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The Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling (ECPIP), home of the RutgersEagleton Poll, was established in 1971. Now celebrating five decades and publication of over 200 public opinion polls on the state of New Jersey, ECPIP is the first and longest continuously running university-based state survey research centers in the United States.

Our mission is to provide scientifically sound, non-partisan information about public opinion. ECPIP conducts research for all levels of government and nonprofit organizations with a public interest mission, as well as college and university-based researchers and staff. ECPIP makes it a priority to design opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students to learn how to read, analyze, design, and administer polls. We pride ourselves on integrity, quality, and objectivity.

To read more about ECPIP and view all of our press releases and published research, please visit our website: eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu.
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## Questions

## TELEHEALTH

Let's talk about some other health care issues.

H1 Have you ever had a telehealth appointment - that is, receive any medical care from a health professional through either an electronic device, such as a tablet or computer, or the telephone...

A Prior to March 2020
B From March 2020 onward

1 Yes
2 No
8 Don't know (VOL)
9 Refused (VOL)

## [IF EITHER H1A OR H1B=1, CONTINUE TO H2]

H2 How likely are you to continue using telehealth services for medical care in the future? Would you say...

1 Very likely
2 Somewhat likely
3 Not very likely
4 Or not at all likely
8 Don't know (VOL)
9 Refused (VOL)
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Weighted Demographics

## 1,006 New Jersey adults 18+

Overall Margin of Error $=+/-3.8$ percentage points

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

|  |  | Deff | MOE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Man | 48\% | 1.54 | +/- 5.3\% |
| Woman | 52\% | 1.47 | +/-5.5\% |
| 18-34 | 27\% | 1.40 | +/- 7.7\% |
| 35-49 | 23\% | 1.41 | +/- 7.5\% |
| 50-64 | 29\% | 1.58 | +/-6.9\% |
| 65+ | 21\% | 1.64 | +/-8.7\% |
| Democrat | 38\% | 1.51 | +/-6.0\% |
| Independent | 42\% | 1.52 | +/-6.1\% |
| Republican | 20\% | 1.48 | +/- 8.5\% |
| HS or Less | 30\% | 1.10 | +/- 8.9\% |
| Some College | 29\% | 1.24 | +/- 7.1\% |
| College Grad | 24\% | 1.17 | +/-5.5\% |
| Grad Work | 17\% | 1.15 | +/-6.4\% |
| White | 57\% | 1.52 | +/-4.9\% |
| Black | 12\% | 1.48 | +/-11.6\% |
| Hispanic | 19\% | 1.45 | +/- 9.2\% |
| Other | 12\% | 1.51 | +/-11.8\% |
| <50K | 22\% | 1.45 | +/- 9.8\% |
| 50K-<100K | 35\% | 1.44 | +/-6.9\% |
| 100K-<150K | 18\% | 1.53 | +/- 9.0\% |
| 150K+ | 24\% | 1.44 | +/- 7.0\% |
| Urban | 17\% | 1.46 | +/- 9.3\% |
| Suburb | 36\% | 1.53 | +/-6.4\% |
| Exurban | 14\% | 1.52 | +/-10.3\% |
| Phil/South | 18\% | 1.55 | +/- 9.2\% |
| Shore | 17\% | 1.52 | +/- 9.1\% |
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## Methodology

The Rutgers-Eagleton Poll was conducted by telephone using live interviewers August 30 to September 8, 2022, with a scientifically selected random sample of 1,006 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 291 adults reached on a landline phone and 715 adults reached on a cell phone, all acquired through random digit dialing; 327 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:


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 2019 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
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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 1,006 New Jersey adults is +/-3.1 percentage points at a 95 percent confidence interval. The design effect ${ }^{3}$ is 1.52 , making the adjusted margin of error $+/-3.8$ percentage points. Thus, if 50 percent of New Jersey adults in this sample favor a particular position, we would be 95 percent sure that the true figure is between 46.2 and 53.8 percent ( $50+/-3.8$ ) if all New Jersey adults had been interviewed,
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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. with sample from Dynata. The questionnaire was developed and all data analyses were completed in house by the Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling (ECPIP). 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.

## TABLES START ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE
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## Questions and Tables

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

H1 Have you ever had a telehealth appointment - that is, receive any medical care from a health professional through either an electronic device, such as a tablet or computer, or the telephone...

|  | Prior to March 2020 | From March 2020 onward |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | $21 \%$ | $60 \%$ |
| No | $79 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| Unweighted $\mathbf{N}=$ | 963 | 987 |

## Eagleton Institute of Politics
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## Prior to March 2020

| Yes | $21 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| No | $79 \%$ |
| Unweighted $\mathbf{N}=$ | 963 |


|  | Party ID |  |  | Gender |  | Race or Ethnicity |  |  |  | Age |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dem | Ind | Rep | Man | Woman | Wht | BIk | Hisp | Other | 18-34 | 35-49 | 50-64 | 65+ |
| Yes | 16\% | 24\% | 24\% | 21\% | 21\% | 21\% | 25\% | 21\% | 17\% | 23\% | 24\% | 19\% | 19\% |
| No | 84\% | 76\% | 76\% | 79\% | 79\% | 79\% | 75\% | 79\% | 83\% | 77\% | 76\% | 81\% | 81\% |
| Unwt $\mathrm{N}=$ | 388 | 381 | 182 | 511 | 441 | 583 | 101 | 155 | 100 | 217 | 233 | 301 | 201 |


|  | Income |  |  |  | Region |  |  |  |  | Education |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <\$50K | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \$ 50 K- \\ <\$ 100 K \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \$ 100 \mathrm{~K}- \\ & <\$ 150 \mathrm{~K} \end{aligned}$ | \$150K+ | Urban | Suburb | Exurban | Phil/ South | Shore | HS or less | Some college | College grad | Grad work |
| Yes | 57\% | 60\% | 62\% | 56\% | 63\% | 61\% | 56\% | 60\% | 59\% | 58\% | 69\% | 62\% | 49\% |
| No | 43\% | 40\% | 38\% | 44\% | 37\% | 39\% | 44\% | 40\% | 41\% | 42\% | 31\% | 38\% | 51\% |
| Unwt $\mathrm{N}=$ | 399 | 389 | 187 | 521 | 456 | 596 | 104 | 159 | 103 | 221 | 238 | 312 | 206 |

## Eagleton Institute of Politics
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## From March 2020 onward

| Yes | $60 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| No | $40 \%$ |
| Unweighted $\mathbf{N}=$ | 987 |


|  | Party ID |  |  | Gender |  | Race or Ethnicity |  |  |  | Age |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dem | Ind | Rep | Man | Woman | Wht | BIk | Hisp | Other | 18-34 | 35-49 | 50-64 | 65+ |
| Yes | 69\% | 40\% | 15\% | 41\% | 50\% | 46\% | 63\% | 40\% | 37\% | 49\% | 43\% | 42\% | 51\% |
| No | 27\% | 56\% | 83\% | 55\% | 47\% | 49\% | 35\% | 58\% | 61\% | 47\% | 54\% | 56\% | 45\% |
| Unwt $\mathrm{N}=$ | 397 | 388 | 186 | 521 | 451 | 593 | 105 | 158 | 102 | 222 | 239 | 305 | 207 |


|  | Income |  |  |  | Region |  |  |  |  | Education |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <\$50K | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \$ 50 K- \\ <\$ 100 K \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \$100K- } \\ & <\$ 150 \mathrm{~K} \end{aligned}$ | \$150K+ | Urban | Suburb | Exurban | Phil/ South | Shore | HS or less | Some college | College grad | Grad work |
| Yes | 59\% | 38\% | 44\% | 48\% | 51\% | 48\% | 46\% | 48\% | 33\% | 42\% | 42\% | 48\% | 58\% |
| No | 37\% | 59\% | 54\% | 48\% | 45\% | 49\% | 48\% | 49\% | 67\% | 55\% | 55\% | 49\% | 39\% |
| Unwt $\mathrm{N}=$ | 142 | 281 | 182 | 272 | 159 | 347 | 134 | 173 | 170 | 129 | 227 | 360 | 263 |
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H2 How likely are you to continue using telehealth services for medical care in the future? Would you say very likely, somewhat likely, not very likely, or not at all likely?

| Very likely | $39 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Somewhat likely | $31 \%$ |
| Not very likely | $19 \%$ |
| Not at all likely | $10 \%$ |
| Don't know | $0 \%$ |
| Unweighted $\mathbf{N}=$ | 649 |


|  | Party ID |  |  | Gender |  | Race or Ethnicity |  | Age |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dem | Ind | Rep | Man | Woman | White, Non-Hispanic | Non-White | 18-34 | 35-49 | 50-64 | 65+ |
| Very likely | 45\% | 38\% | 28\% | 36\% | 41\% | 31\% | 50\% | 41\% | 44\% | 39\% | 29\% |
| Somewhat likely | 34\% | 31\% | 29\% | 33\% | 31\% | 35\% | 27\% | 28\% | 30\% | 32\% | 37\% |
| Not very likely | 13\% | 24\% | 22\% | 21\% | 17\% | 20\% | 18\% | 21\% | 17\% | 20\% | 18\% |
| Not at all likely | 8\% | 8\% | 20\% | 9\% | 11\% | 14\% | 5\% | 10\% | 8\% | 8\% | 16\% |
| Don't know | 1\% | 0\% | 1\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 1\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% |
| Unwt N= | 253 | 266 | 122 | 324 | 316 | 393 | 242 | 137 | 177 | 201 | 128 |


|  | Income |  | Region |  |  |  |  | Education |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <\$100K | \$100K+ | Urban | Suburb | Exurban | Phil/South | Shore | Some college or less | College grad or more |
| Very likely | 39\% | 40\% | 41\% | 41\% | 23\% | 43\% | 41\% | 37\% | 41\% |
| Somewhat likely | 31\% | 33\% | 30\% | 29\% | 46\% | 27\% | 33\% | 30\% | 33\% |
| Not very likely | 17\% | 22\% | 19\% | 21\% | 23\% | 16\% | 14\% | 20\% | 18\% |
| Not at all likely | 13\% | 5\% | 9\% | 8\% | 8\% | 15\% | 12\% | 12\% | 8\% |
| Don't know | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% |
| Unwt $\mathrm{N}=$ | 276 | 311 | 101 | 232 | 79 | 124 | 113 | 227 | 420 |

Eagleton Institute of Politics
Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey 191 Ryders Lane
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901-8557
eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu
Twitter: @EagletonPoll
Facebook: /RutgersEagletonPoll
poll@eagleton.rutgers.edu
848-932-8940


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ NCHS, National Health Interview Survey, 2017-2019; U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 20172019.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ 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.
    ${ }^{3}$ 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 nonresponse.

