

The original documents are located in Box 64, folder “May 11, 1972 - John N. Mitchell - Second Wave Polling” of the Robert Teeter Papers at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Committee for the Re-election of the President

MEMORANDUM

May 11, 1972

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE HONORABLE JOHN N. MITCHELL
 FROM: ROBERT M. TEETER
 SUBJECT: Second Wave Polling

The purpose of this memorandum is to recommend the design of our second wave polling and to get your approval of the basic design so I can begin to work with the vendors on questionnaire design and specific cost estimates.

Purpose

The purpose of this wave of polling will be to update our polling information in the priority states after all the major Presidential Primaries are over and after perception of the potential Democratic candidates is better defined. The Primaries and national events have undoubtedly changed public opinion in several important areas since January, and we need current polling data to reevaluate our position in each of the priority states, to further define our national campaign plan, and to develop individual state campaign plans.

This set of polls will allow us to identify changes in the various candidates ballot strength or perception or in the basic issue structure since January. It will also allow us to begin to develop some trend lines on both the candidates and issues for the campaign.

Some of the major areas I think should be covered on this wave are:

Secret ballot measurement of the President vs. Humphrey, McGovern, and Kennedy with and without Wallace

Ballot effect of various potential Vice-Presidential candidates

Perception of the major candidates

Familiarity/Amount of knowledge of the candidates
 Approval rating/Why
 Personal perception data

Measurement of core pro and anti Nixon vote

Determined to be an
Administrative Marking

By SD NARA, Date 12/31/02



National issue structure
Rating of intensity of issue concern
Rating of candidates ability to handle major issues
Perception of whether a problem has gotten better or worse under the Nixon administration
Attitudes toward specific national problems

Tax reform/VAT
National defense
Status and attitudes toward police
Attitudes toward Congress
Attitudes toward trade unions/George Meany
Attitudes toward Phase II
Marijuana/Drugs
Farm problems
Women's issues

This data would all be tabulated and analyzed by past voting behavior, by current voting intention, by degree of commitment for or against the President, by geographic regions, and by the various demographic groups. These are essentially the same breaks that we used in Wave I and would allow us to identify any specific changes in the President's strength since January. The data from this wave would also be run by Area of Dominate Influence (ADI) which would allow the advertising people to use the data more effectively by relating it to the major media markets.

Design

I think we should divide the states to be polled into two groups on this wave and do a fairly long interview designed to get in-depth data on the candidates and issues only in the top priority states and do a much shorter (and less expensive) interview designed to get the basic head-to-head and issue data in the other states.

The states I recommend we do in June are:

Long Interview

California
Texas
Illinois
Ohio
New Jersey
New York

Pow





Short Interview

- Alabama ✓
- Pennsylvania ✓
- Maryland ✓
- Michigan ✓
- Connecticut ✓
- Washington ✓
- Wisconsin ✓
- Missouri ✓
- Oregon ✓
- West Virginia ✓
- Indiana ✓

While Indiana and Alabama are... think we ought to check Indiana... and we should survey Alabama... strength in one of the deep... simply on the basis that we... basis with Red Blount.

... of priorities, I... various state problems... the President's voting... Alabama was selected... the study on a shared cost

Timing

The appropriate schedule of

be:

Approval of basic	May 15
Development of q	Final design May 16-25
Preliminary app	naire and
signing of con	ers
Final approval of	May 30
Interviewing	June 8
Preliminary repo	June 15-30
Final reports	July 5
	July 15

Cost

The approximate cost of this... estimate does not, however... studies with individual sta... this project is approved... ments in Pennsylvania, Ohio... possibly Washington, and O

\$250,000. This cost... eration any shared cost... negotiate as soon as... the shared cost arrange-... ana, Illinois, Texas, and

The final cost would be de... is finalized and will be s

the questionnaire and design... for approval.

Recommendation: That you... list of states to be polle... exact cost estimated will

and wave of polling, the... ble. The questionnaire and... your approval by May 30.

Approve _____

Comment _____