

**FRIDAY, JANUARY 26, 2024**

**CONTACT:**

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

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

## **Outlook on New Jersey Is Stagnant as Quality of Life Falls Slightly**

### ***Rutgers-Eagleton Poll shows little movement on ratings for senate candidates; 2025 gubernatorial hopefuls remain largely unknown***

NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J. (January 26, 2024) – It might be a new year, but not a whole lot has changed when it comes to New Jerseyans’ views of their state and politicians, according to the latest Rutgers-Eagleton Poll.

New Jerseyans’ outlook on the state has changed little in the past six months, continuing to trend more negative than positive. Forty-three percent say the state is headed in the right direction, while 47 percent say it is on the wrong track; 11 percent are unsure.

While not a sizeable shift, residents’ ratings of New Jersey as a whole have taken a few-point hit. Slightly more than half say the Garden State is an “excellent” (12 percent) or “good” (40 percent) place to live – a small downturn for each from when last measured in 2022. Thirty-two percent rate life in New Jersey as “only fair” and another 15 percent as “poor,” up slightly from two years ago.

“New Jerseyans’ outlook on the state continues to be divided in these polarizing times, and positive views on quality of life here are at their lowest point in over a decade,” said Ashley Koning, an assistant research professor and director of the [Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling](#) (ECPPI) at [Rutgers University–New Brunswick](#). “Partisanship significantly colors perceptions of both the state’s present and future, as it does most issues these days, with Democrats in a much more optimistic mindset than either Independents or Republicans.”

When it comes to the 2024 Senate primary in New Jersey, large majorities continue to not know or have an opinion on two of Sen. Bob Menendez’s challengers, U.S. Representative Andy

Kim and New Jersey First Lady Tammy Murphy.

Two-thirds are either unaware (45 percent) or unsure (23 percent) of Kim, down a few points from November 2023. While the number of those unfavorable toward Kim has stayed virtually the same (10 percent), his favorability has climbed to 23 percent (up 6 points). More New Jerseyans have taken sides on Murphy: 6 in 10 say they are unaware (38 percent) or unsure (24 percent) of her, compared with 7 in 10 last November. Both favorable and unfavorable impressions of Murphy have increased in just a couple of months, with now 18 percent viewing her favorably (up 5 points) and 20 percent viewing her unfavorably (up 6 points). These same patterns hold up among those who say they are registered to vote.

While Kim and Murphy each garner about the same numbers from Democrats, Kim has an edge with Independents – 23 percent favorable versus 12 percent favorable for Murphy.

“Both Andy Kim and Tammy Murphy still have a long way to go in terms of name recognition, and they only have less than five months to do it,” said Koning. “If there is any real difference in public opinion on these two candidates right now, Kim has had slightly more positive movement in his numbers compared to Murphy among the small number of those who provided an opinion, but the verdict is still out on each of them for the vast majority of New Jerseyans.”

Menendez’s ratings continue to suffer in the wake of multiple federal indictments. Nine percent of New Jerseyans have a favorable impression of Menendez (up 3 points since November 2023), compared with 60 percent who have an unfavorable one. Fifteen percent of all New Jerseyans have no opinion, and 16 percent are unaware of who Menendez is.

Negativity toward the senator spans across all demographics, including all partisans. Democrats, however, are slightly more favorable than their counterparts at 13 percent. These latest numbers for Menendez precede the most recent superseding indictment in his case.

“Sen. Menendez’s initial nosedive in favorability from November continues in these latest numbers,” said Koning. “His favorability continues to trail both Andy Kim’s and Tammy Murphy’s, and while his challengers need to gain ground in terms of name recognition, Menendez has the much harder task of reversing the negativity surrounding him if he decides to stay in the race.”

Gov. Phil Murphy garners the same favorability rating as he did in November – 46 percent – but the number of those who have an unfavorable impression of him has now crept back up to 34 percent (up 6 points). Sixteen percent say they have no opinion on the governor, and four percent claim to not know who he is.

Those vying to become Murphy’s predecessor in 2025 are mostly unknown by New Jerseyans. On the Democratic side, two-thirds of New Jerseyans either don’t know (39 percent) or have no opinion (27 percent) on former State Senate President Steve Sweeney; the rest are divided on

## New Jersey Ratings Rutgers-Eagleton Poll

Sweeney, with 15 percent having a favorable impression of him, compared with 19 percent with an unfavorable one. Even fewer are aware of Jersey City Mayor Steve Fulop, with 1 in 5 taking sides on the gubernatorial hopeful (11 percent favorable, 8 percent unfavorable) and 8 in 10 either saying they don't know him (57 percent) or have no opinion of him (25 percent).

On the Republican side, the presumptive candidates don't fare much better. Two-thirds remain unaware of (39 percent) or undecided on (26 percent) former Republican gubernatorial candidate Jack Ciattarelli; 19 percent are favorable toward him while 16 percent are unfavorable. Nearly 9 in 10 either don't know (66 percent) or are unsure (20 percent) of State Sen. Jon Bramnick; 8 percent have a favorable opinion of him, and 6 percent an unfavorable one.

Numbers among registered voters for all four of these political figures are essentially the same.

"Despite their prominent roles in New Jersey politics, Bramnick, Ciattarelli, Fulop, and Sweeney are mostly unknown to New Jerseyans," said [Jessica Roman](#), a research associate at ECIPI. "And we still have to go through multiple other elections until the 2025 gubernatorial begins to heat up and voters start paying attention."

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

###

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

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

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

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

*Home of the Rutgers-Eagleton Poll, the Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling (ECPIP) was established in 1971 and is the oldest and one of the most respected university-based statewide polling operations in the United States. Now in its 52nd year and with the publication of over*

*200 polls, ECPIP's mission is to provide scientifically sound, nonpartisan information about public opinion. To read more about ECPIP and view all of our press releases, published research and data archive, please visit our website: [eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu](http://eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu). You can also visit our [Facebook](#) and [Twitter](#).*

**ABOUT THE EAGLETON INSTITUTE OF POLITICS**

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

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

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

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

**Questions and Tables**

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

---

**NJ1A We'd like to ask you about some people. Please indicate if your general impression of each one is favorable or unfavorable, or if you do not have an opinion or do not know the person.**

*Note: This question was part of a split sample. Half of respondents received NJ1A and half received NJ1B.*

**Phil Murphy**

	<b>RV*</b>	<b>GP*</b>
<b>Favorable</b>	46%	46%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	37%	34%
<b>No opinion</b>	14%	16%
<b>Don't know person</b>	3%	4%
<b>Unweighted N=</b>	721	828

	<b>Party ID</b>			<b>Gender</b>		<b>Race or Ethnicity</b>		<b>Age</b>			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	White, Non-Hispanic	Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
<b>Favorable</b>	74%	40%	14%	45%	46%	41%	53%	38%	46%	46%	54%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	8%	35%	70%	38%	29%	46%	20%	23%	36%	42%	33%
<b>No opinion</b>	15%	21%	10%	12%	21%	11%	21%	30%	14%	10%	11%
<b>DK person</b>	3%	4%	6%	5%	4%	2%	6%	9%	4%	2%	2%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	287	332	200	446	378	527	289	205	191	232	200

---

\* Note: RV indicates registered voters and GP indicates general population. All crosstab tables are based on the general population only.

**New Jersey Ratings  
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

	Income				Region					Education			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
<b>Favorable</b>	47%	48%	45%	46%	60%	52%	40%	34%	38%	38%	43%	49%	56%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	26%	32%	39%	42%	12%	28%	41%	43%	49%	31%	38%	38%	29%
<b>No opinion</b>	22%	15%	14%	11%	20%	16%	18%	19%	11%	24%	15%	12%	14%
<b>DK person</b>	5%	5%	3%	1%	9%	4%	1%	4%	3%	8%	4%	2%	1%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	175	220	144	219	112	295	129	154	138	175	217	188	247

**New Jersey Ratings  
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

**NJ1A We'd like to ask you about some people. Please indicate if your general impression of each one is favorable or unfavorable, or if you do not have an opinion or do not know the person.**

*Note: This question was part of a split sample. Half of respondents received NJ1A and half received NJ1B.*

**Steven Fulop**

	<b>RV</b>	<b>GP</b>
<b>Favorable</b>	10%	11%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	8%	8%
<b>No opinion</b>	24%	25%
<b>Don't know person</b>	57%	57%
<b>Unweighted N=</b>	717	824

	<b>Party ID</b>			<b>Gender</b>		<b>Race or Ethnicity</b>		<b>Age</b>			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	White, Non-Hispanic	Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
<b>Favorable</b>	17%	7%	9%	14%	8%	10%	12%	9%	12%	12%	11%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	5%	8%	11%	9%	6%	9%	6%	6%	9%	7%	8%
<b>No opinion</b>	26%	28%	19%	25%	25%	23%	28%	25%	25%	22%	28%
<b>DK person</b>	53%	57%	61%	52%	61%	59%	54%	60%	54%	59%	53%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	286	332	197	445	375	525	287	204	190	233	197

	<b>Income</b>				<b>Region</b>					<b>Education</b>			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
<b>Favorable</b>	10%	9%	8%	16%	26%	11%	10%	5%	3%	10%	6%	11%	17%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	7%	9%	8%	6%	10%	6%	11%	4%	9%	8%	9%	7%	6%
<b>No opinion</b>	25%	27%	31%	22%	32%	23%	28%	28%	16%	21%	26%	24%	30%
<b>DK person</b>	58%	56%	52%	56%	32%	59%	51%	63%	71%	61%	59%	57%	47%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	176	219	143	216	112	293	128	154	137	175	218	185	245

**New Jersey Ratings  
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

**NJ1A We'd like to ask you about some people. Please indicate if your general impression of each one is favorable or unfavorable, or if you do not have an opinion or do not know the person.**

*Note: This question was part of a split sample. Half of respondents received NJ1A and half received NJ1B.*

**Jack Ciattarelli**

	<b>RV</b>	<b>GP</b>
<b>Favorable</b>	21%	19%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	17%	16%
<b>No opinion</b>	25%	26%
<b>Don't know person</b>	37%	39%
<b>Unweighted N=</b>	718	825

	<b>Party ID</b>			<b>Gender</b>		<b>Race or Ethnicity</b>		<b>Age</b>			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	White, Non-Hispanic	Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
<b>Favorable</b>	7%	19%	40%	25%	14%	24%	14%	11%	19%	26%	21%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	24%	15%	7%	20%	12%	20%	12%	13%	19%	14%	19%
<b>No opinion</b>	27%	28%	22%	23%	28%	23%	28%	24%	24%	29%	25%
<b>DK person</b>	42%	39%	32%	33%	45%	33%	46%	53%	38%	31%	35%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	285	333	198	446	375	526	287	204	191	232	198

	<b>Income</b>				<b>Region</b>					<b>Education</b>			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
<b>Favorable</b>	15%	18%	24%	25%	11%	21%	25%	19%	20%	19%	19%	22%	19%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	10%	13%	20%	22%	14%	15%	19%	13%	19%	12%	13%	17%	23%
<b>No opinion</b>	21%	27%	29%	27%	35%	19%	26%	29%	26%	16%	28%	28%	33%
<b>DK person</b>	54%	42%	26%	26%	40%	44%	31%	40%	34%	52%	41%	34%	25%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	176	218	143	218	112	292	129	154	138	175	218	185	246



**New Jersey Ratings  
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

**NJ1A We'd like to ask you about some people. Please indicate if your general impression of each one is favorable or unfavorable, or if you do not have an opinion or do not know the person.**

*Note: This question was part of a split sample. Half of respondents received NJ1A and half received NJ1B.*

**Steve Sweeney**

	<b>RV</b>	<b>GP</b>
<b>Favorable</b>	15%	15%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	20%	19%
<b>No opinion</b>	27%	27%
<b>Don't know person</b>	38%	39%
<b>Unweighted N=</b>	718	825

	<b>Party ID</b>			<b>Gender</b>		<b>Race or Ethnicity</b>		<b>Age</b>			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	White, Non-Hispanic	Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
<b>Favorable</b>	13%	15%	16%	18%	13%	14%	18%	17%	13%	13%	14%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	13%	16%	26%	24%	12%	18%	17%	22%	24%	11%	20%
<b>No opinion</b>	24%	27%	30%	28%	26%	27%	32%	32%	19%	24%	25%
<b>DK person</b>	50%	41%	27%	30%	48%	41%	34%	29%	44%	53%	41%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	176	219	143	217	112	293	128	154	138	175	217

	<b>Income</b>				<b>Region</b>					<b>Education</b>			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
<b>Favorable</b>	20%	13%	12%	18%	12%	17%	13%	10%	12%	19%	20%	20%	13%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	14%	18%	28%	24%	14%	25%	12%	7%	20%	24%	25%	14%	18%
<b>No opinion</b>	28%	29%	22%	27%	26%	26%	27%	28%	25%	26%	28%	28%	29%
<b>DK person</b>	37%	41%	38%	32%	48%	33%	47%	55%	43%	30%	27%	37%	41%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	286	333	197	446	375	526	287	204	191	232	198	286	333

**New Jersey Ratings  
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

**NJ1B We'd like to ask you about some people. Please indicate if your general impression of each one is favorable or unfavorable, or if you do not have an opinion or do not know the person.**

*Note: This question was part of a split sample. Half of respondents received NJ1A and half received NJ1B.*

**Tammy Murphy**

	<b>RV</b>	<b>GP</b>
<b>Favorable</b>	19%	18%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	21%	20%
<b>No opinion</b>	25%	24%
<b>Don't know person</b>	35%	38%
<b>Unweighted N=</b>	728	826

	<b>Party ID</b>			<b>Gender</b>		<b>Race or Ethnicity</b>		<b>Age</b>			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	White, Non-Hispanic	Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
<b>Favorable</b>	29%	12%	11%	13%	23%	17%	20%	17%	15%	21%	21%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	9%	21%	36%	27%	13%	24%	14%	16%	18%	25%	20%
<b>No opinion</b>	26%	23%	22%	24%	24%	26%	21%	19%	23%	23%	31%
<b>DK person</b>	35%	43%	31%	36%	40%	32%	44%	48%	44%	31%	28%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	317	323	182	407	411	546	263	235	167	221	201

	<b>Income</b>				<b>Region</b>					<b>Education</b>			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
<b>Favorable</b>	19%	24%	15%	15%	13%	21%	13%	24%	17%	19%	17%	20%	17%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	15%	15%	29%	26%	16%	18%	27%	15%	27%	18%	22%	22%	20%
<b>No opinion</b>	21%	26%	26%	20%	20%	26%	18%	21%	31%	18%	25%	24%	31%
<b>DK person</b>	45%	35%	30%	38%	50%	35%	42%	40%	25%	45%	36%	34%	32%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	158	236	153	204	113	320	127	131	135	207	175	221	221

**New Jersey Ratings  
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

**NJ1B We'd like to ask you about some people. Please indicate if your general impression of each one is favorable or unfavorable, or if you do not have an opinion or do not know the person.**

*Note: This question was part of a split sample. Half of respondents received NJ1A and half received NJ1B.*

**Andy Kim**

	<b>RV</b>	<b>GP</b>
<b>Favorable</b>	24%	23%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	10%	10%
<b>No opinion</b>	24%	23%
<b>Don't know person</b>	42%	45%
<b>Unweighted N=</b>	729	827

	<b>Party ID</b>			<b>Gender</b>		<b>Race or Ethnicity</b>		<b>Age</b>			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	White, Non-Hispanic	Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
<b>Favorable</b>	31%	23%	8%	20%	25%	26%	19%	18%	19%	28%	26%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	4%	7%	25%	13%	7%	12%	6%	10%	7%	14%	7%
<b>No opinion</b>	19%	24%	28%	24%	22%	24%	21%	17%	27%	20%	30%
<b>DK person</b>	46%	46%	39%	43%	47%	38%	54%	56%	47%	37%	38%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	317	324	182	407	412	547	263	235	167	222	201

	<b>Income</b>				<b>Region</b>					<b>Education</b>			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
<b>Favorable</b>	21%	21%	24%	27%	13%	21%	15%	35%	30%	19%	20%	27%	26%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	10%	8%	10%	10%	1%	9%	11%	13%	15%	10%	9%	10%	9%
<b>No opinion</b>	20%	24%	31%	20%	25%	20%	23%	23%	28%	18%	30%	18%	28%
<b>DK person</b>	49%	47%	35%	43%	62%	50%	51%	29%	27%	52%	40%	44%	37%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	158	236	153	205	113	320	127	132	135	208	175	221	221

**New Jersey Ratings  
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

**NJ1B We'd like to ask you about some people. Please indicate if your general impression of each one is favorable or unfavorable, or if you do not have an opinion or do not know the person.**

*Note: This question was part of a split sample. Half of respondents received NJ1A and half received NJ1B.*

**Bob Menendez**

	<b>RV</b>	<b>GP</b>
<b>Favorable</b>	9%	9%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	64%	60%
<b>No opinion</b>	15%	15%
<b>Don't know person</b>	12%	16%
<b>Unweighted N=</b>	728	826

	<b>Party ID</b>			<b>Gender</b>		<b>Race or Ethnicity</b>		<b>Age</b>			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	White, Non-Hispanic	Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
<b>Favorable</b>	13%	8%	4%	6%	12%	5%	14%	10%	8%	11%	7%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	57%	55%	73%	69%	51%	72%	44%	40%	51%	69%	80%
<b>No opinion</b>	14%	16%	12%	10%	19%	13%	17%	17%	19%	15%	10%
<b>DK person</b>	16%	20%	10%	15%	18%	10%	25%	34%	22%	5%	4%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	316	324	182	407	411	546	263	235	167	222	200

	<b>Income</b>				<b>Region</b>					<b>Education</b>			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
<b>Favorable</b>	16%	10%	4%	6%	12%	11%	8%	7%	5%	14%	7%	5%	7%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	38%	62%	67%	73%	54%	61%	64%	49%	71%	47%	59%	74%	67%
<b>No opinion</b>	18%	14%	17%	10%	17%	10%	13%	24%	14%	16%	17%	12%	13%
<b>DK person</b>	27%	15%	13%	11%	16%	18%	15%	21%	11%	23%	17%	8%	13%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	158	236	153	205	112	320	127	132	135	208	175	221	220

**New Jersey Ratings  
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

**NJ1B We'd like to ask you about some people. Please indicate if your general impression of each one is favorable or unfavorable, or if you do not have an opinion or do not know the person.**

*Note: This question was part of a split sample. Half of respondents received NJ1A and half received NJ1B.*

**Jon Bramnick**

	<b>RV</b>	<b>GP</b>
<b>Favorable</b>	8%	8%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	7%	6%
<b>No opinion</b>	20%	20%
<b>Don't know person</b>	65%	66%
<b>Unweighted N=</b>	728	826

	<b>Party ID</b>			<b>Gender</b>		<b>Race or Ethnicity</b>		<b>Age</b>			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	White, Non-Hispanic	Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
<b>Favorable</b>	7%	7%	11%	7%	9%	7%	9%	7%	9%	10%	6%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	5%	5%	11%	8%	5%	7%	5%	8%	4%	7%	4%
<b>No opinion</b>	19%	21%	18%	19%	20%	19%	20%	18%	24%	20%	19%
<b>DK person</b>	69%	67%	60%	67%	67%	67%	65%	67%	63%	63%	72%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	317	323	182	407	411	547	262	234	167	222	201

	<b>Income</b>				<b>Region</b>					<b>Education</b>			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
<b>Favorable</b>	9%	7%	9%	8%	7%	4%	17%	9%	7%	7%	6%	10%	9%
<b>Unfavorable</b>	6%	5%	12%	5%	0%	8%	3%	5%	11%	7%	7%	7%	3%
<b>No opinion</b>	22%	17%	15%	26%	21%	22%	19%	16%	19%	13%	28%	21%	22%
<b>DK person</b>	64%	72%	64%	62%	72%	66%	60%	70%	63%	73%	60%	62%	66%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	157	236	153	205	113	319	127	132	135	207	175	221	221

**New Jersey Ratings  
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

**NJ2 In general, would you say the state of New Jersey [ROTATE: is currently going in the right direction] or [has gone off on the wrong track]?**

	<b>GP</b>
<b>Right direction</b>	43%
<b>Wrong track</b>	47%
<b>Don't know</b>	11%
<b>Unweighted N=</b>	1655

	<b>Party ID</b>			<b>Gender</b>		<b>Race or Ethnicity</b>				<b>Age</b>			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
<b>Right</b>	68%	34%	17%	43%	42%	39%	52%	48%	44%	44%	42%	35%	51%
<b>Wrong</b>	23%	51%	77%	48%	45%	52%	34%	45%	36%	38%	48%	58%	41%
<b>DK</b>	10%	15%	6%	9%	13%	9%	15%	8%	19%	18%	10%	8%	8%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	603	657	382	853	790	1073	160	213	180	440	359	454	400

	<b>Income</b>				<b>Region</b>					<b>Education</b>			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
<b>Right</b>	41%	44%	38%	46%	51%	45%	39%	39%	36%	41%	36%	44%	51%
<b>Wrong</b>	47%	46%	55%	46%	39%	44%	48%	49%	56%	47%	54%	46%	38%
<b>DK</b>	12%	11%	7%	9%	10%	11%	12%	12%	9%	12%	10%	10%	11%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	333	456	297	424	225	615	256	286	273	383	392	410	467

**New Jersey Ratings  
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

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

*Note: Additional items held for later release.*

**New Jersey**

	<b>GP</b>
<b>Excellent</b>	12%
<b>Good</b>	40%
<b>Fair</b>	32%
<b>Poor</b>	15%
<b>Don't know</b>	0%
<b>Unweighted N=</b>	1652

	<b>Party ID</b>			<b>Gender</b>		<b>Race or Ethnicity</b>				<b>Age</b>			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
<b>Excellent</b>	19%	9%	6%	12%	12%	11%	13%	12%	15%	14%	9%	10%	14%
<b>Good</b>	49%	37%	32%	39%	41%	41%	38%	39%	44%	39%	41%	37%	47%
<b>Fair</b>	27%	35%	35%	32%	32%	31%	31%	35%	30%	33%	30%	34%	29%
<b>Poor</b>	5%	19%	26%	17%	14%	16%	18%	14%	10%	13%	20%	19%	9%
<b>DK</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	1%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	602	656	381	852	788	1073	159	212	179	438	357	455	400

**New Jersey Ratings  
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

	Income				Region					Education			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
<b>Excellent</b>	13%	11%	9%	13%	14%	13%	12%	9%	9%	10%	9%	13%	16%
<b>Good</b>	33%	44%	37%	45%	43%	39%	47%	40%	37%	36%	38%	39%	50%
<b>Fair</b>	30%	33%	37%	28%	30%	35%	26%	32%	32%	35%	32%	35%	26%
<b>Poor</b>	23%	11%	16%	13%	13%	13%	14%	19%	21%	19%	20%	12%	8%
<b>DK</b>	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%
<b>Unwt N=</b>	331	455	297	424	225	615	255	285	272	380	391	410	468



## **Methodology**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

## New Jersey Ratings Rutgers-Eagleton Poll

adjustment can be incorporated into tests of statistical significance when using these data. The so-called "design effect" or *deff* represents the loss in statistical efficiency that results from a disproportionate sample design and systematic non-response. The total sample design effect for this survey is 1.39.

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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