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, OCT. 22, 2025

CONTACT:

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

All news releases are available at https://eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu/press releases/. Follow the Rutgers-Eagleton Poll on Facebook and Bluesky.

Sherrill and Ciattarelli Are in Close Race for New Jersey Governor, With Half of Voters Saying Trump is a Major Factor

The candidates are neck-and-neck on economic issues, schools, and transportation, according to a Rutgers-Eagleton Poll

NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J. (Oct. 22, 2025) – Just weeks ahead of the Nov. 4 election, congresswoman and Democratic nominee for governor Mikie Sherrill has a five-point lead over former state assemblyman and Republican nominee Jack Ciattarelli among likely voters in New Jersey, according to the latest Rutgers-Eagleton Poll.

Fifty percent say they would vote for Sherrill if the election were held today, 45% say they would vote for Ciattarelli, 3% say they would vote for neither or someone else, and 2% are unsure. The five-point lead is within the margin of error.

"As all eyes turn to New Jersey's governor's race as a test of the nation's political mood, the contest has narrowed in its final weeks," said Ashley Koning, an assistant research professor and director of the Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling at Rutgers University-New
Brunswick. "Polls show a close race as voters tune in and opinions solidify, but the outcome will ultimately hinge on each campaign's turnout operation. This is especially true in off-year elections, which are usually accompanied by comparatively smaller and less predictable electorates."

Partisans are taking their respective sides, with 95% of Democrats saying they would vote for Sherill and 94% of Republicans saying they would vote for Ciattarelli. Independents are more split, however – 49% for Sherrill versus 40% for Ciattarelli (within the margin of error), with 6% saying neither or someone else and 5% unsure.

There are notable differences in other key demographics, including a sharp gender gap, with women 18 points more likely than men to say they would vote for Sherrill and 16 points less

likely to vote for Ciattarelli.

Non-Hispanic white voters lean in Ciattarelli's favor (46% Sherrill to 53% Ciattarelli), but Sherrill leads by 30 points among nonwhite voters (59% to 29%). Sherrill is a clear favorite among voters 65 years or older (61% to 36%), whereas younger cohorts are more mixed – 49% to 43% among those 18 to 34, 39% to 53% among those 35 to 49, and 49% to 48% among those 50 to 64. Sherill does better with voters who have at least a college degree (61% to 35%), while Ciattarelli does better with those who have some college education or less (38% to 55%).

Regardless of who voters prefer, 43% think Sherrill will win and 42% think Ciattarelli will win; less than 1% say someone else will win and 15% are unsure.

President Donald Trump continues to loom large over the race, with 52% of voters saying he is a "major factor" in their vote for governor, 14% saying he is a "minor" one and 34% saying he isn't a factor at all.

Democrats are much more prone to say Trump is a "major factor" for them (78%) than Republicans (38%). Four in 10 independents (42%) say Trump is a "major factor" for them, 20% a "minor" one and 38% not a factor at all.

Sherrill and Ciattarelli are neck-and-neck when it comes to who voters trust to do a better job handling a variety of fiscal issues.

Voters are split on who would better handle the cost of living and affordability (42% say Sherrill, 41% say Ciattarelli), New Jersey's economy and jobs (40% say Sherrill, 46% say Ciattarelli), the state budget and government spending (39% say Sherrill, 45% say Ciattarelli), and taxes (37% say Sherrill, 44% say Ciattarelli). Voters are also divided when it comes to education and schools (47% say Sherrill, 40% say Ciattarelli), as well as transportation and infrastructure (41% say Sherrill, 40% say Ciattarelli).

Sherrill is the clear favorite with likely voters on health care (50% to 35%), while Ciattarelli is the clear favorite on crime and safety (49% to 35%).

Forty-two percent of likely voters are favorable toward Sherrill as the election draws near, while 45% are unfavorable, 11% have no opinion, and 2% don't know who she is. Forty-one percent of likely voters are favorable toward Ciattarelli, while 47% are unfavorable, 9% have no opinion, and 2% don't know who he is.

Results are from a statewide poll of 795 likely voters contacted via live calling and texting from Oct. 3 to Oct. 17. This likely voter sample has a margin of error of +/- 4.7 percentage points.

###

ABOUT THE EAGLETON CENTER FOR PUBLIC INTEREST POLLING

2025 Gubernatorial Election Rutgers-Eagleton Poll

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 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 likely voters unless otherwise noted; all percentages are of weighted results. Interpret groups with samples sizes under 100 with extreme caution.

ANALYSIS IN THE RELEASE AND INFORMATION IN THE THREE TABLES BELOW IS BASED ON COMBINATION OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

- H1. There will be an election for governor of New Jersey in November. If the election for governor were being held today, would you vote for...?
 - [ROTATE: Mikie Sherrill the Democrat], [Jack Ciattarelli the Republican], Neither/Someone else, Don't know
- H1_6. Thinking about the upcoming election for governor, did you vote for...?

 [ROTATE: Mikie Sherrill the Democrat], [Jack Ciattarelli the Republican], Neither/Someone else, Don't know Note: This question was only asked of respondents who said they already voted.
- H1A. If you had to choose between one of the following candidates at this moment, would you lean toward...? [ROTATE: Mikie Sherrill the Democrat], [Jack Ciattarelli the Republican], Neither/Someone else, Don't know Note: This question was only asked of those who responded "neither/someone else" or "don't know" to H1.

Mikie Sherrill the Democrat	50%
Jack Ciattarelli the Republican	45%
Neither/Someone else	3%
Don't know	2%
Unweighted N=	795

2025 Gubernatorial Election Rutgers-Eagleton Poll

		Party ID		Gender		Race or Ethnicity		Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Non-Hispanic white	Nonwhite	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Sherrill	95%	49%	5%	40%	58%	46%	59%	49%	39%	49%	61%
Ciattarelli	2%	40%	94%	53%	37%	53%	29%	43%	53%	48%	36%
Neither/Else	2%	6%	1%	4%	3%	1%	7%	4%	5%	2%	2%
Don't know	1%	5%	0%	2%	2%	1%	6%	4%	3%	1%	1%
Unwt N=	252	315	228	430	349	582	186	169	209	189	228

	Inco	ome	Education		
	<\$100K \$100K+		Some college	4-year college	
			or less	degree +	
Sherrill	53%	48%	38%	61%	
Ciattarelli	41%	48%	55%	35%	
Neither/else	4%	2%	4%	2%	
Don't know	2%	2%	3%	2%	
Unwt N=	303	428	328	466	

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	42%
Unfavorable	45%
No opinion	11%
Don't know person	2%
Unweighted N=	793

		Party ID		Gender		Race or Ethnicity		Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Non-Hispanic white	Nonwhite	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Favorable	80%	41%	5%	36%	47%	40%	46%	38%	32%	43%	53%
Unfavorable	6%	43%	86%	54%	37%	52%	31%	46%	54%	47%	35%
No opinion	10%	14%	8%	8%	13%	6%	19%	13%	13%	7%	10%
DK person	3%	2%	1%	1%	3%	1%	4%	3%	1%	3%	2%
Unwt N=	251	314	228	428	349	581	185	169	209	189	226

	Inco	ome	Education							
	<\$100K	\$100K+	Some college	4-year college						
			or less	degree +						
Favorable	42%	43%	33%	50%						
Unfavorable	41%	49%	52%	39%						
No opinion	15%	7%	12%	9%						
DK person	3%	1%	3%	1%						
Unwt N=	302	427	327	465						

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	41%
Unfavorable	47%
No opinion	9%
Don't know person	2%
Unweighted N=	791

		Party ID		Gender		Race or Ethnicity		Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Non-Hispanic white	Nonwhite	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Favorable	6%	31%	88%	48%	35%	48%	26%	39%	48%	43%	35%
Unfavorable	80%	55%	6%	43%	52%	45%	54%	47%	37%	47%	58%
No opinion	10%	13%	5%	8%	11%	6%	16%	13%	12%	7%	6%
DK person	4%	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	4%	1%	2%	3%	2%
Unwt N=	252	312	227	426	349	581	184	169	209	188	225

	Inco	ome	Education		
	<\$100K \$100K+		Some college or less	4-year college degree +	
Favorable	38%	44%	46%	36%	
Unfavorable	47%	48%	41%	54%	
No opinion	12%	7%	11%	8%	
DK person	3%	1%	2%	1%	
Unwt N=	303	425	326 464		

H3. Regardless of who you might prefer, which candidate do you think is going to win? Just take your best guess.

Mikie Sherrill	43%
Jack Ciattarelli	42%
Someone else	<1%
Don't know	15%
Unweighted N=	793

		Party ID		Gender		Race or Ethnicity		Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Non-Hispanic Nonwhite white		18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Sherrill	71%	44%	14%	40%	47%	38%	55%	46%	36%	45%	45%
Ciattarelli	11%	39%	76%	47%	36%	48%	29%	37%	48%	43%	38%
Else	<1%	1%	0%	1%	<1%	<1%	1%	<1%	<1%	1%	0%
Don't know	18%	17%	10%	13%	17%	14%	15%	17%	15%	11%	17%
Unwt N=	251	315	227	430	347	580	186	169	209	188	227

	Inco	ome	Educ	ation	
	<\$100K \$100K+		Some college	4-year college	
			or less	degree +	
Sherrill	44%	44%	38%	49%	
Ciattarelli	39%	42%	49%	34%	
Else	1%	<1%	1%	0%	
Don't know	17%	13%	13% 17%		
Unwt N=	302	427	327 465		

H4. 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	14%
Not a factor at all	34%
Don't know	1%
Unweighted N=	795

		Party ID		Gender		Race or Ethnicity		Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Non-Hispanic Nonwhite white		18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Major	78%	42%	38%	45%	59%	53%	52%	50%	43%	54%	60%
Minor	7%	20%	13%	18%	9%	13%	15%	18%	9%	15%	12%
Not a factor	14%	38%	49%	36%	32%	34%	32%	32%	48%	29%	28%
Don't know	1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	1%	<1%	1%	<1%	0%	2%	0%
Unwt N=	252	315	228	430	349	582	186	169	209	189	228

	Inco	ome	Education			
	<\$100K	\$100K+	Some college	4-year college		
			or less	degree +		
Major	58%	47%	48%	56%		
Minor	11%	18%	13%	14%		
Not a factor	30%	35%	38%	30%		
Don't know	1%	<1%	1% <1%			
Unwt N=	303	428	328	466		

New Jersey's economy and jobs

Mikie Sherrill	40%
Jack Ciattarelli	46%
Neither	7%
Don't know	7%
Unweighted N=	786

		Party ID		Gender		Race or Ethnicity		Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Non-Hispanic white	Nonwhite	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Sherrill	84%	34%	3%	32%	48%	36%	48%	32%	32%	42%	52%
Ciattarelli	5%	42%	91%	51%	40%	51%	34%	50%	52%	46%	37%
Neither	5%	13%	2%	10%	4%	8%	7%	9%	7%	7%	5%
Don't know	5%	11%	4%	6%	8%	5% 11%		9%	9%	4%	6%
Unwt N=	249	310	227	424	346	577	182	168	208	186	224

	Inco	ome	Education			
	<\$100K	\$100K+	Some college or less	4-year college degree +		
Sherrill	43%	40%	30%	50%		
Ciattarelli	43%	46%	57%	35%		
Neither	7%	8%	7%	7%		
Don't know	6%	6%	6%	8%		
Unwt N=	301	422	322	463		

Taxes

Mikie Sherrill	37%
Jack Ciattarelli	44%
Neither	12%
Don't know	7%
Unweighted N=	791

		Party ID		Gender		Race or Ethnicity		Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Non-Hispanic white	Nonwhite	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Sherrill	74%	34%	4%	30%	44%	34%	44%	38%	27%	36%	46%
Ciattarelli	6%	41%	86%	51%	38%	51%	31%	46%	52%	42%	38%
Neither	9%	19%	7%	16%	9%	11%	13%	11%	12%	15%	10%
Don't know	11%	6%	3%	4%	9%	4% 12%		5%	8%	7%	6%
Unwt N=	252	313	226	427	348	580	184	169	209	187	226

	Inco	ome	Education			
	<\$100K \$100K+		Some college or less	4-year college degree +		
Sherrill	39% 35%		30%	44%		
Ciattarelli	40%	48%	50%	39%		
Neither	12%	12%	12%	12%		
Don't know	9%	5%	8%	5%		
Unwt N=	303	425	326	464		

The state budget and government spending

Mikie Sherrill	39%
Jack Ciattarelli	45%
Neither	10%
Don't know	6%
Unweighted N=	787

		Party ID		Ger	Gender Race or Ethnicit		thnicity	Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Non-Hispanic white	Nonwhite	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Sherrill	81%	35%	2%	30%	48%	35%	47%	32%	33%	39%	52%
Ciattarelli	4%	41%	92%	54%	37%	51%	33%	46%	53%	47%	36%
Neither	6%	17%	5%	12%	7%	10%	9%	13%	8%	8%	9%
Don't know	10%	7%	1%	4%	8%	4% 10%		8%	5%	7%	3%
Unwt N=	251	309	227	425	347	577	183	167	209	187	224

	Inco	ome	Education			
	<\$100K	\$100K+	Some college or less	4-year college degree +		
Sherrill	43%	36%	31%	48%		
Ciattarelli	41%	48%	54%	37%		
Neither	9%	11%	10%	9%		
Don't know	8%	4%	6%	6%		
Unwt N=	301	423	325	461		

Education and schools

Mikie Sherrill	47%
Jack Ciattarelli	40%
Neither	7%
Don't know	5%
Unweighted N=	788

		Party ID		Ger	Gender Race or Ethnicity		thnicity	Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Non-Hispanic white	Nonwhite	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Sherrill	88%	48%	6%	39%	55%	43%	57%	43%	42%	45%	59%
Ciattarelli	2%	33%	87%	46%	34%	46%	27%	39%	47%	43%	32%
Neither	4%	12%	6%	10%	5%	8%	6%	9%	7%	7%	6%
Don't know	7%	7%	2%	4%	6%	3%	10%	9%	3%	5%	3%
Unwt N=	251	310	227	424	348	580	181	169	209	186	224

	Inco	ome	Education			
	<\$100K	\$100K+	Some college or less	4-year college degree +		
Sherrill	48%	47%	38%	57%		
Ciattarelli	36%	43%	49%	31%		
Neither	10%	5%	9%	6%		
Don't know	6%	4%	5%	6%		
Unwt N=	302	423	325	462		

Cost of living and affordability

Mikie Sherrill	42%
Jack Ciattarelli	41%
Neither	10%
Don't know	7%
Unweighted N=	790

		Party ID		Gender		Race or Ethnicity		Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Non-Hispanic white	Nonwhite	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Sherrill	82%	39%	6%	35%	48%	38%	50%	34%	35%	43%	55%
Ciattarelli	5%	35%	85%	46%	36%	47%	29%	42%	50%	41%	33%
Neither	5%	18%	6%	12%	8%	11%	9%	12%	9%	11%	9%
Don't know	8%	9%	4%	6%	8%	4%	12%	12%	6%	5%	3%
Unwt N=	252	311	227	426	348	581	182	169	209	188	224

	Inco	ome	Education		
	<\$100K	\$100K+	Some college	4-year college	
			or less	degree +	
Sherrill	45%	41%	34%	50%	
Ciattarelli	39%	43%	47%	35%	
Neither	9%	11%	12%	8%	
Don't know	7%	5%	7%	7%	
Unwt N=	302	425	326	463	

Crime and safety

Mikie Sherrill	35%
Jack Ciattarelli	49%
Neither	7%
Don't know	8%
Unweighted N=	789

		Party ID		Gender		Race or Ethnicity		Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Non-Hispanic white	Nonwhite	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Sherrill	73%	31%	3%	26%	44%	35%	38%	29%	28%	36%	48%
Ciattarelli	8%	47%	92%	59%	40%	54%	39%	49%	61%	50%	37%
Neither	9%	12%	1%	9%	6%	6%	10%	11%	5%	5%	8%
Don't know	10%	10%	3%	6%	10%	6%	13%	11%	6%	8%	7%
Unwt N=	250	312	227	426	347	579	183	169	209	187	224

	Inco	ome	Education			
	<\$100K	\$100K+	Some college or less	4-year college degree +		
Sherrill	37%	35%	30%	41%		
Ciattarelli	43%	55%	55%	43%		
Neither	11%	5%	7%	8%		
Don't know	10%	6%	8%	8%		
Unwt N=	302	424	325	463		

Transportation and infrastructure

Mikie Sherrill	41%
Jack Ciattarelli	40%
Neither	9%
Don't know	10%
Unweighted N=	788

		Party ID		Gender		Race or Ethnicity		Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Non-Hispanic white	Nonwhite	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Sherrill	77%	41%	5%	37%	45%	39%	46%	34%	37%	42%	50%
Ciattarelli	5%	32%	84%	44%	35%	45%	29%	41%	42%	44%	32%
Neither	6%	15%	5%	11%	8%	8%	10%	12%	12%	5%	8%
Don't know	12%	11%	6%	8%	12%	8%	15%	13%	9%	9%	10%
Unwt N=	252	311	225	424	348	578	183	168	209	187	224

	Inco	ome	Education		
	<\$100K	\$100K+	Some college	4-year college	
			or less	degree +	
Sherrill	41%	43%	33%	50%	
Ciattarelli	36%	41%	46%	33%	
Neither	10%	7%	10%	8%	
Don't know	13%	8%	11%	9%	
Unwt N=	301	424	324	463	

Healthcare

Mikie Sherrill	50%
Jack Ciattarelli	35%
Neither	8%
Don't know	7%
Unweighted N=	787

	Party ID		Gender		Race or Ethnicity		Age				
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Non-Hispanic white	Nonwhite	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Sherrill	92%	48%	11%	45%	55%	46%	60%	46%	46%	46%	61%
Ciattarelli	2%	28%	76%	37%	33%	41%	22%	30%	39%	40%	31%
Neither	1%	14%	8%	12%	4%	8%	7%	11%	9%	9%	3%
Don't know	5%	10%	5%	6%	8%	5%	11%	13%	5%	5%	5%
Unwt N=	250	311	226	424	347	578	182	168	209	186	224

	Inco	ome	Education				
	<\$100K	\$100K+	Some college	4-year college			
			or less	degree +			
Sherrill	52%	49%	42%	58%			
Ciattarelli	33%	36%	42%	28%			
Neither	8%	9%	10%	6%			
Don't know	7%	6%	7%	7%			
Unwt N=	301	423	323	463			

Methodology

The Rutgers—Eagleton Poll was conducted by telephone using live interviewers October 3-17, 2025, with a random sample of New Jersey likely voters (n=795). Likely-voter status was modeled at the respondent level: Each self-identified voter received an individual turnout probability based on past voting history and reported likelihood of voting. That probability was then incorporated into the post-stratification weights described below. This poll included 140 adults reached through live calling and 655 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 call 13% Landline call 4% Text to web 82%

The data were weighted to represent the population of registered voters in New Jersey. A base weight was not applied, as the sample was selected with equal probability from records that included a phone number. Table 1 outlines the variables used in the calibration process and identifies the sources of the benchmark distributions.

The calibration was accomplished using iterative proportional fitting (IPF). 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. 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.

Table 1. Calibration Variable Definitions and Benchmark Sources

Variable (categories)	Source
Sex (M, F)	L2 voter file
Age (18-34, 35-49, 50-64, 65+)	L2 voter file
Education (HS grad or less, some college / Assoc	CPS 2024 Voting and Registration
degree, 4-yr college grad, graduate degree)	Supplement PUMS data ¹
Race (White~Hisp, Black~Hisp, Hisp, Asian~Hisp,	CPS 2024 Voting and Registration
Other/mixed~Hisp)	Supplement PUMS data
Region (urban, suburb, exurban, Phila/south, shore)	L2 voter file
2024 recalled vote (Harris, Trump, other, did not vote) ²	The American Presidency Project, UC Santa
	Barbara ³

Post-data collection statistical adjustments require analysis procedures that reflect departures from simple random sampling. SSRS calculates 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

¹ U.S. Census Bureau. *Current Population Survey, November 2024: Voting and Registration Supplement [Public Use Microdata Sample]*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce. Released April 21, 2025. Available at <u>Census.gov</u>.

² The 2024 vote distribution pulled from The American Presidency Project was adjusted so that the proportion of voters who reported not voting matched the unweighted percentage in the survey data.

³ https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/statistics/elections/2024.

2025 Gubernatorial Election Rutgers-Eagleton Poll

sample design and systematic non-response. The total sample design effect for this likely voter sample is 1.83.

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. The survey's margin of error is the largest 95% confidence interval for any estimated proportion based on the total sample — the one around 50%. In this poll, the simple sampling error for 795 New Jersey likely voters is +/-3.5 percentage points at a 95% confidence interval. Sampling error should also be adjusted to recognize the effect of weighting the data to better match the population. The design effect is 1.83, making the adjusted margin of error +/- 4.7 percentage points. Thus, if 50% of New Jersey voters in this sample favor a particular position, we would be 95% sure that the true figure is between 45.3% and 54.7% (50 +/- 4.7) 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 of greater or lesser magnitude.

This Rutgers-Eagleton Poll was fielded by Braun Research, Inc. and Rumble Up with sample from L2 Data and Marketing Systems Group (MSG). Special thank you to Siena Research Institute for consultation on likely voter modeling and weighting. 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. 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.

2025 Gubernatorial Election Rutgers-Eagleton Poll

Weighted Demographics 795 New Jersey Likely Voters Overall Margin of Error = +/- 4.7 percentage points

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

	deff	MOE			deff	MOE
31%	1.83	+/- 8.4%	<100K	49%	1.78	+/- 7.5%
37%	1.92	+/- 7.6%	100K+	51%	1.82	+/- 6.4%
32%	1.73	+/- 8.5%				
			Some college or Less	50%	1.78	+/- 7.2%
48%	1.79	+/- 6.3%	4-Yr College Degree or More	50%	1.76	+/- 6.0%
52%	1.80	+/- 7.0%				
64%	1.78	+/- 5.4%				
36%	1.65	+/- 9.2%				
25%	1.77	+/- 10.0%				
24%	1.94	+/- 9.4%				
26%	1.73	+/- 9.4%				
26%	1.85	+/- 8.8%				
	37% 32% 48% 52% 64% 36% 25% 24% 26%	31% 1.83 37% 1.92 32% 1.73 48% 1.79 52% 1.80 64% 1.78 36% 1.65 25% 1.77 24% 1.94 26% 1.73	31% 1.83 +/- 8.4% 37% 1.92 +/- 7.6% 32% 1.73 +/- 8.5% 48% 1.79 +/- 6.3% 52% 1.80 +/- 7.0% 64% 1.78 +/- 5.4% 36% 1.65 +/- 9.2% 25% 1.77 +/- 10.0% 24% 1.94 +/- 9.4% 26% 1.73 +/- 9.4%	31% 1.83 +/- 8.4%	31% 1.83 +/- 8.4%	31% 1.83 +/- 8.4%