Online Appendix:

Further Details on Index of Abortion Regulation's Restrictiveness' Construction:

Within each bloc at level 3 a separate ranking in terms of the degree to which these hurdles are present was created (see table 4). For cost coverage, the absence or only conditional granting of public funding are interpreted as such hurdles.

Note that we assume a term model (choice) to exist even though a woman is still obliged to give reasons for her decisions and/or to declare a state of personal emergency, provided that it is not specified what would be acknowledged as such reasons nor what would constitute such a state of personal emergency. An additional condition here is that it is legally not foreseen to scrutinize the woman's reasons nor to check if she is indeed in a state of personal emergency. In that, 'choice' in our conceptualization goes beyond pure or *de jure* 'abortion on demand'. However, as long as the self-declaration of a woman is still necessarily based on specified, i.e. pre-defined and listed reasons for an abortion, we assume an (albeit in liberal) social indication model rather than a choice model.

Table 4: Composition of Index of Abortion Regulation's Restrictiveness (Dependent Variable)

Model (Level 1)	Value	Gestation Limit (Level 2)	Value	Procedural Hurdles (Level 3)	Value
Total prohibition	7	Up to 12th week	.8	**Medical/expert approval**	
Medical indication (life threat only)	6	Up to 16th week	.6	3 Persons/a committee/ a state agency	.03
Medical indication (health threat)	5	Up to 24th week	.4	2 Persons/2 persons *plus* (if more than 2 is optional)	.02
Criminal *or* fetal indication	4	More than the 24th, but not 40th week	.2	1 person	.01
				None	.00
Criminal *and* fetal indication	3	Up to 40th week (unrestricted)	.0	**Husband's/genitor's rights**	
				Approval	.02
Social/personal situation ('distress') indication	2			Notification (only)	.01
				None	.00
Term model (choice)	1			**Consultation obligations**	
				Directional advice/ Consultation hurdles (e.g. mandatory waiting period)	.01
				No directional advice/ No consultation hurdles	.00
				Cost coverage	
				No	-02
				Partial/if indigence	.01
				Full	.00

Note: Levels 1 and 2 create a two-digit value with level two's figure forming the first decimal place. Procedural Hurdles (level 3) is an additive index forming the second decimal place. A finale complete figure looks like this: 1, 82, which means a choice model with strict gestation (time) limit and medium to low additional hurdles (e.g. no cost coverage for abortions on woman's request (choice) only, but no further hurdles).

Table 5: Summary Statistics of Dependent and Central Independent Variables

Variable		Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max	Obs.	
Abortion index	overall	3.417	1.873	1.4	7	N =	816
	between		1.393	1.683	7	n =	16
	within		1.299	-0.107	6.375	T =	51
Women in parliament	overall	15.674	12.216	0	47.3	N =	809
	between		8.077	5.970	30.12	n =	16
	within		9.396	-3.671	42.32	T-bar = 50.563	
Tertiary edcuation, women	overall	6.079	5.302	0.15	31.37	N =	816
	between		2.349	1.98	10.025	n =	16
	within		4.789	-1.896	27.424	T =	51
Difference in tertiary	overall	3.904	2.915	-3.46	15.07	N =	816
education men and women	between		2.389	0.419	9.599	n =	16
	within		1.773	-2.042	12.248	T =	51
Labor force participation,	overall	55.751	13.735	19.856	82.801	N =	782
women	between		9.717	4.159	71.524	n =	16
	within		9.987	21.359	78.616	T-bar = 48.875	
Difference in labor force	overall	27.741	15.968	2.194	83.937	N =	782
participation men and	between		9.118	10.189	42.257	n =	16
women	within		13.266	1.529	78.978	T-bar = 48.875	

Data Definitions and Sources (Independent Variables):

Tertiary education completed, women: Share of female population over 25 years old that has completed tertiary education. Source: Barro-Lee data v. 2.0, 06/14 (Barro and Lee 2013).

Women in parliament: Yearly percentage of parliament seats held by women. Sources: Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU). 2015; The World Bank 2015; UN Data 2015; McBride and Mazur 2011.

Female labor force participation: Number of females working part or full-time or actively seeking employment at ages 15–64 divided by the total female population aged 15-64. Sources: Brady, Huber, and Stephens 2014; OECD Statistics 2015; The World Bank 2015.

GDP per capita: PPP Converted GDP per Capita (Laspeyres), derived from growth rates at 2005 constant prices. Source: Penn World Table Version 7.1 (Heston, Summers, and Aten 2012).

Share of Catholics: Share of total population belonging to the Catholic denomination. Source: World Religion Project (WRP) Version 1.1 (Maoz and Henderson 2013).

State-Church relationship: The state's stance on religion as either hostile (*hostility)*, cooperating (*cooperation)* or the existence of a *state religion*. This variable is in principle based on the index by Fox (2008, 32 ff.). Fox's index 'Official Government Involvement in Religions' consists of fourteen categories, with lower numbers indicating hostility of the state towards religions or a strict separation, numbers in the middle specifying degrees of cooperation between state and church, and higher numbers indicating variants of state religions, reaching from quasi-state religions to historical state religions to religious regimes. The dataset covers the years from 1990 to 2008. For our purposes we condensed the index into three categories that represent state religion hostility or strict separation (value 0), a cooperation between the two (value 1) and state religions, including quasi[1] state religions (value 3). Missing years were filled through our own investigations.

---

[1] The Variable 'Official Government Involvement in Religions' in the Religion and State dataset by Fox includes a category (value 9) that indicates states with a preferred religion that serves unofficially as the state religion,

Left and liberal parties in government: Share of cabinet seats held by left or liberal parties according to the party families concept. Source: [Reference deleted for reasons of anonymization of authorship].

Institutional constraints: "The measure of political constraints estimates the feasibility of policy change (the extent to which a change in the preferences of any one actor may lead to a change in government policy)". Henisz (2002) constructed this variable by identifying the number of government branches that possess veto power over policy change, taking into account the (ideological) political alignment across and within branches by using data on the party composition of the executive and legislative. Source: Political Constraint Index (POLCON) dataset (Henisz 2002, 2013).

receiving special recognition and benefits, see Fox (2008) We count this unofficial or quasi state religion as a state religion.