# **The Economics of Abortion:**

### An Overview of the Collection and Economic Impacts of Abortion



Maila



## **Speakers**

_	_	-	~	-		1	-		-	-	-	T	1	1	1	1	1	1
-	_	-	~	-	~	~	-	~	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
-	-	-	-	-	-	~	-		-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
-	_	-	~	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
-	-	-	~	-	~	~	-		-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
~	_	-	~	-	~	~	-	~	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
-	-	-	-	-	~	~	-	~	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
-	-	-	~	-	~	~	-	~	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
-	-	-	*	-	~	1	-	~	-	-	-	1	1	I.	1	ï	1	1
-	-	-	-	-	~	~	-	-	-	-	-	1	١	1	1	I.	Т	١
-	-	-	1	-	~	-	-	-	-	-	-	١	1	1	T.	1	١	1
-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	١	1	I.	т	Т	Т	1
-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	>	-	-	-	I.	1	1	1	1	1	1
-	-	-	~	-	~	~	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
-	-	-	*	-	~	~	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
-	-	-	1	-	~	~	-	~	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	~	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
-	-	-	1	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
-	-	-	*	-	~	~	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
π.		-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Ę	D	a.	5	-	1	1	-	>	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
				-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

#### **Ernestina Coast**

Professor of Health and International Development, Department of International Development, London School of Economics and Political Science

#### Yana van der Meulen Rodgers

Professor of Labor Studies and Employment Relations and Faculty Director for the Center for Women and Work, Rutgers University

#### Samantha Lattof

CEO and Co-Founder, Maila Health GmbH

#### **Cheri Poss**

Associate Director of Program Evidence, Technical Excellence Department, Ipas

#### **Brittany Moore**

Advisor, Scientific and Technical Division, Ipas

# Agenda

- Introduction
- Methodology
- Economic Impacts of Abortion
  - Micro-Level
  - Meso-Level
  - Macro-Level
  - Links with Stigma
- Take-Away Points
- Q&A



## Introduction

Key Objectives:

- Provide medical professionals, healthcare providers, advocates, researchers, policy-makers, and other key stakeholders with systematic evidence on the economic repercussions of abortion.
- Synthesize the knowledge base in social science literature.
- Focus on the impact of abortion-related care and policies across the safety continuum, including post-abortion care (PAC).

### Methodology: PRISMA-SCR Flowchart



## **Economic Outcomes**

**Financial Cost:** cost of receiving or providing abortion care or financial costs resulting from abortion policies

**Impact:** the effect or influence of abortion care or policies

**Benefit:** advantages or profits gained from receiving or providing abortion care or implementing abortion policies

**Value:** the importance, worth, welfare gains, or utility of receiving or providing abortion care or implementing abortion policies



# **Included Studies by Region**

Region	# of Studies
Northern America	122
Africa	68
Asia	53
Europe	49
Latin America & Caribbean	34
Oceana	9
Cross-Regional Studies	30



## Microeconomic Outcomes

#### Costs

- Seeking abortion-related care has frequently substantial - costs for individuals (implications for the timing and type of care sought)
- Evidence from settings where abortionrelated services are (theoretically) free-ofcharge
- Conditionality of care

#### **Indirect costs**

 Companion costs; childcare; overnight accommodation; travel costs; time off work; consumables; unofficial payments

### Microeconomic Outcomes

#### **Resources for costs**

 Abortion funds; credit / loans; social networks; families; partners

#### Costs x type of abortion-related careseeking

• PAC more expensive than SA

### Costs x delays

 Points at which economic factors introduce / compound delays gives insight into the points at which information and services might be better designed to reduce delays.



### **Microeconomic Outcomes**

#### **Gestational limits**

- Impact: Women turned away due to gestational limits less likely to have an aspirational plan and to have achieved it. [US]
- Impact: Costs increase at key gestational intervals

#### Waiting periods

 Impact: multiple mandated visits and pregnancy outcome [x individual characteristics]



### **Microeconomic Outcomes**

#### Costs x type of care sought

• Contexts where less safe methods are cheaper than safer methods

#### **Benefits + Values**

- Positive outcomes for women able to access financing [USA]
- Linked to reason for abortion: economic in/ability to afford or cope with a/nother child; pregnancy timing; costs of pregnancy/childbirth (distinct from costs of a child); partner and others' influences; positive implications for existing children; avoidance of health-related issues; avoiding pregnancy at a young age; continuation of education

### **Microeconomic Outcomes**

#### **Obstruction to Care (formerly: conscientious objection\*)**

- Impact: Travel to receive care
- [refusal to refer]

#### **Restrictions as to who can provide**

 Impact: Facility closure due to increased restrictions increases costs and need to disclose [US]

### Criminalisation

- [care-seeker: fears / perceptions of legal consequences]
- [providers: exploit fears for fees in settings where legal]



# **Mesoeconomic Outcomes**

### Financing

- Costs of PAC were a financial burden to health systems
- Savings can be realized while maintaining or even improving quality
- Limited resources negatively affect health facilities' ability to meet demand and provide quality services

### Criminalization

- Costs to health facilities are higher in locations with patchwork abortion laws
- Immense health system resources are required to treat complications resulting from unsafe abortions





# **Mesoeconomic Outcomes**

#### Task shifting

- When possible, shifting provision of simpler procedures to lower-level hospitals or primary clinics minimized costs
- Setting and context must be considered before shifting tasks

#### Universal health coverage

- Health insurance and public health systems effectively disincentivize abortion outright or disincentivize certain methods
- Economic disincentives to delivering medical abortion in the public sector can limit patients' access to the full range of abortion services

## **Mesoeconomic Outcomes**

#### **Obstruction of access to care (formerly: conscientious objection\*)**

• Public providers who consciously object may willingly overlook these concerns to perform abortions in the more profitable private sector

#### **Restrictions as to who can provide services**

- Can be costly, especially where task-shifting could lead to savings
- Requiring abortion to be performed by OBGYNs in hospitals leads to higher costs of care and decreased client access

#### **Gestational limits**

Abortion at later gestational ages costs more to provide than abortion at earlier gestational ages



## Macroeconomic Outcomes

#### Financing

- Integrating abortion into full set of reproductive health services has societal benefits
  - This approach is more effective in terms of lives saved and is more cost effective compared to a non-integrated strategy without family planning and safe abortion services
- Post-abortion care services constitute a large share of GDP/capita in some countries
- Restricting abortion access has negative spillover effects on women's educational attainment and labor supply





## Macroeconomic Outcomes

#### **Task shifting**

- Some countries are actively working to provide more cost-effective and innovative options
  - Medical abortion often considered the cheaper option at the national level and more governments are moving to approve medical abortion in the future
- Some countries (e.g. UK) moving toward regulatory reforms in which nurses and midwives are allowed to perform abortions in order to provide cost savings at national level

## Macroeconomic Outcomes

#### Criminalization

- Large body of research at macro level on liberalization of abortion laws, with positive effects on women's educational attainment, labor supply, and human capital investment of the next generation
  - Selection effects of abortion law liberalization are associated with other long-term benefits for children
- Abortion law liberalization may lead to lower crime rates

#### **Gestational limits**

 Macro effects of women denied an abortion due to gestational limits – higher poverty for children



## Macroeconomic Outcomes

#### Universal health coverage

- Public sector coverage of abortion care services is sparse, and individuals often bear most of the financial costs
  - Very few countries have public sectors that fully cover the financial costs of obtaining an abortion
- There are cost savings to society from public coverage of abortion services that reduce need for public spending on medical and welfare costs of pregnancies carried to term among lowincome women



## Secondary Outcome: Stigma

- The ability to confide in a social support network has an impact on available financial resources to access services.
- Inadequate access to and sharing of information about abortion can lead to barriers to accessing care.
- Abortion-related stigma can lead individuals to abortion care services outside the formal sector.
- Refusal to provide abortion services or referrals can result in substantial delays in care.
- Anti-abortion movements and related political action can restrict abortion access for women through legal regulations.

## Conclusion

	-	~	~	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-	~	1	-	- 8	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-	~	~	-	8	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
$= -\infty \infty$	-	$\mathbf{x}$	~	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-	~	8	-	$\mathbf{N}$	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
~ - ~ ~	-	-	~	-	8	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-	~	~	-	8	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-	1	~	-	~	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-	~		-	8	-	-	-	Т	T	1	1	1	1	1
	-	~	~	-	8	-	-	-	Т	١	1	÷.	Ť.	Т	Y
	-	~	~	-	-	-	-	-	x	Т	1	1	1	x	1
	-	~	\$	-	8	-	-	-	۸	T	Т	÷.	T	T	1
S - S S	-	~	~	~	8	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-	~	~	~	8	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-	~	~	-	8	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-	~	~	-	8	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-	-	~	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-	~	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-	~	~	-	*	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
-	-	*	~	-	8	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Ings	-	~	~	-	8	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Ipαs	-	~	~	-	~	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

- Third-party authorization impacts individuals, largely minors, by raising the direct and indirect price of abortion
- As a result, unintended pregnancies increase, and individuals may seek illegal abortions
- Restrictions on who can provide abortion services decreases individuals' access and increases costs of care
- Advocacy for universal health
  coverage that includes abortion is critical

## Conclusion

	-	1	-	~	8	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-	~	-	~		-	- 8	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
110	-	-	-	~	~	~	8	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	~	~	-	$\mathbf{x}$	~	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-	×	-	$\mathbf{x}$	8	-	$\mathbf{N}$	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
·~ -	-		-	8	~	-	~	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-	~	-	~	~	-	8	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-		-	\$	~	-	8	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-	1	-	~	~	-	8	-	-	-	1	1	Т	1	1	1	1
11	-	-	-	~	~	-	8	-	-	-	Т	X	1	Т	Т	1	1
	-	8	-	~	~	-	*	-	-	-	x	Т	1	1	1	٨	1
Se -	-	8	-	$\mathbf{x}$	8	-	$\mathbf{S}$	-	-	-	1	т	Т	1	Т	1	1
× -	-	8	-	8	~	-	8	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-	~	-	~	~	*	8	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-	\$	-	~	~	-	8	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-	-	-	~	~	-	8	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-	~	-	~	~	-	- >	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-	~	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	-	~	-	~	~	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
-			-	~	~	-	8	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	T.
Ip	a	S	-	~	~	-	8	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
-1	-		-	8		*	-		-	•	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

- **Criminalization** leads to greater costs for abortion seekers and for health systems providing PAC
- Liberalizing these laws can generate financial savings and positive macroeconomic outcomes
- **Gestational limits** result in individuals being less likely to achieve their aspirational plans, higher costs to health systems, and higher childhood poverty
- Mandated waiting periods increase costs for individuals, facilities, and health systems, as well as unwanted or mistimed births

## Gaps in the Knowledge Base



- Economics of abortion in the informal health sector
- Economics of medical abortion outside of health facilities
- Economic impact of having or not having access to abortion care services in lower-income countries
- Economics of abortion in communities
- Future research to take more of an explicit economic lens on abortion access and policies

# Thank you!







Maila HEALTH

