EXPERT REPORT OF JOHN R. ALFORD, Ph.D.

Scope of Inquiry

I have been retained by the Georgia Secretary of State as an expert to provide analysis related to NAACP, et al., v. Brian Kemp and Austin Thompson, et al. v. Brian Kemp. For this report, I have examined the expert report provided by plaintiffs’ expert Dr. Richard Engstrom on August 8, 2018 in this case. I have provided a replication of the Ecological Inference analysis of past statewide elections involving Black candidates that were analyzed by Dr. Engstrom in his report in this case. In addition, I have provided similar Ecological Inference analysis of voting in several additional statewide elections involving white candidates in the same ten-county Atlanta metropolitan area of Georgia covered in Dr. Engstrom’s analysis. My rate of compensation in this matter is $400 per hour.

Qualifications

I am a tenured full professor of political science at Rice University. At Rice, I have taught courses on redistricting, elections, political representation, voting behavior and statistical methods at both the undergraduate and graduate level. Over the last thirty years, I have worked with numerous local governments on districting plans and on Voting Rights Act issues. I have previously provided expert reports and/or testified as an expert witness in voting rights and statistical issues in a variety of court cases, working for the U.S. Attorney in Houston, the Texas Attorney General, a U.S. Congressman and various cities and school districts.
In the 2000 round of redistricting, I was retained as an expert to provide advice to the Texas Attorney General in his role as Chair of the Legislative Redistricting Board. I subsequently served as the expert for the State of Texas in the state and federal litigation involving the 2001 redistricting for U.S. Congress, the Texas Senate, the Texas House of Representatives, and the Texas State Board of Education.

In the 2010 round of redistricting in Texas, I was again retained as an expert by the State of Texas to assist in defending various state election maps and systems including the district maps for the U.S. Congress, the Texas Senate, the Texas House of Representatives, and the current at large system for electing Justices to the State Supreme Court and Court of Appeals, as well as the winner-take-all system for allocating Electoral College votes. I have also worked as an expert on redistricting and voting rights cases at the state and/or local level in New York, Michigan, Washington, Louisiana, New Mexico, Mississippi, Wisconsin, Florida, Georgia, and Alabama. The details of my academic background, including all publications in the last ten years, and work as an expert, including all cases in which I have testified by deposition or at trial in the last four years, are covered in the attached vita (Appendix 1).

**Data and Sources**

In preparing my report, I have reviewed the report filed by the plaintiffs’ expert, Dr. Richard Engstrom, in this case. I have relied on precinct level data, including election results, and voter turnout data available publicly from the Georgia Secretary of State’s web site, as well as data provided by Dr. Engstrom that he utilized in his report in this case, and provided by him in response to a request for the data used to produce the election analysis estimates in his report in this case.
Gingles Prongs Two and Three

Two techniques commonly used in Voting Rights Act lawsuits to assess voter cohesion and polarization—Ecological Regression (ER) and Ecological Inference (EI)—are described below. While both techniques are often reported together in these cases, Dr. Engstrom reports only Ecological Inference estimates in his report. This is not problematic here, as Ecological Inference is the more recent approach, and in practice the results of the two techniques rarely provide substantively different conclusions given sufficient data.

Ecological Regression analysis is the original statistical estimation technique used in VRA lawsuits to assess voter cohesion and polarization. In a nutshell, regression is a mathematical technique for estimating the single best-fitting straight line that could be drawn to describe the relationship between two variables in a scatter plot. Ecological regression (also called Goodman’s regression) is distinct from simple regression in that it relies on a data set made up of precinct level aggregations of voters and election results, rather than a data set of individual voter characteristics and vote choices. This is necessary for the sort of analysis we wish to do here because while we have election results for groups of voters at the polling-place level and also have racial characteristics for the voters in the precinct, we do not have access to the actual vote choice of individual voters.

Applied to voting rights cases, the logic of regression analysis is to determine to what degree, if any, the vote for a candidate increases in a linear fashion as the concentration of voters of a given ethnicity in the precincts increases. This is done by finding the equation for the line that best fits the scatterplot of precinct-level demographics (e.g., percent Black as a proportion of voter turnout in a precinct) and precinct-level support for a given candidate. The
slope of this equation is an estimate of Black voting cohesion for the candidate. The estimates in the same equation can be used to estimate non-Black or non-Hispanic white voting cohesion.¹

Gary King’s Ecological Inference (EI) procedure differs from Ecological Regression by recognizing that at least some of the statistical assumptions underlying regression analysis do not hold when one has aggregate data rather than individual data (as we do here). Specifically, the assumptions underlying the regression technique do not recognize that the data are bounded—that is, no more than 100% and no less than 0% of Blacks can vote for a given candidate. Regression can sometimes lead to unsatisfying conclusions, e.g., a model that predicts -10% of Blacks will support a candidate, or relatedly that 110% support among Blacks for another candidate. More importantly, the regression technique does not utilize the information that is inherent in these bounds. For example, if we know that a precinct has 100 voters, of which 98 are Black and 99 people voted for the Black candidate, then we know with complete certainty that at least 97 of the Black voters voted for the Black candidate and at most 98 did. Ecological Regression fails to utilize this deterministic information and so, in some circumstances, does not use all the available data optimally. In contrast, Ecological Inference methods incorporate this information about the bounds for each precinct into the statistical analysis.

As mentioned above, Ecological Regression assumes a linear relationship between the racial composition of precincts and the precinct vote returns. Ecological Inference, in contrast, allows the relationship between the size of the demographic group and support for a candidate to be non-linear. The other major difference is in the mechanism of the actual estimation of

¹ Dr. Engstrom analysis distinguished only between African American and non-African American voters. In other words, white, Hispanic, Asian, and Other categories were grouped together as “non-African American.”
the parameters of the model. Ecological Regression uses a mathematical formula that produces a single specific estimated equation given a set of election data. Ecological Inference estimates the model parameters by an iterative procedure that, over a large number of repeated trials, yields an estimated model that may vary to some degree in repeated estimations, even given the exact same input data. While the details of this estimation procedure are mathematically complex, the bottom line is that Ecological Inference techniques use the available data in a potentially more efficient and less biased way than previous methods.

**Election Analysis**

To assess the degree of racially polarized voting Dr. Engstrom analyzes elections from 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016. He includes 13 bi-racial Georgia House elections, six bi-racial Georgia Senate elections, and nine bi-racial statewide elections. In every case except one, the Black candidate in the election was also the Democratic candidate in the election.

Overall, the pattern in these elections included in Dr Engstrom’s Tables 1 through 4 is very similar regardless of year or the level of office. Black support for the Democratic candidate is typically in the high 90 percent range in the House, Senate, and statewide elections. The percent of non-Black support for Democratic candidate is typically in the 20s or 30s. Black voters are providing very stable cohesive support for Democratic candidates across offices and elections, and non-Black voters are providing consistent and stable support, albeit at less extreme levels, for Republican candidates.

I have replicated all of Dr. Engstrom’s statewide elections, but unlike Dr. Engstrom, I have also included as well two-party contested statewide elections from the same year and ballot that did not include a Black candidate. For the 2010 elections, this added six contests to
the three contests analyzed by Dr. Engstrom. For 2012, there were no additional two-party contested statewide contests beyond the single presidential contest analyzed by Dr. Engstrom. For the 2014 elections, this added four contests to the five contests analyzed by Dr. Engstrom. These results are provided in Tables 1 and 2 below, organized by election year\(^2\).

The first thing to note is that in every instance my EI estimations for elections that were included in Dr. Engstrom’s report are virtually identical to his estimates. Nothing in any of what I draw from the election analysis depends in any way on a distinction between the point estimates or confidence intervals reported by Dr. Engstrom and the substantively identical point estimates and confidence intervals reported here.

### Table 1: Statewide Two-Party Contested Elections 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>% Black Support</th>
<th>Low CI</th>
<th>High CI</th>
<th>% non-Black Support</th>
<th>Low CI</th>
<th>High CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senator</td>
<td>Michael Thurmond</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>Roy E. Barnes</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt Governor</td>
<td>Carol Porter</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>Georganna Sinkfield</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>Ken Hodges</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State School Supt.</td>
<td>Joe Martin</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Comm’r</td>
<td>Darryl Hicks</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm’r of Insurance</td>
<td>Mary Squires</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm’r of Agriculture</td>
<td>J. B. Powell</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) I have focused on the statewide elections because, unlike the districted House and Senate elections, the statewide elections on a given ballot all cover the same geography and the same set of voters are receiving the ballots. Within a given election year, comparing for example, a district with one Black candidate and one white candidate to a district with two white candidates, would necessarily involve comparing two completely distinct sets of voters. Likewise, comparing in a single district an election with one Black candidate and one white candidate to an earlier or later election in the same district with two white candidates, would necessarily involve comparing different election years and, at least to some degree, different voters.
Looking down the column for “% Black Support” indicates clearly that the tendency of Black voters to give highly cohesive support to Democratic candidates is not a function of the race of the candidates. Whether the Democratic candidate is Black or white, Black voter support for the Democratic candidate is always above 90 percent, and typically in the high 90 percent range. Comparing the three similar ‘Commissioner’ offices in the 2010 election, we can see that Darryl Hicks, a Black Democrat running for Labor Commissioner, was supported by an estimated 99.2% of Black voters. Mary Squires, a white Democrat running for Commissioner of Insurance, was supported by an estimated 99.6% of Black voters. J.B. Powell, a white Democrat running for Commissioner of Agriculture, was supported by an estimated 99.6% of Black voters.

Similarly, looking down the entire Table 1 column for “% non-Black Support” indicates clearly that the tendency for the percent of non-Black voter support for Democratic candidates to be in the 20s or 30s is not a function of the race of the candidates. Whether the Democratic candidate is Black or white, non-Black voter support for the Democratic candidate is in the 20 percent range. For the same three similar ‘Commissioner’ offices in the 2010 election discussed above, we can see that Darryl Hicks, a Black Democrat running for Labor Commissioner, was supported by an estimated 24.1% of non-Black voters. Mary Squires, a white Democrat running for Commissioner of Insurance, was supported by an estimated 27.2% of non-Black voters. J.B. Powell, a white Democrat running for Commissioner of Agriculture, was supported by an estimated 23.0% of non-Black voters. Thus, the support that non-Black voters gave to the Black candidate Mr. Hicks, was a bit lower than the support they gave to one of the white Commissioner candidates, Ms. Squires, but it was also bit higher than the support they gave to the other white Democratic candidate, Mr. Powell.
The 2014 election, reported below in Table 2, shows a similar pattern. Again, looking down the entire column for “% Black Support” indicates that the tendency of Black voters to give highly cohesive support to Democratic candidates is not a function of the race of the candidates. Whether the Democratic candidate is Black or white, Black voter support for the Democratic candidate is always above 90 percent, and typically in the high 90 percent range. Comparing the three similar ‘Commissioner’ offices in the 2010 election, we can see that Christopher Irvin, a white Democrat running for Commissioner of Agriculture, was supported by an estimated 98.7% of Black voters. Elizabeth Johnson, a Black Democrat running for Commissioner of Insurance, was supported by an estimated 99.5% of Black voters. Robbin Shipp, a Black Democrat running for Labor Commissioner, was supported by an estimated 99.4% of Black voters.

Table 2: Statewide Two-Party Contested Elections 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>% Black Support</th>
<th>Low CI</th>
<th>High CI</th>
<th>% non-Black Support</th>
<th>Low CI</th>
<th>High CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senator</td>
<td>M. Michelle Nunn</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>Jason J. Carter</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt Governor</td>
<td>Connie J. Stokes</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary Of State</td>
<td>Doreen Carter</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>Gregory K. Hecht</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm’r Of Agriculture</td>
<td>Christopher J. Irvin</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm’r Of Insurance</td>
<td>Elizabeth N. Johnson</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State School Supt</td>
<td>Valarie D. Wilson</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm’r Of Labor</td>
<td>Robbin K. Shipp</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Turning to non-Black voter support, in the column labeled “% non-Black Support” in Table 2, indicates clearly that the tendency for the percent of non-Black voter support for Democratic candidates to be in the 20s or 30s is not a function of the race of the candidates. Whether the Democratic candidate is Black or white, the percent of non-Black voter support for Democratic candidates is in the 20s or 30s. For the same three similar ‘Commissioner’ offices in the 2014 election discussed above, we can see that Christopher Irvin, a white Democrat running for Commissioner of Agriculture, was supported by an estimated 25.3% of non-Black voters. Elizabeth Johnson, a Black Democrat running for Commissioner of Insurance, was supported by an estimated 26.5% of non-Black voters. Robbin Shipp, a Black Democrat running for Labor Commissioner, was supported by an estimated 27.0% of non-Black voters. Thus, support among non-Black voters for the white Democratic candidate, Mr. Irvin, was similar, and if anything slightly lower, than the level of support among non-Black voters for the two Black Democratic candidates.

The fact that the patterns found by Dr. Engstrom in his analysis are patterns of voters responding to the partisan labels of candidates, and not the race of the candidates, is clear in the larger set of statewide elections provided here and discussed above. In Dr. Engstrom’s analysis, the fact that all but one of the Black candidates in his tables were also the Democratic candidates, made it difficult to see this fact, since in all but that one election, support for the Democratic candidate and support for the Black candidate were the same thing. That one exception, however, is notable. The Black candidate in the 2012 election for House District 86 was the Republican, Lisa Kinnemore. Her white Democratic opponent was Michele Henson. In Dr. Engstrom’s Table 1 he reports that he estimated that Lisa Kinnemore received 1 percent
of the Black vote. In other words, 99 percent of Black voters supported the Democratic candidate, even though that Democratic candidate was white, and her Republican opponent was Black.

That is exactly the opposite of what we would expect based on the remaining 27 elections in Dr. Engstrom’s analysis – if we assume that what those other elections show is, as Dr. Engstrom suggests, that Black voters typically give 99 percent of their votes to the Black candidate because they are responding to the fact that the candidate is Black, rather than responding to the fact that the candidate is a Democrat. In contrast, the direction and cohesion of Black votes in District 86 is exactly what we would expect based on the broader set of elections provided here that show that regardless of the race of the Democratic candidate, Black voters typically give something very close to 99 percent of their votes to the Democratic candidate.

In discussing the District 86 election, Dr. Engstrom offers no explanation at all for the complete reversal of Black voter support for the Black candidate in House District 86. Instead, Dr. Engstrom draws attention to the behavior of non-Black voters. He notes that his analysis suggests that in 2012, Lisa Kinnemore, the Black Republican, only received 47.5% of the non-Black vote. As noted above, both Dr. Engstrom’s analysis and the additional analysis provided here suggests that percent of non-Black voters’ support for Democratic candidates typically falls in the 20s or 30s. In the case of this election in District 86, non-black voters are actually providing a slight majority of their votes (52.3%) to the Democratic candidate. Is this because non-Black voters in this contest are shifting their votes to avoid supporting a Black candidate over a white candidate, even at the cost of crossing party lines? Or, is it simply a
function of the atypical partisan alignment of non-Black voters in the geography of District 86 (i.e. more white Democratic voters than would be typical in the 10-county area)?

Looking at another contest on the same ballot that year, the presidential contest, is helpful in addressing this question. In that election the Black candidate, President Obama, was also the Democratic candidate. In House District 86 then, the 2012 ballot provides a direct test of the importance of candidate race versus candidate party in the comparison of these two contests. The results of a replication of Dr. Engstrom’s analysis for the House District 86 election, along with a similar analysis in District 86 for the 2012 presidential contest are presented in Table 3 below. Unlike the analysis in the 10-county statewide contests, only the District 86 precincts were used in the analysis in Table 3.

Table 3: State House District 86 Elections 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>2012 % Black</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>% non-Black</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House District 86</td>
<td>Henson</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kinnemore</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Obama</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Romney</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The replication of the House District 86 analysis reported by Dr. Engstrom yields results that again are virtually identical to those that he reported in his Table 1. He estimated that Kinnemore received 1.0% of the Black vote and here the estimate is a very similar 2.8% of the vote. The same Black voters in District 86 were giving President Obama an estimated 99.1% of their votes in the presidential contest at the top of the ballot. In other words, these results show that Black voters were consistent in their response to the partisan cues in these
elections, voting almost exclusively for the Democratic candidate in each of these contests. In contrast, Black voters could hardly have been any less responsive to the racial cues in this election, giving one Black candidate more than 99% of their votes and the other Black candidate less than 3% of their support. Again, this clearly demonstrates that Black voters are highly cohesive, but it is equally clear that this is not cohesion for Black candidates, but instead cohesion for Democratic candidates regardless of whether that candidate is Black or white, and even, as we see here in District 86, if the Democratic candidate is white and the Republican candidate is Black.

For non-Black voters, Dr. Engstrom estimated that they provided Ms. Kinnemore with 47.5 percent of their votes, and the replication here yields the same estimate of 47.5%. This is clearly an unusually low level of support for a Republican candidate, particularly when compared to the statewide contests reported here for the full 10-county Atlanta Metro area. Dr. Engstrom notes in regard to Kinnemore’s weak showing among non-Black voters that it “is the lowest estimated vote by far among the non-African American voters for a Republican candidate. The other 12 Republican candidates were estimated, as noted above, to have received from 67.3 percent to 82.2 percent of the non-African American vote” (page 10).

Since the other 12 Republican candidates that Dr. Engstrom is referring to were all white, the implication seems to be that non-Black voters are not willing to support a Black Republican at the same levels that they would a white Republican. However, looking at the results in Table 3 we can see that in fact that is not the case. These same non-Black voters gave white Republican Mitt Romney only 47.6 percent of their votes, while giving 52.4 percent support to President Obama. Apparently, a larger than average proportion of non-Black voters in the geography of District 86 lean Democratic, and their vote splits accordingly.
Any implication that non-Black support for Republican Lisa Kinnemore was diminished by the fact that she was Black, and her opponent Michele Henson is white, is not tenable in light of the essentially identical low level of non-Black support for the white Republican Mitt Romney in a contest in which he ran against a black Democrat.

Summary Conclusions

Dr. Engstrom’s report attempts to demonstrate that the race of candidates is linked directly to the behavior of Black versus non-Black voters in recent elections in the 10-county Metro Atlanta area. As he notes in his summary of his findings on page 12 of his report:

Racially polarized voting is acute in state House elections, state Senate elections, and statewide elections in the 10-county metro Atlanta area. As noted consistently above, African American voters in that area have been strongly cohesive in their support for the African American candidates in these elections. There is only one exception to this among the 28 elections examined. Likewise, non-African American voters have not shared this preference. Again, there is only one election where that is not the case.

Note that Dr. Engstrom is explicit in connecting the race of the candidates with the race of the voters. As he says, “African American voters in that area have been strongly cohesive in their support for the African American candidates”, while in contrast “non-African American voters have not shared this preference” (for African-American candidates) (page 12, emphasis added). This is an important point, as the existence of, and the empirical demonstration of, this connection between the race of the candidate and the preferences of voters is at the heart of what distinguishes voting behavior and election losses based on race, from voting behavior and elections losses based on group differences in policy preferences or party affiliation. While Dr. Engstrom asserts that the election analysis provides empirical support for his contention
that the race of the candidates is driving voter polarization, the election analysis demonstrates exactly the opposite.

What the voting patterns actually show is that there is clear evidence of high levels, typically over 90 percent, of Black support for Democratic candidates, and clear, typically around 75 percent, non-Black support for Republican candidates. This clear pattern of partisan voting remains stable regardless of the race of the candidates.

September 28, 2018.

John R. Alford, Ph.D
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"The 1990 Congressional Election Results and the Fallacy that They Embodied an Anti-Incumbent Mood" with John R. Hibbing, *PS* 25 (June, 1992).


Awards and Honors:


Research Grants:

National Science Foundation, 2009-2011, “Identifying the Biological Influences on Political Temperaments”, with John Hibbing, Kevin Smith, Kim Espy, Nicolas Martin and Read Montague. This is a collaborative project involving Rice, University of Nebraska, Baylor College of Medicine, and Queensland Institute for Medical Research.

National Science Foundation, 2007-2010, “Genes and Politics: Providing the Necessary Data”, with John Hibbing, Kevin Smith, and Lindon Eaves. This is a collaborative project involving Rice, University of Nebraska, Virginia Commonwealth University, and the University of Minnesota.

National Science Foundation, 2007-2010, “Investigating the Genetic Basis of Economic Behavior”, with John Hibbing and Kevin Smith. This is a collaborative project involving Rice, University of Nebraska, Virginia Commonwealth University, and the Queensland Institute of Medical Research.

Rice University Faculty Initiatives Fund, 2007-2009, “The Biological Substrates of Political Behavior”. This is in assistance of a collaborative project involving Rice, Baylor College of Medicine, Queensland Institute of
Medical Research, University of Nebraska, Virginia Commonwealth University, and the University of Minnesota.

National Science Foundation, 2004-2006, “Decision-Making on Behalf of Others”, with John Hibbing. This is a collaborative project involving Rice and the University of Nebraska.


Faculty Research Grants Program, University of Georgia, Summer, 1982. Impact of Media Structure on Congressional Elections, with James Campbell.

**Papers Presented:**


“Identifying the Biological Influences on Political Temperaments” National Science Foundation Annual Human Social Dynamics Meeting (2010), with John Hibbing, Kimberly Espy, Nicholas Martin, Read Montague, and Kevin B. Smith.

“Political Orientations May Be Related to Detection of the Odor of Androstene” Annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL (2010), with Kevin Smith, Amanda Balzer, Michael Gruszczynski, Carly M. Jacobs, and John Hibbing.

“Toward a Modern View of Political Man: Genetic and Environmental Transmission of Political Orientations from Attitude Intensity to Political Participation” Annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC (2010), with Carolyn Funk, Kevin Smith, and John Hibbing.

“Genetic and Environmental Transmission of Political Involvement from Attitude Intensity to Political Participation” Annual meeting of the International Society for Political Psychology, San Francisco, CA (2010), with Carolyn Funk, Kevin Smith, and John Hibbing.

“Are Violations of the EEA Relevant to Political Attitudes and Behaviors?” Annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL (2010), with Kevin Smith, and John Hibbing.

“The Neural Basis of Representation” Annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Toronto, Canada (2009), with John Hibbing.
“Genetic and Environmental Transmission of Value Orientations” Annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Toronto, Canada (2009), with Carolyn Funk, Kevin Smith, Matthew Hibbing, Pete Hatemi, Robert Krueger, Lindon Eaves, and John Hibbing.


“The Heritability of Value Orientations” Annual meeting of the Behavior Genetics Association, Minneapolis, MN (2009), with Kevin Smith, John Hibbing, Carolyn Funk, Robert Krueger, Peter Hatemi, and Lindon Eaves.

“The Ick Factor: Disgust Sensitivity as a Predictor of Political Attitudes” Annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL (2009), with Kevin Smith, Douglas Oxley Matthew Hibbing, and John Hibbing.


“The Physiological Differences of Liberals and Conservatives” Annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL (2008), with Kevin Smith, Douglas Oxley, and John Hibbing.

“Looking for Political Genes: The Influence of Serotonin on Political and Social Values” Annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL (2008), with Peter Hatemi, Sarah Medland, John Hibbing, and Nicholas Martin.

“Not by Twins Alone: Using the Extended Twin Family Design to Investigate the Genetic Basis of Political Beliefs” Annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, IL (2007), with Peter Hatemi, John Hibbing, Matthew Keller, Nicholas Martin, Sarah Medland, and Lindon Eaves.


“Not by Twins Alone: Using the Extended Twin Family Design to Investigate the Genetic Basis of Political Beliefs” Annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL (2007), with Peter Hatemi, John Hibbing, Nicholas Martin, and Lindon Eaves.


"Can We Trust the NES Trust Measure?" Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois (2001), with Stacy Ulbig.

"The Impact of Organizational Structure on the Production of Social Capital Among Group Members" Annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, Atlanta, Georgia (2000), with Allison Rinden.


"The Electorally Indistinct Senate," Norman Thomas Conference on Senate Exceptionalism, Vanderbilt University; Nashville, Tennessee; October (1999), with John R. Hibbing.


"Constituency Population and Representation in the United States Senate," Electing the Senate; Houston, Texas; December (1989), with John R. Hibbing.

"The Disparate Electoral Security of House and Senate Incumbents," American Political Science Association Annual Meetings; Atlanta, Georgia; September (1989), with John R. Hibbing.


**Other Conference Participation:**

Roundtable Participant – Closing Round-table on Biopolitics; UC Merced Conference on Bio-Politics and Political Psychology, Merced, CA.

Roundtable Participant “Genes, Brains, and Core Political Orientations” 2008 Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Political Science Association, Las Vegas.


Short Course Lecturer, "What Neuroscience has to Offer Political Science” 2006 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association.


Panel chair, "Economic Attitudes and Public Policy in Europe," 1990 Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association


Co-convener, with Bruce Oppenheimer, of Electing the Senate, a national conference on the NES 1988 Senate Election Study. Funded by the Rice Institute for Policy Analysis, the University of Houston Center for Public Policy, and the National Science Foundation, Houston, Texas, December, 1989.


Invited participant—Hendricks Symposium on the United States Senate, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska, October, 1988


**Professional Activities:**

**Other Universities:**

Invited Speaker, Annual Lecture, Psi Kappa -the Psychology Club at Houston Community College, 2018.
Invited Speaker, Annual Allman Family Lecture, Dedman College Interdisciplinary Institute, Southern Methodist University, 2016.

Invited Speaker, Annual Lecture, Psi Sigma Alpha – Political Science Dept., Oklahoma State University, 2015.

Invited Lecturer, Department of Political Science, Vanderbilt University, 2014.

Invited Speaker, Annual Lecture, Psi Kappa -the Psychology Club at Houston Community College, 2014.

Invited Speaker, Graduate Student Colloquium, Department of Political Science, University of New Mexico, 2013.

Invited Keynote Speaker, Political Science Alumni Evening, University of Houston, 2013.

Invited Lecturer, Biology and Politics Masters Seminar (John Geer and David Bader), Department of Political Science and Biology Department, Vanderbilt University, 2010.

Invited Lecturer, Biology and Politics Senior Seminar (John Geer and David Bader), Department of Political Science and Biology Department, Vanderbilt University, 2008.

Visiting Fellow, the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, 2007.

Invited Speaker, Joint Political Psychology Graduate Seminar, University of Minnesota, 2007.

Invited Speaker, Department of Political Science, Vanderbilt University, 2006.

**Member:**


Planning Committee for the National Election Studies' Senate Election Study, 1990-92.

Nominations Committee, Social Science History Association, 1988

**Reviewer for:**

American Journal of Political Science
American Political Science Review
American Politics Research
American Politics Quarterly
American Psychologist
American Sociological Review
Canadian Journal of Political Science
Comparative Politics
Electoral Studies
Evolution and Human Behavior
International Studies Quarterly
Journal of Politics
Journal of Urban Affairs
Legislative Studies Quarterly
National Science Foundation
PLoS ONE
Policy Studies Review
Political Behavior
Political Communication
Political Psychology
Political Research Quarterly
Public Opinion Quarterly
Science
Security Studies
Social Forces
Social Science Quarterly
Western Political Quarterly

University Service:

Member, University Parking Committee, 2016-2018.

Member, University Benefits Committee, 2013-2016.

Internship Director for the Department of Political Science, 2004-2018.

Member, University Council, 2012-2013.

Invited Speaker, Rice Classroom Connect, 2016.

Invited Speaker, Glasscock School, 2016.

Invited Speaker, Rice Alumni Association, Austin, 2016.

Invited Speaker, Rice Alumni Association, New York City, 2016.

Invited Speaker, Rice TEDxRiceU, 2013.

Invited Speaker, Rice Alumni Association, Atlanta, 2011.

Lecturer, Advanced Topics in AP Psychology, Rice University AP Summer Institute, 2009.


Invited Speaker, Rice Alumni Association, Austin, Chicago and Washington, DC, 2006.


Director: Rice University Behavioral Research Lab and Social Science Computing Lab, 2005-2006.
University Official Representative to the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, 1989-2012.


Member, Rice University Information Technology Access and Security Committee, 2001-2002


Divisional Member of the John W. Gardner Dissertation Award Selection Committee, 1998

Social Science Representative to the Educational Sub-committee of the Computer Planning Committee, 1989-1990.

Director of Graduate Admissions, Department of Political Science, Rice University, 1986-1988.


Faculty Associate, Hanszen College, Rice University, 1987-1990.

Director, Political Data Analysis Center, University of Georgia, 1982-1985.

**External Consulting:**


Consultant, City of Clute, Texas – Demographic analysis and redrawing of election districts, 2015.


Consultant, Houston ISD – Incorporation of North Forest ISD, and the consequent redrawing of all nine board member election districts including demographic analysis, board and public hearing presentations and support for pre-clearance submission, 2014.


Consultant, Lamar ISD – redrawing of all board member election districts including demographic analysis and redrawing of election districts, board and public hearing presentations, and support for pre-clearance submission, 2012.

Expert witness for Harris Co, Rodriguez, et. al. v., challenge to adopted Harris County Commissioners’ Court precincts, 2011.

Consultant, City of Baytown – redrawing of all board member election districts including demographic analysis and redrawing of election districts, board and public hearing presentations, and support for pre-clearance submission, 2011.

Consultant, Goose Creek ISD – redrawing of all board member election districts including demographic analysis and redrawing of election districts, board and public hearing presentations, and support for pre-clearance submission, 2011.


Expert witness for the State of Texas, Texas v US, preclearance suit for Texas statewide districts, 2011.*

Expert witness for the State of Texas, Davis v Perry (and consolidated cases), challenge to adopted Texas Senate districts, 2011.


