#### Eagleton Institute of Politics Rutgers University–New Brunswick 191 Ryders Lane New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901

eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu poll@eagleton.rutgers.edu 848-932-8940

#### WEDNESDAY, JULY 2, 2025

#### **CONTACT:**

Ashley Koning, Director Office: 848-932-8940 akoning@rutgers.edu

All news releases are available at <a href="https://eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu/press">https://eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu/press</a> releases/. Follow the Rutgers-Eagleton Poll on <a href="facebook">Facebook</a> and <a href="mailto:Bluesky">Bluesky</a>.

# In Governor's Race, Sherrill Holds Edge Over Ciattarelli With New Jersey Voters, but Gap Narrows on Economic Issues

Enthusiasm is high for both candidates, yet Sherrill is seen as more moderate; half say Trump is a "major factor" in voting choice

NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J. (July 2, 2025) – As the fall campaign season officially kicks off, congresswoman and Democratic nominee for New Jersey governor Mikie Sherrill takes the lead out of the gate and is seen as more trustworthy to handle a number of issues facing the state, according to the latest Rutgers-Eagleton Poll.

But with several months to go, notable numbers of voters haven't yet made up their minds – and the gaps between Sherrill and former state assemblyman and Republican nominee Jack Ciattarelli are smallest when it comes to some of the most important issues facing New Jersey.

Fifty-one percent say they would vote for Sherrill if the election were being held today, while 31% say they would vote for Ciattarelli; 5% say neither or someone else and 13% are unsure. When leaners are included, 56% go for Sherrill, 35% for Ciattarelli, 3% say neither or someone else and 6% are uncertain.

"Early polling on the governor's race should serve as a baseline or a barometer of how voters are feeling in the moment – not as some crystal ball predicting the future four months from now," said Ashley Koning, an assistant research professor and director of the Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling at Rutgers University-New Brunswick. "A lot can happen between now and November, and we know this gap will very likely narrow in the next several months. We only need to look back to 2021 to see how much a race can change throughout a cycle. Add to this an intense national political landscape that will, once again, surely play a role in the governor's race here at home. Come November, what will matter is who actually turns out to vote."

Sherrill's base has more quickly coalesced around her than Ciattarelli's: 89% of Democrats (95%

with leaners) say they will vote for their party's nominee, versus 74% of Republicans (79% with leaners) who say the same about theirs. Twice as many Republicans as Democrats are unsure (14% to 7%, respectively). Independents are about one-and-a-half times more likely to go for Sherrill over Ciattarelli right now – 45% to 28% (51% to 34% with leaners), though 20% are undecided at this point (10% with leaners).

President Donald Trump looms large over the race: 52% of voters say he is a "major factor" in their vote for governor and another 18% say he is a "minor" one, while 30% say he isn't a factor at all. Those likely in Sherrill's camp are much more prone to say Trump is a "major factor" for them (69% of Democrats, 75% of 2025 Sherrill supporters, 74% of 2024 Kamala Harris voters, and 71% of 2021 Murphy voters) than those who are likely in Ciattarelli's camp (35% of Republicans, 27% of 2025 Ciattarelli supporters, 31% of 2024 Trump voters, and 23% of 2021 Ciattarelli voters). Nearly half of independents (48%) say Trump is a "major factor" for them, 20% a "minor" one and 32% not a factor at all.

"Trump's influence appears to be more of a benefit to Sherrill right now, given key groups more likely to support her are also more likely to claim the president is a factor in their vote choice, while those more supportive of Ciattarelli do not," Koning said. "While Trump's endorsement may have helped in the primaries, these numbers are an early sign that the endorsement may play differently when it comes to the general."

Voters on each side have an equal amount of enthusiasm for their respective candidate: 78% of Sherrill voters say they are "very" (30%) or "somewhat" (48%) enthusiastic about Sherrill, while 80% say the same (29% "very," 51% "somewhat) about Ciattarelli.

Seventy-eight percent say they will "definitely vote" in the November election, while another 15% say they will "probably vote."

Sherrill performs better than Ciattarelli on a variety of issues, though her edge vanishes on the top issue facing the state. Voters virtually are split on who would better handle taxes in New Jersey: 39% say Sherrill, 34% say Ciattarelli, 14% say neither and 14% are unsure. When it comes to the second biggest problem facing New Jersey, more voters choose Sherrill, with 45% trusting her to handle cost of living and affordability, while 29% say they would trust Ciattarelli more; 13% say neither and 13% are unsure.

On other fiscal issues, voters give Sherrill a slimmer advantage: 42% to 33% Ciattarelli on New Jersey's economy and jobs and 42% to 32% Ciattarelli on the state budget and government spending; in each case, a quarter either say "neither" would do a better job on these issues or are unsure.

Sherrill is a clear favorite with voters right now on the issues of health care (51% to 24%) and education and schools (50% to 24%), as well as transportation and infrastructure (45% to 29%). Ciattarelli, once again, comes within the margin of error to Sherrill on the issue of crime and safety, however, with 39% saying Sherrill will do a better job, while 37% say Ciattarelli will; 9%

say neither and 14% are unsure.

While Democrats and Republicans side with their respective candidates in terms of who would handle each of these issues better, it's a true toss-up for independents on the economy, taxes, cost of living and affordability and crime and safety. Independents give Sherrill a definite edge when it comes to education and schools (46% to 19%), health care (45% to 16%), and transportation and infrastructure (40% to 23%).

Sherrill is seen as the more moderate candidate between the two and overall seen by a majority of voters as "moderate" to "somewhat liberal." Twenty-five percent say she is moderate, 35% say somewhat liberal and 16% say "very liberal." Three percent say she is "somewhat conservative" and 1% say "very conservative." Nineteen percent are unsure how to classify Sherrill's ideology.

On the other hand, more than two-thirds of voters view Ciattarelli as conservative ideologically at some level. Thirty-four percent say the Republican nominee is "very conservative," 34% say "somewhat conservative," 10% say "moderate," 4% say "somewhat liberal" and 1% say "very liberal." Seventeen percent are unsure how to classify Ciattarelli's ideology.

Sherrill and Ciattarelli have both made large gains in terms of name recognition since April. Fifty percent of voters are now favorable toward Sherrill (up 30 points), while 21% are unfavorable (up 7 points), 17% have no opinion (down 5 points) and 12% don't know who she is (down 32 points). Thirty-three percent of voters are now favorable toward Ciattarelli (up 15 points), while 42% are unfavorable (up 18 points), 15% have no opinion (down 11 points) and 9% don't know who he is (down 23 points).

Democrats are more supportive of Sherrill (82%) than Republicans are of Ciattarelli (71% favorable). A plurality of independents are favorable toward Sherrill (43% favorable to 16% unfavorable) but unfavorable toward Ciattarelli (28% favorable to 40% unfavorable).

Results are from a statewide poll of 621 adults contacted through the probability-based Rutgers-Eagleton/SSRS Garden State Panel from June 13 to June 16. The full sample has a margin of error of +/- 5.4 percentage points. The registered voter subsample contains 579 registered voters and has a margin of error of +/- 5.2 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 Kiana Miranda at <a href="mailto:kiana.miranda@eagleton.rutgers.edu">kiana.miranda@eagleton.rutgers.edu</a>.

#### 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: <a href="mailto:eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu">eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu</a>. You can also visit our Facebook and Bluesky.

#### 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.

#### 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 degreegranting 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.

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.

#### LV1. There will be an election for governor of New Jersey in November. How likely are you to vote in this election?

Definitely will vote	78%
Probably will vote	15%
Probably will not vote	4%
Definitely will not vote	1%
Don't know	1%
Unweighted N=	577

	ı	Party ID		Gender		Race or Ethnicity		Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	White, Non-Hispanic	Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Def will	84%	71%	79%	79%	77%	86%	66%	56%	75%	81%	96%
Prob will	10%	20%	17%	16%	15%	10%	24%	28%	18%	16%	2%
Prob won't	4%	4%	3%	4%	4%	3%	5%	12%	3%	1%	0%
Def won't	0%	4%	1%	0%	2%	1%	3%	4%	1%	1%	0%
Don't know	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	3%	1%	3%	2%	1%
Unwt N=	269	183	125	265	310	367	208	119	143	166	149

		Inc	ome		Education				
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K		HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work	
Def will	68%	79%	84%	80%	77%	77%	76%	82%	
Prob will	20%	17%	12%	13%	20%	13%	16%	11%	
Prob won't	7%	0%	2%	5%	2%	5%	3%	5%	
Def won't	2%	2%	1%	1%	0%	3%	3%	0%	
Don't know	3%	1%	1%	1%	0%	2%	2%	2%	
Unwt N=	123	153	121	142	124	142	146	165	

# H1. If the election for governor were being held today, would you vote for [ROTATE: Mikie Sherrill the Democrat] or [Jack Ciattarelli the Republican]?

Mikie Sherrill the Democrat	51%
Jack Ciattarelli the Republican	31%
Neither/Someone else	5%
Don't know	13%
Unweighted N=	575

	F	Party ID		Gender		Race or Ethnicity		Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	White,	Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
						Non-Hispanic					
Sherrill	89%	45%	8%	44%	58%	39%	70%	59%	60%	36%	53%
Ciattarelli	2%	28%	74%	37%	25%	44%	10%	16%	20%	44%	39%
Neither/Else	3%	7%	4%	4%	4%	4%	6%	6%	5%	5%	3%
Don't know	7%	20%	14%	14%	12%	13%	15%	20%	15%	15%	6%
Unwt N=	268	182	125	265	308	365	208	119	143	165	148

		Inc	ome		Education				
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work	
Sherrill	48%	54%	52%	53%	48%	48%	53%	55%	
Ciattarelli	28%	28%	36%	30%	37%	37%	28%	22%	
Neither/Else	6%	4%	3%	6%	4%	6%	5%	4%	
Don't know	19%	15%	9%	11%	11%	10%	14%	19%	
Unwt N=	122	153	120	142	123	141	146	165	

#### H1A. If you had to choose between one of the following candidates at this moment, would you lean toward...?

#### [COMBINED H1+H1A: VOTE CHOICE + LEANERS]

Mikie Sherrill the Democrat	56%
Jack Ciattarelli the Republican	35%
Neither/Someone else	3%
Don't know	6%
Unweighted N=	575

	ı	Party ID	rty ID Gend		der Race or Ethnicity		Age				
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Man Woman		Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
						Non-Hispanic					
Sherrill	95%	51%	11%	50%	62%	43%	78%	64%	65%	43%	56%
Ciattarelli	2%	34%	79%	41%	30%	49%	12%	20%	24%	48%	42%
Neither/Else	1%	5%	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%	4%	2%	4%	0%
Don't know	2%	10%	7%	8%	5%	6%	7%	12%	9%	4%	1%
Unwt N=	268	182	125	265	308	365	208	119	143	165	148

		Inco	ome		Education				Presidential Vote 2024		Gov Vote 2021	
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	Harris	Trump	Harris	Trump	College grad	Grad work	Harris	Trump	Murphy	Ciattarelli
Sherrill	60%	57%	53%	58%	57%	50%	59%	59%	90%	14%	80%	6%
Ciattarelli	28%	33%	42%	34%	37%	40%	35%	27%	1%	69%	11%	79%
Neither/Else	5%	2%	2%	2%	3%	4%	2%	2%	4%	3%	3%	6%
Don't know	8%	8%	3%	6%	4%	6%	4%	11%	5%	15%	6%	9%
Unwt N=	122	153	120	142	123	141	146	165	318	175	276	108

#### LV2A. How enthusiastic are you about voting for Mikie Sherrill?

[Note: This question was only asked of those who said they either would vote for or lean toward Mikie Sherrill.]

Very enthusiastic	30%
Somewhat enthusiastic	48%
Not very enthusiastic	17%
Not at all enthusiastic	2%
Don't know	3%
Unweighted N=	367

#### LV2B. How enthusiastic are you about voting for Jack Ciattarelli?

[Note: This question was only asked of those who said they either would vote for or lean toward Jack Ciattarelli.]

Very enthusiastic	29%
Somewhat enthusiastic	51%
Not very enthusiastic	15%
Not at all enthusiastic	3%
Don't know	2%
Unweighted N=	156

HF1. Regardless of who you support, please indicate if your general impression of each 2025 gubernatorial candidate is favorable or unfavorable, or if you do not have an opinion or do not know the person.

#### Mikie Sherrill

Favorable	50%
Unfavorable	21%
No opinion	17%
Don't know person	12%
Unweighted N=	576

	F	Party ID		Gender		Race or	Age				
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	White,	Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
						Non-Hispanic					
Favorable	82%	43%	13%	48%	52%	43%	61%	49%	49%	45%	55%
Unfavorable	3%	16%	50%	24%	18%	27%	11%	14%	15%	27%	25%
No opinion	7%	24%	23%	19%	15%	20%	13%	20%	24%	18%	9%
DK person	8%	16%	13%	9%	15%	10%	15%	17%	11%	9%	11%
Unwt N=	271	182	123	264	310	366	208	119	142	166	149

	Income					Educ	ation		2024 Presidential Vote		2021 Gov Vote	
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K		Trump	Harris	Trump	College grad	Grad work	Harris	Trump	Murphy	Ciattarelli
Favorable	49%	51%	48%	51%	52%	44%	42%	61%	80%	19%	73%	18%
Unfavorable	17%	21%	20%	20%	19%	30%	25%	10%	1%	43%	10%	57%
No opinion	9%	19%	17%	24%	12%	18%	19%	22%	10%	25%	10%	16%
DK person	24%	9%	15%	5%	17%	8%	14%	8%	8%	14%	7%	9%
Unwt N=	123	153	119	142	124	141	146	165	322	172	279	108

HF1. Regardless of who you support, please indicate if your general impression of each 2025 gubernatorial candidate is favorable or unfavorable, or if you do not have an opinion or do not know the person.

#### Jack Ciattarelli

Favorable	33%
Unfavorable	42%
No opinion	15%
Don't know person	9%
Unweighted N=	576

	F	Party ID			Gender		Race or Ethnicity			Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	White, Non-Hispanic	Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+		
Favorable	9%	28%	71%	39%	27%	43%	16%	17%	27%	45%	39%		
Unfavorable	65%	40%	14%	42%	42%	39%	48%	48%	48%	29%	46%		
No opinion	14%	22%	10%	14%	17%	14%	18%	19%	16%	21%	7%		
DK person	12%	10%	5%	4%	14%	5%	17%	17%	9%	5%	8%		
Unwt N=	269	183	124	265	309	367	207	119	143	166	148		

		Income				Educ	ation		Presidential Vote 2024		Gov Vote 2021	
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	_ ·	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work	Harris	Trump	Murphy	Ciattarelli
Favorable	37%	29%	34%	32%	42%	37%	31%	21%	5%	68%	16%	77%
Unfavorable	35%	43%	45%	45%	37%	40%	45%	48%	73%	11%	64%	15%
No opinion	13%	19%	12%	17%	13%	19%	11%	19%	12%	15%	11%	8%
DK person	15%	9%	10%	6%	8%	4%	14%	12%	11%	6%	9%	0%
Unwt N=	124	152	120	141	124	142	145	165	320	174	277	108

#### H2. Is Donald Trump's presidency a major factor, a minor factor, or not a factor at all in your vote for governor?

Major factor	52%
Minor factor	18%
Not a factor at all	30%
Unweighted N=	577

	F	Party ID			Gender		Race or Ethnicity			Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	White, Non-Hispanic	Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+		
Major	69%	48%	35%	49%	54%	49%	56%	53%	55%	41%	59%		
Minor	10%	20%	27%	23%	14%	21%	14%	22%	16%	21%	14%		
Not a factor	21%	32%	38%	28%	32%	30%	29%	25%	29%	38%	26%		
Unwt N=	269	183	125	265	310	367	208	119	143	166	149		

		Inc	ome			Education			2025 Gov Vote		2024 Pres Vote		2021 Gov Vote	
	<\$50K	•	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work	Sherrill	Ciattarelli	Harris	Trump	Murphy	Ciattarelli
Major	57%	54%	41%	52%	56%	46%	53%	52%	75%	27%	74%	31%	71%	23%
Minor	12%	20%	18%	22%	16%	22%	12%	24%	11%	30%	11%	26%	11%	27%
Not	30%	26%	41%	26%	28%	32%	35%	24%	14%	44%	15%	43%	18%	50%
Unwt N=	123	153	121	142	124	142	146	165	339	138	320	175	278	108

### New Jersey's economy and jobs

Mikie Sherrill	42%
Jack Ciattarelli	33%
Neither	10%
Don't know	14%
Unweighted N=	575

	F	Party ID			Gender		Race or Ethnicity			Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	White, Non-Hispanic	Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+		
Sherrill	76%	34%	6%	37%	48%	35%	54%	48%	42%	34%	46%		
Ciattarelli	5%	31%	73%	39%	28%	42%	18%	22%	26%	46%	35%		
Neither	6%	20%	6%	13%	8%	11%	10%	10%	14%	10%	9%		
Don't know	13%	15%	15%	12%	16%	12%	18%	21%	19%	11%	9%		
Unwt N=	269	182	124	265	308	367	206	117	142	166	150		

		Inc	ome		Education					
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work		
Sherrill	51%	45%	40%	36%	44%	43%	39%	43%		
Ciattarelli	33%	25%	38%	33%	38%	35%	31%	27%		
Neither	7%	14%	6%	12%	10%	12%	7%	13%		
Don't know	8%	16%	16%	19%	8%	11%	22%	17%		
Unwt N=	122	153	120	141	125	140	146	164		

#### Taxes

Mikie Sherrill	39%
Jack Ciattarelli	34%
Neither	14%
Don't know	14%
Unweighted N=	575

	Party ID		Gender		Race or Ethnicity		Age				
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	White,	Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
						Non-Hispanic					
Sherrill	71%	27%	9%	31%	46%	33%	48%	39%	45%	30%	42%
Ciattarelli	5%	35%	70%	40%	29%	42%	21%	28%	25%	48%	31%
Neither	9%	22%	10%	17%	10%	14%	12%	15%	10%	10%	19%
Don't know	15%	16%	10%	13%	15%	11%	19%	19%	20%	12%	7%
Unwt N=	269	181	125	264	309	366	207	118	141	167	149

		Inc	ome		Education				
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work	
Sherrill	41%	43%	41%	33%	38%	39%	36%	42%	
Ciattarelli	34%	24%	35%	41%	35%	38%	35%	27%	
Neither	8%	17%	15%	13%	10%	15%	15%	15%	
Don't know	18%	15%	9%	12%	17%	8%	14%	16%	
Unwt N=	122	152	121	141	124	141	145	165	

### The state budget and government spending

Mikie Sherrill	42%
Jack Ciattarelli	32%
Neither	11%
Don't know	15%
Unweighted N=	576

	Party ID		Gender		Race or Ethnicity		Age				
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	White, Non-Hispanic	Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Sherrill	75%	34%	6%	37%	46%	34%	53%	44%	40%	33%	49%
Ciattarelli	4%	29%	74%	36%	29%	40%	20%	23%	27%	41%	35%
Neither	4%	22%	7%	15%	6%	11%	10%	11%	11%	12%	9%
Don't know	17%	15%	13%	12%	18%	14%	17%	21%	22%	13%	7%
Unwt N=	269	182	125	265	309	367	207	119	142	166	149

		Inc	ome		Education				
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work	
Sherrill	39%	47%	43%	37%	42%	40%	39%	45%	
Ciattarelli	39%	23%	35%	34%	38%	37%	32%	23%	
Neither	5%	11%	12%	13%	6%	13%	11%	14%	
Don't know	17%	19%	10%	16%	14%	11%	17%	18%	
Unwt N=	123	152	120	142	123	142	146	165	

#### **Education and schools**

Mikie Sherrill	50%
Jack Ciattarelli	24%
Neither	11%
Don't know	15%
Unweighted N=	579

	Party ID		Gender		Race or Ethnicity		Age				
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	White, Non-Hispanic	Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Sherrill	81%	46%	13%	46%	53%	43%	62%	57%	49%	38%	56%
Ciattarelli	2%	19%	59%	25%	23%	32%	12%	12%	23%	33%	26%
Neither	4%	21%	8%	14%	8%	11%	10%	10%	11%	13%	10%
Don't know	13%	13%	20%	15%	15%	15%	16%	21%	17%	16%	8%
Unwt N=	271	183	125	265	312	368	209	119	143	167	150

		Inc	ome		Education				
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work	
Sherrill	43%	55%	51%	52%	47%	45%	51%	57%	
Ciattarelli	32%	20%	21%	22%	29%	32%	20%	15%	
Neither	9%	11%	10%	11%	9%	15%	13%	7%	
Don't know	16%	14%	18%	16%	15%	7%	17%	21%	
Unwt N=	124	153	121	142	125	142	146	166	

### Cost of living and affordability

Mikie Sherrill	45%
Jack Ciattarelli	29%
Neither	13%
Don't know	13%
Unweighted N=	578

	Party ID		Gender		Race or Ethnicity		Age				
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	White,	Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
					Non-Hispanic						
Sherrill	80%	34%	10%	39%	50%	33%	64%	51%	46%	35%	48%
Ciattarelli	2%	26%	68%	31%	27%	40%	12%	16%	22%	44%	30%
Neither	6%	25%	10%	18%	8%	16%	9%	15%	13%	11%	15%
Don't know	11%	15%	13%	11%	15%	12%	15%	19%	18%	10%	7%
Unwt N=	270	183	125	265	311	368	208	119	142	167	150

		Inc	ome		Education				
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work	
Sherrill	54%	41%	48%	39%	49%	43%	43%	42%	
Ciattarelli	28%	25%	29%	30%	31%	36%	27%	22%	
Neither	5%	18%	10%	18%	11%	12%	12%	20%	
Don't know	12%	16%	13%	13%	9%	9%	18%	16%	
Unwt N=	123	153	121	142	124	142	146	166	

# **Crime and safety**

Mikie Sherrill	39%
Jack Ciattarelli	37%
Neither	9%
Don't know	14%
Unweighted N=	578

	Party ID			Ger	Gender Race or			Ethnicity		Age	
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	White,	Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
						Non-Hispanic					
Sherrill	72%	31%	5%	32%	47%	31%	52%	39%	46%	30%	45%
Ciattarelli	6%	35%	80%	44%	30%	47%	20%	28%	26%	47%	41%
Neither	7%	16%	5%	11%	7%	8%	11%	14%	9%	8%	8%
Don't know	15%	18%	10%	13%	16%	13%	17%	20%	19%	15%	6%
Unwt N=	271	183	124	265	311	367	209	119	142	167	150

		Inc	ome		Education				
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work	
Sherrill	40%	40%	44%	36%	43%	39%	36%	39%	
Ciattarelli	39%	34%	38%	34%	38%	43%	36%	30%	
Neither	7%	11%	6%	13%	8%	10%	7%	13%	
Don't know	13%	15%	13%	16%	12%	8%	20%	17%	
Unwt N=	124	153	120	142	125	141	146	166	

#### **Transportation and infrastructure**

Mikie Sherrill	45%
Jack Ciattarelli	29%
Neither	9%
Don't know	17%
Unweighted N=	577

	Party ID			Ger	nder	Race or	Race or Ethnicity		Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	White,	Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+	
					Non-Hispanic							
Sherrill	77%	40%	6%	42%	47%	36%	58%	47%	47%	37%	48%	
Ciattarelli	4%	23%	68%	32%	27%	39%	12%	17%	22%	40%	34%	
Neither	2%	21%	6%	12%	7%	9%	10%	16%	7%	8%	8%	
Don't know	17%	15%	19%	15%	19%	16%	19%	20%	25%	15%	10%	
Unwt N=	269	183	125	265	310	368	207	118	142	167	150	

		Inc	ome		Education				
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work	
Sherrill	46%	41%	45%	47%	48%	40%	42%	49%	
Ciattarelli	31%	29%	28%	26%	31%	36%	28%	21%	
Neither	6%	12%	12%	7%	6%	11%	13%	8%	
Don't know	17%	18%	14%	20%	15%	13%	17%	22%	
Unwt N=	122	153	121	142	124	141	146	166	

#### **Health care**

Mikie Sherrill	51%
Jack Ciattarelli	24%
Neither	14%
Don't know	12%
Unweighted N=	578

	Party ID			Ger	nder	Race or	Ethnicity		Age		
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	White,	Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
					Non-Hispanic						
Sherrill	85%	45%	10%	47%	54%	42%	65%	56%	53%	41%	54%
Ciattarelli	2%	16%	62%	24%	24%	33%	10%	16%	18%	33%	26%
Neither	4%	25%	15%	18%	9%	15%	11%	14%	13%	16%	12%
Don't know	9%	14%	13%	11%	13%	10%	14%	14%	16%	10%	8%
Unwt N=	271	182	125	265	311	367	209	118	143	167	150

		Inc	ome		Education				
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work	
Sherrill	53%	52%	50%	50%	52%	45%	51%	53%	
Ciattarelli	30%	22%	24%	20%	31%	30%	20%	14%	
Neither	8%	14%	13%	17%	10%	16%	14%	16%	
Don't know	9%	13%	13%	14%	7%	9%	15%	16%	
Unwt N=	124	152	121	142	125	142	145	166	

H4A. Would you consider Mikie Sherrill to be [ROTATE ORDER: very liberal, somewhat liberal, moderate, somewhat conservative, very conservative]?

16%
35%
25%
3%
1%
19%
579

	Party ID		Ger	Gender		Race or Ethnicity		Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	White, Non-Hispanic	Non-White	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Very lib	6%	14%	32%	18%	15%	21%	10%	10%	15%	20%	19%
Smwht lib	40%	32%	31%	38%	32%	33%	39%	40%	32%	35%	32%
Moderate	35%	26%	12%	25%	25%	25%	26%	17%	32%	24%	28%
Smwht cons	5%	2%	2%	1%	5%	3%	4%	3%	2%	5%	3%
Very cons	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%	3%	1%	3%	0%	0%
Don't know	13%	24%	22%	16%	22%	19%	20%	28%	17%	15%	18%
Unwt N=	271	183	125	265	312	368	209	119	143	167	150

		Inc	ome		Education				
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work	
Very lib	17%	12%	18%	15%	17%	21%	19%	9%	
Smwht lib	25%	33%	44%	42%	27%	32%	36%	45%	
Moderate	24%	29%	17%	29%	28%	23%	20%	30%	
Smwht cons	5%	4%	4%	1%	5%	5%	2%	1%	
Very cons	2%	0%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	0%	
Don't know	26%	21%	17%	13%	22%	18%	22%	14%	
Unwt N=	124	153	121	142	125	142	146	166	

H4B. Would you consider Jack Ciattarelli to be [ROTATE ORDER: very liberal, somewhat liberal, moderate, somewhat conservative, very conservative]?

Very liberal	1%
Somewhat liberal	4%
Moderate	10%
Somewhat conservative	34%
Very conservative	34%
Don't know	17%
Unweighted N=	574

	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 lib	0%	2%	0%	0%	2%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%
Smwht lib	4%	2%	5%	1%	6%	4%	3%	2%	6%	1%	5%
Moderate	5%	11%	17%	12%	9%	10%	10%	12%	10%	9%	10%
Smwht cons	22%	31%	55%	42%	28%	39%	27%	32%	31%	42%	32%
Very cons	48%	35%	13%	37%	30%	33%	34%	33%	34%	34%	33%
Don't know	21%	19%	11%	9%	26%	13%	25%	19%	18%	14%	19%
Unwt N=	268	181	125	263	309	366	206	119	142	166	147

		Inc	ome		Education				
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work	
Very lib	0%	0%	4%	0%	1%	0%	2%	0%	
Smwht lib	5%	8%	2%	0%	5%	7%	2%	0%	
Moderate	14%	12%	2%	8%	14%	15%	9%	2%	
Smwht cons	27%	22%	43%	46%	31%	35%	34%	38%	
Very cons	27%	36%	36%	34%	31%	27%	34%	41%	
Don't know	27%	21%	12%	11%	17%	16%	19%	17%	

#### Methodology

The Rutgers-Eagleton Poll was conducted using the Rutgers-Eagleton/Garden State Panel from June 3 to 16, 2025, with a scientifically selected random sample of 621 New Jersey adults, 18 or older. Analysis is based on a registered voter subsample of 577 New Jersey adults, 18 or older, who are self-reported registered voters. The Rutgers-Eagleton/SSRS Garden State Panel is a probability-based panel of New Jersey adults aged 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. Sample drawn was stratified by county, age, gender, race and ethnicity, and education to ensure adequate representation of each demographic group. Only panelists who complete surveys by web in English were eligible for selection for this study.

Data were weighted to represent the residential adult population of New Jersey **who are registered to vote**. Weighting was done by applying a base weight, making an adjustment to account for sampling only panelists who prefer to be contacted via web, and calibrating sample demographic distributions to match target population benchmarks.

At this point the data were filtered to include only respondents who reported that they were registered to vote. With the base weight applied, the data were weighted to balance the demographic profile of the sample to target population parameters.

Data were calibrated by raking sample distributions to target population distributions using iterative proportional fitting. This procedure balances each calibration variable to target benchmarks individually and iteratively. The entire set of calibration variables is cycled through until the weights converge across all dimensions.

Data were weighted to distributions of sex by age, sex by education, age by education, detailed education, race/ethnicity, region, home tenure, number of adults per household, civic engagement, internet use frequency and 2024 presidential recalled vote. Missing data in the raking variables were imputed using hot decking. Hot deck imputation replaces the missing values of a respondent randomly with another similar respondent without missing data.<sup>1</sup>

The following table shows the data sources used for calibration totals.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Hot decking was done using an SPSS macro detailed in 'Goodbye, Listwise Deletion: Presenting Hot Deck Imputation as an Easy and Effective Tool for Handing Missing Data' (Myers, 2011).

**Table 1. Calibration Variable Sources** 

Calibra	ation Variables	Sources					
•	Sex						
•	Age						
•	Education						
•	Race	2024 Current Population Survey <sup>2</sup>					
•	Hispanic nativity						
•	Number of adults in household						
•	Home tenure						
•	Region	U.S. Census Bureau. "Age and Sex." American Community Survey, ACS 1-Year Estimates Subject Tables, Table S0101, 2023 <sup>3</sup>					
•	Civic engagement Internet frequency	Modeled from SSRS Opinion Panel					
•	Voter registration	CPS 2024 Voting and Registration Supplement <sup>4</sup>					
•	2024 Presidential recalled vote	National Election Pool					

Weights were trimmed at the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 98<sup>th</sup> percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on survey-derived estimates.

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. The total sample design effect for this survey is 1.85. The design effect for the registered voter subsample is 1.63.

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 621 New Jersey adults is +/-3.9 percentage points at a 95% confidence interval. The design effect is 1.85, making the adjusted margin of error +/- 5.4 percentage points. Thus, if 50% of New Jersey adults in this sample favor a particular position, we would be 95% sure that the true figure is between 44.6 and 55.4% (50 +/- 5.4) if all New Jersey adults had been interviewed, rather than just a sample. Among the registered voter subsample (n=577), the simple sampling error is +/- 4.1 percentage points. Design effect for the registered voter subsample is 1.63, making the adjusted margin of error +/- 5.2 percentage points.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Sarah Flood, Miriam King, Renae Rodgers, Steven Ruggles, J. Robert Warren, Daniel Backman, Annie Chen, Grace Cooper, Stephanie Richards, Megan Schouweiler and Michael Westberry. IPUMS CPS: Version 11.0 [dataset]. Minneapolis. MN: IPUMS. 2023.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Regional registered voter distribution was derived by applying the GP weighted registered voter incidence for each region to the region's adult population and reproportioning.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Current Population Survey, November 2024: Voting and Registration Supplement [machine-readable data file] conducted by the Bureau of the Census for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. - Washington: Bureau of the Census [producer and distributor], 2024.

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. The questionnaire was developed and all data analyses were completed in house by the Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling (ECPIP). Ashley Koning and Jessica Roman led analysis and preparation of this release, with assistance from David Martin and Kyle Morgan. 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 <a href="mailto:eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu">eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu</a>. For more information, please contact <a href="mailto:poll@eagleton.rutgers.edu">poll@eagleton.rutgers.edu</a>.

# Weighted Demographics 579 New Jersey Registered Voters Overall Margin of Error = +/- 5.2 percentage points

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

		deff	MOE			deff	MOE
Democrat	39%	1.77	+/- 7.9%	<50K	24%	1.72	+/- 11.5%
Independent	33%	1.54	+/- 9.0%	50K-<100K	26%	1.53	+/- 9.8%
Republican	29%	1.44	+/- 10.5%	100K-<150K	22%	1.66	+/- 11.5%
				150K+	28%	1.61	+/- 10.4%
Man	48%	1.68	+/- 7.8%				
Woman	52%	1.59	+/- 7.0%	HS or Less	28%	1.53	+/- 10.8%
				Some College	22%	1.74	+/- 10.9%
White, Non-Hisp	62%	1.55	+/- 6.4%	College Grad	25%	1.49	+/- 9.9%
Non-White	38%	1.75	+/- 9.0%	<b>Grad Work</b>	24%	1.65	+/- 9.8%
18-34	23%	1.77	+/- 11.9%				
35-49	22%	1.73	+/- 10.8%				
50-64	27%	1.54	+/- 9.4%				
65+	28%	1.50	+/- 9.8%				