

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

CONTACT:

Ashley Koning, Director
Office: 848-932-8940
Cell: 908-872-1186
akoning@rutgers.edu

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

Majority of New Jerseyans Disagree With Supreme Court’s Concealed Carry Decision, Agree With Recent State Gun Legislation

NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J. (May 18, 2023) – As New Jersey’s latest firearm legislation undergoes its own battle in the courts, a majority of New Jerseyans disagree with the U.S. Supreme Court’s 2022 ruling in *Bruen* and side with the Garden State’s new concealed carry law, according to a Rutgers-Eagleton Poll in partnership with the New Jersey Gun Violence Research Center.

Sixty-one percent of Garden State residents disagree with the Supreme Court’s ruling last year in *New York State Rifle and Pistol Association v. Bruen*. A similar number – 58 percent – believe that individual states should be allowed to require firearm owners to demonstrate a justifiable need for a firearm in public places when applying for a carry permit.

When it comes New Jersey’s new firearm law in response to *Bruen*, solid majorities support the following parts of the legislation that enact certain requirements and restrictions on concealed firearm carry in public:

- Requiring firearm safety training courses (92 percent)
- Mandating permit holders purchase liability insurance to carry a firearm in public (67 percent)
- Banning the concealed carry of a firearm on private property unless the property owner allows it (67 percent)
- Banning the concealed carry of a firearm in “sensitive areas” such as schools, hospitals, polling places, beaches, theaters and other public spaces (62 percent)

New Jerseyans are more divided, however, when it comes to prohibiting permit holders from keeping a loaded firearm in their cars: 50 percent support it, while 47 percent oppose the

move.

“The data clearly show that, post-*Bruen*, judicial decisions regarding firearms are in direct contrast to the wishes of New Jerseyans, overall, and, in many cases, that’s true across party lines and for both firearm owners and non-firearm owners,” said [Michael Anestis](#), associate professor in urban-global public health at the [Rutgers School of Public Health](#) and executive director of the [New Jersey Gun Violence Research Center](#). “Increasing the carrying of firearms across New Jersey will increase the risk of firearm injury and death – and that risk is not something that New Jersey residents want in their communities.”

When it comes to *Bruen* and what individual states should be allowed to do, some demographic differences emerge. Republicans, men, people 18 to 34 years old, those living in the southwestern region of the state, those with a high school education or less and those with firearms in the home are more split on whether they agree or disagree with the U.S. Supreme Court on *Bruen* than their counterparts.

Republicans, men, those living in the southwestern area of the state, those with a high school education or less and those with firearms in the home are likewise divided when it comes to whether individual states should be allowed to require firearm owners demonstrate a justifiable need for a firearm in public places when applying for a carry permit.

While many of these groups are more opposed compared with their counterparts when it comes to individual pieces of the latest New Jersey firearm legislation, sizeable numbers within each of these groups – at times, reaching a majority –express support for some of these items.

Support for requiring firearm safety training courses is widespread, including among Republicans (89 percent) and firearm owners (92 percent). Majorities across the board – including just over half of Republicans and firearm owners – also support mandating permit holders to purchase liability insurance and banning the concealed carry of a firearm on private property unless allowed by the owner. Nearly half of firearm owners (49 percent) and roughly four in 10 Republicans (42 percent) support banning concealed carry in sensitive public areas. Six in 10 of each of these groups, however, are opposed to prohibiting permit holders from keeping a loaded firearm in their car.

“Throughout our five decades of polling, New Jerseyans, on the whole, have always been supportive of firearm restrictions and regulations,” said [Ashley Koning](#), an assistant research professor and director of the [Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling](#) (ECPIP) at [Rutgers University–New Brunswick](#). “As New Jerseyans witnessed at least four mass shootings nationally while this poll was being conducted, and on the heels of multiple active shooter scares throughout the Garden State in recent months, this sentiment remains strong. Even if New Jersey’s recent firearm legislation ultimately works its way to the U.S. Supreme Court, public opinion has already chosen sides.”

One in five New Jerseyans report some sort of firearm being kept in or around their home.

Republicans (32 percent), men (26 percent), people 35 to 49 years old (25 percent), those in households making \$150,000 or more annually (32 percent) and those living in the exurban (28 percent), southwestern (28 percent), or the Jersey Shore (25 percent) areas of the state are all more likely to live in a household with firearms.

Results are from a statewide poll of 1,002 adults contacted by live interviewers on landlines and cell phones from April 27 to May 5. The full sample has a margin of error of +/- 3.6 percentage points.

###

Broadcast interviews: Rutgers University–New Brunswick has broadcast-quality television and radio studios available for remote live or taped interviews with Rutgers experts. For more information, contact Patti Zielinski at patti.zielinski@rutgers.edu

ABOUT RUTGERS UNIVERSITY–NEW BRUNSWICK

Rutgers University–New Brunswick is where Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, began more than 250 years ago. Ranked among the world’s top 60 universities, Rutgers’s flagship university is a leading public research institution and a member of the prestigious Association of American Universities. It is home to internationally acclaimed faculty and has 12 degree-granting schools and a Division I Athletics program. It is the Big Ten Conference’s most diverse university. Through its community of teachers, scholars, artists, scientists and healers, Rutgers is equipped as never before to transform lives.

ABOUT THE EAGLETON CENTER FOR PUBLIC INTEREST POLLING

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

ABOUT THE EAGLETON INSTITUTE OF POLITICS

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

QUESTIONS AND TABLES START ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE

Questions and Tables

The questions covered in this release are listed below. Column percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding. Respondents are New Jersey adults; all percentages are of weighted results. Interpret groups with samples sizes under 100 with extreme caution.

G1. Last year, the United States Supreme Court ruled that it is unconstitutional for a state to require a license to carry a concealed firearm in public in most circumstances. Do you agree or disagree with their decision?

Agree	36%
Disagree	61%
Don't know	2%
Unweighted N=	996

	Party ID			Gender		Race or Ethnicity				Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Agree	15%	43%	53%	46%	27%	35%	26%	42%	37%	43%	36%	37%	28%
Disagree	82%	54%	45%	52%	70%	63%	71%	54%	63%	53%	63%	62%	69%
DK	3%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	4%	4%	0%	4%	2%	1%	3%
Unwt N=	351	383	230	498	488	602	143	143	76	232	288	273	203

	Income				Region					Education			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
Agree	32%	40%	37%	33%	25%	33%	36%	48%	42%	42%	35%	37%	29%
Disagree	67%	58%	59%	65%	72%	65%	61%	48%	57%	54%	62%	61%	70%
DK	1%	2%	4%	2%	3%	2%	3%	4%	1%	4%	3%	2%	0%
Unwt N=	160	260	187	279	157	340	145	179	175	138	276	319	257

**Firearms May 2023
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

	Firearm In/Around Home	
	Firearm(s) kept in/around home	No firearms kept in/around home
Agree	50%	29%
Disagree	49%	69%
DK	2%	2%
Unwt N=	212	705

G2. Do you think individual states should or should not be allowed to require firearm owners to demonstrate a justifiable need for a firearm in public places when applying for a carry permit?

Should	58%
Should not	38%
Don't know	3%
Unweighted N=	993

	Party ID			Gender		Race or Ethnicity				Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Should	76%	54%	43%	52%	64%	60%	53%	58%	65%	58%	60%	54%	63%
Should not	22%	43%	54%	46%	30%	37%	41%	40%	30%	39%	37%	42%	33%
DK	2%	3%	3%	1%	5%	3%	6%	2%	4%	3%	4%	4%	4%
Unwt N=	350	382	229	498	485	598	142	144	76	232	288	272	201

	Income				Region					Education			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
Should	59%	57%	54%	64%	58%	59%	63%	52%	60%	48%	59%	64%	68%
Should not	37%	37%	43%	35%	37%	38%	33%	44%	38%	48%	37%	35%	31%
DK	3%	5%	3%	1%	5%	3%	4%	4%	2%	5%	5%	1%	2%
Unwt N=	157	259	187	280	156	341	145	179	172	138	275	316	258

**Firearms May 2023
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

	Firearm In/Around Home	
	Firearm(s) kept in/around home	No firearms kept in/around home
Should	49%	65%
Should not	51%	31%
DK	1%	4%
Unwt N=	211	705

G3. In the wake of the U.S. Supreme Court decision, New Jersey passed new firearm legislation at the end of last year. Do you support or oppose each of the following parts of the new law?

Mandating permit holders to purchase liability insurance in order to carry a firearm in public

Support	67%
Oppose	30%
Don't know	2%
Unweighted N=	985

	Party ID			Gender		Race or Ethnicity				Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Support	86%	63%	51%	63%	72%	64%	77%	68%	77%	69%	69%	64%	68%
Oppose	12%	34%	48%	35%	26%	34%	19%	31%	22%	29%	29%	35%	28%
DK	2%	3%	2%	2%	3%	3%	4%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	4%
Unwt N=	346	381	227	494	481	597	139	142	73	229	287	268	201

	Income				Region					Education			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
Support	70%	66%	64%	71%	79%	68%	69%	60%	60%	58%	69%	71%	73%
Oppose	27%	32%	34%	27%	17%	31%	31%	36%	37%	38%	29%	27%	26%
DK	3%	2%	2%	2%	4%	1%	1%	4%	4%	3%	2%	2%	1%
Unwt N=	156	256	185	275	155	337	144	177	172	136	271	312	259

**Firearms May 2023
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

	Firearm In/Around Home	
	Firearm(s) kept in/around home	No firearms kept in/around home
Support	52%	75%
Oppose	46%	22%
DK	2%	3%
Unwt N=	212	697

Prohibiting permit holders from keeping a loaded firearm in their car

Support	50%
Oppose	47%
Don't know	3%
Unweighted N=	986

	Party ID			Gender		Race or Ethnicity				Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Support	67%	46%	35%	45%	55%	51%	57%	50%	49%	52%	50%	50%	49%
Oppose	31%	51%	63%	52%	42%	47%	42%	45%	51%	44%	47%	48%	49%
DK	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%	3%	1%	5%	0%	3%	3%	2%	3%
Unwt N=	345	382	228	494	482	597	139	142	74	228	287	269	202

	Income				Region					Education			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
Support	48%	45%	52%	57%	54%	48%	53%	51%	49%	37%	50%	59%	60%
Oppose	49%	52%	44%	42%	43%	49%	43%	45%	50%	58%	48%	39%	39%
DK	3%	3%	4%	1%	3%	3%	3%	4%	1%	5%	2%	2%	2%
Unwt N=	157	257	185	274	156	336	144	177	173	136	272	313	258

**Firearms May 2023
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

	Firearm In/Around Home	
	Firearm(s) kept in/around home	No firearms kept in/around home
Support	38%	57%
Oppose	61%	40%
DK	1%	3%
Unwt N=	212	698

Requiring firearm safety training courses

Support	92%
Oppose	7%
Don't know	1%
Unweighted N=	987

	Party ID			Gender		Race or Ethnicity				Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Support	95%	92%	89%	91%	94%	91%	94%	93%	95%	94%	89%	94%	92%
Oppose	5%	8%	10%	9%	5%	8%	4%	6%	5%	6%	10%	6%	7%
DK	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%
Unwt N=	346	382	228	495	482	598	139	142	74	229	287	269	202

	Income				Region					Education			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
Support	88%	94%	96%	92%	95%	91%	92%	93%	93%	91%	92%	94%	92%
Oppose	10%	6%	4%	7%	3%	8%	8%	7%	7%	8%	8%	6%	7%
DK	2%	0%	0%	0%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%
Unwt N=	157	257	185	275	156	337	144	177	173	136	272	313	259

**Firearms May 2023
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

	Firearm In/Around Home	
	Firearm(s) kept in/around home	No firearms kept in/around home
Support	92%	93%
Oppose	8%	6%
DK	0%	1%
Unwt N=	212	699

Banning the concealed carry of a firearm on private property unless the property owner allows it

Support	67%
Oppose	29%
Don't know	4%
Unweighted N=	986

	Party ID			Gender		Race or Ethnicity				Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Support	82%	64%	52%	65%	68%	65%	66%	69%	74%	68%	67%	69%	62%
Oppose	16%	33%	44%	32%	27%	32%	29%	26%	25%	28%	30%	28%	32%
DK	2%	3%	4%	4%	5%	4%	5%	5%	1%	4%	4%	3%	6%
Unwt N=	346	381	228	494	482	598	139	142	74	229	286	269	202

	Income				Region					Education			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
Support	64%	65%	65%	70%	70%	70%	67%	58%	64%	57%	69%	71%	72%
Oppose	32%	30%	30%	29%	25%	27%	28%	35%	33%	36%	26%	27%	26%
DK	4%	5%	5%	1%	5%	3%	4%	6%	3%	7%	4%	2%	2%
Unwt N=	157	257	185	275	156	337	144	177	172	136	271	313	259

**Firearms May 2023
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

	Firearm In/Around Home	
	Firearm(s) kept in/around home	No firearms kept in/around home
Support	51%	74%
Oppose	46%	22%
DK	3%	4%
Unwt N=	212	699

Banning the concealed carry of a firearm in “sensitive areas” like schools, hospitals, polling places, beaches, theaters, and other public spaces

Support	62%
Oppose	34%
Don't know	4%
Unweighted N=	987

	Party ID			Gender		Race or Ethnicity				Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Support	83%	58%	42%	58%	66%	63%	75%	51%	69%	63%	64%	58%	64%
Oppose	16%	36%	55%	38%	31%	35%	24%	43%	27%	33%	32%	38%	34%
DK	1%	5%	3%	4%	4%	2%	0%	6%	4%	4%	4%	4%	2%
Unwt N=	346	381	229	494	483	599	139	141	74	229	287	269	202

	Income				Region					Education			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
Support	56%	63%	62%	67%	69%	64%	56%	59%	61%	49%	63%	69%	72%
Oppose	40%	33%	33%	32%	28%	33%	39%	39%	35%	46%	33%	29%	27%
DK	4%	4%	5%	1%	3%	4%	5%	3%	5%	5%	4%	2%	2%
Unwt N=	157	257	185	275	156	336	144	177	174	136	272	313	259

**Firearms May 2023
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

	Firearm In/Around Home	
	Firearm(s) kept in/around home	No firearms kept in/around home
Support	49%	69%
Oppose	49%	28%
DK	2%	3%
Unwt N=	211	700

G4. Are there any firearms typically kept in or around your home?

Yes	21%
No	78%
Don't know	1%
Unweighted N=	932

	Party ID			Gender		Race or Ethnicity				Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Yes	11%	25%	32%	26%	17%	23%	14%	20%	21%	20%	25%	22%	16%
No	89%	74%	67%	73%	82%	77%	83%	78%	77%	77%	75%	75%	84%
DK	0%	1%	2%	1%	1%	0%	3%	2%	2%	2%	0%	2%	0%
Unwt N=	346	354	204	454	470	570	135	136	70	218	266	254	194

	Income				Region					Education			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
Yes	10%	20%	26%	32%	17%	15%	28%	28%	25%	17%	25%	25%	16%
No	90%	79%	71%	67%	81%	85%	68%	72%	73%	81%	74%	74%	83%
DK	0%	1%	3%	1%	2%	0%	4%	0%	2%	3%	1%	1%	1%
Unwt N=	154	248	174	264	151	322	135	166	158	121	256	307	244

Methodology

The Rutgers-Eagleton Poll was conducted by telephone using live interviewers April 27 to May 5, 2023, with a scientifically selected random sample of 1,002 New Jersey adults, 18 or older. Persons without a telephone could not be included in the random selection process. Respondents within a household are selected by asking randomly for the youngest adult male or female currently available. If the named gender is not available, the youngest adult of the other gender is interviewed. This telephone poll included 304 adults reached on a landline phone and 698 adults reached on a cell phone, all acquired through random digit dialing; 250 of the cell phone completes were acquired through one-to-one SMS text messaging by live interviewers that led respondents to an online version of the survey. Distribution of phone use in this sample is:

Cell	45%
Text to Web	25%
Landline	30%

The data were weighted to be representative of the residential adult population of New Jersey. The weighting balances sample demographics to target population parameters. The sample is balanced, by form and overall, to match parameters for sex, age, education, race/ethnicity, region and phone use. The sex, age, education, race/ethnicity, and region parameters were derived from 2021 American Community Survey PUMS data. The phone use parameter was derived from estimates provided by the National Health Interview Survey Early Release Program.¹

Weighting was done in two stages. The first stage of weighting corrects for different probabilities of selection across the telephone samples associated with the number of adults in each household and each respondent’s telephone usage patterns. This adjustment also accounts for the overlapping landline and cell sample frames and the relative sizes of each frame and each sample.²

The final stage of weighting balances sample demographics, overall and by form, to match target population benchmarks. This weighting was accomplished using SPSSINC RAKE, an SPSS extension module that simultaneously balances the distributions of all variables using the GENLOG procedure. Weights were trimmed to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on survey estimates. The use of these weights in statistical analysis ensures that the demographic characteristics of the sample closely approximate the demographic characteristics of the target population.

Post-data collection statistical adjustments require analysis procedures that reflect departures from simple random sampling. We calculate the effects of these design features so that an appropriate adjustment can be incorporated into tests of statistical significance when using these data.

All surveys are subject to sampling error, which is the expected probable difference between interviewing everyone in a population versus a scientific sampling drawn from that population. Sampling error should be adjusted to recognize the effect of weighting the data to better match the population. In this poll, the simple sampling error for 1,002 New Jersey adults is +/-3.1 percentage points at a 95

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

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

percent confidence interval. The design effect³ is 1.36, making the adjusted margin of error +/- 3.6 percentage points. Thus, if 50 percent of New Jersey adults in this sample favor a particular position, we would be 95 percent sure that the true figure is between 46.4 and 53.6 percent (50 +/- 3.6) if all New Jersey adults had been interviewed, rather than just a sample.

Sampling error does not consider other sources of variation inherent in public opinion studies, such as non-response, question wording, or context effects.

This Rutgers-Eagleton Poll was fielded by Braun Research, Inc. The questionnaire was developed and all data analyses were completed in house by the Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling (ECPIP). Jessica Roman assisted with analysis and preparation of this report. The Rutgers-Eagleton Poll is paid for and sponsored by the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, a non-partisan academic center for the study of politics and the political process. Full questionnaires are available on request and can also be accessed through our archives at eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu. For more information, please contact poll@eagleton.rutgers.edu.

**Weighted Demographics
1,002 New Jersey adults 18+
Overall Margin of Error = +/- 3.6 percentage points**

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

		deff	MOE			deff	MOE
Man	48%	1.36	+/- 5.1%	White	55%	1.34	+/- 4.6%
Woman	52%	1.36	+/- 5.2%	Black	12%	1.32	+/- 9.4%
18-34	26%	1.31	+/- 7.3%	Hispanic	20%	1.26	+/- 9.2%
35-49	25%	1.37	+/- 6.7%	Other	13%	1.16	+/- 12.0%
50-64	27%	1.36	+/- 6.9%	<50K	24%	1.31	+/- 8.9%
65+	22%	1.37	+/- 8.0%	50K-<100K	31%	1.39	+/- 7.1%
Democrat	35%	1.35	+/- 6.1%	100K-<150K	19%	1.32	+/- 8.2%
Independent	40%	1.35	+/- 5.8%	150K+	26%	1.26	+/- 6.6%
Republican	25%	1.38	+/- 7.6%	Urban	17%	1.36	+/- 9.1%
HS or Less	27%	1.12	+/- 8.8%	Suburb	35%	1.36	+/- 6.2%
Some College	31%	1.23	+/- 6.5%	Exurban	14%	1.35	+/- 9.5%
College Grad	23%	1.17	+/- 5.9%	Phil/South	17%	1.41	+/- 8.7%
Grad Work	19%	1.17	+/- 6.6%	Shore	17%	1.31	+/- 8.5%

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