



Gender Differences in Giving Motivations for Bequest Donors and Non-Donors

Xiaonan Kou, Hao Han, and Heidi Frederick¹
with assistance from Deborah E. Hirt

The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University

Made possible by an Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP)
research grant supported by Legacy Leaders

November 2009

¹ Contact : Melissa Brown, Associate Director of Research, The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University, 550 W. North Street, Suite 301, Indianapolis, IN, 46202. Phone: 317-278-8964
E-mail: msbrown@iupui.edu

Executive Summary

This study explores gender differences in the inclusion of a charitable provision in one's will. We found that overall among representative samples of households polled in different regions of the U.S., gender is not a statistically significant predictor of the intent to leave a charitable bequest, after controlling for other factors, such as age, income, and marital status.

Predictors of having a charitable bequest

Among all donors, higher education is strongly associated with having a charitable bequest. This is consistent with findings by other scholars.

As expected based on reports from organizations receiving charitable bequests, single individuals (men and women who had never been married) were more likely to have a charitable provision in their wills than either widowed individuals or married couples. However, the importance of marital status diminished as income increased. When income was \$100,000 or more, after controls for other factors, marital status was not associated with the probability of having a charitable bequest in a will.

Even after controls for other factors, people with a high level of education, a higher income, or more frequent religious attendance were also more likely to have a charitable bequest in their will.

Among those who attend religious services frequently, men were more likely than women to say they have made a charitable provision in their wills. This is the only gender difference found in the probability of having a charitable bequest.

Motivations for giving among bequest donors and those without a charitable bequest

We looked at motivations for all charitable giving among those with charitable bequests, those without a charitable bequest but who have a will, and those without a will.

Comparing donors who have arranged for a charitable bequest with donors who do not have a charity in their will, those with a charitable bequest were more likely to report being motivated to give to charity by a:

- Feeling that those with more should help those with less (identified by 67.9% of male and 76.4% of female charitable bequest pledge makers as a motive for giving); and,
- Belief that charities are more effective than government or private business at providing public services (selected by 62% of men and 65.2% of women with a will that includes a charitable bequest).

Among donors who have a will but do not have a charitable bequest, motivations for giving to charity differ somewhat from those with a bequest. The top motivations, not including religious belief, are:

- Feeling that those with more should help those with less (at lower percentages than among those with a bequest -- 58% of men and 69.8% of women)
- Meeting others' material needs (40.9% of men and 51.8% of women) and
- The fact that a charity helped the donor, donor's friends or family (39% of men and 53.9% of women)

For donors without a will, the pattern is similar to that among people with a will with no charitable bequest. Again, not including religious belief as a motivation for charitable giving, these donors selected:

- Feeling that those with more should help those with less (at lower percentages than among those with a bequest -- 62.7% of men and 74% of women)
- The fact that a charity helped the donor, donor's friends or family (48.3% of men and 57.6% of women)
- Belief that charity can activate change or bring about a desired impact (44.8% of men and 54.7% of women) and
- Help meet people's material needs (42.4% of men and 54% of women)

Implications

The study did not examine the specific circumstances associated with making a bequest provision. Instead it asked donors their motivations for overall giving and whether or not they have charitable provisions in their will. Nonprofit organizations that seek to implement tactics for engaging more current donors as eventual bequest donors should test carefully message points or approaches based on these findings. Among the possible messages to use in testing are the following.

- Ask men and women equally since we found nearly no gender differences among those with a charitable provision in their will.
- Show a charitable bequest can *help those with less*. This sense of equity, that those with more should help those with less, is a dominant reason for giving among most groups, whether they had a bequest in a will already or not.
- Emphasize a charitable bequest as a way to meet others' material needs (as appropriate for your organization's mission) or as a way to reciprocate for services or benefits the donor or the donor's loved ones have received. These are important reasons for giving among donors who do not have a will and for donors who have a will but do not yet have a bequest.
- For women, focus on the potential impact of a bequest gift. Women were much more interested than men in knowing about a gift's impact when they made charitable

donations. Among women, 55% of those without a will and 51% of those with a will but no charitable bequest identified impact as one of their motives for giving.

Limitations

The data used for research are drawn from surveys that ask people about their motivations for making any charitable gift and about whether they had made provisions for a charity in their will. The study does not verify the charitable provisions reported and it does not test the motivations in any formal manner. People's self-reported statements are accepted as true representations of what they see as motivations for making charitable gifts.

Contents

Introduction.....	1
Literature Review.....	2
Profile of Charitable Bequest Donors	2
Factors other than gender.....	3
Motives and Incentives for Charitable Bequest Giving.....	6
Contribution to the Field.....	8
Purpose and Methodology	9
Data.....	9
Analysis and Results.....	10
Characteristics of Charitable Bequest Givers	13
By Marital Status	13
By Income Level.....	14
By Marital Status and Income Level	15
By Age	16
By Religious Affiliation and Frequency of Religious Attendance	17
Gender Differences in Motivations for Charitable Giving.....	19
Regression Analysis.....	23
Study Limitations.....	24
Conclusions.....	26
Implications for Practitioners.....	27
References.....	28
Appendix.....	31

Introduction

Women and philanthropy is growing as a field of study for researchers, practitioners, financial advisors, and donors themselves. Previous studies revealed important differences in charitable giving by gender after controlling for income, age, and education (such as Mesch et al., 2006; Rooney et al., 2005). Gender may also be critical for understanding planned giving and bequest behavior. The data from the National Center for Health Statistics show that women, on average, outlived men by five years in 2005 (life expectancy of 80.4 and 75.2 respectively). According to 2000 U.S. Census data, the average age of a widow is 55 years, and nearly 12 million women are widowed, more than four times the number of men (approximately 2.7 million). If women tend to outlive men, it may also be that much of the estimated \$41 trillion of wealth (in 1998 dollars) predicted to be transferred to others over the 55-year period from 1998 to 2052 will be controlled by women (Havens & Schervish, 1999).

Despite the growing body of research on charitable giving and women in philanthropy, few articles have been published in the past several years that address gender issues in planned giving (such as Nichols, 2001; Sharpe, 2005). Most of the articles that do exist are not based on a significantly large sample size or empirical methods. Only one quantitative analysis of gender differences in planned giving was identified after reviewing the prior literature. Cindy Sterling, a senior associate at Washburn & McGoldrick and former director of gift planning at Vassar College, examined capital campaigns held between 1988 and 1998 at eight small liberal arts colleges (Sterling, 2000). The study found that women's bequests accounted for 22 percent of the campaign totals at women's colleges on average, more than three times the average percentage for male bequests. The results, however, were institution-specific, as they were limited to alumnae of women's and co-ed colleges that had formerly been all male, making the sample too small and too limited (not including all-male colleges or formerly all-male colleges that are now co-educational) to draw conclusions to the general population.

This study attempts to bridge the gap in the literature by exploring empirically gender differences in charitable bequest provision and in motives for charitable giving among those with bequests and those without. Prior research usually investigates the estates of a decedent where a charitable bequest has been made, rather than the future intention of the living donor. In this study, we will examine gender differences among current donors, which offers insights for fundraisers hoping to influence planned giving decisions.

Data and analysis methods

This research analyzes data from eight regional giving studies using the same basic set of questions and conducted by the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University from 2005 through 2008. We combined the data and examine descriptive statistics including:

- i) The likelihood that a given individual will report a provision in their will for charity;
- ii) Whether the motives for charitable giving significantly differ between those with a charitable bequest, donors with a will but no charitable provision, and donors without a will; and

- iii) Whether there are gender differences between bequest and non-bequest pledge makers in their reported motivations and incentives for all charitable giving.

Further, by using probit regression analysis, we explore the effect of gender on the intent of leaving a charitable bequest, after controlling for demographic variables and major motivational factors.

The paper starts with a review of prior research on personal characteristics of charitable bequest givers, and on the motivations as well as incentives for their bequest giving behavior, followed by an explanation of the methodology and data used. Thirdly, the findings of this study are discussed. Finally, the limitations of the study and some practical implications of the research results are presented.

Literature Review

In this summary, legacy pledger, bequest donor, pledger, pledge maker, and legacy donor are all terms used to describe a donor who has made provisions for a charity through his or her estate plan.

Profile of Charitable Bequest Donors

Prior research on bequest giving suggests that there are gender differences in planned giving. Specifically, IRS estate tax return data for 2001 revealed that returns filed for female decedents were more likely to include charitable deductions than male decedents. Approximately 22.1 percent of female estate tax decedents left charitable bequests, whereas 12.8 percent of male decedents did (*Giving USA*, 2006). This analysis, however, does not examine estates without surviving spouses.

Some research shows that living individuals who had made a legacy gift were predominantly female (Sargeant, Wymer, & Hilton, 2006b; Sargeant & Jay, 2004; Sargeant & Hilton, 2005; Richardson & Chapman, 2005); moreover, two studies found that pledge makers were significantly more likely to be female than was found among general supporters (Sargeant et al., 2006b; Sargeant & Jay, 2004).

Nevertheless, other work has not consistently found that gender was a significant predictor of charitable bequests. In his recent longitudinal study of nearly 18,500 seniors based on data from the 1995-2006 Health and Retirement Study, James (2008) did not find a significant gender difference in the likelihood of including a charitable provision in the will. Similarly, another study done by Barker (2007) based on data from the "Giving and Volunteering in the United States 2001" study showed that gender had no statistically significant impact on the probability of leaving a bequest after controlling for the personal and attitudinal characteristics.

Further, as reported in *Giving USA 2006*, Eller (2005) found gender differences in the type of charitable organizations supported by the bequests. A higher percentage of women left bequests to religion, health, human services, and the environment. Men were more likely to leave bequests to public-society benefit and educational organizations. According to *Giving USA 2006*, the

“dollar distribution by type of recipient varies largely because women left more to charity (because more women left gifts),” (p. 83). Men left a higher percentage of charitable dollars distributed to philanthropy and volunteerism, whereas women left a higher percentage of dollars to health and religion (*Giving USA*, 2006).

Factors other than gender

Other research has found that charitable bequest pledge makers have different personal characteristics from general donors.

- Age

Two previous studies showed that bequest pledge makers are generally between 45 and 54 years of age. A survey conducted by the National Committee on Planned Giving (NCPG) in 2000 collected data from a sample of 170,000 U.S. households on bequests, charitable remainder trusts, and charitable gift annuities. Among the 782 respondents who had completed bequests, the NCPG survey found that most respondents first set up gifts to a charity in their wills at age 49 (Brown, 2004; Richardson & Chapman, 2005). The 45- to 54-year-old group accounted for 26 percent of total charitable bequest pledgers in the survey, followed by the 55- to 64-year-old group (22 percent) and the 65- to 74-year-old group (20 percent) (Sargeant & Shang, 2008). Similarly, exclusive national research for *The NonProfit Times* (Exclusive NPT Research will be used for simplicity) conducted by Opinion Research also found that individuals aged 45 to 54 years were more likely to have made provisions for a charity in their will than those aged 65 or older (Clolery & Hrywna, 2007).

- Absence of children/grandchildren

The absence of children or grandchildren was consistently found to be a critical characteristic of bequest pledge makers (James, 2008; Sargeant & Shang, 2008; Routley, Sargeant, & Scaife, 2007; Sargeant et al., 2006b; Sargeant & Hilton, 2005; Sargeant & Jay, 2004). In the NCPG survey, over 80 percent of pledge makers had no children under 18 years old living at home (Sargeant & Shang, 2008). James (2008) also found that among donors with a will or trust in the sample, individuals with no offspring were five times more likely to include a charitable provision than those with grandchildren. Compared to general supporters, bequest donors are significantly less likely to have children (Sargeant et al., 2006b; Sargeant & Hilton, 2005). In the Barker’s study (2007), however, whether or not the respondent has children remained statistically insignificant.

- Marital status

According to estate tax data about charitable bequests for 2001, single decedents overall were most likely to make bequests to charities, with 44.8 percent of single females giving to charities in comparison to 34.2 percent of single males (*Giving USA*, 2006). Married women were the least likely group to make charitable bequests, as 6.5 percent of those estates contributed to charity.

Prior studies suggest similar findings. Based on the data from the 1992 Gallup National Survey of Giving and Volunteering, Chang, Okunade, and Kumar (1999) found that married individuals

were significantly less likely to leave charitable bequests to unrelated individuals than were unmarried ones. By analyzing data on large Connecticut estates from the 1930s and 1940s, Barthold and Plotnick (1984) further confirmed that the presence of a surviving spouse and children diminished the size of a charitable bequest.

Moreover, a significant difference in the marital status was reported between bequest donors and general supporters. Pledge makers were found to be significantly more likely than general supporters to be living alone, either because they were single or because they had been widowed (Sargeant et al., 2006b; Sargeant & Hilton, 2005; Sargeant & Jay, 2004).

- **Income**

Prior research showed that income was not a strong indicator of being a bequest donor. This may be because legacy gifts are more likely to be associated with wealth instead of income. Donors generally come from a wide range of income levels, but individuals at the \$50,000 to \$75,000 income level were slightly more likely to make legacy gifts than those from other income groups (Sargeant & Shang, 2008; Clolery & Hrywna, 2007; Sargeant & Jay, 2004). In the NCPG survey, the average income among bequest donors was \$75,900, while 58 percent of bequest pledgers earned less than \$75,000, including 22 percent from the income group of \$50,000 to \$75,000 (Sargeant & Shang, 2008). In addition, Sargeant and Jay (2004) conducted a mail survey of 1,290 bequest donors and general supporters and found no significant differences in income levels between these two groups. Moving beyond the probability of leaving a charitable bequest at all to look at amounts bequeathed, Schervish and Havens (1999, 2003) found a strong positive relationship between the value of estates (after fees and spousal deduction) and the percentage of the estate value going to charity as charitable bequests, after analyzing IRS Federal Estate Tax Returns filed in 1999 and 2000.

- **Education**

Previous studies showed inconsistent findings about the relationship between education and the likelihood of bequest giving. According to the Exclusive NPT Research, completion of high school, rather than a college degree, seemed to be an important indicator of bequest giving. Only 17 percent of individuals who had not completed high school made charitable provisions in their wills, whereas approximately 40 percent of those who had finished high school or had a college degree included a charity in their will (Clolery & Hrywna, 2007). The research conducted by James (2008), however, suggested that education was positively associated with the probability of being a bequest donor. Individuals with a college degree or post-college education were 22 percent and 47 percent, respectively, more likely to have charitable provisions than high school graduates were.

- **Race**

According to a study by James (2008), both Black and Hispanic individuals in his sample are significantly less likely to have charitable provisions in their wills, but there is no significant difference by race in the probability of including charitable provisions among all individuals that have a will. Put another way, the racial difference found in leaving legacy gifts lies in whether or not the individual has a will. The Exclusive NPT Research further confirmed the latter point, by showing that among all respondents who included charities in a will there were more Black and

Hispanic donors than there were white donors, representing 65 percent, 62 percent, and 50 percent, respectively (Clolery & Hrywna, 2007).

The amount left to charity varies somewhat with race, in part because of differences in wealth. Havens and Schervish (2004) examined wealth transfer among African American households by using the Wealth Transfer Microsimulation Model (WTMM) developed by the Center on Wealth and Philanthropy at Boston College. According to their study, African American households generally leave 4 to 8 percent of their wealth to charitable causes compared with 15 to 18 percent bequeathed to charities from all households, which may be explained by the relatively higher concentration of African American estates below \$1 million.

- Religious affiliation

Few studies examined the religious affiliation of bequest pledge makers. Individuals with religious affiliations were shown to be more likely to offer bequests (McGranahan, 2000), and those of the Jewish faith were found to be significantly less likely to make legacy gifts than other religious denominations (Chang et al., 1999). Chang and his colleagues explained that Jewish individuals might make more lifetime donations than bequests or leave more bequests within their families than to unrelated individuals. Barthold and Plotnick (1984) further revealed that religious beliefs had a significant, large positive effect on the size of the charitable bequest. By examining three kinds of religious affiliation, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, they concluded that a stated preference for any one of the three had a strong, positive effect on the size of the bequest, and that the size did not significantly vary among the types of religious affiliation.

- Other variables

Other variables are also known to correlate with bequest giving. Residence tenure was found to have an effect on bequest probability. Chang, Okunade, and Kumar (1999) found that the propensity to bequeath was significantly and positively associated to the first ten years of residence in the same location. This may be because the “sense of belonging” became stronger with the increase of residence tenure. Tenure of over ten years, however, was found to reduce the possibility of leaving a bequest to a charity.

According to the NCPG survey, individuals who were members of a charity were found most likely to leave a bequest, compared to those with no affiliation or with other types of primary affiliation to the charity, such as alumni, volunteers, or beneficiaries (Richardson & Chapman, 2005).² Finally, there is some evidence that entrepreneurship is associated with the likelihood of leaving a charitable bequest (Schervish & Havens, 1999).

In addition, previous studies showed that among bequest givers, the income of their children (Auten & Joulfaian, 1996), their residence tenure status (Chang et al., 1999), and type of affiliation with the charity (Richardson & Chapman, 2005) might also affect the likelihood of bequest giving and the amounts of bequests. These factors are not discussed in detail here, because we are not able to examine them using our data.

² “Members of charity” does not include volunteering, alumni, employees, or trustees.

Motives and Incentives for Charitable Bequest Giving

The literature also identifies motivational differences or variations in incentives for making a charitable bequest. Sargeant (such as Sargeant & Shang, 2008; Sargeant et al., 2006a) generally groups bequest motives into three categories: general individual motives, bequest-specific motives, and organizational factors. Individual motives are those factors that may affect general charitable giving, and have a strong impact on bequest giving. They may include reciprocation, altruism, or prestige. Bequest-specific motives are those specific to the bequest context, but they are not typically associated with general giving. Factors under this category are the lack of a family need, the need to manage estate tax, a desire to live on in memory after death, and a desire to make a lasting difference. In addition, some organizational factors may affect bequest giving, such as the performance, professionalism, and communication quality of the organization requesting the gift. We discuss each motive and incentive from the first two categories separately below.

- Lack of family need

Several researchers have documented that one prerequisite for legacy gifts is the perceived absence of a need to support family or close friends (Sargeant et al., 2006a, b; Sargeant & Shang, 2008; Sargeant & Jay 2004; Routley et al., 2007). Researchers at Boston College's Center on Wealth and Philanthropy suggested that wealthy individuals tended to seek deeper purposes for their assets once they felt that their families were financially secure (Schervish, Havens, & Whitaker, 2006).

- A desire to be remembered

The need to "live on" is another significant factor for bequest giving (Sargeant et al., 2006a, b; Sargeant & Shang, 2008; Routley et al., 2007). Bequests to a charity may memorialize the donors as evidence of being affiliated with particular causes or organizations (Routley et al., 2007). Pledge makers wanted to be remembered either by those working in the nonprofit, by their family, or by future generations and society in general. This may be particularly essential to wealthy or super-wealthy individuals. Pledge makers, compared to non-pledge makers, are significantly more likely to be motivated by this need (Sargeant et al., 2006b).

- A desire to limit amount to family

Based on focus groups, two studies suggested that the desire to limit the amount that would be available to family was another popular reason for many individuals to leave charitable bequests (Sargeant et al., 2006a; Sargeant & Shang, 2008). The respondents thought that the family would not appreciate, or would even waste, the money; they thought that their family did not deserve the money.

- A desire to make a difference; Continuous support to the charity; Gratitude for a positive past experience

A strong desire to make a big impact on particular causes (Sargeant & Shang, 2008), the wish to support the charity continuously (Sargeant et al., 2006a; Richardson & Chapman, 2005), gratitude for good fortune or God's blessing in achieving financial success (Schervish & Havens, 1999; Schervish, 2005), and gratitude for a positive past experience triggered by the process of

reminiscence (Routley et al., 2007) were also identified by previous studies as key drivers for bequest giving particularly.

- Reciprocation; Altruism; Affinity (with a particular community or nonprofit organization); or Empathy

In addition, reciprocation, altruism, and empathy are commonly cited motives for both annual givers and bequest donors, and they are especially relevant in the context of bequests (Sargeant et al., 2006a; Routley et al., 2007; Sargeant & Shang, 2008). Many pledge makers wanted to give something back in return for the benefits that they or their loved ones received. Especially for individuals who are “cash-poor/asset-rich,” the bequest could serve as a suitable tool to repay benefits received (Routley et al., 2007). Prior research identified altruism, i.e., feeling a duty to help others, as a motivating force for bequest givers (Sargeant et al., 2006a; Routley et al., 2007; Chang et al., 1999). A strong affinity with a particular cause or nonprofit organization and an empathy with the beneficiaries are key factors as well, according to the responses from focus groups conducted by Sargeant and his colleagues (Sargeant et al., 2006a, b).

- Perceptions of financial security

Schervish and his colleagues found a strong positive relationship between perceived financial security and charitable giving in general (Schervish & Havens, 1999; Schervish, 2005). Their studies revealed that the more financially secure a respondent felt, the more they gave to charity. In the “Deutsche Bank Study on Wealth with Responsibility 2000” conducted by the Center on Wealth and Philanthropy at Boston College, Schervish and his colleagues examined the meaning and practice of wealth by individuals in households with a net worth at or above \$5 million, by analyzing data on 112 completed questionnaires (Schervish, 2005). Respondents with a net worth of \$15 million or less who rated their financial security as 8 out of 10 or lower contributed only 5 percent of their income to charity on average, whereas those who chose complete financial security (10 out of 10) donated 23.4 percent of their income on average. And among respondents with a net worth of more than \$15 million, those who rated their financial security as 8 out of 10 or lower contributed 7.6 percent of their income, whereas those who chose complete financial security donated 51 percent of their income on average.

Few have looked at the relationship between financial security and bequest giving. Furthermore, this factor may be even more critical for women, if women generally feel less financially secure than men do. “The Allianz Women, Money, and Power Study” released by Allianz Life Insurance Company of North America in 2006 found that 90 percent of a total 1,925 women surveyed said they felt somewhat, or not at all, financially secure (Allianz Life Insurance Company of North America, 2006). Nevertheless, according to the annual “Love and Money” survey of about 1,500 wealthy individuals, commissioned by The PNC Financial Services Group in 2005, women reported that they need a median amount of \$1.6 million to feel completely financially secure about the future, whereas men reported that they needed a median amount of \$2.2 million. This finding was opposite to the result of a later PNC survey, when women required a median amount of \$3.3 million while men reported \$3.1 million (The PNC Financial Services Group, 2006).

- The need to manage estate taxation

The avoidance or reduction of taxes is thought to be a frequent motive for bequest giving. Boskin (1976) examined data from the 1957-59 Treasury Special Study and the 1969 Estate Tax returns, and found that the cost of charitable bequests would go up with the decrease in estate tax rates, and thus the likelihood of bequest giving would be reduced. The research findings from Barthold and Plotnick (1984) suggest a similar result. By using estate tax return data, Joulfaian (2000), Bakija and Gale (2003), and McClelland (2004) all reported that estate tax repeal would reduce charitable bequests, though by different magnitudes. Furthermore, Joulfaian (2009) reviewed the recent economic studies on the effects of estate taxation on giving, and concluded that it was difficult to evaluate the different findings in the literature due to differences in estimation and simulation methodologies.

Based on mail questionnaires and focus groups conducted by Sargeant and his colleagues, tax considerations were essential for individuals to make decisions about bequest giving, but it was not a motivating force for leaving a bequest to a particular organization (Sargeant et al., 2006a, b; Sargeant & Shang, 2008; Sargeant & Jay 2004). The pledge makers mostly consider tax-related factors as less critical compared to the lack of family need and the desire to live on in memory (Sargeant & Jay 2004). The 2000 NCPG survey also found that tax considerations were much less important to encourage charitable bequest giving than the desire to support the charity and the ultimate use of the gift by the charity (Richardson & Chapman, 2005).

Contribution to the Field

The literature on charitable bequest giving provides us with some indication that gender matters when examining planned giving. However, this literature is not large in scope and does not examine the future intentions of donors, those very donors fundraisers seek to convert from non-pledge makers to pledge makers within the donor's lifetime. Therefore, we examine whether or not there are gender differences in the intention to leave a charitable bequest.

The literature also offers little information on gender difference in motivations for charitable giving. Previous research has found that women are motivated by different factors than men when they make charitable contributions (such as Brown et al., 2008). Does this difference in gender persist in donors who have made charitable bequests and are therefore presumed to be more committed to the charity? Do different factors motivate women than motivate men as donors and as pledgers of a charitable bequest?

This study attempts to seek answers to these questions by using a large-scale dataset and analyzing in a statistically rigorous manner. The findings of the study contribute to enhancing the understanding of the role gender plays in planned giving decisions and build a foundation for more scholarly research in this area.

Purpose and Methodology

The purpose of our study is to examine the gender differences in the charitable motivations of donors who do or do not leave a bequest to charity. Investigating the interaction of gender with other demographics such as age and income, we examined whether or not women are more likely to report having a charitable provision in their will. We also examined how gender differences interact with level of religious attendance, age, income, and marital status. Further, we tested whether motivations for all giving differ in systematic ways by gender for donors with a charitable provision in their will, donors without a will, and donors who have not yet made a charitable bequest pledge in their will.³

We used descriptive statistics (i.e., means, averages, and ranges) to provide estimates of charitable bequest intent. We used t-tests and chi-square tests to determine statistically significant differences between two or more proportions. Finally, we also used probit regression analysis to understand the determinants of intent to leave a charitable bequest, particularly examining whether gender was a significant predictor of intent after controlling for other variables.

Data

This study compiles data from eight studies of charitable giving in a metropolitan region or a state, all of which were conducted by the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University from 2005 through 2008. The studies are for Arizona 2007, Georgia 2008, Illinois 2006, Indiana 2007, Kansas City 2008, Memphis 2008, Michigan 2007, and New Hampshire 2005. These studies consist of random-digit dialing telephone surveys, which are representative of the residents living in each region. Because high net-worth households make a significant contribution to charity, higher income households were oversampled. These studies had an effective response rate of between 22-25 percent, depending on the region.

In the data used in this study, only donor households answered questions about whether or not they had charitable provisions in a will. Across all the regional studies, the surveys first asked if the donor had a will and then asked questions about the inclusion of charitable provisions in a will. Therefore, this analysis examines the intent to leave a charitable bequest. The surveys also included questions about *inter vivos* (in life) charitable giving, about motivations or incentives for charitable giving, and demographic information. Total charitable giving questions were modeled after the philanthropy questions from the Center on Philanthropy Panel Study (COPPS), a module of the Panel Study on Income Dynamics (PSID) conducted at the University of Michigan. These regional studies have been previously used to estimate charitable giving from individuals and to analyze differences in all giving behavior by various demographic characteristics, but they have not been used to understand the determinants of intent to leave a charitable bequest.

³ Please refer to appendix for explanation of t-test and regression analysis.

Analysis and Results

The combined dataset used for this study consists of 8,495 responses, among which 6,219 were donors. Nearly 65 percent of donors were female in our sample. Approximately 57 percent of donors already had a will, and 15.7 percent of those with a will had named a charity in their will. When we examine the percentage of donors with a will, both widowed and married donors were significantly more likely to have a will than those of other marital status (with a p -value of .000) (see Table 1). Married male donors are also statistically more likely to have a will compared to married female donors (with a p -value of .0001).

Singles (both men and women) were significantly more likely to have a charitable provision in their will than married people or widows (with a p -value of .000). However, only among married donors, there was a statistically significant difference by gender in the likelihood to have a charitable provision in a will (see Table 1).

Table 1. Percentage of donors who have a will and who have named a charity in a will by gender and marital status

	Single		Married		Widowed		Other ^o
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	
Percentage of donors with a will	36.6%	40.1%	63.3%***	57.1%***	81.8%	80.7%	46.6%
Percentage of donors with a charitable provision in their will	24.7%	27.2%	17.0%*	14.1%*	14.4%	13.3%	16.6%

Note: ^o Donors in the other group include those living with a partner and those separated or divorced.

*** $p < .01$, * $p < .1$

Table 2 summarizes the demographics of those with a charitable bequest, based on those with a will.

Table 2. Demographics of charitable bequest givers

Demographic Composition	Of those With a Will, Percentage with Charitable Bequest Provision
ALL	15.7
% by Age Bracket	
<40	15.0
40-64	16.8
65+	14.9
% by Marital Status	
Single	26.3
Married	15.3
Widowed	13.6
Other ^o	16.6
% by Income Status	
<\$50,000	13.7
\$50,000-\$100,000	16.4
>\$100,000	19.3
% by Religious Belief	
Christian	16.1
Other	18.2
No Belief	12.9
% by Education	
Less than High School	6.7
High School	10.3
Some College	14.5
College Graduate	20.0
% by Church Attendance	
More than once a week	21.8
Once a week	18.4
Once or twice a month	12.1
A few times a year	11.6
Seldom or never	9.9
% by Race	
% of White	16.1
% of Black	12.8
% of Latino	17.6
% of Other	16.9
Sample size (N=3551)	

Note: ^o Donors in the other group include those living with a partner and those separated or divorced.

Donors with a will donated significantly more to charity (\$4,189 on average) than donors without a will donated (\$2,025 on average) in one year (2006 dollars). This difference is statistically significant, confirming that those with wills gave more to charity. Donors with a charitable provision in their will also donated more, on average, to charity in one year (\$5,372) than those who had a will but did not have a charitable provision in their will (\$4,006), although the difference was not statistically significant.

In the next few sections, we will discuss characteristics of donors in our sample with a charitable provision in their will, and then examine the gender differences in motivations for charitable giving among donors with or without a charitable bequest, and those without a will.

Characteristics of Charitable Bequest Givers

By Marital Status

We find that among all donors, both men and women, those who were never married were significantly more likely to include a charitable provision in their will (26 percent) than those who were married or widowed (with a p -value of .000) (see Table 3). This is particularly true for female donors (see Figure 1). Married men were slightly more likely to report a charitable provision in their will (17 percent) compared with married women (14 percent), which was statistically significant at the 10 percent level.

Table 3. Percentage of donors with a will who have a charitable provision, by marital status

	Single	Married	Widowed	Other ^o
Percentage of donors with a charitable provision in their will ***	26.3%	15.3%	13.6%	16.6%

Note: ^o Donors in the other group include those living with a partner and those separated or divorced.

*** $p < .01$

Figure 1. Percentage of donors with a will who have a charitable provision, by gender and marital status




Note: ^o Donors in the other group include those living with a partner and those separated or divorced.

* $p < .1$

By Income Level

As Figure 2 shows, there is a positive and significant relationship between a household annual income and having a charitable provision in a will. As is the case throughout the report, only donor households reported whether or not they had charitable provisions in a will. For those households with an annual income above \$100,000, approximately 19 percent of male and female donors have named a charity in their wills, which is significantly higher than the percentages of male and female donors with an annual household income less than \$50,000 (with a *p*-value of .01).

Figure 2. Percentage of donors with a will who have a charitable provision, by gender and income



Note: The differences by gender in all income groups are not statistically significant.

By Marital Status and Income Level

By annual household income level, we further examined the proportion of those donor households with a charitable provision in their will by gender and marital status (see Table 4).

Married individuals were significantly less likely to have a charitable provision in their will than either single men or single women at all income levels. However, there were no statistically significant differences between single men and single women at any income level.

Table 4. Percentage of donors with a will who have a charitable provision, by gender, marital status, and annual household income level


Annual household income	Donors with a charitable bequest		
	Single men	Single women	Married
Below \$50,000	22.5%^	25.9%	13.0%***
\$50,000 - \$100,000	30.0%^	27.8%	13.7%***
Above \$100,000	29.4%^	71.4%^	18.7%*

Note: ^ Sample size less than 50. *** $p < .01$, * $p < .1$

By Age

Younger (<40) and older (65+) male donors were more likely than were female donors of the same age to have a charitable provision in their will (see Figure 3). The level of statistical significance ($p < .1$) is considered to be weak by some researchers and is accepted by others. There was no statistical difference in charitable bequest provision between middle-aged (40-64) female and male donors.

Figure 3. Percentage of donors with a will who have a charitable provision, by gender and age



Note: * $p < .1$

By Religious Affiliation and Frequency of Religious Attendance

Approximately 18 percent of male Christian donors included a charitable provision in their will, which is significantly higher than the proportion of female Christian donors (15 percent) (see Table 5). However, there was no statistically significant gender difference among bequest pledge makers with other religious affiliations or with no religious beliefs. Among the three religious affiliation groups, there are no significant differences in having a charitable bequest.

Table 5. Percentage of donors with a will who have a charitable provision, by religious affiliation

	Christian		Other		No Belief	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Donors with a charitable provision in their will	18.1%**	15.0%**	16.7%	19.1%	11.6%	14.3%

Note: ** $p < .05$

Additionally, the percentage of charitable bequest pledge makers significantly increases as the frequency of religious attendance increases, for both female and male donors (see Table 6 and Figure 4). Among donors who have a will, those who attend religious services at least once a week are significantly more likely to have named a charity in their will.


Table 6. Percentage of donors with a will who have a charitable provision, by religious attendance

	More than once a week	Once a week	Once/ Twice a month	A few times a year	Seldom or never
Percentage of donors with a charitable provision in their will ***	21.8%	18.4%	12.1%	11.6%	9.9%

Note: *** $p < .01$.

For male donors who attend religious services more than once a week, the percentage of charitable bequest pledge makers is significantly (almost 10 percentage points) higher than that of female donor who attend religious services. Among donors who seldom or never attend religious services, around 11 percent of female donors have named a charity in their wills, whereas nearly 8 percent of male donors have done so, but this difference is not statistically significant.

Figure 4. Percentage of donors with a will who have a charitable provision, by gender and church attendance



Note: *** $p < .01$

Gender Differences in Motivations for Charitable Giving

In this and the following section, we examine donors' self-reported motivations for charitable giving among donors with a charitable bequest in their will, donors who have a will but have not yet included a charitable bequest provision, and donors without a will, respectively.

The survey questions asked donors about motivations and incentives for charitable giving in general, not specifically for charitable bequest giving. Donors surveyed were offered several options to choose from, and they were asked to identify each motivation and incentive as a major, minor, or no motivation at all. Our analysis is restricted to those motivational statements shared across the eight regional studies combined in our dataset (see Table 7).

Table 7. Motivations shared across eight regional studies


Key words of motivation	Survey question: How much of a motivation is:
Meet material needs	Helping individuals meet their material needs
Being asked	Being asked to give by a friend or associate
Tax benefit	Tax benefits
Employer asked	Being asked by your employer
For Equity	Feeling that those who have more should help those with less
Charities more effective	The belief charities can provide public services more effectively than governments or private businesses can
Religious belief	Religious beliefs
Reciprocity	The fact a charity helped you, your friends or family
Achieve a desired impact	The belief charity can active change or bring about a desired impact

Gender Differences in Motivations for Charitable Giving among Donors with a Charitable Bequest in Their Will

We first examined the motivations for *donors who have named a charity in their will* (see Figure 5). The three most frequent motivations for men and women combined are “for equity,” i.e. a feeling that those with more should help those with less, “religious belief,” and “charities more effective.”

When comparing the motivations of bequest pledgers, women were more likely than men, with statistical significance, to select four motivations as major factors for their charitable giving including: “for equity,” “achieve a desired impact,” “reciprocity,” and “meet material needs.”

Figure 5. Motivations for donors with a charitable bequest, by gender



Note: *** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$ for differences between men and women.


Source: The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University, 2009.

Gender Differences in Motivations for Charitable Giving among Donors without a Charitable Bequest in their Will

This section analyzes gender differences in motivations for charitable giving among *donors who have a will but who have not yet named a charity in their will*. Like donors with a charitable bequest, donors in this group most frequently reported “for equity,” “religious belief” and “charities more effective” as major motivations (see Figure 11). Moreover, donors in this group ranked “meet material needs” (the fourth most often reported) higher than donors with a charitable bequest (the sixth most often reported), whereas they ranked “reciprocity” (the fifth most frequently cited) lower than donors who do not currently have a will (the third most frequently cited).

Gender differences in motivations for giving remained strong among donors who do not have a charitable bequest. Women were significantly more likely than men to indicate all motivations as a major factor for their charitable giving, except for “charities more effective” and “tax benefit.”

Figure 6. Motivations for donors with a will but without a charitable bequest, by gender




Note: *** $p < .01$, difference between men and women
 Source: The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University, 2009.

Gender Differences in Motivations for Charitable Giving among Donors without a Will

Gender differences in motivations for giving are more pronounced among *donors without a will*, compared to the differences for donors with a charitable provision in their will. Female donors who do not have a will were significantly more likely than male donors without a will to indicate all motivations, except for “charities more effective,” “tax benefit,” and “employer asked,” as major motivations for their charitable giving.

Figure 7 shows the motivations for donors who do not have a will. The motivation most often identified by both male (63 percent) and female donors (74 percent) in this group is “for equity,” followed by “religious belief” and “reciprocity.”

Figure 7. Motivations for donors without a will, by gender



Note: *** $p < .01$ for differences between men and women.

Source: The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University, 2009.

Regression Analysis

Like all charitable giving, the decision to leave a charitable bequest reflects a convergence of various factors. Therefore, we employed regression analysis to test whether gender has an effect on a donor's intention to leave a charitable bequest, after controlling for other factors such as frequency of religious attendance, income, age, and education.

We present results from probit regression models in Appendix I, Tables 1 and 2. Model 1 presents all donors with a charitable provision in their will, and model 2 presents high-income donors (\$100,000 and above) with a charitable provision in their will.

Next, in models 3-5, we investigate whether various motivations for giving are associated with being a charitable bequest pledge maker. The motivation variable is coded into a dummy where 1 equals those respondents who reported a major motivation for their giving and 0 equals those who reported otherwise. We focus on the top three motivations selected by both donors with and without a charitable provision in their will: "for equity," "religious belief," and "charities more effective." One motivation is tested with each model, while all the other factors that might influence the decision to leave a charitable bequest are controlled for.

Models 6-8 present results for donors who do not have a charitable provision in their will, testing one of the top three motivations in each model. Similarly, models 9-11 present results for the determinants of being a donor without a will.

Overall, the estimates of variables confirm our findings from the descriptive statistics and those from previous research. Regression results confirm that a married donor is strongly less likely to be a charitable bequest pledge maker than an unmarried donor. Additionally, a more religious donor is more likely to be a charitable bequest pledge maker than someone who is not religiously observant. Education level was significantly, positively related to the probability of being a donor with a charitable bequest. Regional differences were insignificant in general. Finally, the number of children has a negative effect as predicted in the literature, but with no statistical significance.

Different from what prior studies suggested, our data show that annual household income has a strong and positive impact on the likelihood of being a charitable bequest pledger. High-income (\$100,000 or above per year) donors are significantly more likely than low-income (below \$50,000 per year) donors to include a charity in their will. In addition, age is not a significant indicator of being a charitable bequest pledge maker. Another interesting finding in model 2 is that for high-income donors (\$100,000 or above), marital status became insignificant in the determination of leaving a charitable bequest, after controlling for other factors; whereas the negative effect of the number of children became significant.

In all the models, gender is not a statistically significant factor in the likelihood that a given donor has a charitable bequest provision in his/her will, after controlling for other factors. Additional analysis also expanded our regression models to include interaction variables using

gender.⁴ We examined the combination of marital status and gender, as well as education level and gender. However, we found no statistically significant effect of gender on the probability of being a donor with a charitable bequest.

When we examine the motivations for giving, two of the top three motivations, “for equity,” and “charities more effective” have positive and significant effects on the likelihood that a donor has a charitable provision in his/her will after controlling for all the other demographic variables. This implies that when respondents select these two motivations as their major motivation, they are significantly more likely to have a charitable provision in their will, even after controlling for differences in income, age, education, and so forth. However, we found no significant gender differences in motivations. When we examined the interaction of gender with the three top motivations for giving for donors with a charitable provision in their wills, we found no statistically significant effects of those interaction variables.⁵

Results also show that donors without a will do not frequently attend religious services, and are more likely to have a lower income or a lower level of education. The top three motivations for giving were not significantly different for this group when compared to donors who do have a will.

Study Limitations

This study is limited in its ability to explore gender differences in bequest giving for a few reasons. First, the data are not nationally representative; instead, they are representative of the eight regions surveyed, which are distributed across the country [Arizona, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Georgia, New Hampshire, Memphis, and Kansas City]. Second, when asking about bequest giving, we only asked donors about their intent to leave a bequest to charity. Donors answered yes when asked if they had contributed \$25 or more to a charity in the prior 12 months. We know from other work (Center on Philanthropy Panel Study) that approximately 70 percent of the population gives in a year but 85 percent contributes at least once when multiple years are considered together. Thus, perhaps 15 percent of the overall sample represented people who give at least sometimes and who might, or might not, have a charity named in a will. These people were not asked about their bequest intent or about their motives for charitable giving. We do not know if these occasional donors differ from the donors who gave in the study year.

We are not capturing what will actually occur when bequest pledgers’ estates are eventually settled. While it is useful for practitioners to learn about factors that influence the inclusion of a charitable bequest in donors’ wills, there is some evidence that intent is not the same as realization of bequests. Reasons for the difference may include:

- Some individuals may have a provision of “whatever is left goes to charity” and there may be no remaining assets in the estate, especially after end-of-life care.
- Surviving spouses can change the bequest intent. For example, women are more likely to be the surviving spouse. Studies show women may develop stronger social ties, especially to family. It is also possible that widows’ change wills to “take care of family.”

⁴ Regression results of these models were not presented.

⁵ Regression results of these models were not presented.

- We have no independent verification of the accuracy of respondents' answers such as administrative records on the extent of bequest pledges. Individuals may report naming a charity in their will because they think they might, or they think they will soon enough, or they did and they forgot they changed it, or for any other reason. The IRS estate tax returns show which estates fulfill charitable intent, but surveys do not have this information. Ideally, we would like to track individuals to determine what fraction of pledge makers leave estates that do fulfill charitable bequest intent.
- The data only asks about overall charitable intent to leave a bequest to charity, it does not ask which types of charities are the intended recipients nor do we know the amount of the intended bequest.

Our sample is limited to motivations for all charitable giving, not motivations specifically for leaving a bequest. Furthermore, the high-income group in our data is oversampled to ensure we capture these charitable givers. This oversampling may cause the estimated percentage of charitable bequest givers to be higher than the actual proportion, and because the regions are demographically different, a weight to correct this issue is not included. Finally, there are some factors identified in the literature for which our data cannot test; for example childhood volunteerism (Barker, 2007) or organizational factors that may affect bequest giving decisions (such as Sargeant & Shang, 2008; Sargeant et al., 2006a). In addition, the regression analysis does not include wealth nor health status, which may be correlated with charitable bequests, because the data were not available.

For this study, the decision to have a will or charitable provision in the will was asked of only donors. Therefore, the next evolution of analysis will include an understanding of who first selects being a donor then selects making a will and including a charitable provision in that will.

There are also a number of individuals who did not have a provision in their will for charity, but who were asked if they would consider adding one. Exploration of these individuals may yield interesting results for practitioners. A preliminary analysis has been conducted using five of the eight regional studies and is available from Campbell & Company (www.campbellcompany.com). In that work, people aged 40-65 were among those most likely to be willing to consider leaving a charitable bequest. Younger donors and donors over aged 65 were less likely to consider a bequest if they did not already have one.

Conclusions

Overall, consistent with the findings of James (2008) and Barker (2007), we found no basic gender differences in the percentage of people reporting a charitable provision in their will, even after controlling for other factors such as frequency of religious attendance, income, age, and education.

In terms of characteristics of charitable bequest givers, consistent with prior research, our findings showed that married donors were significantly less likely than unmarried donors to have a charitable provision in their wills. Our study also found that donors with an annual household income of \$100,000 or above were significantly more likely than those with low-income (below \$50,000) to have a charitable bequest. Furthermore, education level was positively related to the likelihood of being a donor with a charitable bequest.

Our study suggests a strong, positive relationship between the frequency of church attendance and the percentage of bequest pledge makers. Donors who go to church at least once a week are strongly more likely than those who are not religiously observant to have a charitable provision in their will. Moreover, among donors who attend religious services more than once a week, the percentage of male charitable bequest pledgers (nearly 29 percent) is significantly higher than that of female charitable bequest pledgers (around 18 percent).

Another interesting finding is that for high-income donors, marital status became insignificant in the determination of leaving a charitable bequest, after controlling for other factors; whereas the negative effect of the number of children became significant. That is, higher-income families are less likely to have a bequest as the number of children increases, all other factors held constant.

We found that “for equity,” “religious belief,” and “charities more effective” are the top three most frequently cited motivations for both donors with a charitable bequest and for those who have not yet named a charity in their will. Moreover, donors without a charitable bequest ranked “meet material needs” (the fourth most often reported) higher than donors with a charitable bequest (the sixth most often reported); whereas they ranked “reciprocity” (the fifth most frequently cited) lower than donors who do not currently have a will (the third most frequently cited).

Gender differences in motivations for giving are more pronounced among donors without a charitable bequest and those without a will, compared to the differences for donors with a charitable provision in their will. Female bequest pledgers were significantly more likely than men to select four motivations of the eight as major factors for their charitable giving including: “for equity,” “achieve a desired impact,” “reciprocity,” and “meet material needs.” However, among donors without a charitable bequest, females were significantly more likely than males to pick each motive as a major reason for giving, except for “charities more effective” and “tax benefit.”

Implications for Practitioners

Based on the analysis from the perspective of gender difference, this study has the following implications for practitioners:

- This study confirms much of the previous literature and suggests that a basic profile of a bequest pledge maker is one who tends to be single, is highly educated, frequently attends religious services, or has an annual household income of \$100,000 or above.
- An overall strategy for planned giving would suggest that fundraisers should ask equally of men and women since we found nearly no gender differences among those with a charitable provision in their will. However, one could focus on *singles* in general (widow(er)s) and single men, including younger and older men, as opposed to younger and older women exclusively).
- This study suggests a focus on higher income households, married or single, because the importance of marital status diminishes when income is above \$100,000.

Results also show that those with a charitable provision in their will are significantly more motivated by “for equity” and “charities are more effective than government” compared to those without a charitable bequest.⁶ Some evidence also shows gender differences in motivations for charitable giving. Gender differences were more pronounced among those without a charitable bequest in their will. Women in this group were significantly more likely than men to indicate almost all motivations as a major factor for their charitable giving. Therefore, we suggest the following:

- First, appeals should be structured for planned gifts particularly based on *helping those with less* (“for equity”). This is a dominant reason for giving among charitable bequest pledge makers. This is also a top reason for giving to charity among a large percentage of people who do not have a bequest in their will.
- Second, when encouraging people to begin creating bequests in their wills, the appeal should focus on how a charitable bequest can meet others’ material needs (as appropriate for your organization’s mission) or reciprocate for benefits received by the donor or those the donor cares most about.
- Last, for female donors who have not yet made a charitable bequest, another strategy is to focus on *demonstrations of the change or impact a bequest can achieve*. If some charity provides services not provided by the government, or can show that it provides them better than a government agency, that can be an important message for some of the key donor prospects for planned gifts.

⁶ Regression results of these models were not presented.

References

- Allianz Life Insurance Company of North America. (2006). *Despite unprecedented wealth and power, most women feel financially insecure, Allianz study finds*. Retrieved from <https://www.allianzlife.com/MediaCenter/PressAllianzStudy.aspx>.
- Auten, G., & Joulfaian, D. (1996). Charitable contributions and intergenerational transfers. *Journal of Public Economics*, 59, 55-68.
- Bakija, J., & Gale, W. G. (2003). *Effects of estate tax reform on charitable giving*. Urban-Brookings Tax Policy Center, Tax Policy Issues and Options, No. 6, July 2003.
- Barker, M. H. (2007, April). *Predicting charitable bequests*. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1961/4145>.
- Barthold, T., & Plotnick, R. (1984). Estate taxation and other determinants of charitable bequests. *National Tax Journal*, 37(2), 225-237.
- Boskin, M. J. (1976). Estate taxation and charitable bequests. *Journal of Public Economics*, 5, 27-56.
- Brown, D. W. (2004). What research tells us about planned giving. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 9(1), 2004, 86-95.
- Brown, M., Rooney, P., Han, H., & Miller, S. (2008). *Generational and gender differences in motivations for giving*. Retrieved from <http://www.philanthropy.iupui.edu/PhilanthropicServices/WPI/docs/GenderGenerationalDifferences.pdf>.
- Chang, C. F., Okunade, A. A., & Kumar, N. (1999). Motives behind charitable bequests. *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing*, 6(4), 69-85.
- Clolery, P., & Hrywina, M. (2007). Where there's no will there's no way: Charities are not in the final plans of a majority of Americans. *The Nonprofit Times*, June 1, 2007.
- Eller, M. Britton, (2005). Which estates are affected by the federal estate tax? An examination of the filing population for Year-of-Death 2001, *Statistics of Income Bulletin*. Retrieved from www.irs.gov.
- Giving USA*. (2006). A publication of the Giving USA Foundation™, researched and written by the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University.
- Havens, J. J., & Schervish, P. G. (1999). *Millionaires and the Millennium: New estimates of the forthcoming wealth transfer and the prospects for a golden age of philanthropy*. Social Welfare Research Institute, Boston College. Chestnut Hill, MA.

- Havens, J. J., & Schervish, P. G. (2004). Wealth transfer estimates for African American households. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, 2005(48), Summer 2005, 47-55.
- James, R. N., III. (2008). Health, wealth, and charitable estate planning: A longitudinal examination of testamentary charitable giving plans. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, October 2008 (Online First).
- Joulfaian, D. (2009). On estate tax repeal and charitable bequests. *Tax Notes*, 123(10), June 2009.
- Joulfaian, D. (2000). *Estate taxes and charitable bequests by the wealthy*. National Bureau of Economic Research Working paper No. 7663, April 2000.
- McClelland, R. (2004). *Charitable Bequests and the Repeal of the Estate Tax*. Congressional Budget Office, Technical paper, 2004-08, July 2004.
- McGranahan, L. M. (2000). Charity and the bequest motive: Evidence from Seventeenth-Century wills. *Journal of Political Economy*, 108(6), 1270-1291.
- Mesch, D. J., Rooney, P. M., Steinberg, K. S., & Denton, B. (2006). The effects of race, gender, and marital status on giving and volunteering in Indiana. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35(4), December 2006, 565-587.
- Nichols, J. E. (2001). The 21st Century case for gift planning. *The Journal of Gift Planning*, 5(1), March 2001, 5-9, 37-39.
- The PNC Financial Services Group. (2006). *This Valentine's Day-give your spouse a budget ... It might save your marriage*. Retrieved from <http://www.prnewswire.com/cgi-bin/stories.pl?ACCT=104&STORY=/www/story/02-09-2006/0004278554&EDATE>.
- Richardson, D., & Chapman, G. (2005). What some recent research tells us about planned giving (legacy marketing) in North America. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 10, February 2005, 33-41.
- Rooney, P. M., Mesch, D. J., Chin, W., & Steinberg, K. S. (2005). The effects of race, gender, and survey methodologies on giving in the U.S. *Economics Letters*, 86(2), February 2005, 173-180.
- Routley, C., Sargeant, A., & Scaife, W. (2007). Bequests to educational institutions: Who gives and why? *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 7(3), 2007, 193-201.
- Sargeant, A., & Hilton, T. (2005). The final gift: Targeting the potential charity legator. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 10, February 2005, 3-16.

- Sargeant, A., Hilton, T., & Wymer, W. (2006a). Bequest motives and barriers to giving: The case of direct mail donors. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 17(1), Fall 2006, 49-66.
- Sargeant, A., & Jay, E. (2004). *Determinants of U.S donor behaviour: The case of bequests*. Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP) and Mal Warwick & Associates, Inc.
- Sargeant, A., & Shang, J. (2008). *Identification, death and bequest giving: A report to AFP and Legacy Leaders*. Association of Fundraising Professionals. Reports on Fundraising and Philanthropy.
- Sargeant, A., Wymer, W., & Hilton, T. (2006b). Marketing bequest club membership: An exploratory study of legacy pledgers. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35(3), September 2006, 384-404.
- Schervish, P. G. (2005). Today's wealth holder and tomorrow's giving: The new dynamics of wealth and philanthropy. *The Journal of Gift Planning*, 9(3), 15-37.
- Schervish, P. G., & Havens, J. J. (1999). Gifts and bequests: Family or philanthropic organizations? In A. H. Munnel & A. Sunden (Eds.), *Death and dollars: The role of gifts and bequests in America*, 130-167. Washington, DC: The Brookings Press.
- Schervish, P. G., & Havens, J. J. (2003, June). *New findings on the patterns of wealth and philanthropy*. Working paper. Social Welfare Research Institute, Boston College. Chestnut Hill, MA.
- Schervish, P. G., Havens, J. J., & Whitaker, A. K. (2006). Leaving a legacy of care. *Philanthropy*, XX(1), January/February, 2006, 11-13.
- Sharpe, R. F., Jr. (2005). *Widows and major gifts: A brave new world*. Presentation to Association of Fundraising Professionals 42nd International Conference, April 5, 2005, Baltimore, MD.
- Sterling, C. (2000). Gender differences in planned giving: The way women give. *Planned Giving Today*, XI(12), 2000, 1-2, 7-10.

Appendices

Appendix I. Regression Tables

Table 1 - Probit Regression Models: Determinants of being a donor with a charitable provision in their will

Independent Variables		All donors (Model 1)	High-income donors (Model 2)	Top 1 motivation: For Equity (Model 3)	Top 2 motivation: Religious Beliefs (Model 4)	Top 3 motivations: Charities More Effective (Model 5)
Gender	Male	0.0145 (1.08)	-0.0153 (-0.51)	0.0194 (1.41)	0.0140 (1.04)	0.0124 (0.91)
Age	Age	0.00493* (1.69)	0.00574 (0.64)	0.00454 (1.55)	0.00462 (1.58)	0.00414 (1.40)
	Age square	-0.0000394 (-1.57)	-0.0000190 (-0.23)	-0.0000346 (-1.37)	-0.0000363 (-1.44)	-0.0000328 (-1.28)
Education Level	Education level	0.0241*** (6.19)	0.0330*** (2.96)	0.0229*** (5.81)	0.0237*** (6.06)	0.0245*** (6.13)
Race	Black	-0.0508* (-1.78)	-0.159*** (-5.47)	-0.0533* (-1.90)	-0.0502* (-1.75)	-0.0455 (-1.55)
	Latino	-0.00588 (-0.19)	0.0504 (0.50)	-0.00773 (-0.25)	-0.00905 (-0.29)	-0.000177 (-0.01)
	Other ethnicity	0.0248 (0.88)	-0.0418 (-0.70)	0.0296 (1.02)	0.0285 (0.99)	0.0217 (0.77)
	Unknown	0.0892 (1.28)	0.212 (0.93)	0.0937 (1.32)	0.0955 (1.34)	0.105 (1.43)
Religious Attendance	More than once a week	0.159*** (3.88)	0.331*** (2.90)	0.160*** (3.85)	0.158*** (3.59)	0.157*** (3.73)
	Once a week	0.102*** (3.24)	0.196** (2.26)	0.0963*** (3.04)	0.101*** (3.01)	0.0995*** (3.08)
	Once or twice a month	0.0194 (0.58)	0.191* (1.82)	0.0211 (0.62)	0.0196 (0.57)	0.0264 (0.75)
	A few times a year	0.0164 (0.50)	0.140 (1.41)	0.0184 (0.55)	0.0216 (0.64)	0.0180 (0.53)
	Unknown	0.0467 (1.21)	0.302** (2.50)	0.0498 (1.27)	0.0490 (1.25)	0.0444 (1.12)
Marital Status	Married	-0.0477*** (-3.08)	-0.0257 (-0.54)	-0.0474*** (-3.02)	-0.0449*** (-2.89)	-0.0422*** (-2.68)
Annual Household	High income	0.0495** (2.14)		0.0490** (2.10)	0.0490** (2.12)	0.0428* (1.86)

Income	Mid income	0.0275 (1.53)		0.0284 (1.56)	0.0269 (1.49)	0.0227 (1.25)
	Unknown	0.0252 (1.16)		0.0264 (1.20)	0.0237 (1.09)	0.0116 (0.54)
Family Size	# of children	-0.00234 (-1.52)	-0.0263** (-2.24)	-0.00246 (-1.57)	-0.00226 (-1.49)	-0.00226 (-1.47)
Rural Status	Rural	0.00221 (0.16)	0.00553 (0.16)	0.00354 (0.26)	0.000353 (0.03)	0.00802 (0.58)
	Unknown	-0.0212 (-0.37)	0.0425 (0.17)	-0.0214 (-0.37)	-0.0190 (-0.33)	-0.0156 (-0.27)
Region	Indiana	0.00414 (0.16)	-0.107** (-2.10)	0.00878 (0.33)	0.00403 (0.15)	0.0000777 (0.00)
	Michigan	0.0883** (2.49)	-0.0137 (-0.15)	0.0920** (2.55)	0.0894** (2.50)	0.0825** (2.32)
	Georgia	0.0335 (1.24)	0.0146 (0.21)	0.0370 (1.33)	0.0334 (1.22)	0.0220 (0.82)
	Illinois	0.0289 (1.05)	0.00387 (0.06)	0.0261 (0.94)	0.0295 (1.06)	0.0188 (0.69)
	Kansas City	0.0412 (1.44)	-0.00668 (-0.10)	0.0393 (1.37)	0.0382 (1.34)	0.0345 (1.22)
	Memphis	0.0509 (1.37)	0.0988 (1.09)	0.0516 (1.37)	0.0506 (1.36)	0.0417 (1.12)
	New Hampshire	-0.0160 (-0.19)	-0.124 (-0.88)	-0.0156 (-0.19)	-0.0205 (-0.25)	-0.0298 (-0.38)
Motivations	For equity			0.0439*** (3.37)		
	Religious beliefs				0.00649 (0.39)	
	Charities more effective					0.0492*** (3.89)
	N	3347	676	3286	3317	3191

Notes: Marginal effects are presented. T statistics are in parentheses.

Statistical significance: * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

When using regression methods, one value for each variable is omitted from analysis and all other values are compared to this base group. Arizona (2007) is used as a base group for the regional comparison and respondents with low income (less than \$50,000) are used as a base group for the comparison by levels of income. Other base groups are: female for gender, white for race, seldom or never for religious attendance, unmarried for marital status, and urban for rural status.

Appendix Table 2 - Probit Regression Models: Determinants of being a donor without a charitable provision in their will versus determinants of being a donor without a will

		Being a donor without a charitable provision in their will			Being a donor without a will		
Independent Variables		Top 1 motivation: For Equity (Model 6)	Top 2 motivation: Religious Beliefs (Model 7)	Top 3 motivations: Charities More Effective (Model 8)	Top 1 motivation: For Equity (Model 9)	Top 2 motivation: Religious Beliefs (Model 10)	Top 3 motivations: Charities More Effective (Model 11)
Gender	Male	-0.0194 (-1.41)	-0.0140 (-1.04)	-0.0124 (-0.91)	-0.0115 (-0.77)	-0.0120 (-0.82)	-0.0159 (-1.06)
Age	Age	-0.00454 (-1.55)	-0.00462 (-1.58)	-0.00414 (-1.40)	-0.0110*** (-3.65)	-0.0103*** (-3.43)	-0.0103*** (-3.36)
	Age square	0.0000346 (1.37)	0.0000363 (1.44)	0.0000328 (1.28)	-0.0000392 (-1.37)	-0.0000467 (-1.64)	-0.0000441 (-1.52)
Education Level	Education level	-0.0229*** (-5.81)	-0.0237*** (-6.06)	-0.0245*** (-6.13)	-0.0364*** (-8.77)	-0.0362*** (-8.75)	-0.0367*** (-8.72)
Race	Black	0.0533* (1.90)	0.0502* (1.75)	0.0455 (1.55)	0.197*** (6.20)	0.196*** (6.17)	0.196*** (6.11)
	Latino	0.00773 (0.25)	0.00905 (0.29)	0.000177 (0.01)	0.152*** (5.05)	0.152*** (5.05)	0.145*** (4.79)
	Other ethnicity	-0.0296 (-1.02)	-0.0285 (-0.99)	-0.0217 (-0.77)	0.0508* (1.85)	0.0510* (1.87)	0.0356 (1.29)
	Unknown	-0.0937 (-1.32)	-0.0955 (-1.34)	-0.105 (-1.43)	-0.0634 (-0.93)	-0.0662 (-0.97)	-0.0625 (-0.89)
Religious Attendance	More than once a week	-0.160*** (-3.85)	-0.158*** (-3.59)	-0.157*** (-3.73)	-0.0784*** (-2.66)	-0.0869*** (-2.76)	-0.0774*** (-2.59)
	Once a week	-0.0963*** (-3.04)	-0.101*** (-3.01)	-0.0995*** (-3.08)	-0.0911*** (-3.38)	-0.0987*** (-3.39)	-0.0953*** (-3.48)
	Once or twice a month	-0.0211 (-0.62)	-0.0196 (-0.57)	-0.0264 (-0.75)	-0.0816*** (-2.79)	-0.0846*** (-2.83)	-0.0820*** (-2.76)
	A few times a year	-0.0184 (-0.55)	-0.0216 (-0.64)	-0.0180 (-0.53)	-0.0155 (-0.52)	-0.0128 (-0.43)	-0.0175 (-0.58)
	Unknown	-0.0498 (-1.27)	-0.0490 (-1.25)	-0.0444 (-1.12)	-0.0207 (-0.65)	-0.0154 (-0.48)	-0.0181 (-0.56)
Marital Status	Married	0.0474*** (3.02)	0.0449*** (2.89)	0.0422*** (2.68)	-0.0524*** (-3.20)	-0.0529*** (-3.25)	-0.0501*** (-3.03)
Annual Household Income	High income	-0.0490** (-2.10)	-0.0490** (-2.12)	-0.0428* (-1.86)	-0.157*** (-7.50)	-0.157*** (-7.53)	-0.160*** (-7.56)
	Mid income	-0.0284	-0.0269	-0.0227	-0.0681***	-0.0665***	-0.0698***

		(-1.56)	(-1.49)	(-1.25)	(-3.77)	(-3.70)	(-3.83)
	Unknown	-0.0264 (-1.20)	-0.0237 (-1.09)	-0.0116 (-0.54)	-0.148*** (-6.78)	-0.144*** (-6.61)	-0.154*** (-6.95)
Family Size	# of children	0.00246 (1.57)	0.00226 (1.49)	0.00226 (1.47)	0.00113 (0.91)	0.00113 (0.91)	0.000841 (0.65)
Rural Status	Rural	-0.00354 (-0.26)	-0.000353 (-0.03)	-0.00802 (-0.58)	0.0205 (1.35)	0.0197 (1.30)	0.0145 (0.94)
	Unknown	0.0214 (0.37)	0.0190 (0.33)	0.0156 (0.27)	0.0633 (1.05)	0.0707 (1.18)	0.0547 (0.90)
Region	Indiana	-0.00878 (-0.33)	-0.00403 (-0.15)	-0.0000777 (-0.00)	0.00777 (0.28)	0.00349 (0.13)	0.00211 (0.08)
	Michigan	-0.0920** (-2.55)	-0.0894** (-2.50)	-0.0825** (-2.32)	0.0234 (0.78)	0.0182 (0.60)	0.0199 (0.66)
	Georgia	-0.0370 (-1.33)	-0.0334 (-1.22)	-0.0220 (-0.82)	-0.0716*** (-2.73)	-0.0730*** (-2.80)	-0.0775*** (-2.94)
	Illinois	-0.0261 (-0.94)	-0.0295 (-1.06)	-0.0188 (-0.69)	-0.00985 (-0.36)	-0.0136 (-0.50)	-0.0160 (-0.58)
	Kansas City	-0.0393 (-1.37)	-0.0382 (-1.34)	-0.0345 (-1.22)	-0.0215 (-0.79)	-0.0252 (-0.93)	-0.0272 (-1.00)
	Memphis	-0.0516 (-1.37)	-0.0506 (-1.36)	-0.0417 (-1.12)	0.0134 (0.38)	0.00459 (0.13)	0.00574 (0.16)
	New Hampshire	0.0156 (0.19)	0.0205 (0.25)	0.0298 (0.38)	-0.0286 (-0.30)	-0.0390 (-0.41)	-0.0221 (-0.22)
Motivations	For equity	-0.0439*** (-3.37)			-0.00526 (-0.34)		
	Religious beliefs		-0.00649 (-0.39)			0.0217 (1.22)	
	Charities more effective			-0.0492*** (-3.89)			-0.0138 (-0.96)
	N	3286	3317	3191	5805	5843	5647

Notes: Marginal effects are presented. T statistics are in parentheses.

Statistical significance: * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

When using regression methods, one value for each variable is omitted from analysis and all other values are compared to this base group. Arizona (2007) is used as a base group for the regional comparison and respondents with low income (less than \$50,000) are used as a base group for the comparison by levels of income. Other base groups are: female for gender, white for race, seldom or never for religious attendance, unmarried for marital status, and urban for rural status.

Appendix II. Basic introduction to t-test and regression analysis.

T-test

A t-test determines whether there is a significant difference between the means of two data sets. In frequency probability, these decisions are almost always made using null-hypothesis tests; that is, ones that answer the question: *Assuming that the null hypothesis is true, what is the probability of observing a value for the test statistic that is at least as extreme as the value that was actually observed?* One use of hypothesis testing is deciding whether experimental results contain enough information to cast doubt on conventional wisdom.

The p-value from a t-test represents the number of times out of 100 you are willing to be incorrect if you reject the null hypothesis. If you choose a p-value of 0.05, 5 times out of 100 you will be incorrect if you reject the null hypothesis. 95 times out of 100, you will be correct because it is more likely that the difference in the means is large enough to assume that the two means come from two different populations.

Regression analysis

In statistics, regression analysis refers to techniques for the modeling and analysis of numerical data consisting of values of a dependent variable (also called a response variable) and of one or more independent variables (also known as explanatory variables or predictors). The dependent variable in the regression equation is modeled as a function of the independent variables, corresponding parameters (constants), and an *error term*. The error term is treated as a *random variable*. It represents unexplained variation in the dependent variable. The parameters are estimated to give a "best fit" of the data. Most commonly, the best fit is evaluated by using the least squares method, but other criteria have also been used. Regression can be used for prediction (including forecasting of time-series data), inference, hypothesis testing, and modeling of causal relationships.