

**Technical Appendix to
Southerners Are Misrepresented on Abortion**

Chelsea N. Jones, Brennan Center for Justice
Samyu Comandur, University of California, Los Angeles

A1. Underlying Data: 2024 Collaborative Multiracial Post Election Survey

To best understand voters' perspectives on abortion policy, we employed data from the 2024 Collaborative Multiracial Post-Election Survey (CMPS). The CMPS is a “post–presidential election online survey” fielded from May to October 2025 in 11 languages: English, Spanish, Chinese (simplified), Chinese (traditional), Korean, Vietnamese, Tagalog, Arabic, Urdu, Farsi, and Haitian Creole.¹ The survey contains responses from more than 15,000 adults across the United States, with representative samples of four broad racial groups: Asian-, Black-, Latino-, and white-identifying respondents. Responses are weighted using a “post-stratification ranking algorithm that balances each demographic category within ± 2 percent of its known demographics on the 2023 U.S. Census American Community Survey (ACS) estimates.”

A2. Interactive Map Underlying Data: State Access Measures

The analysis features an interactive map displaying each state's region, abortion access rating, maternal mortality rate, and state House and Senate partisan supermajorities. Table 1, below, outlines the data underlying this map. Abortion access was categorized by the Center for Reproductive Rights.² States where abortion is totally or nearly banned are categorized as *illegal* and *hostile*, respectively; states where abortion is accessible but not safeguarded by law are categorized as *not protected*. States where abortion is protected by state law are categorized as *protected*, and states with further protections like statutes or constitutional amendments are categorized as having *expanded access*.

Each state's maternal mortality rate was collected by KFF, with underlying data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).³ Data on state House and Senate partisan supermajorities was collected by MultiState and reflects partisan balances before the 2026 midterm elections.⁴

Table 1. State-Level Data Underlying Interactive Map

State	Region	Abortion Access	Maternal Mortality per 100k Live Births (2018–2022)	State House and Senate Partisan Supermajorities (2026)
AL	Deep South	Illegal	38.6	Rep — Both Chambers
AK	West	Protected	NR	None
AZ	West	Protected	30	None
AR	Peripheral South	Illegal	38.3	Rep — Both Chambers
CA	West	Expanded Access	10.5	Dem — Both Chambers
CO	West	Protected	16	None
CT	Northeast	Expanded Access	15.6	Dem — Both Chambers
DE	Peripheral South	Protected	NR	Dem — Both Chambers
DC	Peripheral South	Protected	NR	N/A
FL	Peripheral South	Hostile	24.1	Rep — Both Chambers
GA	Deep South	Hostile	32.1	None
HI	West	Expanded Access	NR	Dem — Both Chambers
ID	West	Illegal	20	Rep — Both Chambers
IL	Midwest	Expanded Access	18.1	Dem — Both Chambers
IN	Midwest	Illegal	30.9	Rep — Both Chambers
IA	Midwest	Hostile	19.5	Rep — One Chamber

KS	Midwest	Protected	22.8	Rep — Both Chambers
	Peripheral		34.6	
KY	South	Illegal		Rep — Both Chambers
LA	Deep South	Illegal	37.3	Rep — Both Chambers
ME	Northeast	Protected	NR	None
	Peripheral	Expanded	21.3	
MD	South	Access		Dem — Both Chambers
MA	Northeast	Protected	16.4	Dem — Both Chambers
MI	Midwest	Protected	19.1	None
		Expanded	12.3	
MN	Midwest	Access		None
MS	Deep South	Illegal	39.1	Rep — One Chamber
MO	Midwest	Protected	23.8	Rep — Both Chambers
MT	West	Protected	NR	None
NE	Midwest	Hostile	25.1	Rep — Both Chambers
NV	West	Protected	20.4	None
		Not	NR	
NH	Northeast	Protected		Rep — One Chamber
		Expanded	26	
NJ	Northeast	Access		None
		Not	28	
NM	West	Protected		None
		Expanded	22.4	
NY	Northeast	Access		Dem — One Chamber
	Peripheral		26.7	
NC	South	Hostile		Rep — One Chamber
ND	Midwest	Hostile	NR	Rep — Both Chambers

OH	Midwest	Protected	24.5	Rep — Both Chambers
OK	Peripheral South	Illegal	29.6	Rep — Both Chambers
OR	West	Expanded Access	16.6	Dem — Both Chambers
PA	Northeast	Hostile	17.5	None
RI	Northeast	Protected	NR	Dem - Both Chambers
SC	Deep South	Hostile	32.3	Rep — Both Chambers
SD	Midwest	Illegal	NR	Rep — Both Chambers
TN	Peripheral South	Illegal	41.1	Rep — Both Chambers
TX	Peripheral South	Illegal	28.2	None
UT	West	Hostile	15.5	Rep — Both Chambers
VT	Northeast	Expanded Access	NR	None
VA	Peripheral South	Not Protected	32.7	None
WA	West	Expanded Access	18	None
WV	Peripheral South	Illegal	23.9	Rep — Both Chambers
WI	Midwest	Hostile	13.2	None
WY	West	Hostile	NR	Rep — Both Chambers

NR = Not reported

A3. Relationship Between State Abortion Access and Policy Congruence (OLS)

To assess whether a relationship exists between a respondent's agreement with the abortion policy in their state, a measure we call policy congruence, and the restrictiveness of their state's abortion policies, we conducted an ordinary least squares regression. The key dependent variable, policy congruence, was derived from the survey question gauging respondents' agreement with the statement *Abortion laws in my state reflect my values*. Responses were converted from categorical to numerical, where those who agree or strongly agree were coded as 1, those who disagree or strongly disagree were coded as 0, and those who did not know their state's abortion policy were excluded from the analysis.

Our key independent variable was the level of restrictiveness of the abortion policies in the respondent's state of residence, as explained in section A2, above. State policies categorized as hostile or illegal were grouped under the restrictive banner and coded as 1, and all other categorizations were coded as 0. We controlled for an individual's view on abortion based on their response to the question *Which of the following opinions best reflects your views on abortion?* Those who believe abortion should not be permitted were coded as 1; those who believe abortion should be permitted under specific conditions, like sexual assault, incest, or to save a woman's life, were coded as 2; those who believe abortion should be legal were coded as 3, and those who said "none of these" were excluded from the analysis. Those measures were then recoded to range from 0 to 1, unsupportive to supportive of abortion legality. We also controlled other factors previously shown to impact one's view on abortion. Race (white identity), gender (male identity), Christian identity, partisanship (Republican identity) were coded as binary, where holding any of these identities was coded as 1. Additional controls like education, church attendance, and agreement with hostile and benevolent sexism questions were scaled from 0 to 1, where the highest level of association was 1.

Table 2 displays the regression output for two assessments. The first examines the relationship between policy congruence and whether one's state has restrictive abortion policies, across all respondents. The significant negative coefficient reflects a decreased probability that an individual in a *restrictive* state had policy congruence — i.e., agreement with their state's

abortion policies. The second assessment, subsetting the respondents to only those living in the South, echoes this finding. The larger, significant coefficient reflects that among Southern states, the impact of living in a *restrictive* state on one's level of agreement with that state's abortion policies is even stronger. More clearly, in the South, those living in *restrictive* states are even less likely than Southerners living in nonrestrictive states to agree with their state's abortion policies.

Table 2. Predictors of Abortion Policy Congruence

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>	
	Abortion Policy Congruence	
	All Respondents	Southern Respondents
	(1)	(2)
Residence in Restrictive State	−0.614*** (0.039)	−1.135*** (0.115)
Support for Legal Abortion	0.247*** (0.067)	−1.729*** (0.121)
White	0.208*** (0.044)	0.126 (0.077)
Man	0.103** (0.041)	−0.024 (0.073)
Education	0.309*** (0.048)	0.224*** (0.087)
Age	−0.007*** (0.001)	−0.009*** (0.002)
Christian	−0.168*** (0.050)	−0.144 (0.094)
Attends Church	0.257*** (0.049)	0.586*** (0.085)
Republican	0.319*** (0.050)	0.743*** (0.085)
Conservative	−0.276*** (0.074)	0.667*** (0.131)
Hostile Sexism	0.506*** (0.085)	1.129*** (0.150)
Benevolent Sexism	0.760*** (0.096)	1.180*** (0.177)
Constant	−0.174 (0.110)	0.497** (0.222)
Observations	11,121	4,547
Log Likelihood	−6,594.574	−2,087.902
Akaike Inf. Crit.	13,215.150	4,201.803

Note:

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

A3.1 Predicted Probability of Policy Congruence

Most variables in the analysis are categorical, meaning that they are associated with a survey answer choice (ex: agree/disagree) rather than a numerical value (ex: age/income). As a result, the coefficients in table 2 do not directly translate to an easily interpretable probability. To better quantify the relationship between state restrictiveness and policy congruence, we used the models we constructed in Table 2 to calculate predicted probabilities for our variable of interest. We calculated the probability that someone who lives in a *restrictive state* believes that the abortion policies in their state reflect their values. This probability is 0.48. We then calculated the same probability for someone who lives in a *nonrestrictive state*, and that probability is 0.63, about 15 percentage points higher. Living in a restrictive state *decreases* the likelihood that a respondent reports congruence with their state’s abortion policies by 15 percentage points.

We replicate this process by subsetting the data to only Southern respondents, and again, this difference becomes even more pronounced. The probability that someone who lives in a *restrictive state* believes that abortion policies in their state reflect their values is 0.43. The same probability for someone who lives in a *nonrestrictive state* is 0.70, about 27 percentage points higher. In the South, living in a restrictive state *decreases* the likelihood that a respondent reports congruence with their state’s abortion policies by 27 percentage points.

Endnotes

¹ Lorrie Frasure et al., “2024 Collaborative Multiracial Post-Election Survey (CMPS),” version 2024 Primary Adult Sample, September 10, 2025, <https://cmeps.ss.ucla.edu/2024-survey/>.

² Nancy Northup, “After Roe Fell: U.S. Abortion Laws by State,” Center for Reproductive Rights, November 2025, <https://reproductiverights.org/maps/abortion-laws-by-state/>.

³ KFF, “Maternal Deaths and Mortality Rates per 100,000 Live Births 2018–2022,” KFF State Health Facts, accessed May 1, 2026, <https://www.kff.org/state-health-policy-data/state-indicator/maternal-deaths-and-mortality-rates-per-100000-live-births/>.

⁴ MultiState, “2026 State Legislative Supermajorities,” accessed May 1, 2026, <https://www.multistate.us/resources/2026-state-legislative-supermajorities>.