STEALTH ANALYTICS

From Field to Strategy in 72 Hours

June 2026

TO: **INTERESTED PARTIES**
FROM: **STEALTH ANALYTICS**
SUBJECT: **FROM FIELD TO STRATEGY IN 72 HOURS**
DATE: **JUNE 9, 2026**

Most polling tells a campaign where the race stands. The harder question — the one that actually wins elections — is what to do about it before the number goes stale. **Stealth Analytics** is built to answer both, inside a single 72-hour window. To show exactly what that looks like end to end, we fielded a complete statewide study on our own dime: the Arizona Republican Attorney General primary, Warren Petersen versus Rodney Glassman, June 2–4, 2026. We built it from one campaign's point of view — it could just as easily have been built for the other side, or for any race on the ballot. The four documents it produced are linked at the end of this memo, exactly as a client would receive them.

Speed Is a Deliverable

Most firms go quiet for three or four days after fielding closes. The weighting, the tabulation, the deck — much of it is still done by hand, even at the largest shops, and manual work is both slow and fragile under deadline. We rebuilt that middle. **NavX**, our production pipeline, automates the mechanical parts of survey research — raking the sample to the modeled electorate, generating the crosstabs, assembling the deliverables — so our analysts spend their hours on judgment instead of arithmetic. Topline and crosstabs are in hand the day fielding closes; the presentation-ready deck follows within 72 hours, while the finding is still actionable. The campaign manager wakes up to insight, not a status update.

What a Stealth Poll Delivers

A complete study ships as three stacked deliverables. Each answers a different question, and each is built to be read in order — from what the electorate thinks, to who thinks it, to what to do about it.

The Topline — what the electorate thinks.

The headline read: ballot, favorables, the issue landscape, the mood. In the demonstration study, Petersen opened at 35% to Glassman's 19%, with 46% undecided — a clear leader, but a wide-open race, inside a deeply conservative, change-hungry electorate (84% conservative, 62% wrong-track).

The Thermal Crosstabs — who thinks it, and where.

Every question broken against ideology, party faction, gender, age, region, congressional district, and Trump affinity — then color-graded by statistical significance, with multiple-comparison correction and small-sample advisories built in. The largest subgroup stories surface in minutes instead of an afternoon spent squinting at a grid.

The Index Deck — what to do about it.

The presentation-ready synthesis. Not which messages poll well, but which ones actually move the ballot — because we test for impact, measuring the change in vote intent rather than favorability. In the demonstration study, the tested case for Petersen lifted his ballot from 35% to 58%; adding the contrast on Glassman's record carried it to 79%. That gap is the difference between a message that is liked and a message that wins — and it tells a campaign exactly where to spend.

Petersen ballot share as tested messages are introduced

Initial ballot, then after the positive case for Petersen, then after the contrast on Glassman's record (demonstration study, n=816).

Built for the Question You're Actually Asking

This was a demonstration — fielded and produced entirely in-house, with no client and no agenda beyond showing the standard. The same pipeline runs for any campaign, committee, or ballot initiative, at any level of the ballot and on either side of a primary. What changes is the question. What doesn't is the speed, the rigor, and the unbroken line from a number to a decision.

The Full Study

The actual, unaltered deliverables from the June 2026 demonstration study:

Topline — the headline read of the electorate.

Thermal Crosstabs — every question, every subgroup, significance-graded.

Index Deck — the strategic synthesis and message tests.

Capabilities Deck — the firm, our method, and what we deliver.

Methodology

This survey was conducted among n=816 likely Arizona Republican primary voters from June 2–4, 2026 via SMS-to-web. The margin of error is ±3.4% at the 95% confidence level. Responses were weighted by gender, age range, county, and likely-voter primary propensity using iterative proportional fitting (raking) to match the target population.