

UCLA

UCLA Previously Published Works

Title

Promoting Research on Global Chinese Philanthropy: an Introduction to the Special Issue

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5s823329>

Journal

The China Nonprofit Review, 11(2)

ISSN

1876-5092

Author

Zhou, Min

Publication Date

2019

DOI

10.1163/18765149-12341362

Peer reviewed

Zhou, Min. 2019. “Promoting Research on Global Chinese Philanthropy: An Introduction to the Special Issue” (guest-edited by Min Zhou). *China Nonprofit Review* 11:193-204

Promoting Research on Global Chinese Philanthropy: An Introduction to the Special Issue

Min Zhou

University of California, Los Angeles

Chinese culture has embedded a long tradition of charity and multiple strands of charitable thought.¹ The ideas of “humaneness and the concern for the well-being of the common people,” rooted in Confucianism, have served as keystones to promote the spirit of philanthropy and the act of doing good.² As culture is dynamic, Chinese philanthropy has been constantly shaped by time and space. Recent studies find trends of divergence and convergence. For example, among Chinese elite groups in different societies outside mainland China, 23 percent of the wealthiest individuals in Singapore and 16 percent in Hong Kong considered philanthropy as one of their top three spending priorities, compared to 41 percent in the United States.³ A study of four ethnic Chinese societies—mainland China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Singapore—show divergent patterns of charitable behavior at the present time. Based on the analysis of several survey datasets, the study finds that, in the aggregate, people in Taiwan display the strongest propensity for helping strangers; people in Hong Kong are most likely to donate money; Chinese Singaporeans spend the most time as volunteers; and mainland Chinese are the least charitable in every respect under study.⁴ Another study of Chinese and Chinese American philanthropy, in contrast, finds some striking similarities. This study shows that philanthropy in China and Chinese America has been on the rise in both size and quantity at the turn of the 21st century. In

China, the number of registered philanthropic organizations increased by 430% between 2006 and 2016 with charitable donations reaching \$16.7 billion in 2014. In the United States, the number of Chinese American foundations also increased exponentially, by 418%, between 2000 and 2014.⁵ Both Chinese and Chinese Americans donate disproportionately to higher education. With this rapid growth in philanthropy in China and the United States, Chinese and Chinese American philanthropists have also interacted more frequently than ever before through public forums and conferences to build platforms through which to communicate and share their experiences and best practices.

Divergent and convergent patterns of Chinese philanthropy are visible. However, the causes and impacts of philanthropic development are less known. Global Chinese philanthropy as an area of intellectual inquiry and scholarly research remains understudied. It is against this backdrop that a multi-phase project—Global Chinese Philanthropy Initiative (GCPI) was launched to fill the gap. Since the articles selected from this special issue were born out of the GCPI project, it is necessary to provide readers with brief background information.

Focusing on China and the United States, the GCPI project is the first academic effort aiming at knowledge production of academically sound scholarship; knowledge dissemination through convenings and media outreach to inform best practices, policy-making, and further research; and the development of a philanthropic ecosystem to build and expand networks and relationships between Chinese and Chinese-American philanthropists, philanthropic organizations, and academic communities.⁶ So far, the project has completed two phases of study, yielding a series of working papers, a GCPI report, and a series of launch events and public forums, including the 2018 GCPI Tsinghua Forum.⁷

The working paper series covers a review of the existing literature that examines patterns, causes, and consequences of philanthropy in mainland Chinese, Hong Kong Taiwan, Singapore, the United States; a historical overview of early and contemporary histories of Chinese philanthropy; selected case studies of philanthropy in higher education; a macro level analysis of philanthropy in the environmental arena; and an assessment of data availability.⁸ These working papers have raised several important analytical issues. First, in the field of philanthropy, practitioners are mostly concerned about action while scholars are concerned about explanation. Practitioners often make a distinction between charity (i.e., natural, emotional, short-term acts of giving in response to an immediate situation) and philanthropy (i.e., more strategic, long-term actions aiming to address the root causes of social issues and look for solutions). They are involved in philanthropic work as an individual or organization. Scholars, in contrast, tend to include charity in their definition of philanthropy. In their research, scholars often draw a distinction between social change philanthropy and charitable philanthropy, as illustrated in environmental sustainability.⁹ Rather than focusing on the act of giving, they focus on identifying patterns and explaining causes and consequences. For example, scholars are interested in exploring how philanthropy, charity, and civil society are related to one another to create social change.¹⁰ Yet, philanthropic work and research can inform each other. It is important to nurture such synergy in pursuing scholarship in this emerging academic field.

Second, culture, religion, family, state, economy and other social forces, such as civil-society organizations, are key determining actors in shaping philanthropy. But as philanthropy is a dynamic phenomenon, these causal factors do not function in isolation. Rather, they are interacting with one another to create distinct patterns and exert variegated impacts.¹¹ For example, scholars zoom in on how state and society relations to explain significant differences in

philanthropy governance: Mainland China has a top-down regulatory model, Hong Kong a self-regulatory model, Taiwan a liberal-democratic model, and Singapore a government management model. These governance models interact with different levels of economic and institutional developments to facilitate or constrain philanthropic behaviors of individuals and civil-society organizations. In other words, divergent patterns in contexts sharing the same cultural traditions are due more to macro-level economic, institutional, and political factors, which vary by history and context, than to micro-level cultural and psychological factors, which appear to be universal.¹²

Third, the study of global Chinese philanthropy benefits from historical and comparative approaches. China may be unique. However, what makes China unique is not merely culture, but complex interactional processes across time and national borders. Historically, the Chinese culture, deeply influenced by familism, Confucianism, and other Eastern religious traditions, promotes benevolence and compassion, values that are now considered universal.¹³ Indigenous philanthropy in China, or Chinese diasporic communities around the world for that matter, are impacted by non-Chinese political and cultural forces. From the early nineteenth century to the founding of the People's Republic of China in 1949, foreign giving by missionaries and foundations shaped the ways in which philanthropic endeavors intersected with religion, politics, economy, and transnationalism.¹⁴ In the Chinese diasporic communities, especially those in Southeast Asia during colonial times, family and clan associations have emerged to provide mutual aid and welfare benefits to members through philanthropy. This has made remarkable contributions to community-building and Chinese education in the diaspora while helping alleviate poverty and stimulate economic development in migrant-sending communities, or *qiaoxiang*, in China.¹⁵ Contemporary Chinese philanthropy has now moved beyond the family

and place of origin and become national and transnational.¹⁶ In fact, China's economic reform since the late 1970s has produced two main trends. One is overseas Chinese giving. While investment by overseas Chinese constitutes a significantly large proportion of foreign investment in China to help jump start China's economy, donations by overseas Chinese for charitable causes in and out of *qiaoxiang* are also remarkable.¹⁷ The other trend is the rise of a super-rich class in China, which accounts for the exponential increase of charitable donations and philanthropic organizations.¹⁸ However, wealthy individuals in China have a tendency to channel their giving through corporate foundations, rather than private foundations, partly because the super-rich, often successful entrepreneurs, see philanthropic activities as a way to promote public image and strengthen government relations.¹⁹

Fourth, insufficient research on global Chinese philanthropy is largely due to a severe shortage of data, especially comparative data. GCPI's preliminary research notes that the lack of data is partly due to the fact that there are few legal requirements for organizations to publicly disclose data even when these organizations collect their own data.²⁰ Moreover, while scholars are pushed innovatively discover and mine existing data from different sources and construct executable datasets for systematic analysis, existing data are often collected in one city or one country, in one time point, or Gallup surveys on perceptions and attitudes.²¹ For example, the World Value Survey (WVS), consisting of nationally representative surveys conducted in 100 countries worldwide, contains information on changing values and their impact on social and political life.²² The World Giving Index (WGI) is an annual report published by the Charities Aid Foundation (CAF) to look at people's giving behavior on three main measures—helping a stranger, donating money, and volunteering time—and rank more than 140 countries in the world according to how charitable they are.²³ The Forbes China Rich Lists and the Forbes China

Charity Lists have valuable information on China's newly emerged super-rich class.²⁴ The Taiwan Social Change Survey (TSCS), a cross-sectional survey conducted annually since 1985 by Academia Sinica in Taiwan, contains some information on people's charitable attitude and behavior in Taiwan.²⁵ The Hong Kong Altruism Index (HKAI), conducted by Centre for Suicide Research and Prevention of the University of Hong Kong, has culturally sensitive data that comprehensively capture Hong Kong residents' altruistic behavior patterns and their profiles.²⁶ These datasets are valuable but lack sufficient information to examine multi-level dynamics in philanthropy.

The GCPI report, entitled *Global Chinese Philanthropy Initiative Report*, analyzes the giving motivations and patterns of 68 distinguished Chinese and Chinese American philanthropists.²⁷ The report suggests several noteworthy trends. First, Chinese and Chinese American philanthropy has experienced tremendous growth and is considered to have extraordinary potential for continued growth. For example, in the United States, major gifts from Chinese American philanthropists accounted for 1.2% of all major philanthropic giving in the U.S. between 2008 and 2014, which was proportional to their representation of the U.S. population. The surge in the number of Chinese American foundations is relatively recent, with more than 80% of them being established since 2000. In China, the number of private foundations in China jumped tenfold over the past decade. Second, philanthropy has already had a significant measurable social impact in both the United States and China and is often targeted at higher education, medical research, and scientific innovation. It is noted that higher education as the cause of philanthropic giving ranked #1 (accounting for more than 60% of all major gifts) by both Chinese and Chinese American philanthropists. Third, while Chinese and Chinese American philanthropists share similarities in terms of their focus on higher education and are

increasingly engaging in bilateral exchanges, the differences in their approach to philanthropy stem largely from their respective government's different domestic strategies related to charity and public welfare initiatives. The GCPI report also makes a number of recommendations to help facilitate greater understanding among philanthropists, community organizations, non-profit executives and policymakers.²⁸

In sum, the preliminary findings from the GCPI project shed important light on future research. As a good beginning of a challenging journey to establish the field of global Chinese philanthropy, this special issue in *The China Nonprofit Review* aims to showcase a variety of case studies, which were presented at the GCPI Tsinghua Forum. Congcong Zhang and Chien-Chung Huang's article is a quantitative study based on data from the Forbes China Rich Lists and the Forbes China Charity Lists. The data clearly confirmed a rising trend in donations by China's extremely wealthy whose net worth equaled at least US\$649 million. The authors built a model to examine what determined donations and who was more likely to donate to what. They found that net worth, source of wealth, social status, and political connection had significant effects on donations. They pointed out, however, that the extremely wealthy with higher net worth, higher social status, and greater political connections were more likely to be on the published charity lists than their wealthy counterparts without these characteristics, particularly those in the real estate industry. Moreover, the extremely wealthy who were in professional, scientific, and technical areas were more likely to make more monetary donations than their counterparts in other areas. These findings highlight the trend of monetary donations while also allude to possible interaction effects between social status and political connections as well as challenges presented by data limitations in accurately identifying key determinants.

Jinghua Xing and Wei Gan's article explores an emerging phenomenon in Chinese philanthropy—a new generation of young Chinese philanthropists, or *shan'erdai* (善二代). This new generation is primarily made up of children of China's super-rich families. *Shan'erdai* is the real second generation, since super rich families are just beginning to transfer their wealth onto their children, quite unlike the situation of the West (or that of Chinese diasporas in Southeast Asia), where super rich families have already sustained more than two generations. Included in this *shan'erdai* are young and successful entrepreneurs who draw from the wealth and experience of their parents to make their own fortunes and those who run their family foundations. Xing and Wei describe this generation of philanthropists as a new social group who is conscious about improving their public image through their involvement in social welfare and charity projects in ways significantly distinct from those of their parents or the older generation. In particular, younger generation philanthropists are keen on experimenting with new forms of philanthropy, charity, and social entrepreneurship that aim for social transformation rather than piecemeal dealings with deep-rooted social problems. Although it is still debatable how to properly define *shan'erdai*, this preliminary study serves to carve out a new area of intellectual inquiry and stimulate new ideas future research.

Marina Tan Harper's study investigates diasporic Chinese cultural traditions, ethos, and value systems through the lens of philanthropy at the micro level. Through in-depth fieldwork, Harper traced the development of value systems and charitable traditions, which were transplanted from the homeland with substantial local modifications through migration and resettlement by ethnic Chinese in Southeast Asia, or the Nanyang region. From the mid-1800s onward, millions of Chinese migrants arrived from Fujian and Guangdong provinces initially as merchants and later as laborers to form the largest Chinese diaspora (accounting

for nearly three quarters of the Chinese overseas) in the world. Harper showed intra- and intergenerational changes in the value systems guiding philanthropic work. Diasporic Chinese, or the China-born first generation, often keep close contact with families back home and compelled their philanthropic actions to their ancestral villages in China, which is affected by their lived experience in China and a dominant sojourner mentality in the diaspora. As diasporic Chinese and their later-generation descendants eventually resettled and incorporated into local societies, as nationals or ethnic group members in various countries in Southeast Asia, the Chinese cultural value systems rooted in Confucianism were confronted, contested, and remolded, and evolved into a localized ethnic culture. Circumstances required that the Chinese overseas build ethnic institutions like family, clan, and hometown associations for self-help and mutual aid through entrepreneurship and ethnic formation. As their businesses thrived and prospered, Chinese entrepreneurs became philanthropists to make contributions to Chinese education and social welfare locally and inspired fellow Chinese to follow. As they engendered gratitude to where they built their wealth, raised families, and honored ancestry in their resettled new homeland in Southeast China, the loyalties, generosity, and philanthropy of the Chinese overseas had also shifted away from China. These intergenerational patterns of diasporic philanthropy among ethnic Chinese in Southeast Asia suggest that culture is dynamic and changes in time and space.

The article by Jiangang Zhu and Yanchun Jing also looks at the transnational aspect of Chinese philanthropy, but places the focus on the diaspora-homeland intersection at the meso-level of institutions. Engaging with the concept of diaspora philanthropy, the authors relied on data from an ethnographic study in Shunde *qiaoxiang*, Guangdong Province, to analyze the patterns and mechanisms of philanthropic giving by overseas Chinese to their

ancestral hometowns, known as *qiaoxiang*. They asked a central research question: “Why has philanthropic giving from overseas Chinese continued to rise even as *qiaoxiang* has already been well developed? They argued that Chinese diaspora philanthropy was affected by the intersection of push and pull factors beyond the sharing of a common cultural tradition, family or kin affinity, and emotional ties. The push and pull mechanisms involved multiple actors—individuals, organizations, and the state—whose action and interaction were subjected to historical circumstances, such as diaspora politics on the homeland and homeland political and economic developments. Historically, family, clan, and hometown associations of overseas Chinese worked with individual members to make donations to their specific home villages, mainly for the purpose of poverty alleviation for families and villages. But the giving trend fluctuated and became stagnant at the peak of the Cultural Revolution. China’s open door and economic reform since the late 1970s have revitalized diasporic relations through favorable government policies. Receptive local governments proactively reach out to the diaspora and facilitate diasporic engagement with hometown development beyond the level of ancestral villages. Such interaction is at the level of the organization rather than the individual. It is the intersection of these multi-level push and pull mechanisms that shapes contemporary Chinese diaspora philanthropy.

The article by Ruisheng Zhang is a case study of philanthropic work in China by a private foreign foundation—the Rockefeller Foundation (RF). Based on analysis of archival sources in the United States, mainland China, and Taiwan, Zhang traced how RF headed out on a modest philanthropic path for China’s agricultural modernization in 1936 and explained why it ended in 1944 without reaching its intended goals. Two main reasons explained why RF decided to engage in rural philanthropy in China. One reason was a

receptive government that was supportive of rural reconstruction and nongovernmental projects. The other was RF's own confidence in collaborating with university professors in different disciplines, including social sciences, in the US and China. The RF's entered China in ways fundamentally different from direct famine, disaster, and poverty relief efforts nor missionary charity work. Instead, it aimed for broad institutional change, working with the government to strengthen governance at the grassroots level on the one hand, and with universities through health, training, and research programs under the auspices of the North China Council for Rural Reconstruction (NCCRR) on the other. The philanthropic programs that RF sponsored in China failed, however, for complicated circumstances beyond the control of RF and NCCRR. Zhang drew a few lessons from this case study. First, rural reconstruction project did not address fundamental issues associated with land ownership and application of modern agricultural technology. Second, counter-productive forces came from the Nationalist Government, Chinese Communist Party, and different regional military regimes to inhibit agricultural reforms. Third, the university-community partnership was too westernized to win the trust and cooperation of constituencies at the grassroots level. And last but not least, anti-Japanese war and civil war further disrupted RF's endeavor. From a historical perspective, this case study illustrates how key factors in determining the effectiveness of philanthropic work are multi-layered and interactive.

Last but not least, Wenjuan Zheng, Zhenxiang Chen, and Paul Ong takes a comparative perspective to investigate environmental philanthropy. Philanthropy involves donating money and/or volunteering time for specific causes. Zheng and her colleagues defined environmental philanthropy as civic engagement through monetary donation and volunteering in various

environmental nonprofit organizations, as well as demonstrations of environmental causes. Using the data from the World Value Survey, the authors compared four predominantly Chinese societies – mainland China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore and examined what affected cross-regional variations on civic engagement, particularly in the domain of environmental philanthropy. Engaging with the debate on whether culture played a role, the authors found that residents of mainland China shared similar environmental concerns and beliefs with Chinese people in the other three regions, but they were least likely to volunteer, donate, and demonstrate for these causes, controlling for individual socioeconomic and demographic characteristics. The authors challenged the common argument that different local environmental culture explained cross regional gap on pro-environmental behavior. By comparing the four regions with similar environmental cultural heritage, the authors argued that varied levels of civil-society development played a more determining role in shaping local environmental philanthropy. These findings imply the importance of both structural and institutional factors and the interaction of these two sets of factors in facilitating or hindering environmental philanthropy.

The studies presented in this special issue are meant to stimulate and promote further research on global Chinese philanthropy. There are more questions left to be answered even on the topics being explored here. For example, who can be called philanthropists and what is unique about Chinese philanthropists? What motivates the Chinese in China and around the world to engage in philanthropy, how and where do they donate, and for what purposes? What are some of the most important institutional elements that define the role of the state in the philanthropic sector? How does rapid economic development in China shape philanthropy in ways that are distinctly Chinese? How do cultural tradition, family or family legacy, religion, civil-society institutions, government agencies, politics and laws interact to encourage or prohibit

philanthropic behaviors of individuals? How do philanthropic values and charitable thought develop, change, or evolve to shape philanthropic context and practice? How is philanthropy commercialized, institutionalized, professionalized, standardized, and diversified, particularly through technological innovation and the Internet, in national contexts with or without a well-developed civil society? How do Chinese philanthropists differ across generations in history and across geographic regions within and beyond China? How do Chinese philanthropists similar to and differ from philanthropists in developed countries of the Global North and developing countries of the Global South? What are the impacts of global Chinese philanthropy and how these impacts are measured? What are some of the opportunities of giving at present and in the near future, that are more innovative, borderless, scalable, and sustainable? What kind of role can the next generation philanthropists play to help further promote philanthropy? The list of theoretically interesting and policy relevant questions runs on.

As global Chinese philanthropy is an emerging and exciting field, we hope that, by moving onto the third phase of GCPI, we will focus on research through a Global Chinese Philanthropy Research Alliance, which was launched at the GCPI Tsinghua Forum in summer 2018 with UCLA Asia Pacific Center and Tsinghua Center for Chinese Entrepreneur Studies as its founding members. We hope that scholars and institutions of higher learning in China, the United States, and elsewhere around the world, will join force to contribute to the further development of the field.

As the guest editor for this special issue, I am immensely grateful for the support of the GCPI Executive Committee for direction, guidance, and funding support. I deeply appreciate the enthusiasm, hard work, and multiple drafts of revisions, and seamless operation from the authors to bring this project to fruition. I thank anonymous reviewers whose insightful and critical

comments are beneficial for improving the quality of the manuscripts. I also thank the *China Nonprofit Review* staff, Professor Xijin Jia and Ms. Yujin Liu particularly, for their effort to move the special issue through the external review and production process, and my former student Grace Gao for her timely and meticulous editorial assistance.

China Nonprofit Review Special Issue on Global Chinese Philanthropy

Table of Contents

(~60,200 words)

Min Zhou (Guest Editor): Promoting Research on Global Chinese Philanthropy: An Introduction to the Special Issue

1 Congcong Zhang and Chien-Chung Huang, “The Donation of the Extremely Wealthy in China”

2 Jinghua Xing and Wei N. Gan, “China’s *Shan’erdai*: The Formation and Transformation of Philanthropy”

3 Marina Tan Harper, “Philanthropic Action of Chinese Diaspora in Southeast Asia: Shaped by Family, Ancestry, Identity and Social Norms”

4 Jiangang Zhu and Yanchun Jing, “Push and Pull: A Case Study of the Dynamics of Chinese Diaspora Philanthropy”

5 Ruisheng Zhang, “Rockefeller Foundation’s Agricultural Philanthropy in Rural China: A Case Study of the North China Council for Rural Reconstruction”

6 Wenjuan Zheng, Zhenxiang Chen, and Paul Ong, “Environmental Philanthropy and Civic Engagement: Comparison of Mainland China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore”

Notes

¹ Kyle David, “A Historical Survey of Indigenous Chinese Philanthropy, 1550-1953.” GCPI Working Paper #4. Los Angeles: UCLA Center for Neighborhood Knowledge, 2016.

<https://www.globalchinesephilanthropy.org/gcpi/research/papers/175431>.

² Joanna F.H. Smith, “Chinese Philanthropy as Seen through a Case of Famine Relief in the 1640s,” pp. 133-168 in Warren F. Ilchman, Stanley N. Katz, and Edward L. Queen II. (eds.), *Philanthropy in the World’s Traditions* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1998), p. 148; Joanna Handlin Smith, *The Art of Doing Good: Charity in Late Ming China* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2009), p. 252.

³ Wenjuan Zheng, Paul Ong, Alycia Cheng, & Karna Wong, “Comparative Philanthropic Literature: Hong Kong, Singapore and Taiwan.” GCPI Working Paper #3. Los Angeles: UCLA Center for Neighborhood Knowledge, 2016b.

<https://www.globalchinesephilanthropy.org/gcpi/research/papers/175441>

⁴ Lilian Lih Rong Wang, Michael P.H. Liu, & Franzi P.H. Lin, “A Comparative Study of Charity in Four Chinese Societies--Based on the Available Data on Charitable Behaviors,” GCPI Working Paper #6 (Los Angeles: UCLA Center for Neighborhood Knowledge, 2016).

⁵ V. Kuo, J. Miao, T. Feng, & M. Hu, *Global Chinese Philanthropy Initiative Report* (Los Angeles, CA: Asian Americans Advancing Justice-Los Angeles, 2017); Teresa Watanabe, “Donors of Chinese Descent Vastly Increase Philanthropy, Mostly to Higher Education,” *Los Angeles Times* September 6, 2017.

⁶ GCPI is led by Stewart Kwoh, John Long, and Archie Kleingartner who serve on the GCPI Executive Committee. Work in the first two phases was conducted by a collaborative research team of Asian American Advancing Justice–Los Angeles, UCLA Luskin School of Public Affairs, and UC Irvine Long China-US Institute. Funding support for the GCPI came mainly from the John and Marilyn Long Family Foundation, Lao Niu Foundation, and Wallace H. Coulter Foundation. Additional support provided by UCLA’s International Institute, Asia Pacific Center, Center for Neighborhood Knowledge, Center for Civil Society, and the Walter & Shirley Wang Endowed Chair in US-China Relations and Communications.

⁷ The GCPI Tsinghua Forum was co-organized by the Asia Pacific Center (APC) of the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) and the Center for Chinese Entrepreneur Studies (CCES) of Tsinghua University. Philanthropists, scholars, experts and foundation representatives from both sides of the Pacific gathered on the Tsinghua campus in Beijing on June 28, 2018, to share ideas, best practices, and research findings on philanthropy and stimulate research on Chinese and Chinese American philanthropy, philanthropy and higher education, Chinese entrepreneurship and philanthropy, and innovative methodologies. For more detail on the GCPI Tsinghua Forum, see GCPI website:

<https://www.globalchinesephilanthropy.org/gcpi/events/12794>, access on August 12, 2019.

⁸ The working papers are available on GCPI website:

<https://www.globalchinesephilanthropy.org/gcpi/research>, access on August 12, 2019.

⁹ Karna Wong, Paul Ong, & Wenjuan Zheng, “American Philanthropy Literature Review,” GCPI Working Paper #2 (Los Angeles: UCLA Center for Neighborhood Knowledge, 2016)

<https://www.globalchinesephilanthropy.org/gcpi/research/papers/175435>; Zheng et al. this issue.

For more detail, see <https://givingcompass.org/article/charity-versus-philanthropy/>, access on August 12, 2019.

¹⁰ Karna Wong, Paul Ong, & Wenjuan Zheng, “American Philanthropy Literature Review.”

¹¹ Wenjuan Zheng, Paul Ong, Alycia Cheng, & Karna Wong, “Comparative Philanthropic Literature: Hong Kong, Singapore and Taiwan,” GCPI Working Paper #3 (Los Angeles: UCLA Center for Neighborhood Knowledge, 2016); Karna Wong, Paul Ong, & Wenjuan Zheng, “American Philanthropy Literature Review.”

¹² Lilian Lih Rong Wang, Michael P.H. Liu, & Franzi P.H. Lin, “A Comparative Study of Charity in Four Chinese Societies;” Wenjuan Zheng, Paul Ong, Alycia Cheng, & Karna Wong, “Comparative Philanthropic Literature.”

¹³ Kyle David, “A Historical Survey of Indigenous Chinese Philanthropy, 1550-1953;” Joanna Handlin Smith, *The Art of Doing Good*.

¹⁴ Sarah Mellors & Yimin Lai, “Foreign Philanthropy in China: A History,” GCPI Working Paper #5 (Los Angeles: UCLA Center for Neighborhood Knowledge, 2016)

<https://www.globalchinesephilanthropy.org/gcpi/research/papers/175433>; Zhang, this issue.

¹⁵ See Harper, this issue; Zhu & Jing, this volume.

¹⁶ Kyle David, “A Historical Survey of Indigenous Chinese Philanthropy, 1550-1953;” Wenjuan Zheng, Paul Ong, & Karna Wong, “Comparative Chinese Philanthropy Literature Review,” GCPI Working Paper #1 (Los Angeles: UCLA Center for Neighborhood Knowledge, 2016) <https://www.globalchinesephilanthropy.org/gcpi/research/papers/175443>.

¹⁷ Khun Eng Kuah, *Rebuilding the Ancestral Village: Singaporeans in China* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000); Min Zhou & Xiangyi Li, “Remittances for Collective Consumption and Social

Status Compensation: Variations on Transnational Practices among Chinese Migrants,”

International Migration Review 52(1):4-42, 2018.

¹⁸ Zhang & Huang, this issue.

¹⁹ Zhang et al., 2010.

²⁰ Wenjuan Zheng, Paul Ong, Alycia Cheng, & Karna Wong, “Comparative Philanthropic Literature.”

²¹ Lilian Lih Rong Wang, Michael P.H. Liu, & Franzi P.H. Lin, “A Comparative Study of Charity in Four Chinese Societies.”

²² The World Value Survey data can be downloaded freely via website <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/wvs.jsp>, access on August 10, 2019; also see Zheng et al., this issue.

²³ WGI reports can be downloaded freely via the CAF website is <https://www.cafonline.org/>, access on August 10, 2019.

²⁴ *Forbes* China website <https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbeschina/>, access on August 12, 2019; also see Zhang & Huang, this issue.

²⁵ Lilian Lih Rong Wang, Michael P.H. Liu, & Franzi P.H. Lin, “A Comparative Study of Charity in Four Chinese Societies.” Data can be accessed through application via TSCS website <https://www2.ios.sinica.edu.tw/sc/en/survey.php>, access on August 10, 2019.

²⁶ Lilian Lih Rong Wang, Michael P.H. Liu, & Franzi P.H. Lin, “A Comparative Study of Charity in Four Chinese Societies.”

²⁷ V. Kuo, J. Miao, T. Feng, & M. Hu, *Global Chinese Philanthropy Initiative Report*.

²⁸ V. Kuo, J. Miao, T. Feng, & M. Hu, *Global Chinese Philanthropy Initiative Report*.