	99	(755)

Table 7.5: Rutgers Students' Perceptions of Crime Compared to Other Areas [Q.12]

	<u>More Crime Than Elsewhere</u>	<u>Same Amount Of Crime</u>	<u>Less Crime</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
STUDENTS	52%	33%	5%	10%	100%	(245)
<u>Race</u>						
--White	55	32	3	10	100	(144)
--African-American/ Hispanic/Latino	47	38	10	5	100	(61)
--Asian	39	31	8	22	100	(36)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	45	39	9	7	100	(755)

Table 7.6: Rutgers Students' Perceptions of Crime in Neighborhood Compared to Other New Brunswick Neighborhoods [Q.15]

	<u>More</u>	<u>Less</u>	<u>Same</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
STUDENTS	9%	68%	21%	2%	100%	(245)
<u>Area</u>						
--College Ave	5	74	19	2	100	(115)
--Douglass	9	64	23	4	100	(96)
--Other	20	60	20	--	100	(34)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	9	64	23	5	101	(755)

Table 7.7: How Safe Rutgers Students Feel in Own Neighborhood at Night [Q.14]

	Very Safe	Somewhat Safe	Not At All Safe	Don't Know	Total	(n)
STUDENTS	23%	64%	11%	1%	99%	(245)
<u>Gender</u>						
--Male	31	60	7	1	99	(101)
--Female	18	67	14	1	100	(144)
<u>Race</u>						
--White	26	63	12	--	101	(144)
--African-American/ Hispanic/Latino	13	72	12	4	101	(61)
--Asian	36	58	6	--	100	(36)
<u>Area</u>						
--College Ave	27	64	7	1	99	(115)
--Douglass	24	61	15	--	100	(96)
--Other	10	76	12	2	100	(34)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	26	59	13	2	100	(755)

Table 7.8: Rutgers Students' Commitment to New Brunswick [Q.9]

	<u>Continue Where Now</u>	<u>Move Elsewhere In New Brunswick</u>	<u>Move Out Of New Brunswick</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
STUDENTS	41%	7%	51%	1%	100%	(245)
<u>Race</u>						
--White	43	8	48	1	100	(144)
--African-American/ Hispanic/Latino	39	3	59	--	101	(61)
--Asian	42	14	44	--	100	(36)
<u>Area</u>						
--College Ave	39	7	55	--	101	(115)
--Douglass	46	6	45	2	99	(96)
--Other	36	10	54	--	100	(34)
PERMANENT RESIDENTS	47	10	40	2	99	(755)

Table 7.9: Rutgers Students' Opinions on How to Improve City* [Q.6]

(n=245)

ADDRESS CRIME PROBLEMS	27%
--Make safer (17%)	
--Deal with drug problem (3%)	
--Increase police force (1%)	
--Better police protection (3%)	
--More foot patrols (2%)	
--Better quality police (1%)	
IMPROVE SCHOOLS	6%
HOUSING	30%
--Build more housing (9%)	
--Build low-income housing (2%)	
--Make landlords maintain property (1%)	
--Replace old housing project (5%)	
--Renovate old buildings (13%)	
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	34%
--Continue downtown improvement (21%)	
--Encourage new businesses (10%)	
--Lower taxes (0%)	
--More job opportunities (3%)	
--More youth recreation	3%
--More parking	7%
--More/better parks	3%
--Clean streets	6%
--Other	31%
--Don't know	13%
--Nothing	2%

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

Table 7.10: Rutgers Students' Awareness and Approval of Renovation Projects [Q.24-26]

	<i>AWARE OF:</i>		<i>APPROVE OF:</i>			
	<u>Students</u> (n=245)	<u>Permanent Residents</u> (n=755)	<u>Students</u> %	<u>Permanent Residents</u> (n)	<u>Students</u> %	<u>Permanent Residents</u> (n)
Cinema Complex At Route 1	79%	87%	60%	(185)	54%	(645)
Boyd Park	34	65	92	(81)	76	(483)
"Renaissance 2000"	20	59	83	(47)	79	(431)
Livingston Manor	14	52	81	(33)	94	(381)
"River Watch" Housing	18	49	56	(42)	71	(359)
A-STEP Program	10	32	94	(245)	93	(755)
INFO-LINE Service	9	12	95	(245)	87	(755)

Table 7.11: Rutgers Students' Awareness of Social Service Organizations [Q.35]

	<u>STUDENTS</u> (n=245)	<u>PERMANENT RESIDENTS</u> (n=755)
Salvation Army	96%	96%
American Red Cross	94	90
Puerto Rican Action Board	11	54
Hungarian Civic Association	28	53
Civic League of crater New Brunswick	22	48
Eric B. Chandler Health Center	18	48
Elijah's Promise	52	47
First Baptist Community Corporation	15	41
St. John's Community Health Center	28	34

APPENDIX A:
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

APPENDIX B:
SAMPLING METHODOLOGY

APPENDIX B

SAMPLING METHODOLOGY

The following describes the methods used to select the sample for the survey.

Sample Selection

One thousand New Brunswick residents 18 years of age and older were interviewed by telephone from May 2 to 16, 1996. 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. Using these methods, a response rate of 74 percent was achieved. Response rate is calculated by dividing the total number of calls made in which a person was contacted (i.e., not a busy signal or no answer) by the number of interviews completed.

The sampling procedures used in this year's study were identical to those employed in the ten previous studies. This allows for direct comparisons to be made between all ten surveys. In 1976, however, the study did not separate permanent residents from full-time students, so that any comparisons with that first survey are based on the total sample.

The sample for this year's survey, as in the past, was selected from the "reverse" or "criss-cross" directory of Middlesex County, in which telephone numbers are listed by address rather than by name. This allows for a more accurate selection of new Brunswick residents, by choosing only those numbers with New Brunswick addresses. Telephone numbers were selected for the sample through a systematic random sampling procedure. Each number was assigned to one of 12 neighborhood designations, based upon the corresponding address. Table 1.2 summarizes these neighborhood designations.

The directory, however, does not include residents with unlisted or new telephone numbers.

Therefore, these people cannot be selected in the sample. People who have unlisted phone numbers or who have recently moved may be different from people whose numbers are listed.

The total sample of 1,000 New Brunswick residents includes 755 permanent residents and 245 full time students. All percentages included and discussed in the text of the report are for permanent residents unless otherwise noted.

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 1,000 respondents is about ± 3 percent at a 95 percent confidence interval. For example, if 35 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 32 and 38 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 -- i.e., men -- 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 1.1 shows the composition of the 1996 sample for both the total sample and for the permanent residents, 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 African-Americans and whites, but a sample of that population was divided 75 percent white to 25 percent black. To make the sample accurately reflect the population the responses of African-Americans would be counted as "2" each, while the responses of whites would only be counted as ".67" each, thus equalizing the sample division at 50/50. In the 1994 sample African-Americans are counted as slightly more than "1" (1.29), and whites and Hispanics as slightly less than "1" (.96 and .89 respectively). The responses of African-Americans, then, are assigned heavier weights to more accurately represent them in proportion to the overall population of New Brunswick.

It should be noted that, as with the 1992 and 1994 surveys, the above "weights" were based on the 1990 census figures for the racial composition of the 18 and older population of New Brunswick, whereas the 1992 through 1990 surveys were based on the 1980 census figures. During that decade the over 18 Hispanic population of the city 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. (The remaining "other race" category remained at about 4 percent.) Comparisons between findings of the current study using the weights derived from the 1980 versus 1990 census figures reveal only minimal (and not statistically significant) differences. Using the more recent census figures allows us to more accurately reflect the current population of New Brunswick, while not compromising the ability to draw comparisons between previous studies.

APPENDIX B

Table 1.1: Comparison of 1996 Sample with Past Samples

	PERMANENT RESIDENTS										ALL RESIDENTS										
	1996	1994	1992	1990	1988	1986	1984	1982	1980	1978	1996	1994	1992	1990	1988	1986	1984	1982	1980	1978	1976
EDUCATION																					
--Less than High School	17%	15%	15%	15%	15%	17%	18%	19%	23%	24%	13%	13%	12%	12%	12%	14%	15%	13%	20%	19%	23%
--High school complete	27	30	29	31	29	35	35	32	30	32	22	27	24	26	24	29	30	25	26	27	33
--College	54	55	55	54	56	48	47	49	46	43	64	60	63	63	63	57	55	61	53	53	42
--No answer	2	--	1	--	1	--	1	1	1	1	1	--	1	--	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
RACE*																					
--White	51	52	52	64	66	69	71	66	68	76	54	58	55	67	69	72	73	71	70	78	78
--Black	27	26	28	25	19	19	19	22	21	19	23	25	24	21	16	16	17	18	19	17	17
--Other	20	20	19	10	13	11	9	10	11	4	20	14	20	10	13	11	10	10	11	4	3
--No answer	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2
AGE																					
--18 - 20	4	3	5	3	4	5	4	4	4	6	11	5	11	6	12	12	9	16	7	12	8
--21 - 24	9	9	13	10	10	9	12	11	10	9	18	13	22	21	19	16	18	20	17	15	15
--25 - 29	14	13	16	14	17	15	18	19	15	13	14	13	14	13	15	14	16	16	15	12	13
--30 - 59	47	51	45	48	43	41	35	38	44	44	37	46	36	39	34	34	30	28	38	38	40
--60 or older	26	23	20	23	25	26	26	23	24	28	20	20	16	19	19	21	22	16	21	23	24
--No answer	2	2	1	2	2	3	6	5	2	--	1	2	2	2	1	3	5	4	2	--	1
INCOME																					
--Under \$5,000	5	5	6	4	5	4	8	7	13	13	9	6	9	6	8	7	10	9	15	16	22
--\$5,000 - \$10,000	6	6	8	7	6	8	10	14	12	14	7	7	9	8	8	10	11	15	14	13	15
--\$10,001 - \$15,000	6	8	8	8	8	11	12	15	16	20	7	9	8	8	8	10	12	14	15	18	17
--\$15,001 - \$20,000	9	10	9	8	9	14	12	14	15	18	8	10	8	8	8	12	11	13	14	18	11
--More than \$20,000	57	57	56	57	58	47	40	37	29	19	51	54	49	51	54	46	39	36	28	21	16
--No Answer	16	14	13	15	14	17	18	13	14	16	14	13	16	18	14	16	17	13	14	15	19
LENGTH OF RESIDENCE																					
IN NEW BRUNSWICK																					
--5 or less years	26	30	35	34	32	27	28	33	28	21	42	47	48	46	46	40	38	51	37	34	30
--6 to 10 year	15	14	12	13	13	12	11	11	11	13	13	13	10	11	11	10	10	8	10	11	10
--11 to 30 years	22	22	22	18	17	19	19	18	17	20	17	19	17	15	14	15	16	14	15	16	20
--More than 30 yrs	14	16	15	12	11	15	15	12	16	15	11	14	12	10	8	12	13	9	13	12	11
--All of life	23	18	16	22	28	27	27	25	28	31	18	16	12	18	22	23	24	18	24	26	29
SEX																					
--Male	50	46	49	45	48	45	46	48	48	49	48	47	49	47	47	45	46	49	49	49	45
--Female	50	54	51	55	52	55	54	52	52	51	52	53	51	53	53	55	54	51	51	51	55

* Note: The decrease in the percentage of whites and the increase in the "other" category of race reflects the use of the new 1990 Census figures for race. Between 1980 and 1990 the percentage of

persons 18 years of age and over of Hispanic origin increased from 8.4% to 16.6%, while the percentage of whites of non-Hispanic origin decreased from 66.3% to 55.4%.

APPENDIX B

Table 1.2: Description of Twelve Neighborhood Areas in New Brunswick

Route 1:

The Route 1 area includes all of New Brunswick east of Route 1 in addition to the areas north of route 18 and west of Route 1. It is adjacent to the Cook-Douglass area.

Cook-Douglass:

The Cook-Douglass area is bounded by Routes 18 and 1 on the north and east, Nichol Avenue and the Cook Campus on the west and south. It is in between the Route 1 and Commercial Avenue - Nichol Avenue areas.

Commercial Avenue - Nichol Avenue:

This area is bounded by Commercial and Nichol Avenues on the east and west and by Route 18 and the city line on the north and south. It is west of Cook-Douglass and bounded by the Remsen Park and East Central areas on its west.

Remsen Park:

The Remsen Park area is bounded by Charles Street, Remsen Avenue, Livingston Avenue and Delevan Street. the Douglass area is on its east, the Kilmer Park area on its west, and the West Central area on the north.

Kilmer Park:

The Kilmer Park - Livingston Avenue is bounded by Elizabeth Street, Livingston Avenue, Handy Street and Jersey Avenue. It is bounded on the east by Remsen Park, on the north by the East and West Central areas, and on the south by the Jersey Avenue area.

East Central:

The east Central area runs from Livingston Avenue along Delevan Avenue to Commercial Avenue to Neilson Street. It is immediately east and south of downtown.

Jersey Avenue:

The Jersey Avenue area is bounded by Jersey Avenue, the city line on the west and south, and Handy Streets. On the north it is adjacent to the Harvey Park and West Central areas, and is west of Kilmer Park.

Harvey Park:

The Harvey Park area runs along French Street to Pardenbergh Street and along Central Avenue to the city line. It is south and east of the Buccleuch and Rutgers areas, and west of the West Central area.

Buccleuch Park:

The Buccleuch Park area runs along George Street to College Avenue to Stone Street to Central Avenue. It is the northwestern corner of the city, adjacent to the Rutgers and Harvey Park areas.

Rutgers:

The Rutgers area runs from Railroad Avenue to Brown and Hardenbergh Streets to Prosper Street to College Avenue and the river. It is immediately west of downtown and adjacent to the Buccleuch and Harvey Park areas.

West Central:

The West Central area is bounded by Livingston Avenue, Handy Street, French Street and Kirkpatrick and Elm Streets. It is immediately south of downtown, and bounded by East Central on the east, Harvey Park on the west, and Kilmer Park on the south.

Downtown Area:

The Downtown area is bounded by the river and the city line, Albany Street, Neilson Avenue, Kirkpatrick and Elm Streets and Commercial Avenue.