

Doepke, Matthias; Tertilt, Michèle; Voena, Alessandra

Working Paper

The economics and politics of women's rights

IZA Discussion Papers, No. 6215

Provided in Cooperation with:

IZA – Institute of Labor Economics

Suggested Citation: Doepke, Matthias; Tertilt, Michèle; Voena, Alessandra (2011) : The economics and politics of women's rights, IZA Discussion Papers, No. 6215, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA), Bonn,
<http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:101:1-201201113750>

This Version is available at:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10419/58668>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

IZA DP No. 6215

The Economics and Politics of Women's Rights

Matthias Doepke
Michèle Tertilt
Alessandra Voena

December 2011

The Economics and Politics of Women's Rights

Matthias Doepke

*Northwestern University
and IZA*

Michèle Tertilt

University of Mannheim

Alessandra Voena

Harvard University

Discussion Paper No. 6215
December 2011

IZA

P.O. Box 7240
53072 Bonn
Germany

Phone: +49-228-3894-0

Fax: +49-228-3894-180

E-mail: iza@iza.org

Any opinions expressed here are those of the author(s) and not those of IZA. Research published in this series may include views on policy, but the institute itself takes no institutional policy positions.

The Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA) in Bonn is a local and virtual international research center and a place of communication between science, politics and business. IZA is an independent nonprofit organization supported by Deutsche Post Foundation. The center is associated with the University of Bonn and offers a stimulating research environment through its international network, workshops and conferences, data service, project support, research visits and doctoral program. IZA engages in (i) original and internationally competitive research in all fields of labor economics, (ii) development of policy concepts, and (iii) dissemination of research results and concepts to the interested public.

IZA Discussion Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

ABSTRACT

The Economics and Politics of Women's Rights*

Women's rights and economic development are highly correlated. Today, the discrepancy between the legal rights of women and men is much larger in developing compared to developed countries. Historically, even in countries that are now rich women had few rights before economic development took off. Is development the cause of expanding women's rights, or conversely, do women's rights facilitate development? We argue that there is truth to both hypotheses. The literature on the economic consequences of women's rights documents that more rights for women lead to more spending on health and children, which should benefit development. The political-economy literature on the evolution of women's rights finds that technological change increased the costs of patriarchy for men, and thus contributed to expanding women's rights. Combining these perspectives, we discuss the theory of Doepke and Tertilt (2009), where an increase in the return to human capital induces men to vote for women's rights, which in turn promotes growth in human capital and income per capita.

JEL Classification: J10, N30, O10

Keywords: women's rights, political economy, development

Corresponding author:

Matthias Doepke
Department of Economics
Northwestern University
2001 Sheridan Road
Evanston, IL 60208
USA
E-mail: doepke@northwestern.edu

* We thank Zoë Cullen and Vuong Nguyen for excellent research assistance. Financial Support from NSF grants SES-0748889 and SES-0820409, SIEPR, and the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München is gratefully acknowledged.

1 Introduction

In today's developed countries, by and large, women enjoy the same legal rights as men. This has not always been the case. Two hundred years ago, in most countries women were considered property of men (typically either a father or a husband) and had no intrinsic rights of their own. They usually could not own property or sign contracts, they had no control over their own body, they could not vote, they had no legal way to end a marriage, and they had no access to their children after a separation. What explains the expansion of women's rights since? And what was the economic impact of these changes? In this paper, we provide a survey of the economics and politics of women's rights.

We focus on legal rights to emphasize the distinction between equality in opportunity as opposed to equality in outcomes.¹ Men and women are different, and hence gender differences in outcomes such as labor force participation, life expectancy, or political involvement should not be surprising. For example, even a small comparative advantage of women in child-rearing may lead to an optimal division of labor in which many women specialize in home production (Becker 1991). Inequalities in outcomes do not necessarily imply that women are disadvantaged. However, if formal rights are gender-specific, then women are denied the same opportunities as men. A large literature on gender differences in outcomes exists, whereas the formal rights of women have received increasing attention only recently.²

We start by documenting the salient facts on women's rights in relation to economic development. In contemporary cross-country data, measures of women's rights and development are highly correlated.³ The fact that women in today's least developed countries have the least legal rights might suggest that rights

¹While the focus is on formal rights, we sometimes also describe *de facto* rights, such as whether violence against women is accepted in a society or not.

²There exists a substantial body of work on other examples of expanding legal rights, such as the abolition of slavery and franchise extensions in the nineteenth century. However, explanations for these phenomena (such as the threat of violence and revolution) usually do not fit the case of women's rights, calling for a separate analysis.

³Duflo (2005) and Sinha, Raju, and Morrison (2007) provide surveys on the relationship between gender inequality and development. See also the 2012 World Development Report on Gender Equality and Development.

will expand naturally once economic development takes hold, just as they did in developed countries. However, there are important differences between today's poor countries and the historical situation in rich countries. Focusing on the cases of the United States and England, we show that the historical expansion of women's rights unfolded through distinct stages: basic economic rights came first, political rights were next, and equal treatment in the labor market and greater control over their own body ultimately followed. In contrast, in most African countries women gained formal political rights (as part of the end of colonialism) before obtaining economic rights. Moreover, there are many specific traditions (such as foot binding, child marriage, and witch killings) affecting the rights of women that are specific to certain cultures. Contemporary phenomena, such as HIV/AIDS, sex-selective abortions, and international sex trafficking also represent challenges to gender equality that were not present in earlier time periods (Kristof and WuDunn 2009).⁴

After reviewing the facts, we describe the economic consequences of women's rights. The bulk of the literature focuses on the effects of property (often land) rights for women. In line with economic intuition, a number of empirical studies find that more rights lead to a redistribution of resources towards women and higher investment in both physical and human capital. Some studies find a decrease in fertility when women obtain more economic rights. Further, equality in the division of marital assets tends to decrease female labor force participation. There is also research on the economic consequences of including women in politics through suffrage and gender quotas. The main finding here is that when women are involved in politics, both as voters and as policymakers, the composition of government spending shifts towards higher expenditures related to health and children. Some studies also find an overall increase in government expenditures, but here the evidence is less robust. Finally, improvements in women's control over their own body seem to increase their career prospects and life satisfaction, and may positively affect female bargaining power in the household.

The political-economy literature on the origins of women's rights is relatively

⁴For example, a myth in some African tribes is that sex with a virgin cures HIV (Leclerc-Madlala 2002).

small.⁵ Why were women's rights changed as economic growth took hold? Considering that women are physically weaker than men, it is not surprising that initially men dominated society and chose to endow women with an inferior legal position. What is more puzzling is that men ultimately gave up their control over women. A recent literature tries to understand the economic forces behind the expansion in women's rights. The forces can be grouped into two broad categories. On the one hand, general cultural changes may have changed male attitudes towards women's rights. On the other hand, technological change may have altered men's economic incentives for extending rights to women. We discuss evidence for each of these explanations. While culture may have played some independent role, the existing explanations suggest that technological change may have driven both cultural attitudes about women's rights and the expansion of rights itself.

The findings on the consequences and origins of women's rights suggest that causality between economic development and women's rights runs in both directions. We conclude our survey by discussing the theory of Doepke and Tertilt (2009), which captures the feedback between economics and politics in a model where human-capital driven growth and the expansion of women's rights mutually reinforce each other. In the model, men initially have all the power, but they can vote to endow women with economic rights that give them more bargaining power in marriage. As voters, men face a tradeoff between the bargaining power of their own wife (which they would prefer to be low) and the bargaining power of other men's wives (which they would prefer to be high). There are two different reasons why men would like women other than their own wife to have power. First, since women attach more weight to the future well-being of their children, empowering women leads to faster human capital accumulation. Men benefit from a general rise in education, because education levels under patriarchy are inefficiently low. Second, men more specifically would like their own daughters to have rights, so as to protect them from exploitation by their husbands. Doepke and Tertilt show that men's incentives to support women's rights depends on

⁵The seminal work by Boserup (1997) is the first economic analysis of how the position of women changes with development. However, Boserup does not deal with the political economy of women's legal rights, which is our focus here.

the return to education. Thus, technological change that increases the demand for human capital can endogenously trigger female empowerment. Conversely, once women have rights human capital accumulation speeds up even more, implying that political change feeds back into economic development.

In the next section we give an overview of the basic facts on women's rights across countries and throughout history. In Section 3, we discuss the economic consequences of various forms of women's rights. Section 4 takes a political-economy perspective to analyze the driving forces behind changes in women's rights. In Section 5, we review the theory of Doepke and Tertilt (2009), where skill-biased technical change drives both economic development and the expansion of women's rights. Section 6 concludes.

2 The Facts

In this section, we illustrate the wide heterogeneity in women's legal rights around the world, documenting the close association between women's empowerment and economic development. We start with a cross-country comparison and then move to a brief historical description for two countries—England and the United States.


2.1 Women's Rights Across Countries

There is tremendous variation in women's legal rights across countries. On the whole, contemporary data support the notion of a strong link between women's rights and development.

Figure I shows a scatter plot of the *Gender Empowerment Measure* (GEM; an index constructed by the United Nations Development Programme) and GDP per capita across countries.⁶ The correlation coefficient of 0.8 suggests a strong connection between women's rights and economic development. The GEM is a mixture of legal rights and economic outcomes for women. Given our emphasis on

⁶See Appendix A.1 for a detailed data description.


Figure I: Female Empowerment and Economic Development Across Countries



formal rights, in Table 1 we display several measures of female empowerment that capture the concept of legal rights more closely. The table gives average values for four groups of countries based on income and also includes the United States as a benchmark. We list values for individual countries in Table 4 in the Appendix.

The table contains several measures of property rights. A value of one means that women have full property rights, while a zero means they do not. The data show that women in high income countries have almost equal access to land, property, and credit as men, while women in many low income countries are excluded. The relationship between women’s property rights and development is also apparent in Figure II, which plots women’s access to land relative to GDP per capita. In all countries with a per capita income of \$20,000 or above (with the exception of Israel) women have equal access to land, while most low-income


Figure II: Access to Land and Economic Development Across Countries



countries cluster on the lower left-hand corner of the graph.

Many countries have laws related to women’s role in the family. For example, *parental authority* is a measure of child custody rules, normalized such that a low value means that mothers do not have the same authority as fathers. As Figure III shows, parental authority is equal for fathers and mothers in essentially all high income countries, while in low income countries parental authority is mostly in the hands of men. *Inheritance discrimination* is a variable that measures whether there is a gender-bias in inheritance practices, ranging from 0 (no gender bias) to 1 (males are favored). The data show that sons are strongly favored over daughters in low income countries, somewhat favored in middle-income countries, while there is no distinction between sons and daughters in the United States. *Repudiation* relates to divorce law. A high number means that husbands can unilaterally cancel the marriage contract, which leaves women without any protection in di-

Figure III: Equality in Child Custody and Economic Development Across Countries




voice. A low number means that repudiation is not allowed. Again, we see that repudiation is common in low-income countries, while essentially non-existent in high income countries.⁷ Another variable related to marriage law is *polygyny*. A high number means polygyny is a legally (or socially) acceptable practice while a low number means it is not. While the (non-)acceptability of polygyny is not exactly a right for women, a marriage law that allows polygyny establishes an asymmetry between men and women, since in those same countries polyandry is typically not allowed.⁸ The data show that the acceptability of polygyny decreases with income and is non-existent in high income countries.⁹

⁷The only high-income countries that allow repudiation are Bahrain and the United Arab Emirates.

⁸Polyandry means the practice of women marrying multiple men.

⁹There are a few exceptions in the Middle East: Bahrain, Kuwait, U.A.E., and Israel.

Figure IV: Contraceptive Prevalence and Economic Development Across Countries



How much control do women have over their own body? High income countries have strict laws against rape and domestic violence, thereby granting women essentially full control over themselves. This is not the case in all parts of the world. The variable *violence* in the table is a summary index of legislation punishing acts of violence against women, including rape, domestic violence, and sexual harassment. The value for low income countries is about twice as high as for high income countries, showing that the protection from violence is much weaker in poor countries. A specific type of violence against the female body is the practice of *female genital mutilation (FGM)*, which essentially exists only in low income countries. The *freedom of movement* is also severely restricted in poor countries. Similarly, in many poor countries women are obliged to wear a veil. Also related to control over one's own body is access to contraception. Since data on the le-

gality and availability of different forms of contraception is difficult to obtain, the table simply shows the percentage of women using modern methods of birth control.¹⁰ The strong positive correlation between contraceptive prevalence and economic development is illustrated in Figure IV.

Finally, consider political rights. Suffrage (i.e. the right to vote and to run for public office) was extended much earlier in high income countries: the median year of women suffrage was 1919 in high income countries, compared to 1957 in low income countries. Another measure related to the political process (even though not directly a right) is the percentage of seats in parliament that are held by women. Even if women's share is far from equal to men's share in most countries, high income countries exhibit a higher share (21.3 percent) compared to the rest of the world. Interestingly, the slope of both indicators with respect to income is not very steep, in particular when moving from middle income to low income countries.

2.2 The History of Women's Rights in England and the United States

The legal position of American and English women changed dramatically over the last two centuries. We discuss these two countries together because the evolution of rights is remarkably parallel. The initial situation was also similar, as the legal system in both countries is grounded in the common law (with exceptions in a few U.S. states that were initially colonized by Spain or France).

The changes to women's rights over the last 200 years can be grouped into three phases. During the second half of the nineteenth century, women gained economic rights related to property, child custody, and divorce. During the early twentieth century, political rights were extended to women. Finally, women gained full equality in the labor market and improved rights over their own body.

¹⁰In some developing countries, access to contraceptives may be limited not only by low availability, but also by legal and customary restrictions, that force women to seek their husband consent to access family planning services (e.g. Ashraf, Field, and Lee (2010)).

Table 1: Women’s Rights Across Countries by Income Group

| Measure of Women’s Rights | U.S. | High income countries | Upper-middle income countries | Lower-middle income countries | Low income countries |
|---|------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| <i>Property Rights</i> | | | | | |
| Women’s access to land | 1 | 0.92 | 0.83 | 0.79 | 0.30 |
| Women’s access to bank loans | 1 | 0.98 | 0.92 | 0.85 | 0.55 |
| Women’s access to property | 1 | 0.98 | 0.93 | 0.89 | 0.52 |
| <i>Family Law</i> | | | | | |
| Repudiation | 0 | 0.07 | 0.12 | 0.16 | 0.28 |
| Polygyny | 0 | 0.11 | 0.18 | 0.25 | 0.67 |
| Parental authority | 1 | 0.89 | 0.74 | 0.75 | 0.26 |
| Inheritance discrimination | 0 | 0.12 | 0.28 | 0.29 | 0.67 |
| <i>Rights Related to a Woman’s Own Body</i> | | | | | |
| Female genital mutilation | 0 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.32 |
| Violence against women | 0.33 | 0.35 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.66 |
| Freedom of movement | 0 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.12 |
| Obligation to wear a veil in public | 0 | 0.04 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.18 |
| Contraceptive prevalence (%) | 76.4 | 70.8 | 52.9 | 57.3 | 28.1 |
| <i>Political Rights</i> | | | | | |
| Median year of suffrage | 1920 | 1919 | 1946 | 1944 | 1957 |
| Women in parliament (%) | 15 | 21.3 | 15.1 | 14.0 | 13.0 |
| Gender Empowerment Measure | 0.76 | 0.68 | 0.54 | 0.44 | 0.33 |

Sources and Variable Descriptions: see Appendix A.1.

Tables 2 and 3 list the most important milestones for the United States and England.

Up until the nineteenth century, under the common law women lost their legal identity upon marriage: they could not hold property or land in their own name, write wills or contracts, nor did they have legal control over their own children. The legal rights of husband and wife were merged upon marriage and exercised exclusively by the husband (Hecker 1971). One of the earliest changes in the legal position of married women concerned child custody rules. In 1838 Iowa was the first U.S. state that permitted custody to mothers, with other states following shortly thereafter (Mason 1994). In England, the Custody of Infants Act passed in 1839, and gave mothers the possibility of custody for children below seven years of age. After several further reforms, by the end of the nineteenth century women could be awarded custody of all minor children in case of divorce.

Divorce laws were also relaxed (and made more symmetric) during the nineteenth century. A key step was the 1857 Matrimonial Causes Act in England. In the United States, by the end of the century divorce was allowed on grounds of cruelty in almost all states (Griswold 1986). Another key area of reform concerned marital property law. Maine was the first state that passed a law to allow married women to own separate property in their own name in 1844. By the end of the century, all married American women had access to some form of property and earnings protection (Khan 1996). In England, the Married Women's Property Act was passed in 1870 and expanded in 1874 and 1882, giving English women control over their own earnings and property (Combs 2005; Holcombe 1983).

By 1900, the initial phase of expanding women's economic rights was complete, yet women still lacked most political rights. The women's suffrage movements began to emerge during the first half of the nineteenth century. In the United States, a handful of Western states already granted women's suffrage during the nineteenth century, starting with Wyoming (1869) and Utah (1870). However, in the majority of states the enfranchisement of women followed only after the nineteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, which granted full voting rights to women in 1920 (Braun and Kvasnicka 2010). Similarly, British women

gained partial suffrage through the Representation of the People Act of 1918.¹¹ In the same year, all women over 21 years old were granted the right to stand for Parliament through The Parliament (Qualification of Women) Act. Equal voting rights with men were only achieved through the Representation of the People Acts of 1928, also known as the Equal Franchise Act, which granted universal suffrage to women over age 21.¹²

Even by the mid-twentieth century, women had not gained legal rights equal to men along all dimensions. In particular, women continued to face unequal legal treatment in the labor market long after they had gained the right to vote. In the United States, restrictions on hours worked, wages, and work conditions of female employees were introduced in almost all states during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, typically disguised as protective legislation (Goldin 1990, Chapter 7). For example, women were not allowed to work night shifts, yet night shift experience was required to move up the career ladder (Huber 1976). Similarly, marriage bars, which excluded married women from certain occupations such as clerical work and teaching, were common until World War II. Legislations that promoted equal treatment in the labor market was introduced during the second half of the twentieth century: the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in the United States and the Equal Pay Act of 1970 in the England. Thus, equality in the labor market was achieved relatively late, and indeed, to the extent that gender discrimination is still an issue of public debate today, the focus is usually on equality in the labor market.

The twentieth century also saw an expansion of women's control over their body. Until 1976, marital rape was legal in every state in the United States. Although by now marital rape is a crime everywhere, some states still do not consider it as serious as other forms of rape. Access to birth control was initially severely restricted. In the United States, the Comstock Act of 1873 outlawed the dissemination of birth control devices or information through the mail. By the 1950s and 1960s, most states had legalized birth control, but many state laws still prohibited the dissemination of information about contraception, and some states still

¹¹The act gave the right to vote to women over the age of 30 who met minimum property qualifications.

¹²Acts available at <http://www.parliament.uk>.

prohibited the possession of contraception. A 1965 Supreme Court decision limited states' ability to restrict access to birth control (*Griswold v. Connecticut*). Of course, technological change was also important for expanding access, in particular through the introduction of the birth control pill. In the United States, the Food and Drugs Administration approved the pill in 1960. However, until the end of the 1960s it could not be prescribed to single women below the age of majority without parental consent. The early 1970s saw a liberalization of abortion with the lifting of abortion bans in all states by 1973 as a result of the Supreme Court decision in the *Roe v. Wade* case (Goldin and Katz 2002).

Another area of reform in the United States during the 1970s concerned the allocation of assets upon divorce. Most U.S. states were originally based on the British common law system, where upon divorce assets were awarded to the spouse who held the formal title. Only eight states, primarily those with a French or Spanish colonial legacy, had a community property system, in which assets were divided equally. The distribution of property rights over marital assets became a relevant issue as divorce laws were liberalized and divorce rates increased in the second half of the twentieth century. In 1970, the Federal Uniform Marriage and Divorce Act provided guidelines for title-based states for adopting equitable distribution of property, in order to grant women a larger share of assets in divorce settlements (Golden 1983).¹³ The last title-based state to introduce equitable distribution of property was Mississippi in 1994 (American Bar Association 1977-2005).

3 Economic Consequences of Extending Rights to Women

In this section, we discuss the economic consequences of the expansion of women's rights. One first-order effect is to redistribute resources (property, earnings, decision power) from men to women in the household, in the labor market,

¹³In equitable distribution regimes, assets are divided by courts, irrespectively of the title to the property, to achieve equity.

Table 2: United States Timeline

| | |
|------|--|
| 1769 | “The very being and legal existence of the woman is suspended during the marriage...” (from English common law) |
| 1785 | Pennsylvania was the first state to pass a statute that allowed both men and women to file for <i>divorce</i> under extreme circumstances (desertion of at least four years, bigamy, sexual incapacity before marriage, and cruelty). Other states followed shortly. |
| 1838 | Kentucky gave <i>school suffrage</i> (the right to vote at school meetings) to widows with children of school age. |
| 1838 | Iowa was first state to allow sole <i>custody of a child</i> to its mother in the event of a divorce. |
| 1839 | Mississippi was the first state that gave married women limited <i>property rights</i> . |
| 1844 | Maine passed <i>Sole Trader Law</i> which granted married women the ability to engage in business without the need for her husband’s consent. Maine also passed a <i>Property Law</i> that granted married women separate control over property. |
| 1857 | Maine passed an <i>Earnings Law</i> which granted married women the rights to their own earnings. |
| 1861 | Kansas gave <i>school suffrage</i> to all women. Many states followed before the turn of the century. |
| 1869 | Wyoming was the first state that gave women the same <i>voting rights</i> as men. Most states did not follow until the beginning of the twentieth century. |
| 1886 | All but six states allowed <i>divorce</i> on grounds of cruelty. |
| 1895 | Almost all states have passed some form of Sole Trader Laws, Property Laws, and Earnings Laws. |
| 1920 | <i>Nineteenth amendment</i> granting all women right to vote. |
| 1965 | <i>Weeks vs. Southern Bell</i> : many restrictive <i>labor laws</i> were lifted, opening previously male-only jobs to women. |
| 1970 | <i>Uniform Marriage and Divorce Act</i> promotes equitable distribution of property |
| 1973 | <i>Roe v. Wade</i> : legalization of abortion. |
| 1974 | <i>Credit</i> discrimination against women outlawed by Congress. |
| 1975 | States are denied the right to exclude women from <i>juries</i> . |
| 1981 | The Supreme Court rules that excluding women from the <i>draft</i> is unconstitutional. |

Sources: Hecker (1971), Salmon (1986), and Khan (1996).

Table 3: England Timeline

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Until | Stark disparity between legal rights of married vs. single women. Single women were considered <i>feme sole</i> which allowed them the right to make contracts and own property in their own name. |
| 1850 | Married women were legally considered <i>feme covert</i> which meant that upon marriage the legal rights of the woman merged and became that of her husband. Married women had practically no rights regarding property, child custody, or the ability to make contracts. |
| 1839 | <i>Custody of Infants Act</i> , which for the first time granted mothers (under special circumstances) custody of children under 7 years in the event of divorce. |
| 1857 | <i>Matrimonial Causes Act</i> , which permitted secular divorce in England, allowing both men and women to file. Note though that this law allowed men to file on grounds of adultery, while women could initiate a divorce only if adultery was coupled with incest, bigamy, cruelty, or desertion. This act also gave divorced women the status of <i>feme sole</i> . |
| 1869 | England granted <i>municipal suffrage</i> to single women and widows. |
| 1870 | Act to provide public elementary education in England and Wales. This act created school boards and gave women <i>school suffrage</i> . |
| 1870 | The <i>Married Women Property Act</i> granted women limited control over their earnings and modest legacies. This act did not give women the same property rights as men, rather it was intended to protect the most vulnerable women from their husband's exploitation. |
| 1873 | 2nd <i>Custody of Infants Act</i> which allowed mothers to petition for custody of children up to 16 yrs. old. |
| 1878 | The <i>Matrimonial Causes Act</i> allowed courts to absolve a wife from her obligation to co-habit and to require her husband to pay a weekly sum to support her, if he had been convicted of aggravated assault against her and she was considered in further danger. |
| 1882 | The <i>Act to Consolidate and amend Acts relating to the Property of Married Women</i> gave women the ability to hold separate property and to contract with respect to their separate estates. |
| 1886 | The <i>Married Women Act</i> allowed maintenance orders to be issued against men who neglected, willfully refused to support, or deserted their wives. |
| 1888 | <i>County Suffrage</i> |
| 1894 | <i>Parish and District Suffrage</i> gave both single and married women the right to elect and be elected to parish and district councils. |
| 1907 | England made women eligible as mayors, aldermen, an county and town councilors. |
| 1918 | The <i>Representation of the People Act</i> give women the right to vote provided they are aged over 30 and either they, or their husband, meet a property qualification. |
| 1918 | The <i>Parliament (Qualification of Women) Act</i> allows women to stand for Parliament |
| 1928 | The <i>Equal Franchise Act</i> is passed giving women equal voting rights with men. |
| 1935 | Act passed that secured a married women's right to assume <i>personal liability</i> for her contracts. |

Source: based on Hecker (1971), Shanley (1986), Kertzer and Barbagli (2001) and the British Parliament archives (available at <http://www.parliament.uk>).

or on the ballot. Granting property rights to women also removes inefficiencies in their economic behavior and increases the scope for investment in their human capital. Women's political rights (as voters and as representatives) have been shown to have a substantial impact on policy outcomes and favor the public provision of goods, in particular in health and education. Below, we summarize a number of empirical and theoretical studies that have examined the implications of extending economic and political rights to women.

3.1 Women's Property Rights

In England, The Married Women's Property Act of 1870 greatly expanded women's control over personal property within marriage.¹⁴ In response, women shifted the composition of their portfolios from real property (such as a cottage) to more personal property (such as money and furniture). However, no difference was observed in their total assets holdings (Combs 2005), possibly because of their limited earning possibilities. The extension of economic rights also had an effect on the economic lives of women living in the United States. Like in England, the immediate impact was limited by the relatively low participation of women in the labor market during the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, patent data from 1790 to 1895 reveal that granting economic rights to women, in particular rights that gave them the ability to own and operate a business without their husband's permission or oversight, led to more patenting by female inventors, especially in urban areas (Khan 1996). Similarly, between 1850 and 1920, the relative investment in the human capital of women increased in those states where they had gained property and earning rights (Geddes, Lueck, and Tenyson 2009). However, there is no evidence that the expansion of economic rights had any significant impact on female labor force participation, at least between 1860 and 1900 (Roberts 2006).

In more recent decades, women's property rights over marital assets upon divorce had a sizeable impact on household behavior in the United States.¹⁵ For

¹⁴Even prior to the Property Act, women had some control over their real assets.

¹⁵See Hamilton (1999) for an analysis of wives' property rights over marital assets in Québec during the nineteenth century.

married couples such rights influence the outside option in marital bargaining, and can thus affect the intra-household allocation.¹⁶ Community property regimes, which often award more resources to women upon divorce than title-based regimes, are associated with lower hours of work by women and higher by men (Chiappori, Fortin, and Lacroix 2002). In the 1970s and 1980s, the elimination of the title-based system brought an increase in the amount of assets awarded to women. However, equal division of property may not always grant more assets to women, or to secondary earners more generally, compared with separate property. Women who consume as much as their husband in marriage, but have lower permanent income, may be better off in a separate property system, in which they can accumulate more savings than their husband to avoid a drop in consumption upon divorce. Equal division of property may also generate a distortion in the incentives to accumulate assets during marriage, since it prevents spouses to save proportionally to their consumption in marriage. Enforceable prenuptial agreements may be better suited at facilitating consumption smoothing upon divorce, especially for women (Voena 2011).

In developing countries, where agriculture usually accounts for a large share of output, gender disparities in access to land and in the security of land property pose particular challenges (Joireman 2008, The World Bank 2012). From a theoretical viewpoint, we would expect the lack of secure property rights to negatively affect the incentives to invest (Besley 1995). Indeed, Zimbabwean women are less likely than men to invest in tree planting when their property rights are insecure due to likely changes in their marital status. However, they are as likely as men to plant when their land tenure is secure (Fortman, Antinori, and Nobane 1997). The lack of well-defined property rights for women is a substantial barrier to efficient agricultural production in Sub-Saharan Africa. Udry (1996) showed that the profitability of land is lower for wives than for husbands. Goldstein and Udry (2008) suggest that lower profitability may be due to the land tenure system. Fear

¹⁶Allocations are also affected by laws that govern the circumstances under which divorce is allowed. In the United States, the introduction of unilateral divorce, which allows one spouse to obtain divorce without the consent of the other, was associated with a significant reduction in rates of domestic violence and female suicide (Stevenson and Wolfers 2006), and with changes in the labor supply of women (although evidence on labor supply is not conclusive, see Gray 1998 and Stevenson 2008). Eswaran and Malhotra (2011), in contrast, find that more female autonomy increases domestic violence in India, as men use violence to increase their bargaining power.

of expropriation, which is more likely for women, leads them to be less likely to let their land fallow and thus negatively affects the productivity of their plots.

Access to secure property rights may also influence women's bargaining position within their marriage. For instance, land property for women in Nepal is associated with greater intrahousehold empowerment of wives and better health outcomes for the children (Allendorf 2007). Examining a land titling program in Peru which explicitly targeted gender equality in land ownership, Field (2003) establishes a causal relationship between land rights, female empowerment, and lower fertility. Women who became more likely to appear as owners on property documents as a result of the program were more likely to participate in household decision-making and significantly less likely to give birth.¹⁷

Summing up, the evidence from a variety of contexts seems to suggest that more property rights for women lead to higher investment, both in physical and human capital, as well a lower fertility.

3.2 Women's Political Rights

Empirical evidence indicates that extending the suffrage to women affected legislative behavior, which is what a model of electoral competition would predict. Female suffrage seems to have shifted public spending towards welfare programs and public health. In the United States, the enfranchisement of women was associated with a 24 percent increase in state social spending, and in particular with higher local public health spending. Other types of public spending did not respond to women suffrage. Female suffrage was also associated with an 8 to 15 percent decline in child mortality (Miller 2008). Further empirical evidence suggests that not only the composition, but also the total amount of public spending was affected: suffrage coincided with more liberal voting patterns and an increase in government expenditures (Lott and Kenny 1999). A similar pattern has been observed in six Western European countries between 1869 and 1960 (Aidt and Dallal 2008). Abrams and Settle (1999) use OECD data between 1960

¹⁷Not only different preferences for children, but also difference in the opportunity cost of childbearing may explain why empowering women can reduce fertility (Iyigun and Walsh 2007).

and 1992 to examine the impact of Switzerland's extension of the franchise to women in 1971. They document a 28 percent increase in social welfare spending with respect to other neighboring countries which had already granted women's suffrage. More recently, Funk and Gathmann (2008) examine survey data on all federal votes in Switzerland between 1981 and 2003, where voters make direct decisions on a broad range of issues two to three times a year. They find only limited evidence that women favor a larger government, but female voters and politicians have a substantial impact on the composition of public spending, favoring public health provision, equal gender rights, environmental protection, and unemployment and social security provisions rather than nuclear energy and the military.

Why do women vote differently from men? One argument is that women have intrinsically different preferences, and in particular care more about children and public health and less about defense than men. A different argument is that women face different economic conditions than men, such as lower incomes and higher financial vulnerability. As a result of these different circumstances, women may demand more public welfare programs. The enfranchisement of women would then increase public spending: as the income of the decisive voter falls relative to the mean, she supports more governmental redistribution (Abrams and Settle 1999). Edlund and Pande (2002) examine the impact of changes in divorce laws, the rise in single motherhood, and female poverty in the United States and find evidence that supports the hypothesis that the political gender gap responds to changes in the economic gender gap.¹⁸

Other evidence on women's political rights comes from natural experiments that instituted quotas for female politicians. In most countries, women occupy only a small fraction of legislative positions and are generally less likely to participate in politics (The World Bank 2012).¹⁹ Gender quotas have been introduced in some countries to expand female presence in politics. The majority of empirical evidence on the impact of gender quotas comes from India, where the specific

¹⁸See also Edlund, Haider, and Pande (2005) for an analysis of this hypothesis in Europe.

¹⁹Lower access to education does not appear to explain the lower involvement of Kenyan women in community participation, although it increases their political knowledge (Friedman et al. 2011).

design of the program allows for causal inference.²⁰ Exploiting random variation in reserved and unreserved seats, Chattopadhyay and Duflo (2004) find that female Village Council heads in West Bengal and Rajasthan favor spending on infrastructure that is relevant for women in their community.²¹ Data on state legislators indicate that in the United States female policymakers affect the composition of public spending as well: more women in state governments contributed to the rise in health care spending as well as a decreased growth rate on prison spending (Rehavi 2007). However, data from U.S. city mayor elections suggests that women's impact may not be as relevant in local governments (Ferreira and Gyourko 2010).

3.3 Women's Rights Over Their Body

The twentieth century also saw fundamental changes that gave women greater control over their body and their lives. Legal access to oral contraceptives gave women control over the timing of childbearing, and thus their labor market participation (Bailey 2006) and their access to professional careers (Goldin and Katz 2002). Access to contraceptives can also improve women's intrahousehold bargaining position (Chiappori and Oreffice 2008). In fact, data from Europe suggests that allowing abortion and oral contraceptives increased women's self-reported life satisfaction (Pezzini 2005).²² In some developing countries, access to contraceptives may be limited not only by low availability, but also by spousal discordance in the demand for children and husband consent requirements. Ashraf,

²⁰For a comprehensive review on gender quotas, see Pande and Ford (2011).

²¹Exposure to quotas seems to also reduce voters' gender bias and lead to greater likelihood of the election of a female policymaker after reservations are removed (Beaman et al. 2008). Other evidence on female representatives in India uses variation due to close elections and indicates that the impact of women policymakers is closely tied to their caste (Clots-Figueras 2007) and has only limited impact on education policy (Clots-Figueras 2011).

²²Access to contraceptive and to abortion may not always increase the well-being of women. Akerlof, Yellen, and Katz (1996) suggest that the availability of such technologies may have eroded the bargaining power of some women, who remained pregnant out-of-wedlock, and thus decreased the frequency of shotgun marriages, and increased poverty among women. More generally, it is interesting to point out that the overall self-reported satisfaction of women has been consistently declining both in absolute terms and relative to men since the 1970s (Stevenson and Wolfers 2009).

Field, and Lee (2010) found that Zambian women who were offered family planning services alone were significantly more likely to use them compared to women who were offered the same services in the presence of their husband.

More rights over their own body likely led to other changes beyond women's reproductive choices. In a theoretical paper, Tertilt (2006) analyzes the impact of giving women property rights over their own body in the context of polygyny in Africa. The analysis shows that allowing women to make their own marriage decisions (in contrast to fathers owning daughters and selling them to future husbands) leads to an increase in savings, a decrease in fertility, and thereby to higher output per capita.²³ The reason is that self-ownership of women decreases the returns on daughters for men, who start investing more in physical capital and less into acquiring wives and large families.²⁴

4 Political Origins of Expanding Women's Rights

We now turn to the political economy of women's rights. Why did legislators and voters, all of whom were male until female suffrage was introduced, decide to empower women? And what explains the timing of the reforms?

4.1 Cultural Explanations

Traditionally, the spread of women's rights has been mostly attributed to cultural changes. For example, historians emphasize the role of the women's movement in changing attitudes about gender equality and ultimately convincing legislators to support women's rights.²⁵ From this perspective, women's rights have been grouped with a general trend towards more rights for various groups in society, including the abolition of slavery, rights for gay people, and even animal

²³See also Tertilt (2005) for an economic analysis of polygyny.

²⁴Similarly, requiring the consent of the marrying individual to the marriage, and not only the consent of his family, favors younger generations and may increase investment (Edlund and Lagerlöf 2006).

²⁵See, for example, Keyssar (2000).

rights. These cultural changes, in turn, have been argued to be rooted in the Age of Enlightenment, which emphasized equality among people. However, not all Enlightenment philosophers agreed that equality should extend to equality between the sexes. While some favored female emancipation, many others, such as Kant and Rousseau, remained strongly opposed.²⁶

Once considered beyond the realm of economics, cultural change has recently become an area of active economic research. One caveat is that this literature concentrates on the impact of culture on economic choices (such as female labor force participation) and the evolution of culture itself; in contrast, it does not deal explicitly with women's legal rights and the political-economy implications of cultural change.²⁷ Nevertheless, recent findings in the economics of culture suggest pathways through which cultural changes may have promoted political reform.

Several recent papers empirically assess the importance of culture using data from second-generation immigrants in the United States (Antecol 2000; Fernández and Fogli 2009; Alesina and Giuliano 2010). The main finding is that the choices of second-generation Americans concerning fertility and female labor supply are correlated with average fertility and labor-force participation rates in their countries of origin. Since second-generation Americans face the same economic conditions and circumstances as other Americans, these findings are interpreted as evidence for a cultural transmission of preferences. For example, the parent generation (i.e., the immigrants) may have formed cultural attitudes about family size or traditional gender roles while growing up in the home country, and then passed on the same views to their American-born children. There is also evidence for a transmission of preferences via television. Chong, Duryea, and La Ferrara (2008) finds that exposure to soap operas in Brazil led to a decrease in fertility. Similarly, Oster and Jensen (2009) show how attitudes about the status of women changed with the arrival of cable television in rural India: the reported acceptability of domestic violence declined, reported son preference and fertility

²⁶For example, Kant and Rousseau argued that women should not be educated. On the other hand, Marie Jean Antoine Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet was an early advocate for women's suffrage in his essay *Sur l'admission des femmes au droit de cité*, published in 1790.

²⁷One exception is Givati and Troiano (2011), who examine how cultural attitudes towards gender-based discrimination influence optimal maternity leave policy.

declined as well, and women's autonomy went up.

A number of theoretical papers develop explicit models of the transmission of culture. In Fernández, Fogli, and Olivetti (2004), attitudes towards women's work are formed in childhood. Men who grow up with a working mother are more likely to marry a woman who remains in the labor force. Fogli and Veldkamp (2011) model culture as endogenously changing beliefs. Specifically, beliefs about the impact of working mothers on their children's success evolve as more information becomes available. The more women participate in the labor force, the faster beliefs change as the information content of observing one's peers increases. This evolution of beliefs leads to an S-shaped increase in female labor force participation.²⁸

The evidence on evolving attitudes towards women's role in society suggest that cultural change may have contributed to political reform, by changing legislators' and voters' views about the society they want to live in. However, this does not imply that cultural change is a deep driving force of political change by itself: the important question is why culture changed when it did. To this end, there is evidence that cultural norms often have economic origins. For example, Miguel (2005) relates the culture of witch killing in Tanzania to poverty. Using variation in rainfall as an instrument for poverty, he documents that witch killing was more prevalent in areas where lack of rainfall led to starvation. Hence, killing women (and calling them witches) may have evolved as a solution to a severe economic problem.²⁹ Cheung (1972) suggests that the tradition of foot binding in China (which results in crippled feet) was a way to establish property rights over daughters. Young girls were often relied on for weaving and spinning in the household. Bossen et al. (2011) argue that foot binding disappeared when the arrival of commercial cloths made the home production of these products unprofitable, which once again links cultural change to technological change. Alesina, Giuliano, and Nunn (2011a, 2011b) find that current cross-country variation in attitudes towards gender roles is related to historical agricultural practices, namely the extent to which agriculture was plough-based (for which male strength was important) versus hoe-based (which women could easily do). Finally, Green-

²⁸A related point is also made by Fernández (2007).

²⁹Oster (2004) makes a similar point in the context of Renaissance Europe.

wood and Guner (2009, 2010) argue that technological progress in home production and birth control technology led to, respectively, falling marriage and divorce rates and more liberal attitudes towards premarital sex.

In sum, one interpretation of the evidence on culture is that the ultimate cause of political reform was economic change that altered attitudes towards women. However, attitudes are a slow-moving variable, and cultural transmission may have been important for the economic changes to reach their full effect, perhaps with a considerable lag. Of course, this still leaves open the question exactly which kind of economic changes were responsible for changing attitudes towards women's rights, which is what we turn to next.

4.2 Explanations Based on Technological Change

Several papers argue that technological change, broadly defined, was responsible for the extension of economic rights to women during the nineteenth century (Geddes and Lueck 2002; Doepke and Tertilt 2009; Fernández 2009). Geddes and Lueck (2002) tie the expansion of rights to increasing labor market opportunities for women. Even though husbands initially had all legal power, they were unable to control how much effort their wives choose to exert at work. When women had no rights, effort provision was inefficiently low. By endowing their wives with economic rights, husbands were able to induce their wives to put in more effort, leading to larger family incomes. In essence, men faced a tradeoff between getting a larger share of a smaller pie or a smaller share of a larger pie. This tradeoff shifted as women's labor market opportunities improved. One caveat for applying this logic to the nineteenth-century reforms is that married women's labor force participation was very low at the time and did not increase when economic rights were expanded.³⁰ However, the mechanism may be relevant for improvements in women's access to the labor market that took place in the twentieth century.

Whereas in Geddes and Lueck (2002) men's motivation is simply to maximize

³⁰Moreover, there is no correlation between female labor force participation rates and women's rights in cross state data (Roberts 2006).

their consumption, in Doepke and Tertilt (2009) and Fernández (2009) men's political preferences are driven by concern for their daughters. The mechanism in Doepke and Tertilt (2009) relates to women's role in the education of children rather than the labor market. By empowering women, men can improve the welfare of their daughters (at the expense of the sons-in-law) and ensure a better education for their grandchildren. These motives become more important when the return to human capital increases over time.³¹ Fernández (2009) proposes a related theory where fertility decline is the ultimate driving force of women's rights. As in Doepke and Tertilt (2009), men have conflicting interests in their role as husbands and fathers. As fertility declines, fathers desire to leave larger bequests to each child. However, without female rights, bequests to daughters are essentially confiscated by the sons-in-law. This problem increases in the size of the desired bequest and is thus exacerbated by declining fertility as well as increasing wealth. Thus, the process of development that triggered the demographic transition and drove wealth accumulation may have also led men to support economic rights for women.

Bertocchi (2011) examines the reasons for extending voting rights to women. Once again, the argument is related to women's role in the labor market. In her model, people's preferred tax rate is decreasing in income. Given that on average women's earnings are lower than those of men, including women in the political decision process leads to an increase in taxes, which most men oppose. However, as the gender wage gap declines (e.g. because of gender-biased technological progress), the gap between the tax rates preferred by male and female voters declines. If there is a societal cost of excluding women from the franchise, men will voluntarily give women voting rights once the tax gap is sufficiently small.

One way to test the various political-economy explanations for changing women's rights is to identify groups that historically were in favor of the expansion of women's rights. Some evidence of this kind can be derived from cross-state variation in the timing of changes in women's rights in the United States. Geddes and Lueck (2002) find that states with larger city populations, more female

³¹We will discuss this theory in more detail in Section 5.

schooling, and higher per capita wealth granted property rights to women earlier. In addition, Fernández (2009) finds that states with low fertility rates were also quick to expand women's rights.

Jones (1991) analyzes data on voting behavior in the U.S. House and Senate on female suffrage during the nineteenth century. She finds that the sex ratio played a large role: representatives from states with a large majority of men were more inclined to vote for suffrage than those with a more balanced sex ratio. Similarly, Braun and Kvasnicka (2010) argue that unbalanced sex ratios explain why Western states were the first to grant female suffrage. Giving women the right to vote was less costly for men in states where they were the majority, and it was hoped that suffrage would attract more women to the West. Jones (1991) establishes a link between prohibition and female suffrage. Those states where the liquor industry was particularly powerful were more opposed to women suffrage (women were more supportive of prohibition).³² While interesting, large variation in sex ratios as well as the connection to prohibition are specific to the U.S. context.

At the individual level, the presence of daughters has been shown to have a favorable effect on the attitude of men towards women's rights. This finding has been documented among American legislators, but also in U.S., Canadian, and British household surveys.³³ This finding accords with the general notion that concern about the next generation is what drives men to support women's rights.

5 Feedback Between Economic and Political Change: A Theory of Women's Liberation

Taken together, the studies discussed so far suggest that causality between economic development and women's rights runs in both directions: women's rights

³²Similarly, Berman (1987) shows that in Arizona in 1912-1916 it was mostly farmers, mormons, and western-born natives who favored prohibition, third party candidates, and women suffrage.

³³See Washington (2008), Warner (1991), Warner and Steel (1999), and Oswald and Powdthavee (2010). However, a recent study based on U.S. nationally representative data suggests that the presence of female offspring may increase conservative political preferences among voters (Conley and Rauscher 2010).

affect choices that feed back into development, and economic development in itself may be a key force driving the political expansion of women's rights. To examine this two-way relationship, we now discuss the theory of Doepke and Tertilt (2009), where economic development and political change are mutually reinforcing trends.

Doepke and Tertilt focus on the expansion of economic rights for married women during the nineteenth century in England and the United States. As described in Section 2.2, these reforms took place before women gained the right to vote. Thus, to explain why the reforms took place, one has to understand what men stood to gain from expanding women's rights. The argument laid out in Doepke and Tertilt (2009) is that men face a tradeoff between the rights of their own wife and those of other men's wives. More legal rights for married women improve their bargaining position in the household and thus increase the female share of household consumption. Thus, from a man's perspective, one's own wife should ideally not have any rights. At the same time, men also care about their daughters, and therefore would like their daughters to have rights to protect them from exploitation by their husbands. Moreover, women attach a higher weight to the well-being of children, which implies that more bargaining power for women translates into higher education investments for children. Since men prefer a higher level of education for their grandchildren than their sons-in-law, this provides another motive for supporting women's rights. Based on this tradeoff, Doepke and Tertilt argue that the ultimate cause of the expansion of women's rights is technological change that increased the return to education. If technology is such that human capital is irrelevant, men prefer patriarchy. In contrast, in a world with high returns to education men care greatly about the education of their descendants, leading them to support women's rights.

To illustrate this mechanism, we review the main model ingredients here. The economy is populated by overlapping generations of men and women in each period. There is random matching in the marriage market. Apart from gender, people are homogeneous, implying that all couples are identical. Men and women derive utility from their own consumption, their spouses' consumption, and the number and well-being of their children. The preferences are summarized by

the following recursive utility function, indexed by gender $g \in \{m, f\}$:

$$U_g(c_g, c_{-g}, n, U'_m, U'_f) = u(c_g, c_{-g}, n) + \gamma_g \left(\frac{U'_m + U'_f}{2} \right).$$

Here c_g is own consumption, and c_{-g} denotes the spouse's consumption. Couples have equal numbers of sons and daughters. The number of boy-girl pairs is denoted by n , and U'_m and U'_f represents the utility of sons and daughters. The weight γ_g that people attach to the welfare of their children differs by gender. In particular, women care more about children: $\gamma_f > \gamma_m$.

The couple faces a common budget constraint. Each spouse is endowed with one unit of time, which can be used for working or raising and educating children. For simplicity, it is assumed that only women raise children. Therefore, men spend all their time working. Women, on the other hand, have to allocate their time optimally between working t_f and educating boys e_m and girls e_f . In addition to the education time, it takes ϕ units of time to raise a boy-girl pair. The female time constraint is therefore given by:

$$t_f + (\phi + e_m + e_f)n \leq 1.$$

The labor of both spouses as well as their human capital is combined by a household production function to produce consumption goods. The household budget constraint for a family where the wife and husband have human capital H_m and H_f is:

$$c_m + c_f = A(t_f H_f)^\alpha (H_m)^{1-\alpha},$$

where $0 < \alpha < 1$.

The point of educating children is to increase their human capital. The human capital production function depends on education time e_g as well as the human capital of the parents:

$$H'_g = \max\{1, (Be_g)^\theta H_f^\beta H_m^{1-\beta}\},$$

where θ and B and are technology parameters that determine the return to education and β specifies the relative importance of fathers' versus mothers' human

capital. Notice that children always receive at least one unit of human capital even if they are not educated. The interpretation is that people have basic productive skills, such as physical strength, that do not depend on receiving formal instruction. The presence of basic human capital implies that parents will not educate their children if the return to education is sufficiently low.

Each couple chooses fertility, the time allocation, and the division of consumption among the spouses. Given that men and women have different preferences (regarding the allocation of consumption between them and the education of the children), decisions must be made using some form of bargaining between the spouses. Doepke and Tertilt assume that bargaining power depends on the political regime, i.e., women's legal rights. On the one extreme, when women have no legal rights they also don't have bargaining power in the household. Hence, men make all decisions—the *patriarchy regime*. On the other extreme, when women do have legal rights, they have better outside options and thus they participate in household decision making. This case is modeled as cooperative bargaining—the *empowerment regime*.³⁴

The political regime is determined through a vote by the male population. Since all men alive at a given time are identical, they agree on the preferred regime. However, if there is technological change, different generations of men face different political incentives. From the perspective of a male voter, the tradeoff is between higher own consumption (under patriarchy) and higher well-being of daughters as well as faster accumulation of human capital (under empowerment).

Consider now what happens when, due to technological change, the return to education increases over time. As long as the return is still low, parents prefer not to educate their children, people only have basic human capital, and there is no economic growth. In this situation men prefer patriarchy, since the gain from sharing power with women is relatively small.³⁵ Once the return to edu-

³⁴More specifically, the patriarchy allocation maximizes the male value function only, while the empowerment allocation maximizes the equally weighted sum of the female and male value functions.

³⁵Daughters would still benefit from the empowerment regime, but the human-capital channel is absent.

cation surpasses a certain threshold, parents will start to educate their children. However, from a man's perspective the speed of accumulation of human capital is inefficiently low. One reason for this is an externality in the marriage market: men do not internalize that their children's human capital will also benefit their children's future spouses. This externality leads to under-investment in human capital. A second channel is that given the structure of preferences, men disagree with their sons-in-law about the optimal education of grandchildren. These frictions do not matter as long as parents do not educate their children, but they become increasingly severe as the return to education keeps increasing. At some point, a second threshold is reached where men are willing to sacrifice some own consumption in order to help their daughters and speed up the accumulation of human capital. By voting for women's rights men can achieve exactly that: they have to share more resources with their wife, but they also provide more bargaining power to all other women in the economy (including their daughters), which leads to more investment in education. Once the empowerment regime is adopted, the political reform feeds back into economic change: the growth rate of output per capita increases due to faster human-capital accumulation.

Formally, Doepke and Tertilt show that a gradual increase in the return to education θ leads to an endogenous transition from patriarchy to empowerment. The first effect of a rise in θ is that education starts to increase and fertility starts to fall. Ultimately, the return to education is sufficiently large for men to vote for empowerment. After the empowerment is implemented, the trends towards low fertility and more education accelerate even more.

According to the model, development (specifically, human capital accumulation) is a prerequisite for women's rights, because men are willing to give up patriarchy only if the demand for human capital is high. In this sense, development causes women's rights. On the other hand, women's rights lead to a further increase in the growth rate of human capital and output. Thus, women's rights also cause development. In sum, economic development and political change mutually reinforce each other.

Doepke and Tertilt also show that the predictions of the theory are consistent with the timing of the expansion of women's rights in England and the United

States during the second half of the nineteenth century. The model implies that women's rights are first introduced during a phase of beginning mass education and fertility decline. And indeed, in the United States the total fertility rate declined from close to seven children at the beginning of the nineteenth century to only about 2.5 children for women born around the turn of the twentieth century. The elementary school enrollment rate increased dramatically over the same time horizon, from less than 50 percent at the beginning of the century to essentially 100 percent by the end. The expansion of legal rights took place right in the middle of these transitions. The picture for England is similar, with the main difference that fertility stayed high for the first half of the nineteenth century. When the major legal reforms were carried out in the second half of the century, fertility was falling fast and education levels were rapidly rising.

6 Conclusion

Less than two centuries ago, in England, the United States, and many other countries women had no legal existence separate from their husbands. Less than one century ago, women had no political rights in most countries. Not even half a century ago, even in the most developed countries women still faced severe discrimination in many areas of life, including the labor market. Today, we observe a high correlation between measures of women's rights and GDP per capita—women's rights are still lacking in most of the poorest countries of the world.

In this survey, we have described the consequences of extending rights to women, in particular economic rights, political rights, and rights over their own body. In addition to redistributing resources to women, expanding women's economic rights appears to favor investment. Similarly, the introduction of women's suffrage has shifted the composition of public spending towards spending related to health, education, and children. We have also examined the political origins of the expansion of women's rights in high income countries. While cultural changes may have played a role, we argue that the most promising explanation is technological change that shifted voters' and politicians' incentives for supporting women's rights. In particular, in the theory of Doepke and Tertilt (2009)

technological progress that increases the return to schooling increases men's incentives to support women's rights. This finding gives hope for the position of women in today's poorest countries: as these countries develop, extending rights to women may happen naturally as a consequence of technological change that raises the demand for human capital.

At the same time, women in today's developing countries face a number of unique challenges that were not present in the historical development process of industrialized countries. For example, son preference appears to be more pronounced in several Asian countries today than it ever was in Europe (Das Gupta et al. 2003). This might be due to modern technologies such as amniocentesis and ultrasound that allow early detection of a fetus' gender, giving rise to selective abortion. Accordingly, in countries such as China or India sex ratios of recent birth cohorts are very skewed (Sen 1990). Even though one might think that scarcity of women will eventually benefit them and lead to a higher appreciation of daughters, so far no such shift in attitudes has been observed.³⁶ Rather, in some instances, scarcity of women seems to make women's plight even worse, for example through sex trafficking and bride kidnapping. To date, we still lack a systematic empirical and economic analysis of these issues.

At a more general level, we also need a better understanding of the nature of the gender asymmetries that underlie observed differences in behavior between men and women. One possibility is that men and women have different hard-wired preferences, for evolutionary reasons.³⁷ Indeed a sizeable part of the existing literature is implicitly or explicitly based on the assumption of a preference gap between men and women. However, a second possibility is that differences in economic and legal circumstances lead women to act differently from men. For example, if marital resources are not split evenly upon divorce, then women might favor more social insurance than men do. Similarly, if women have little

³⁶Edlund and Lee (2009) argue that the sex ratio has become less skewed in recent years in South Korea as a response to development. Neelakantan and Tertilt (2008) show that a skewed sex ratio at birth does not directly translate into scarcity in the marriage market, if spousal age gaps and gender-specific mortality are taken into account. See also Anderson and Ray (2010) on the topic of missing women.

³⁷For example, women may have evolved to care relatively more about children because they have a lower reproductive capacity than men, or because men face paternity uncertainty (Doepke and Tertilt 2009).

access to savings technologies, they may invest more in children to insure their old age consumption. As Doepke and Tertilt (2011) show, distinguishing these explanations for gender differences in behavior is difficult. For example, endogenous specialization in household production may lead women to act as if they cared more about children, even when the true preferences of men and women are symmetric.

In summary, this survey shows that substantial progress has been made in understanding the causes and consequences of the expansion of women's rights. Yet, many open questions remain. Most importantly, more empirical and theoretical research is needed to identify the precise mechanisms underlying the economics of women's rights and to analyze the specific challenges surrounding the expansion of women's rights in developing countries.

A Cross Country Data

[INSERT TABLE 4 HERE]

A.1 Data Description

With the exception of women suffrage, all data is from the OECD Gender, Institutions and Development Data Base (GID 2006). Here we give the definition of each variable and its original source.

Gender Empowerment Measure: measures inequality between men's and women's opportunities, combining measures of inequality in political participation and decision making, in economic participation and decision making, and in power over economic resources. Based on the 2003 Human Development Report of the United Nations Development Programme.

GDP per capita: Per capita Gross Domestic Product in international \$ PPP, 2005. Based on World Bank, World Development Indicators (2005).

Women Access to Land: Women's access to land ownership (between "1=full" and "0=impossible"). Primarily based on Lang (1998).

Women's Access to Bank Loans: Women's access to bank loans (between "1=full" and "0=impossible"). Primarily based on Lang (1998).

Women's Access to Property: Women's rights to own property other than land (between "0=no" and "1=yes"). Primarily based on Lang (1998).

Repudiation: Unilateral termination of marriage through husband's repudiation of his wife (level of discrimination between "0=not possible" and "1=legally binding practice"). Primarily based on Lang (1998).

Early Marriage: Share of female population between ages 15 and 19 ever married. Based on UNDP, Human Development Report (2005).

Polygyny: Acceptance of polygyny within a society (between "0=no" and "1=complete acceptance"). Based on various primary sources.

Parental Authority: Parental authority granted to father and mother equally (between "0=no" and "1=yes"). Primarily based on Lang (1998).

Inheritance discrimination: Inheritance practices in favor of male heirs (level between "0=no" and "1=yes"). Primarily based on Lang (1998).

Female Genital Mutilation: Prevalence of female genital mutilation (share of women affected: "0=none", "1=all"). Based on various sources (e.g. WHO, Amnesty International, StopFGM).

Violence Against Women: Legislation punishing acts of violence against women; e.g. rape, domestic violence, sexual harassment (level of discrimination between "0=specific legislation in place" and "1=no legislation in place"). Based on UNIFEM, Not a Minute More - Ending Violence Against Women (2003).

Freedom of Movement: Freedom to move freely outside of the house (level of discrimination between "0=yes" and "1=no"). Primarily based on Lang (1998).

Obligation to Wear a Veil in Public: Level of discrimination between "0=no" and "1=full". Primarily based on Lang (1998).

Contraceptive Prevalence: Percentage of women of reproductive age (15-49) married or in a union who are using (or whose partner is using) a modern contraceptive method. Based on World Health Organization (2005).

Women's Suffrage: Year in which the right to vote for women was recognized on a universal and equal basis. If partial rights were recognized before full rights were granted, we report the year of granting of the partial recognition of the right to vote. Source: 2004 Human Development Report of the United Nations Devel-

opment Programme.

Women in Parliament: Seats in parliament held by women (as % of total). Based on World Bank, Gender Stats (2005).

References

- Abrams, Burton A., and Russell F. Settle. 1999. "Women's Suffrage and the Growth of the Welfare State." *Public Choice* 100 (3–4): 289–300 (September).
- Aidt, T.S., and B. Dallal. 2008. "Female Voting Power: The Contribution of Women's Suffrage to the Growth of Social Spending in Western Europe (1869–1960)." *Public Choice* 134 (3): 391–417.
- Akerlof, George A., Janet L. Yellen, and Michael L. Katz. 1996. "An Analysis of Out-of-Wedlock Childbearing in the United States." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 111 (2): 277–317.
- Alesina, Alberto, and Paola Giuliano. 2010. "The Power of the Family." *Journal of Economic Growth* 15:93–125.
- Alesina, Alberto F., Paola Giuliano, and Nathan Nunn. 2011a. "Fertility and the Plough." *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings* 101 (3): 499–503 (May).
- . 2011b, May. "On the Origins of Gender Roles: Women and the Plough." Working paper 17098, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Allendorf, Keera. 2007. "Do Women's Land Rights Promote Empowerment and Child Health in Nepal?" *World Development* 35 (11): 1975–88 (November).
- American Bar Association. 1977–2005. "Family Law in the Fifty States: an Overview." *Family Law Quarterly*.
- Anderson, Siwand, and Debraj Ray. 2010. "Missing Women: Age and Disease." *The Review of Economic Studies* 77:1262–1300.
- Antecol, Heather. 2000. "An Examination of Cross-Country Differences in the Gender Gap in Labor Force Participation Rates." *Labour Economics* 7 (4): 409–426.
- Ashraf, N., E. Field, and J. Lee. 2010. "Household Bargaining and Excess Fertility: An Experimental Study in Zambia." *BREAD Working Paper No. 282*.
- Bailey, M.J. 2006. "More Power to the Pill: The Impact of Contraceptive Freedom on Women's Life Cycle Labor Supply." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 121 (1): 289–320.

- Beaman, L., R. Chattopadhyay, E. Duflo, R. Pande, and P. Topalova. 2008. "Powerful Women: Does Exposure Reduce Prejudice?" *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 124 (4): 1497–1540 (November).
- Becker, Gary S. 1981 (Enlarged ed. 1991). *A Treatise on the Family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Berman, David R. 1987. "Male Support for Woman Suffrage: An Analysis of Voting Patterns in the Mountain West." *Social Science History* 11 (3): 281–294 (Autumn).
- Bertocchi, G. 2011. "The Enfranchisement of Women and the Welfare State." *European Economic Review* 55:535 – 553.
- Besley, Timothy. 1995. "Property Rights and Investment Incentives: Theory and Evidence from Ghana." *Journal of Political Economy* 103 (5): 903–37.
- Boserup, Ester. 1970 (Reprinted 1997). *Woman's Role in Economic Development*. London: Earthscan.
- Bossen, Laurel, Wang Xurui, Melissa J. Brown, and Hill Gates. 2011. "Feet and Fabrication: Footbinding and Early Twentieth-Century Rural Women's Labor in Shaanxi." *Modern China* 37 (4): 347–383.
- Braun, Sebastian, and Michael Kvasnicka. 2010. Men, Women, and the Ballot. Gender Imbalances and Suffrage Extensions. Kiel Working Paper No. 1625.
- Chattopadhyay, Raghavendra, and Esther Duflo. 2004. "Women as Policy Makers: Evidence from a Randomized Policy Experiment in India." *Econometrica* 72 (5): 1409–1443 (September).
- Cheung, Steven N. S. 1972. "The Enforcement of Property Rights in Children, and the Marriage Contract." *The Economic Journal* 82 (326): pp. 641–657.
- Chiappori, P.A., B. Fortin, and G. Lacroix. 2002. "Marriage Market, Divorce Legislation, and Household Labor Supply." *Journal of Political Economy* 110:37–72.
- Chiappori, Pierre-André, and Sonia Oreffice. 2008. "Birth Control and Female Empowerment: An Equilibrium Analysis." *Journal of Political Economy* 116:113–140.

- Chong, A., S. Duryea, and E. La Ferrara. 2008. "Soap Operas and Fertility: Evidence from Brazil." *CEPR Discussion Papers*, vol. 6785.
- Clots-Figueras, Irma. 2007. Are Female Leaders Good for Education?: Evidence from India. Unpublished manuscript, UC3M Working papers Universidad Carlos III de Madrid.
- . 2011. "Women in Politics: Evidence from the Indian States." *Journal of Public Economics* 95 (7-8): 664–690.
- Combs, Mary Beth. 2005. "A Measure of Legal Independence: The 1870 Married Women's Property Act and the Portfolio Allocations of British Wives." *Journal of Economic History* 65 (4): 1028–57.
- Conley, D., and E. Rauscher. 2010. The Effect of Daughters on Partisanship.
- Das Gupta, Monica, Jiang Zhenghua, Li Bohua, Xie Zhenming, Woojin Chung, and Bae Hwa-Ok. 2003. "Why is Son preference so persistent in East and South Asia? A cross-country study of China, India and the Republic of Korea." *The Journal of Development Studies* 40 (2): 153–187.
- Doepke, Matthias, and Michéle Tertilt. 2009. "Women's Liberation: What's in It for Men?" *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 124(4):1541–1591.
- . 2011. "Does Female Empowerment Promote Economic Development?" CEPR Discussion Paper 8441.
- Duflo, Esther. 2005. Gender Equality in Development. BREAD Policy Paper No. 011.
- Edlund, Lena, Laila Haider, and Rohini Pande. 2005. "Unmarried Parenthood and Redistributive Politics." *European Economic Association* 3 (1): 95–119 (March).
- Edlund, Lena, and Nils-Petter Lagerlöf. 2006. "Individual vs. Parental Consent in Marriage: Implications for Intra-household Resource Allocation and Growth." *American Economic Review* 96 (2): 304–307 (May). Papers and Proceedings.
- Edlund, Lena, and Chulhee Lee. 2009. "Son Preference, Sex Selection and Economic Development: Theory and Evidence from South Korea." *Columbia University Discussion Paper*.

- Edlund, Lena, and Rohini Pande. 2002. "Why have Women Become Left-Wing? The Political Gender Gap and the Decline in Marriage." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 117 (3): 917–961 (August).
- Eswaran, Mukesh, and Nisha Malhotra. 2011. "Domestic Violence and Women's Autonomy: Evidence from India." *Canadian Journal of Economics*, forthcoming.
- Fernández, Raquel. 2007. "Culture as Learning: The Evolution of Female Labour Force Participation Over a Century." *CEPR Discussion Paper*, no. DP6451 (September).
- . 2009. "Women's Rights and Development." *NBER Working Paper Series*, no. 15355.
- Fernández, Raquel, and Alessandra Fogli. 2009. "Culture: An Empirical Investigation of Beliefs, Work and Fertility." *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* 1 (1): 146–177.
- Fernández, Raquel, Alessandra Fogli, and Claudia Olivetti. 2004. "Mothers and Sons: Preference Formation and Female Labor Force Dynamics." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 119 (4): 1249–1299.
- Ferreira, F., and J. Gyourko. 2010. Does Gender Matter for Political Leadership? The Case of US Mayors. Unpublished manuscript, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania.
- Field, Erica. 2003. Fertility Responses to Urban Land Titling Programs: The Roles of Ownership Security and the Distribution of Household Assets. Unpublished manuscript.
- Fogli, Alessandra, and Laura Veldkamp. 2011. "Nature or Nurture? Learning and the Geography of Female Labor Force Participation." *Econometrica* 79 (4): 1103–1138 (July).
- Fortman, Louise, Camille Antinori, and Nontokozo Nobane. 1997. "Fruits of their Labor: Gender, Property Rights, and Tree Planting in Two Zimbabwe Villages." *Rural Sociology* 62 (3): 295–314.
- Friedman, W., M. Kremer, E. Miguel, and R. Thornton. 2011. "Education as Liberation?" *NBER Working Paper No.* 16939.

- Funk, Patricia, and Christina Gathmann. 2008. *Gender Gaps in Policy Making: Evidence from Direct Democracy in Switzerland*. unpublished manuscript, University of Mannheim.
- Geddes, Rick, and Dean Lueck. 2002. "The Gains From Self-Ownership and the Expansion of Women's Rights." *American Economic Review* 92 (4): 1079–1092 (September).
- Geddes, Rick, Dean Lueck, and Sharon Tennyson. 2009. "Human Capital Accumulation and the Expansion of Women's Economic Rights." unpublished manuscript, Cornell University.
- Givati, Y., and U. Troiano. 2011. "Law, Economics and Culture: Theory and Evidence from Maternity Leave Laws." *Harvard Law and Economics Working Paper*.
- Golden, Lawrence J. 1983. *Equitable Distribution of Property*. Shepard's/McGraw-Hill.
- Goldin, C., and L. Katz. 2002. "The Power of the Pill: Oral Contraceptives and Women's Career and Marriage Decisions." *Journal of Political Economy* 110 (4): 730–770.
- Goldin, Claudia. 1990. *Understanding the Gender Gap: An Economic History of American Women*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goldstein, Markus, and Christopher Udry. 2008. "The Profits of Power: Land Rights and Agricultural Investment in Ghana." *Journal of Political Economy* 116 (6): 981–1022 (December).
- Gray, J.S. 1998. "Divorce-Law Changes, Household Bargaining, and Married Women's Labor Supply." *American Economic Review* 88:628–642.
- Greenwood, Jeremy, and Nezih Guner. 2009. "Marriage and Divorce Since World War II: Analyzing the Role of Technological Progress on the Formation of Households." *NBER Macroeconomics Annual 2008* 23:231–276.
- . 2010. "Social Change: The Sexual Revolution." *International Economic Review* 51 (4): 893–923.
- Griswold, Robert L. 1986. "Law, Sex, Cruelty, and Divorce in Victorian America, 1840-1900." *American Quarterly* 38 (5): 721–45.

- Hamilton, Gillian. 1999. "Property Rights and Transaction Costs in Marriage: Evidence from Prenuptial Contracts." *The Journal of Economic History* 59 (1): 68–103.
- Hecker, Eugene A. 1971. *A Short History of Women's Rights*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Holcombe, Lee. 1983. *Wives and Property: Reform of the Married Women's Property Law in Nineteenth Century England*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Huber, Joan. 1976. "Towards a Sociotechnological Theory of the Women's Movement." *Social Problems* 23 (4): 371–88.
- Iyigun, M., and R.P. Walsh. 2007. "Endogenous Gender Power, Household Labor Supply and the Demographic Transition." *Journal of Development Economics* 82 (1): 138–155.
- Joireman, S. F. 2008. "The Mystery of Capital Formation in Sub-Saharan Africa: Women, Property Rights and Customary Law." *World Development* 36 (7): 1233–46 (July).
- Jones, Ethel B. 1991. "The Economics of Women Suffrage." *Journal of Legal Studies* 20 (2): 423–37.
- Kertzer, David, and Marzio Barbagli. 2001. *Family Life in the Long Nineteenth Century 1789-1913*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Keyssar, Alexander. 2000. *The Right to Vote: The Contested History of Democracy in the United States*. New York: Basic Books.
- Khan, B.Z. 1996. "Married Women's Property Laws and Female Commercial Activity: Evidence from United States Patent Records, 1790–1895." *The Journal of Economic History* 56 (02): 356–388.
- Kristof, Nicholas D., and Sheryl WuDunn. 2009. *Half the Sky: Turning Oppression into Opportunity for Women Worldwide*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Lang, Jack. 1998. *Enquête sur la Situation des Femmes dans le Monde*. Paris: Assemblée Nationale.
- Leclerc-Madlala, Suzanne. 2002. "On the Virgin Cleansing Myth: Gendered Bodies, AIDS and Ethnomedicine." *African Journal of AIDS Research* 1:87–95.

- Lott, John R., and Lawrence W. Kenny. 1999. "Did Women's Suffrage Change the Size and Scope of Government?" *Journal of Political Economy* 107:1163–1198.
- Mason, Mary Ann. 1994. *From Father's Property to Children's Rights: The History of Child Custody in the United States*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Miguel, Edward. 2005. "Poverty and Witch Killing." *Review of Economic Studies* 72:1153–1172.
- Miller, Grant. 2008. "Women's Suffrage, Political Responsiveness, and Child Survival in American History." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 123 (3): 1287–1327 (August).
- Neelakantan, Urvi, and Michèle Tertilt. 2008. "A Note on Marriage Market Clearing." *Economic Letters* 101:103–105.
- OECD, Development Centre. 2006. "Gender, Institutions and Development."
- Oster, Emily. 2004. "Witchcraft, Weather and Economic Growth in Renaissance Europe." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 18 (1): 215–228.
- Oster, Emily, and Robert Jensen. 2009. "The Power of TV: Cable Television and Women's Status in India." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 124 (3): 1057–1094.
- Oswald, Andrew J., and Nattavudh Powdthavee. 2010. "Daughters and Left-Wing Voting." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 92 (2): 213–227.
- Pande, Rohini, and Deanna Ford. 2011. *Gender Quotas and Female Leadership: A Review*. Background Paper for the World Development Report on Gender.
- Pezzini, S. 2005. "The Effect of Women's Rights on Women's Welfare: Evidence from a Natural Experiment." *The Economic Journal* 115 (502): C208–C227.
- Rehavi, Marit. 2007. *Sex and Politics: Do Female Legislators Affect State Spending?* Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan.
- Roberts, Evan. 2006. "Women's Rights and Women's Labor: Married Women's Property Laws and Labor Force Participation, 1860–1900." Unpublished manuscript, Victoria University of Wellington.
- Salmon, Marylynn. 1986. *Women and the Law of Property in Early America*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

- Sen, Amartya. 1990. "More Than 100 Million Women Are Missing." *The New York Review of Books*.
- Shanley, Mary Lyndon. 1986. "Suffrage, Protective Labor Legislation, and Married Women's Property Laws in England." *Signs* 12 (1): 62–77.
- Sinha, Nistha, Dhushyanth Raju, and Andrew Morrison. 2007. "Gender Equality, Poverty and Economic Growth." *World Bank Policy Research Paper*, no. 4349 (September).
- Stevenson, B. 2008. "Divorce law and women's labor supply." *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies* 5 (4): 853–873.
- Stevenson, B., and J. Wolfers. 2006. "Bargaining in the Shadow of the Law: Divorce Laws and Family Distress." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 121 (1): 267.
- . 2009. "The Paradox of Declining Female Happiness." *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 1 (2): 190–225.
- Tertilt, Michèle. 2005. "Polygyny, Fertility, and Savings." *Journal of Political Economy* 113 (6): 1341–1371.
- . 2006. "Polygyny, Women's Rights, and Development." *Journal of the European Economic Association* 4 (2-3): 523–530.
- The World Bank. 2012. "2012 World Development Report on Gender Equality and Development." Technical Report, The World Bank.
- Udry, Christopher. 1996. "Gender, Agricultural Production, and the Theory of the Household." *Journal of Political Economy* 104 (5): 1010–46.
- Voena, Alessandra. 2011. Yours, Mine and Ours: Do Divorce Laws Affect the Intertemporal Behavior of Married Couples? SIEPR Discussion Paper 10-022.
- Warner, Rebecca L. 1991. "Does the Sex of Your Children Matter? Support for Feminism among Women and Men in the United States and Canada." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 53 (4): pp. 1051–1056.
- Warner, R.L., and B.S. Steel. 1999. "Child Rearing as a Mechanism for Social

Change: The Relationship of Child Gender to Parents' Commitment to Gender Equity." *Gender & Society* 13 (4): 503–517.

Washington, Ebonya L. 2008. "Female Socialization: How Daughters Affect Their Legislator Fathers' Voting on Women's Issues." *American Economic Review* 98 (1): 311–332 (March).

Table 4: Cross-sectional Facts

| Country | Income Group | Land Access | Credit Access | Property Access | Reputation | Polygyny | Parental Authority | Inheritance | Female Mutilation | Violence | Freedom of Movement | Veil | Contraception | Year of Suffrage | Parliament | GEM |
|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Australia | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 76.1 | 1902 | 24.7 | 0.754 |
| Austria | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.17 | 0 | 0 | 50.8 | 1918 | 33.9 | 0.782 |
| Bahrain | HIC | 0.5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.75 | 0 | 0 | 61.8 | 1973 | 0 | n/a |
| Belgium | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.17 | 0 | 0 | 78.4 | 1919 | 34.7 | 0.695 |
| Canada | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0 | 74.7 | 1917 | 21.1 | 0.771 |
| Denmark | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0 | 78.0 | 1915 | 36.9 | 0.825 |
| Finland | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 77.4 | 1906 | 37.5 | 0.801 |
| France | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.01 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0 | 74.6 | 1944 | 12.2 | n/a |
| Germany | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.17 | 0 | 0 | 74.7 | 1918 | 32.8 | 0.776 |
| Greece | HIC | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.02 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0 | n/a | 1927 | 14 | 0.519 |
| Hong Kong, China | HIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 86.2 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Iceland | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | n/a | 1915 | 30.2 | 0.847 |
| Ireland | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.17 | 0 | 0 | n/a | 1918 | 13.3 | 0.683 |
| Israel | HIC | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.15 | 0.85 | 0.15 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 68.0 | 1948 | 15 | 0.612 |
| Italy | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.42 | 0 | 0 | 60.2 | 1945 | 11.5 | 0.561 |
| Japan | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.67 | 0 | 0 | 55.9 | 1945 | 7.1 | 0.515 |
| Korea, Rep. | HIC | 1 | 1 | n/a | 0 | n/a | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.17 | n/a | 0 | 61.8 | 1948 | 13 | 0.363 |
| Kuwait | HIC | 0.5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 50.2 | n/a | 0 | n/a |
| Luxembourg | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.42 | 0 | 0 | n/a | 1919 | 23.3 | n/a |
| Malta | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.67 | 0 | 0 | n/a | 1947 | 9.2 | n/a |
| Netherlands | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.17 | 0 | 0 | 78.5 | 1919 | 36.7 | 0.794 |
| New Zealand | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0 | 74.9 | 1893 | 28.3 | 0.75 |
| Norway | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0 | 73.8 | 1907 | 38.2 | 0.837 |
| Portugal | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0 | 66.3 | 1931 | 19.5 | 0.647 |
| Puerto Rico | HIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.42 | n/a | n/a | 77.7 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Singapore | HIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.5 | n/a | n/a | 62.0 | 1947 | 16 | 0.594 |
| Slovenia | HIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.75 | n/a | n/a | 73.8 | 1945 | 12.2 | 0.582 |
| Spain | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0 | 80.9 | 1931 | 36 | 0.709 |
| Sweden | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78.0 | 1861 | 45.3 | 0.831 |
| Switzerland | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0 | 82.0 | 1971 | 25 | 0.72 |
| U.A.E. | HIC | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.31 | 0.75 | 0.5 | 1 | 27.5 | n/a | 0 | 0.315 |
| United Kingdom | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.08 | 0 | 0 | 84.0 | 1918 | 18.1 | 0.675 |
| United States | HIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0 | 76.4 | 1920 | 15 | 0.76 |

| Country | Income Group | Land Access | Credit Access | Property Access | Repudiation | Polygyny | Parental Authority | Inheritance | Female Mutilation | Violence | Freedom of Movement | Veil | Contraception | Year of Suffrage | Parliament | GEM |
|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Argentina | UMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0 | n/a | 1947 | 33.7 | n/a |
| Botswana | UMC | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0 | 40.4 | 1965 | 11.1 | 0.564 |
| Chile | UMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.42 | 0 | 0 | n/a | 1931 | 12.5 | 0.467 |
| Costa Rica | UMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0 | 75.0 | 1949 | 35.1 | 0.67 |
| Croatia | UMC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.25 | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1945 | 21.7 | 0.534 |
| Czech Republic | UMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.42 | 0 | 0 | 72.0 | 1920 | 17 | 0.579 |
| Estonia | UMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0 | 70.3 | 1918 | 18.8 | 0.56 |
| Gabon | UMC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | 32.7 | 1956 | 9.2 | n/a |
| Hungary | UMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 77.4 | 1918 | 9.1 | 0.518 |
| Latvia | UMC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.75 | n/a | n/a | 48.0 | 1918 | 21 | 0.576 |
| Lebanon | UMC | 0.5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.75 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 61.0 | 1952 | 2.3 | n/a |
| Libya | UMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 39.7 | 1964 | n/a | n/a |
| Lithuania | UMC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.5 | n/a | n/a | 46.6 | 1921 | 22 | 0.499 |
| Malaysia | UMC | 1 | 0.8 | 0 | 0 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.42 | 0 | 0 | 54.5 | 1957 | 9.1 | 0.503 |
| Mauritius | UMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.42 | 0 | 0 | 74.7 | 1956 | 5.7 | n/a |
| Mexico | UMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.17 | 0 | 0 | 68.4 | 1947 | 22.6 | 0.516 |
| Oman | UMC | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.2 | 0.75 | 0.5 | 1 | 23.7 | n/a | 2.4 | n/a |
| Panama | UMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.17 | 0 | 0 | 58.2 | 1941 | 16.7 | 0.471 |
| Poland | UMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0 | 49.4 | 1918 | 20.2 | 0.594 |
| Saudi Arabia | UMC | 0 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.7 | 1 | 31.8 | n/a | 0 | n/a |
| Slovak Republic | UMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.67 | 0 | 0 | 74.0 | 1920 | 16.7 | 0.598 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | UMC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.33 | n/a | n/a | 38.2 | 1946 | 19.4 | 0.642 |
| Uruguay | UMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.42 | 0 | 0 | n/a | 1932 | 12.1 | 0.516 |
| Venezuela, RB | UMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.42 | 0 | 0 | 21.0 | 1946 | 9.7 | 0.441 |
| Albania | LMC | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0 | 0 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.75 | 0 | 0 | 57.5 | 1920 | 6.4 | n/a |
| Algeria | LMC | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0.75 | 0 | 0 | 64.0 | 1962 | 6.2 | n/a |
| Armenia | LMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.8 | 0 | 0 | 0.75 | 0 | 0 | 60.5 | 1921 | 5.3 | n/a |
| Belarus | LMC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.5 | n/a | n/a | 50.4 | 1919 | 29.4 | n/a |
| Bolivia | LMC | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.42 | 0 | 0 | 53.4 | 1938 | 19.2 | 0.522 |
| Bosnia & Herzegov | LMC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.5 | n/a | n/a | 47.5 | n/a | 16.7 | n/a |
| Brazil | LMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.58 | 0 | 0 | 76.7 | 1934 | 8.6 | n/a |
| Bulgaria | LMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0 | 41.5 | 1944 | 26.3 | n/a |
| China | LMC | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0 | 0 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.58 | 0 | 0 | 83.8 | 1949 | 20.2 | n/a |
| Colombia | LMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0 | 76.9 | 1954 | 12 | 0.501 |

| Country | Income Group | Land Access | Credit Access | Property Access | Reputation | Polygyny | Parental Authority | Inheritance | Female Mutilation | Violence | Freedom of Movement | Veil | Contraception | Year of Suffrage | Parliament | GEM |
|----------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|------------|----------|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|----------|---------------------|------|---------------|------------------|------------|-------|
| Cuba | LMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 73.3 | 1934 | 36 | n/a |
| Dominican Republic | LMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 64.7 | 1942 | 17.3 | 0.529 |
| Ecuador | LMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.17 | 0 | 0 | 65.8 | 1929 | 16 | 0.489 |
| Egypt, Arab Rep. | LMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0.9 | 1 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.97 | 0.75 | 0 | 0.7 | 56.1 | 1956 | 2.9 | 0.253 |
| El Salvador | LMC | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.17 | 0 | 0 | 59.7 | 1939 | 10.7 | 0.459 |
| Fiji | LMC | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.75 | 0 | 0 | 41.0 | 1963 | 8.5 | n/a |
| Guatemala | LMC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.67 | n/a | n/a | 38.2 | 1946 | 8.2 | n/a |
| Honduras | LMC | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.67 | 0 | 0 | 61.8 | 1955 | 5.5 | 0.408 |
| Iran, Islamic Rep. | LMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 72.9 | 1963 | 4.1 | n/a |
| Iraq | LMC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | 13.7 | n/a | 31.6 | n/a |
| Jamaica | LMC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.67 | n/a | n/a | 65.9 | 1944 | 11.7 | n/a |
| Jordan | LMC | 0.2 | 1 | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0.8 | 55.8 | 1974 | 5.5 | n/a |
| Kazakhstan | LMC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.25 | n/a | n/a | 66.1 | 1924 | 10.4 | n/a |
| Macedonia | LMC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.5 | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1946 | 19.2 | n/a |
| Morocco | LMC | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0 | 50.3 | 1963 | 10.8 | n/a |
| Namibia | LMC | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0 | 1 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 28.9 | 1989 | 25 | 0.578 |
| Paraguay | LMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.17 | 0 | 0 | 57.4 | 1961 | 10 | 0.412 |
| Peru | LMC | 1 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.42 | 0 | 0 | 68.9 | 1955 | 18.3 | 0.521 |
| Philippines | LMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.9 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.17 | 0 | 0 | 46.5 | 1937 | 15.3 | 0.539 |
| Romania | LMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0 | 63.8 | 1929 | 11.1 | 0.46 |
| Russian Federation | LMC | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0 | n/a | 1918 | 9.8 | 0.44 |
| Serbia & Montenegro | LMC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.75 | n/a | n/a | 58.3 | n/a | 7.9 | n/a |
| South Africa | LMC | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 1 | 0.1 | 0.42 | 0 | 0 | 56.3 | 1930 | 32.8 | n/a |
| Sri Lanka | LMC | 0.5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0 | 66.1 | 1931 | 4.9 | 0.272 |
| Swaziland | LMC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.75 | n/a | n/a | 27.7 | 1968 | 10.8 | n/a |
| Syrian Arab Republic | LMC | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 36.1 | 1949 | 12 | n/a |
| Thailand | LMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.9 | 0 | 0 | 0.33 | 0 | 0 | 72.2 | 1932 | 10.6 | 0.457 |
| Tunisia | LMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 | 1 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0 | 60.0 | 1957 | 22.8 | n/a |
| Turkey | LMC | 0.5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.42 | 0 | 0 | 63.9 | 1930 | 4.4 | 0.29 |
| Turkmenistan | LMC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.75 | n/a | n/a | 61.8 | 1927 | 26 | n/a |
| Ukraine | LMC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.42 | 0 | 0 | 67.5 | 1919 | 5.3 | 0.406 |
| West Bank and Gaza | LMC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Afghanistan | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | 4.8 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Angola | LIC | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 6.2 | 1975 | 15 | n/a |

| Country | Income Group | Land Access | Credit Access | Property Access | Reputation | Polygyny | Parental Authority | Inheritance | Female Mutilation | Violence | Freedom of Movement | Veil | Contraception | Year of Suffrage | Parliament | GEM |
|---------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|------------|----------|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|----------|---------------------|------|---------------|------------------|------------|-------|
| Azerbaijan | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.75 | n/a | n/a | 55.4 | 1921 | 10.5 | n/a |
| Bangladesh | LIC | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0.08 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 53.8 | 1972 | 2 | 0.218 |
| Benin | LIC | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.5 | 0.17 | 0.75 | 0 | 0 | 18.6 | 1956 | 7.2 | n/a |
| Bhutan | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.67 | n/a | n/a | 18.8 | 1953 | 8.7 | n/a |
| Burkina Faso | LIC | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.72 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0 | 11.9 | 1958 | 11.7 | n/a |
| Burundi | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.75 | n/a | n/a | 15.7 | 1961 | 18.4 | n/a |
| Cambodia | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.58 | n/a | n/a | 23.8 | 1955 | 9.8 | 0.347 |
| Cameroon | LIC | 0 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.75 | 0 | 0 | 19.3 | 1946 | 8.9 | n/a |
| Central African Rep | LIC | 0 | 1 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.43 | 0.75 | 0 | 0 | 27.9 | 1986 | 7.3 | n/a |
| Chad | LIC | 0 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.45 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 7.9 | 1958 | 6.5 | n/a |
| Congo, Dem. Rep. | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.05 | 0.75 | n/a | n/a | 31.4 | 1967 | 12 | n/a |
| Congo, Rep. | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.75 | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1963 | 8.5 | n/a |
| Cote d'Ivoire | LIC | 0.4 | 1 | 0 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.43 | 0.42 | 0 | 0 | 15.0 | 1952 | 8.5 | n/a |
| Equatorial Guinea | LIC | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | n/a | 1963 | 18 | n/a |
| Eritrea | LIC | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.95 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.5 | 8.0 | 1955 | 22 | n/a |
| Ethiopia | LIC | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.8 | 0.75 | 0 | 0 | 8.1 | 1955 | 7.7 | n/a |
| Gambia, The | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.8 | 0.5 | n/a | n/a | 9.6 | 1960 | 13.2 | n/a |
| Georgia | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.75 | n/a | n/a | 40.5 | 1918 | 9.4 | 0.381 |
| Ghana | LIC | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0.7 | 0.25 | 0.58 | 0 | 0 | 22.0 | 1954 | 10.9 | n/a |
| Guinea | LIC | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0.8 | 1 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.99 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 6.2 | 1958 | 19.3 | n/a |
| Guinea-Bissau | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.5 | 1 | n/a | n/a | 7.6 | 1977 | 14 | n/a |
| Haiti | LIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.67 | 0 | 0 | 27.4 | 1950 | 3.6 | n/a |
| India | LIC | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.33 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 48.2 | 1950 | 8.3 | n/a |
| Indonesia | LIC | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.67 | 0 | 0 | 57.4 | 1945 | 11.3 | n/a |
| Kenya | LIC | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 1 | 1 | 0.38 | 0.17 | 0 | 0 | 39.0 | 1919 | 7.1 | n/a |
| Korea, Dem. Rep. | LIC | n/a | n/a | 0 | n/a | 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 | 0 | n/a | 80.5 | n/a | 20.1 | n/a |
| Kyrgyz Republic | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.58 | n/a | n/a | 59.5 | 1918 | 6.7 | n/a |
| Lao PDR | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.42 | n/a | n/a | 32.2 | 1958 | 22.9 | n/a |
| Lesotho | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.25 | n/a | n/a | 30.4 | 1965 | 11.7 | n/a |
| Liberia | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.6 | 1 | n/a | n/a | 6.4 | n/a | 5.3 | n/a |
| Madagascar | LIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.75 | 0 | 0 | 18.8 | 1959 | 6.9 | n/a |
| Malawi | LIC | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.75 | 0 | 0 | 30.6 | 1961 | 14 | n/a |
| Mali | LIC | 0 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.92 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8.1 | 1956 | 10.2 | n/a |
| Mauritania | LIC | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.25 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.5 | 8.0 | 1961 | 3.7 | n/a |

| Country | Income Group | Land Access | Credit Access | Property Access | Reputation | Polygyny | Parental Authority | Inheritance | Female Mutilation | Violence | Freedom of Movement | Veil | Contraception | Year of Suffrage | Parliament | GEM |
|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Moldova | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.42 | n/a | n/a | 62.4 | 1978 | 15.8 | 0.468 |
| Mongolia | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.58 | n/a | n/a | 67.4 | 1924 | 6.8 | n/a |
| Mozambique | LIC | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.4 | 0.75 | 0 | 0 | 5.6 | 1975 | 34.8 | n/a |
| Myanmar | LIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.75 | 0 | 0 | 32.7 | 1935 | n/a | n/a |
| Nepal | LIC | 0 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.58 | 0 | 0 | 39.3 | 1951 | 5.9 | n/a |
| Nicaragua | LIC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 68.6 | 1955 | 20.7 | n/a |
| Niger | LIC | 0 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.05 | 1 | 0 | 0.8 | 14.0 | 1948 | 12.4 | n/a |
| Nigeria | LIC | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.25 | 0.75 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 15.3 | 1958 | 4.7 | n/a |
| Pakistan | LIC | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.05 | 0.5 | 1 | 1 | 27.6 | 1947 | 21.3 | 0.414 |
| Papua New Guinea | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.75 | n/a | n/a | 25.9 | 1964 | 0.9 | n/a |
| Rwanda | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 | n/a | n/a | 13.2 | 1961 | 48.8 | n/a |
| Senegal | LIC | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.25 | 0 | 0 | 12.9 | 1945 | 19.2 | n/a |
| Sierra Leone | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.9 | 0.75 | n/a | n/a | 4.3 | 1961 | 14.5 | n/a |
| Somalia | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.98 | 0.75 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Sudan | LIC | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.89 | 0.75 | 0.7 | 1 | 8.3 | 1964 | 9.7 | n/a |
| Tajikistan | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.5 | n/a | n/a | 33.9 | 1924 | n/a | n/a |
| Tanzania | LIC | 0 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.65 | 0 | 1 | 0.18 | 0.25 | 0 | 0 | 25.4 | n/a | 21.4 | n/a |
| Timor-Leste | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.83 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 25.3 | n/a |
| Togo | LIC | 0 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.5 | 0.12 | 0.75 | 0 | 0 | 25.7 | 1945 | 6.2 | n/a |
| Uganda | LIC | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0 | 0.3 | 0 | 1 | 0.05 | 0.75 | 0 | 0 | 22.8 | 1962 | 23.9 | n/a |
| Uzbekistan | LIC | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.75 | n/a | n/a | 67.2 | 1938 | 17.5 | n/a |
| Vietnam | LIC | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.75 | 0 | 0 | 78.5 | 1946 | 27.3 | n/a |
| Yemen, Rep. | LIC | 0 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.23 | 0.75 | 0.5 | 1 | 20.8 | 1967 | 0.3 | 0.127 |
| Zambia | LIC | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 1 | 0 | 0.75 | 0 | 0 | 34.2 | 1962 | 12.7 | n/a |
| Zimbabwe | LIC | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.1 | 0.67 | 0 | 0 | 53.5 | 1957 | 10 | n/a |