

## Private Wealth, Philanthropy, and Social Development: Case Studies from the United States and China

**Francis Barchi**

**Guosheng Deng**

**Chien-Chung Huang**

**Carolyn Isles**

**Juliann Vikse**

Growing income inequality has created excessive barriers to social mobility for the poor. Charitable giving by the wealthy can reduce the societal effects of the income gap by reinvestment in public goods such as education. We apply the CIPP model to investigate the role of philanthropy in advancing educational opportunities in the United States and China, using historical and contemporary cases of individual philanthropists. The findings suggest that the cases reviewed in this study created mechanisms by which to contribute to social development in their respective countries. There are similarities and differences in how these individuals approached education philanthropy. Whereas the cases in the U.S. generally engage in philanthropy at a distance from government, the relationship between private philanthropy and the public sphere in China appears to be more intentionally collaborative.

**Keywords:** Inequality, Philanthropy, Social Development, Wealth

## Background

The nature of the relationship between economic growth and income inequality is a topic of debate among scholars who contend that income inequality is an inevitable consequence of growth and those who, on the other hand, believe that income inequality is the result of the inequitable distribution of opportunities within a population such that only a few can take advantage of the benefits of economic growth (Kuznets, 1955; Piketty, 2014; Stiglitz, 2015). There seems almost universal agreement, however, that where one finds income inequality, one will also find social inequality, and that the cumulative effects of social inequality result in large numbers of people being left behind. Income inequality creates disproportional opportunities for the wealthy and barriers for the poor, resulting in social inequalities in the distribution of public goods such as education, healthcare, and social services (Stiglitz, 2012; United Nations, 2013; Dabla-Norris et al., 2015). Inequalities of opportunity lead to inequality in educational attainment, social positions, and social mobility (Breen & Johnson, 2005).

Economic inequality in the U.S. has attracted increasing attention within the past decade. In the U.S. income inequality is approaching levels not seen since the Great Depression (Saez & Zucman, 2014; Hatch & Rigby, 2015). In the 1970's the Gini Coefficient was roughly 0.391. It continued to rise to 0.481 in 2013, the highest level in American history (Noss, 2014). Likewise, income inequality has increased substantially in China. The Gini coefficient in China was roughly 0.30 between 1970 and 1979, but started to increase after 1979 due to economic reforms, reaching 0.40 by 1995, 0.50 by 2005, and approximately 0.55 in 2012 (Shi, Li, Sato, & Sicular, 2013; Xie & Zhou, 2014).

When examining financial inequality it is crucial to consider the opportunity gap. Unequal distribution of wealth shifts the standards of society, creating disproportionate opportunities for those with substantial wealth, and thereby further increasing social inequality (Stiglitz, 2012; Stiglitz, 2015; United Nations, 2013). Public-sector initiatives can mitigate the effects of social inequalities through tax levies, public policies, and the direct provision of services (Stiglitz, 2015). An alternative, or in some countries a complement, to these initiatives is private philanthropy, which can, either directly through service provision or indirectly through support for service agencies and NGOs, distribute public goods that promote equal access to economic opportunity and social mobility (Acs, 2013).

In both China and the U.S., private wealth has played a positive role in ameliorating opportunity inequality. Between 1995 and 2012, combined assets of grant-making foundations in the U.S. rose from \$272 billion to \$625 billion (Urban Institute, 2012). In 2014 charitable giving amounted to over 358 billion dollars in the U.S.; 72% came from individuals, compared to 15% from foundations, 8% from bequests, and 5% from corporations (Giving USA, 2015). Likewise, the charitable giving in China has grown substantially over the past decade, from 10 billion RMB in 2006, 22 billion RMB in 2007, and jumped to 107 billion RMB in 2008, largely due to the Wenchuan earthquake in May 2008 (China Philanthropy Times, 2008). The total giving reduced to 54 billion RMB in 2009, but then steadily increased over time and was at 104 billion RMB in 2014 (China Charity Information Center, 2015). The emergence of a philanthropic sector in China has been attributed variously to government attitudes, economic development, recent charity laws and regulations, and the compel-

ling draw of several major national disasters (Shieh & Deng, 2011; Huang et al., 2013; Deng, 2014; Deng, 2015b).

## Educational philanthropy in the United States

In 1643 Harvard College officials composed a publicity tract called "New England's First Fruits," in which they described their longing for an institution—a "first flower in the wilderness"—to advance and perpetuate learning among current and future generations. Embedded in early documents such as this are the tenets of early American philanthropy: private giving in conjunction with public support, accountability, and reciprocity (Acs, 2013; Thelin & Trollinger, 2014). Philanthropy in the American colonies often took the form of in-kind donations, such as gifted land, legal services, or facility construction (Thelin & Trollinger). In many cases donations promoted the education, and subsequently the projected salvation, of the poor and marginalized (Acs, 2013; Thelin & Trollinger, 2014).

Modern philanthropic foundations emerged a century later, in the mid-nineteenth century, as the Industrial Revolution provided opportunities for entrepreneurs to amass private fortunes. Early foundations, such as those established by industrialists Andrew Carnegie in 1902 and John D. Rockefeller in 1913, often highlighted educational inequities and funded liberal initiatives to expand access to various forms of education (Watkins, 2001).

Research has highlighted the growth and transformation of philanthropic involvement in education policy and practice over the last several decades (Ball, 2008; Reckhow & Snyder, 2014). While the Carnegie and Rockefeller institutions were rooted in traditional concepts of public obligation, a newer brand of "venture philanthropy" emphasizes privatization and social investment (Saltman, 2010).

Foundations continue to support a wide range of initiatives aimed at improving educational equality, and now often do so by leveraging social and political mechanisms to advance change (Quinn et al., 2014). Currently, private foundations in the U.S. alone spend approximately \$2 billion annually on education-related initiatives (Reckhow & Snyder, 2014). In 2012 a majority (85.2%) of wealthy households donated to education related causes. Amongst these households, 73% donated to higher education and 59% to K-12 education. Another study found that 56% of wealthy households identified education as the most important current policy issue (U. S. Trust, 2014). Fifty percent of all donated funds in 2013 benefitted general education and higher education initiatives (U. S. Trust, 2014).

### Educational philanthropy in China

Philanthropic development in China bears the indelible imprint of traditional Chinese culture and philosophy. Confucianism promotes the cultivation of virtue and encompasses three core values: benevolence (*ren*), righteousness (*yi*), and ritual (*li*). These are intrinsically linked to people's giving behavior in China. Confucianism prompts its followers to maintain a constant awareness of others' hardships and their own social responsibility to participate in the collective solving of problems. Philanthropy in China is rooted in the virtues of *ren* and *yi*, and the ensuing resurgence of social norms around promoting the public good is a manifestation of *li* (Deng, 2015a).

While Western philanthropy continues to be dominated by private efforts, government has played a dominant role in modern Chinese philanthropy (Deng, 2015a; Wang et al., 2015). For thousands of years China was an agricultural society, and natu-

ral disasters and disease epidemics caused significant damage and loss of life. In these situations, the government often turned to local wealthy landowners and Confucian scholars to assist in providing supplemental financial assistance and disaster relief services. This form of community-based philanthropy became regarded as both a moral obligation and a status symbol among the gentry (Kim, 2009; Deng, 2015a). Education assistance became an increasing focus during the Ming and Qing dynasties. Wealthy elites provided education subsidies to poor children and generously awarded high achievers (Deng, 2015a).

In the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the Western model of modern philanthropy began to impact the structure and objectives of philanthropy in China. The Rockefeller Foundation established the China Medical Board in 1914, followed by the Peking Union Medical College in 1919, with the purpose of training medical professionals. The role of educational philanthropy in China continued to grow as dramatic social and economic development in the country generated a greater demand for trained professionals (Deng, 2015a; Wang et al., 2015).

The wealthy continue to play an important role in philanthropy and NGO development in China today, particularly in education (Clark & Huang, 2015; Deng, 2015b; 2015 Hurun Report, 2015). In 2014, 27% of all donations benefitted educational initiatives, followed by public interests (20%), disaster relief (19%), poverty (11%), and miscellaneous (23%) (Hurun Report, 2015). Within the field of education, donations largely go toward infrastructure and scholarship funding (Hurun Report, 2015).

### Methodology

This paper used a case study approach to examine how wealthy individuals in the United States and China

have used their resources to benefit social development, particularly in the sphere of education, and the institutions they have established to carry out their philanthropic activities. It focuses on four U.S. and four Chinese philanthropists, with two historical cases and two contemporary cases from each country. Literature reviews were used to construct an historical perspective on philanthropy in each country and develop the four historical case studies. The contemporary case studies were developed using a combination of literature review as well as in-person, in-depth interviews with the philanthropists or representatives of their philanthropic institutions.

Case analyses of both historical and contemporary philanthropists used as their conceptual framework the CIPP model, developed by Shufflebeam and colleagues (1983) to evaluate educational and human service programs. The model enabled the examination of the philanthropic 'styles' of wealthy individuals according to context, programmatic inputs, methods and processes, and the products and outcomes of these activities (Shufflebeam, 1983).

Notable historical cases who had engaged in educational philanthropy were selected, including Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller from the United States, and Xiling Xiong and Jian Zhang from China. For the contemporary cases, we selected two out of the top four charitable donors in the United States in 2014 (Forbes, 2015a) who had focused on educational giving: Bill Gates and Michael Bloomberg. For the Chinese sample we selected the two Chinese members of the Synergos Institute Global Philanthropists Circle (GPC) who focus on educational philanthropy. Founded in 2001 by Peggy Dulany and her father, David Rockefeller, the GPC is a dynamic network of leading philanthropic families from across the world committed to fighting

global poverty and social injustice. The GPC uses multiple selection criteria to ensure that its members are philanthropic leaders in the countries in which they reside, and are committed to reducing poverty and promoting social justice (Synergos, 2015).

## Historical Cases

### Andrew Carnegie

Born in 1835, Andrew Carnegie was an industrialist who led the expansion of the steel industry in the late 1800s, and is often considered the father of American philanthropy. Carnegie was raised in a Scottish family, who believed that continued hard work was the key to success. He began his career as a teenager, and took a book-keeping position with the Pennsylvania Railroad, where he worked his way up to become the superintendent of the company's western division. In 1856, Carnegie purchased \$600 worth of stock in the Adams Express Company, a freight and cargo transport business. He continued to invest in transport companies. Within several years, Carnegie earned several times his salary annually. At this time, he left his position at the Pennsylvania Railroad and focused on his investments. In 1872, Carnegie organized a partnership to establish a steel manufacturing firm titled Carnegie, McCandless and Company (the firm was soon re-named Carnegie Steel, Ltd). In 1901, Carnegie sold his company to businessman J.P. Morgan for \$480 million. He retired at this point, and focused solely on philanthropy (Nasaw, 2006; Wall, 1970).

In *Triumphant Democracy* Andrew Carnegie famously wrote, "Upon no foundation but that of popular education can man erect the structure of an enduring civilization" (1886). Several years later, in an article for the *North American Review* (1889) he proposed that the solution for growing economic inequality was for the wealthy to redi-

tribute their surplus wealth responsibly and carefully (Nasaw, 2006; Wall, 1970).

Over the course of his lifetime, Andrew Carnegie donated \$350 million, over 90% of his wealth and the equivalent of several billion dollars by today's standards (Carnegie Corporation of New York, n.d.). In the area of education, Carnegie donated \$2 million in 1901 to start Carnegie Technical Schools which has since grown to become today's Carnegie Mellon University in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. In founding the technical school, Carnegie hoped to make vocational training available to children of the working-class citizens of Pittsburgh, many of whom worked in Carnegie's steel mills. Carnegie actively confronted the role that race played in economic inequality, and incorporated these views into his philanthropic endeavors. He adamantly supported educational opportunities for African Americans (Carnegie Corporation of New York, n.d.; Nasaw, 2006).

In 1905, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching was established to provide retiring pensions to university teachers. Later, the Foundation became involved in researching and advocating for education policies and standards. In 1911, at the age of 76, Carnegie established the Carnegie Corporation of New York, at the time was the largest philanthropic trust ever established. It devoted funding to promoting international peace and advancing education and knowledge, primarily in the United States (Carnegie Corporation of New York, n.d.). Toward the end of Carnegie's lifetime, the Corporation created the Chinese Educational Commission, which supported Chinese students studying in the U.S.; undertook the Americanization Studies project in 1918, focused on expanding educational opportunities for immigrants (Carnegie Corporation of New York,

n.d.; Nasaw, 2006).

In 2013, the Carnegie Corporation of New York reported assets of \$3 billion, ranked 24<sup>th</sup> in size among foundations in the United States, and distributed \$130 million in grants that year (Foundation Center, n.d.). Currently, the Corporation's national goals are focused on developing educational and economic opportunities for historically underserved populations, particularly within the spheres of secondary and higher education (Carnegie Corporation of New York, n.d.). Its urban and higher education initiatives seek to generate change through supporting the adoption of common assessments and proficiency standards; strengthening support for teachers and school leaders; supporting innovative school designs; and building public receptivity to policy implementation.

### John D. Rockefeller

John D. Rockefeller, Sr., was born in 1837. At age 16 he began his career in Cleveland, Ohio, taking a job as an assistant bookkeeper for commission merchants and produce shippers Hewitt & Tuttle. In 1859, months shy of his 20<sup>th</sup> birthday, Rockefeller left Hewitt & Tuttle and established a wholesale grain and grocery business with his neighbor, Maurice Clark. The business was successful in its early stages and boomed during the Civil War (Chernow, 1998). In 1863, Rockefeller began his involvement in the oil industry. He and his grocery business partners built an oil refinery in Cleveland, which they named Rockefeller & Samuels. He devoted the rest of his career to oil. Rockefeller & Samuels met with success, and in 1870 Rockefeller converted the business into a joint-stock corporation, the Standard Oil Company of Ohio. This corporation continued to grow and eventually generated the greater part of Rockefeller's wealth. By 1914 Rockefeller's net worth was over \$1 billion, equivalent to \$23.5 billion in 2015. This made him

the world's first billionaire (Chernow, 1998; Ernst, 1994). He established the foundation which bears his name in 1913 to consolidate and administer his philanthropic activities.

As a philanthropist Rockefeller was chiefly interested in supporting education and scientific research. He gave extensively to a number of colleges, including the University of Chicago, Denison University, and Spelman College. He also financially supported the United Negro College Fund (UNCF), which concurrently lent fiscal credibility and drew lasting support to that organization (Geiger, 2002).

The Rockefeller Foundation made contributions totaling \$129 million to the General Education Board (GEB), which it had established in 1903 with Frederick T. Gates to improve education and reduce educational inequality in the U.S. At the time this constituted the largest ever donation to a philanthropic organization. The GEB, which was chartered by an act of Congress, surveyed black and white schools across the southern U.S. and, based on its findings, launched a funding campaign to support black southern colleges. It also distributed \$94 million to 25 medical schools between 1913 and 1929, transforming medical education, and offered grants for endowments, programs, scholarships and fellowships across the U.S. (Chernow, 1998; Ernst, 1994).

In 1914, the China Medical Board (CMB) was established and became one of the first operating divisions of the Rockefeller Foundation. The primary mission of the CMB was to develop modern medicine in China. Over the course of six years the CMB used funds from the Rockefeller Foundation to establish the Peking Union Medical College (PUMC) in Beijing in 1919. The institution cost roughly \$8 million and the 313 doctors who graduated between 1924 and 1943 were offered grants to continue their medical re-

search abroad. Many of these graduates returned to China and went on to become leaders in medical administration, teaching, and research (The Rockefeller Archives, n.d.).

In total, Rockefeller donated approximately \$540 million before his death in 1937. Through his philanthropy Rockefeller created two of the world's most prominent public health research universities, engaged in extensive poverty relief across the American South, developed educational opportunities for African Americans, founded the University of Chicago, drastically transformed medical research and medical training in both the United States and China, and improved public health worldwide (Chernow, 1998).

#### *Xiling Xiong*

Xiling Xiong was born in 1870 to an affluent family in southern China and became a Xiucai Scholar (equivalent to a bachelor's degree) at age 14. At 27, he rose to the level of Jinshi Scholar, the highest academic achievement during the Qing Dynasty. Xiong was a reformist, and his views garnered little support from the government. In 1913, he was appointed by Shikai Yuan, recently elected Provisional President of the Republic of China, as the Premier and Finance Minister. Following Yuan's restoration of the emperorship in 1915, Xiong resigned from office and chose to focus on charity work and education.

In 1920, Xiong established the Xiangshan Orphanage in Beijing, which provided schooling and child care for orphans who had survived war and natural disaster. This project reflected Xiong's philanthropic values, rooted in supporting those who helped themselves. Xiong believed that education could develop minds and produce valuable long-term skills, compared to temporary monetary assistance (Chow, 2008). The Xiangshan Orphanage had on-site child care, as well as a school

providing kindergarten through college education. Xiong believed in the importance of virtue and religion and incorporated both into the Orphanage environment. He displayed images of Confucius, Buddha, and Jesus and asked the children to worship these figures equally. He also placed great importance on developing marketable skills. The orphanage was designed to help children realize their potential and independence. Over six thousand children resided at the Xiangshan Orphanage between 1920 and the late 1940s, many of whom became skilled, well-adjusted members of society (Liu, 2013). In 1932, Xiong donated all of his remaining wealth, \$270,000, to charity (Zeng, 2011).

#### *Jian Zhang*

In 1891, at the age of 41, Jian Zhang too had achieved Jinshi Scholar status. He became a high-level government official within the Qing Dynasty, and became involved in light industry. In 1898, he established the Dashen Spinners Mill in Nantong, a highly successful venture. Zhang extended his involvement to other light industries, and eventually established more than 20 companies, most in the Nantong area. Zhang was regarded as the "father of light industry" in China (Zeng, 2011). As Zhang expanded his business, his discovery of a shortage in skilled labor, prompted his founding of training schools, an investment he continued throughout his lifetime. In 1902, he used profits from the Spinners Mill and solicited donations to found China's first teacher training school, Nantong Normal College. Zhang went on to establish the Fudan School in 1905 and the Spinner Vocational School in 1912.

Zhang was an active philanthropist, and his philanthropic view was largely based on the Confucian concept of *ren* or benevolence (Zeng, 2011). He used his business profits and personal wealth to support his philan-

thropic ventures. In responding to populations impacted by war and natural disaster, Zhang preferred to implement work and training programs, rather than provide monetary aid. He developed a river reconstruction project to support victims of flooding. Zhang believed that people with disabilities, in particular, would benefit from education and vocational training. He established the School for Deaf and Blind Children, and advocated extensively for children, seniors and other vulnerable populations. Zhang donated over CNY \$1.5 million to charity throughout his life (Zeng, 2011).

## Contemporary Cases

### Bill Gates

Bill Gates, the former chairman and co-founder of Microsoft, is one of the most successful businessmen in the United States. Gates, along with co-founder Paul Allen, established Microsoft in 1975. He remained the CEO of Microsoft until 2000, then served as Chief Software Architect until 2008 and as Chairman of the Board of Directors until 2014. At that time, Gates stepped down in order to dedicate his time to philanthropy (Curtis, 2014). As of September, 2015, Gates' net worth stood at \$76.5 billion, making him the wealthiest person in America at that time (Forbes, 2015b).

In 2000, Bill Gates and his wife, Melinda, established the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (the Gates Foundation) with the aim of providing assistance to the world's underserved communities. The foundation focuses primarily on health, economic development, and education—and policy and advocacy within each of these spheres (The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, n.d.). In 2013, the Foundation's assets totaled \$41 billion, making it the largest foundation in the United States. It operates programs in over 100 countries, and in 2013 alone,

awarded more than \$3.3 billion in grants (Foundation Center, n.d.; The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, n.d.). This is more than any other philanthropic foundation in the United States (Foundation Center, n.d.).

One of the Foundation's earliest projects, beginning in 1997, involved funding free Internet access in libraries in the U.S. and abroad. Since that time the Foundation has partnered with governments and both private and public partners to encourage innovation in public libraries, train leaders, and advocate for supportive policies as part of this Global Libraries project (The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, n.d.). Most recently it has provided grants to literacy organization Worldreader, to pilot the use of mobile devices and Kindles in libraries across Kenya, and to the Southeastern Library Network (SOLINET), to assist libraries on the Gulf Coast in the wake of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita (The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, n.d.).

The Foundation's other U.S. education initiatives are rooted in the goal of promoting access to high-quality K-12 and post-secondary education for all students. Overall, its strategy is to better prepare K-12 students for college success, and at the same time to significantly increase the number of young people pursuing post-secondary education "with labor-market value" (The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, n.d.). Through its College-Ready Education program the Foundation advocates for policies that align K-12 standards and college-level course expectations, and supports programs that reinforce teacher-student connections. Its second program, Post-secondary Success, seeks to increase college completion rates among low-income youth by investing in innovations to improve colleges' productivity and performance and reduce costs (The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, n.d.).

The Foundation consistently invests in innovative programming that provides teachers the "goals, tools, and skills they need" to strengthen their bonds with students (The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, n.d.). For instance, in 2002, the average graduation rate among public high schools in New York City was 50.8%, compared to the national average of 71% (Greene & Winters, 2005). That year the Foundation partnered with the New York City Department of Education to support the development of 67 new high schools, as part of the city's overall plan to create 200 effective and rigorous small high schools in economically struggling communities (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 2003). The "small schools of choice initiative" ultimately cost \$51.2 million and was designed to prepare underserved students for success in a demanding U.S. economy. The grant was distributed through seven intermediary organizations (Bishop & Green, 2009). In addition to providing infrastructure funding for the project, the Gates Foundation also contributed policy guidance and research support (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 2003; Bloom, Thompson, & Unterman, 2010).

According to an evaluation completed by the American Institutes for Research, the initiative was, in many ways, successful. Over 80% of the new small schools of choice (SSCs) had attendance rates higher than district averages. Students in the new schools also made more significant progress in ELA (English and Language Arts). By 2008, the graduation rate for SSCs rose to 73%, which was roughly 25% more than the schools they had replaced (Bishop & Green, 2009). Additionally, students in the new schools reported more engagement in their studies and higher aspirations for their futures (Bloom, Thompson, & Unterman, 2010). The achievements were not as significant as the stakeholders had

hoped, however. In the Gates Foundation 2009 annual letter, Bill Gates discussed the progress of the SSC initiative and expressed that high school graduation rates had fallen short of their targets. He argued that some schools had not taken bold enough steps to change the learning culture, and pointed out that the SSC initiative had less success attempting to change existing schools than it had in helping to create new schools (Gates, 2009).

### *Michael Bloomberg*

Michael Bloomberg received a bachelor's of arts degree from Johns Hopkins University in 1964, and obtained a master's degree on business administration from Harvard Business School in 1966. Bloomberg began working on Wall Street in an entry-level position at Salomon Brothers investment bank in 1966, and became a general partner at Salomon Brothers in 1973. In 1982, he established his own financial news and information company, Bloomberg LP (Bloomberg, 2001; Purnick, 2010). In 2002, he ran for Mayor of New York City, which began his 12-year tenure in that office. After completing his third and final term as Mayor of New York City in 2014, Bloomberg resumed his position as CEO of Bloomberg, LP. As of September, 2015, his net worth was \$38.8 billion, the eighth wealthiest person in America (Forbes, 2015b). Alongside his business and political accomplishments, Bloomberg is known for his philanthropic efforts. As of 2013, he had donated over \$3 billion to a variety of causes and organizations.

Bloomberg established his philanthropic foundation, The Bloomberg Family Foundation (now Bloomberg Philanthropies), in 2006. At that time he pledged to donate at least one half of his total wealth to philanthropy (Foundation Center, 2015). Bloomberg Philanthropies has several key focus areas, including public health, environment, education, government inno-

vation, and arts and culture. In 2013, the foundation was the 12<sup>th</sup> largest in the country, with assets totaling \$5.4 billion and having distributed \$204 million in grants (Foundation Center, n.d.).

Bloomberg's support of education initiatives has generally focused on higher education. In 2013, he pledged \$350 million to his alma mater, which brought his total contributions to over \$1 billion and made Bloomberg the most generous living donor of any U.S. educational institution (Barbaro, 2013). Bloomberg's contributions to Johns Hopkins University were transformational. The university has used his donations to erect a physics building, children's hospital, stem-cell research institute, malaria institute and library wing, and commission art. The contribution underwrites 20% of all needs-based undergraduate financial aid grants, within the last several years. In an interview with *The New York Times*, Bloomberg stated that he had announced his contributions to Johns Hopkins publicly because he wanted to encourage charitable giving for education. He believed that society was defunding education, but that philanthropy could help to turn this around (Barbaro, 2013).

In 2014, Bloomberg Philanthropies established "Collegepoint," an initiative designed to help high-achieving, low- and moderate- income students enroll in top colleges and universities (Bloomberg Philanthropies, 2015). When the initiative was designed, a mere one-third of students in this group were enrolled in the top 256 colleges and universities in the U.S., despite their seeming qualifications (Bloomberg Philanthropies, 2014). The initial goal of Collegepoint was to raise that statistic to one half. Over a period of two years, the foundation pledged \$10 million to support well-trained college advisors, online content for prospective students, research evaluat-

ing the impact of the intervention, a task force at the Aspen Institute to provide guidance, and shared technology tools to strengthen relationships between students and advisors (Bloomberg Philanthropies, 2014).

In addition to partnering with programs that encourage student success, Bloomberg Philanthropies has also funded programs that support teachers and educational leaders. In recent years, the foundation has partnered with America Achieves to establish a number of fellowship opportunities for educators to collaborate, and thereby enhance student achievement. Along with several partner organizations, Bloomberg Philanthropies developed a pilot program to help US schools compare their performance with schools across the world (Bloomberg Philanthropies, 2014 & 2015).

### *Dezhi Lu*

In the early 1990's Dezhi Lu worked as director of the Office of Policy Studies for the Hunan Communist Party Committee. Lu became involved in the development of a state-owned enterprise, and went on to become the general manager in the mid-1990s. His role changed once more in the early 2000s, when he moved into private business (Luo, 2015). Since that time Lu has met with great success as an investor in the insurance, finance, energy, commodities, agriculture and travel industries. He now sits on the boards of a number of corporations, including Tehua Investment, Huan Property Insurance, and Hongkang Life Insurance. In 2014 alone, Lu donated roughly ¥70 Million RMB to support philanthropy. The sum of his contributions is over ¥500 million RMB.

Lu earned a Doctorate of Ethics from Hunan Normal University, and has written and lectured extensively on the nature of capital, and the relationships among capital, philanthropy, and sharing (Luo, 2015). Based on his academic background and business

experience, Lu has recently devoted himself to the theoretical and practical exploration of philanthropy, particularly modern Chinese philanthropy. He has published several books on capital, philanthropy, and collective sharing. Lu highlights the importance of what he terms the “spirit of capital” and “collective sharing of capital”.

In 2008, Lu co-founded the Huamin Charity Foundation. With an endowment of ¥200 million RMB, it was the largest private foundation in China at that time. In 2012, the Foundation Association in China ranked Huamin Foundation amongst the top Chinese foundations. The Huamin Foundation allotted roughly \$25 million RMB to support these programs in 2013, and was ranked fifth among private foundations in China (Huamin Foundation, 2013; China Foundation Center, n.d.). Its primary focus is on education, as Lu considers education the most important means to connect the past, present, and future.

In the 2000s, high unemployment rates among low-income college graduates became a serious social problem in China (Lai, Tian, & Meng, 2011). In response, the Huamin Foundation developed education and youth outreach programs, most notably the Huamin Employment Assistance Project (HEAP) in 2008. This project aimed to reduce employment barriers and redress education inequality. The foundation partnered with 20 higher education institutions to provide financial assistance and training workshops for 100 students at each institution. In 2009, the program adapted its training workshops to meet changing needs, and, in 2010 began providing internship opportunities. Over time, HEAP has become increasingly comprehensive. By 2014, it had extended its reach to 50 institutions across 29 provinces, and provided 5,000 students with financial assistance, training, and personalized support. The Huamin Char-

ity Foundation has contributed ¥136 million RMB to support HEAP overall, which has provided financial assistance to 30,160 students, and training and employment support to 65,000 students, between 2008 and 2014. In 2014, after reviewing 470 programs, China’s Department of Civil Affairs designated nineteen programs as models; HEAP was the only one selected from a private foundation (Huamin Foundation, 2015). To ensure the effectiveness of its programs, including HEAP, the foundation consistently engages in needs assessment, evaluation, and annual reviews.

The Huamin Charity Foundation has also awarded millions of dollars to support research on philanthropy at universities in China and abroad, including Tsinghua University, Beijing Normal University, Renmin University, San Yen-Sen University, and Rutgers University. It also sponsors international conferences and events to promote research on philanthropy.

Lu’s expressed goal is to utilize modern philanthropy to collectively share the benefits of capital. The Huamin Charity Foundation is Lu’s platform by which he hopes to achieve this goal. Lu believes that philanthropy is key to achieving modernization in China, as it meaningfully engages a growing civil society. Philanthropy has the power to inspire compassion and shared responsibility among the Chinese public, which is especially important in a society that has historically taken its cues from government. Lu has also emphasized that entrepreneurs maintain awareness of their moral responsibility as they accumulate wealth, and allow the spirit of capital and collective sharing to guide their actions.

#### **Bing Wang**

Bing Wang earned a bachelor's degree in economics from Capital University of Economics and Business in 1991, followed by an EMBA from Chi-

na Europe International Business School (CEIBS) in 2003. Wang began investing in the mid 1990s, and was among the first to be involved in the securities market in China. Wang established Zhongdingxin Financial Advisors in 1994. In 2000 he founded Dingtian Asset Management, where he is currently the Chairman of the Board of Directors. He also serves on the boards for TCL, Huiyuan, Huayi, Lianhua, Tongwei, and Wantong.

Wang and his partners had been involved in philanthropy prior to 2004. However, they were dissatisfied with the lack of transparency and accountability they encountered at that time. Following the Chinese government’s release of their Foundation Regulations policy in 2004, Wang teamed up with 30 entrepreneurs to establish the Ai You Foundation and served as the Board Chairperson. This was one of the first private foundations created by entrepreneurs in China. As the policy environment changed, Wang and his fellow entrepreneurs, who had previously donated to both public and private foundations, found that philanthropy could be used as a vehicle to share their wealth with society. In 2014 the Ai You Foundation had assets totaling ¥233 million. The foundation received approximately ¥211 million in donations, and allocated ¥162 million for grants and programs in 2014 (Ai You Foundation, 2015).

The Ai You Foundation initially focused on providing medical and health care for low-income children. The Ai You Young Heart Project (AYYHP) was launched in 2006 to fund surgeries for low-income children with congenital heart disease. In addition to financial support, Ai You continues to partner with more than 60 hospitals to ensure that the surgeries are performed safely and effectively. In 2014 AYYHP provided support to 5,859 children and their families. Since its creation the program has provided

assistance to 26,609 children, making it the world's largest surgical treatment project for low-income children with CHD (Ai You Foundation, 2015). In 2011, Ai You extended its focus to children with Leukemia, and launched the Ai You Angel Project (AYAP) to support orphaned and low-income children obtain the care they needed. Within three years AYAP had partnered with 10 hospitals and provided medical assistance to 933 children. The accumulated expenditures for AYAP is ¥2,700 million RMB over time (Ai You Foundation, 2015). The foundation also developed the Ai You Reborn Project (AYRP) in 2011, which provides medical care to orphans, and the Ai You Hekang Rehab Center to provide services to children with autism (Ai You Foundation, 2015).

In addition to medical care, Ai You utilizes venture philanthropy to strengthen charitable organizations in China. In 2013, Ai You launched Ai You Philanthropy+ (AYP+) to support charitable organizations with strong potential for social impact. The program provides organizations with comprehensive training and resources, including strategic guidance, branding, financial support and management, IT, and human resource management. It also utilizes its own network on organizations' behalf. There are five full-time staff members, each of whom has venture capital investment experience. Since 2013 AYP+ has received over 1,000 applications and has selected 10 and 20 organizations to support in 2013 and 2014, respectively. The staff designs an individualized strategy and development plan for each organization, depending on its stage of development. They emphasize performance and evaluation, while paying close attention to business planning, measurable results, financial accountability, and sound management. The goal is to guide each organization toward results-oriented perfor-

mance. Although AYP+ is still in its early stages, it shows great promise. The Institute of Public and Environmental Affairs (IPEA), one of its 2013 grantees, had its funding and staff double over the course of one year. Part of their strategy had been to integrate cloud computing resources through Alibaba, and has facilitated IPEA to receive a ¥20 million donation from the Alashan SEE Ecological Association.

Wang and his partners insist on every project including a needs assessment, expert implementation, and evaluation. Additionally, they have expanded their focus to include medical research and political advocacy. It is their hope that enhanced research will help to provide clearer understanding of diseases, thus allowing for improved prevention and intervention efforts. The foundation actively supports policy changes based on their experiences working with various medical assistance projects. For instance, they have advocated for reformed health insurance reimbursement procedures to reduce the financial burden on needy families. Although Wang does not believe that philanthropy can replace government's role in social welfare, he believes that philanthropy has the ability to reduce inequality in China, and enhance social stability and functioning. He emphasizes the importance of an innovative philanthropic approach, on improving social development.

### Discussion

This study focused on philanthropists in the United States and China in an effort to ascertain similarities and differences in educational philanthropy between countries and across time. Table 1 summarizes the CIPP model of contemporary cases addressed in this paper, with a focus on modern educational philanthropy.

With respect to the context, there

are several key characteristics that connect these cases. Each individual we studied achieved enormous personal and professional success, and accumulated tremendous wealth over his lifetime. Each leveraged this success to improve society, and promote social and economic development, through philanthropy. All, too, expressed a perceived obligation to share the benefits of wealth with underserved communities. They came to understand that personal wealth, reputation, influence and business acumen were powerful tools with which they could benefit their respective societies. While each philanthropist supported multiple causes, all viewed education as an important means to reduce social inequality and held that insufficient resources are allocated toward this end.

The eight men studied also differed in their ideological approaches to philanthropy and to economic inequality. Certainly, disparate cultural and historical contexts played a role in shaping their philosophies. Carnegie and Rockefeller were raised in working class families, and both emphasized in their writings the value of hard work and perseverance. On the heels of America's Gilded Age, Carnegie and Rockefeller advocated for a new philosophy of giving, which obliged elites to reinvest their Industrial Revolution wealth back into society (Link & Link, 2012). Their views of inequality were not entirely negative. Rockefeller once compared the growth of large business to the "survival of the fittest" (Hofstadter, 1944), and in "The Gospel of Wealth" Carnegie posited that inequality was inevitable, and perhaps even beneficial--"much better this great irregularity than universal squalor" (1889). Certainly Xiang and Zhang, the historical Chinese philanthropists profiled, were both influenced to some degree by Confucianism and the moral climate of their time. Zhang in particular advocated for educational reforms,

too, as a pragmatic means to strengthen his nation during a time of failing economic and foreign policy (Shao, 2004). Realizing that new schools would ultimately prepare a new generation of Chinese leaders for the modern economy and global affairs, Zhang became an emblem of “force and progress” (Shao, 2004).

Reviewing these case studies also highlights the disparate evolution of public and private philanthropy in the U.S. and China. In the U.S. social welfare had its roots in private and religious traditions. Carnegie and Rockefeller pioneered the development of large-scale private foundations following their careers in the private sector. Bloomberg and Gates carried on this tradition of private philanthropy, while concurrently developing innovative public-private partnerships to promote their efforts. Whereas philanthropy in the U.S. continues to operate at a distance from government, and enjoys a relationship that is sometimes grounded in shared values and goals, the relationship between private philanthropy in China and state-provided public welfare appears to be more intentionally collaborative. The Chinese philanthropists studied also exhibited stronger links to the public sphere. Xiong, Zhang and Lu, while entrepreneurs, also served as high-level government officials. Wang did not work for the government, but given the government’s tight regulation of philanthropy he determined to wait on new policy developments before moving forward with his philanthropic vision. Lu has emphasized the importance of Chinese philanthropy embracing its unique structure, based on Chinese cultural values and mode of government.

The philanthropists we studied also differed in their process. Historically, particularly in the case of the Americans, foundations were established long after the trajectory of chari-

table giving was established and largely to maintain and manage a legacy of giving. Carnegie and Rockefeller established foundations later in life, after decades of donations and programmatic investment. Both men preferred to donate large sums to institutions and support those leaders in carrying out their foundations’ vision. Instilled with intense religious conviction, and raised in a climate of economic insecurity, Rockefeller held that the best mode of philanthropy was to cure evils at their source through large, strategic donations (Chernow, 1998). Alternatively, Xiong and Zhang pursued their philanthropic visions mid-career, and more closely engaged with the philanthropic projects they supported. Each founded schools and training programs that they and their staff directly managed and administered. Modern philanthropists in both China and the U.S. have pursued a balance between these methods. One common trend is that, like Xiong and Zhang, each contemporary philanthropist established his foundation mid-career as a vehicle for effecting change and managing giving—in contrast to their historical counterparts.

In the product dimension as well, each focuses on a different set of targets. While Gates concentrates on academic achievement among high school students, for instance, Lu seeks to increase employment prospects for low-income college students. Each discussed philanthropist has also taken a different approach to advancing the programs and services he supports. For example, Bloomberg provides grants to support the initiatives that fit his goals, while Wang engages in venture philanthropy to implement programs.

While engagement with the public sector certainly looks different in each country, philanthropists in both the U.S. and China have provided a greater level of direction over the life-course

of their philanthropic activities, and been more involved in the systems and policies relating to their endeavors, than their respective historical counterparts. The largest education foundations in the U.S., including those led by Gates and Bloomberg, increasingly support nation-level advocacy organizations, as well as “jurisdictional challenger” organizations that compete with public sector institutions (Reckhow & Snyder, 2014). Lu and Wang have likewise engaged in policy advocacy and worked with the government to improve program service delivery. In this sense, modern philanthropists have become part of (and in some cases have established) the developing networks and policy communities that enable new forms of social governance within the field of education policy (Ball, 2008).

While individual philanthropists’ efforts have importantly shaped the trajectory of philanthropy in the U.S. and China, tax policy has also played an important role. In the U.S. the Revenue Acts of 1913 and 1917, respectively, established tax exemptions for specific charitable organizations, and individual income tax deductions for charitable donations. One year later, an estate tax deduction for charitable bequests was codified. Between the 1940s and 1960s, subsequent changes to the tax code required the first 990 forms to be filed, established 501(c) status, and raised the limitation on charitable donations to 30% of gross income (Arnsberger et al, 2008). These changes have encouraged charitable donations and facilitated the growth of philanthropy.

Overall, the findings suggest that in both China and the U.S., philanthropy has come to play a stronger role in shaping educational policies and practices than it had in previous generations. While some traditional funders shifted focus away from K-12 and higher education to pre-K and other

sectors in the early 2000s, it is now clear that educational philanthropy is experiencing an important resurgence—one that is “targeted and policy-focused” (Hess & Henig, 2015). This has prompted a global dialogue, and much controversy, around the nature and ethics of philanthropy. That similar trends are evident in both China and the U.S., despite the countries’ dissimilar economic, social and cultural contexts, and despite the entirely disparate beginnings of their respective philanthropic sectors, suggests a convergent quality to modern global philanthropy in an increasingly interconnected world. While their direction is inspired by different factors, philanthropic pursuits are now increasingly coordinated, evidence-based, and actively engaged with both the private and public sectors.

### Conclusion

Economic inequality has drawn considerable concern in recent years. Scholars and experts have proposed different approaches to reducing income inequality, including tax policy reform, creative capitalism, and philanthropy (Piketty, 2014; Clark & Huang, 2015). This paper has investigated the effects of private wealth on reducing income inequality and facilitating educational and social development through philanthropy. Educational philanthropy has the potential to connect past and present generations, enable institutions’ future service, and develop and expand access to an array of opportunities (Thelin & Trollinger, 2014). Thus, when private wealth is invested in education initiatives it can provide expanded access to services and opportunities for social and economic mobility. As more low-to-middle income students gain access to quality, affordable higher education, they will be able to seek higher paying jobs and opportunities for advancement. Over time this may significantly

reduce income inequality (Acs, 2013; Stiglitz, 2015).

The findings suggest that in all eight cases reviewed, wealthy individuals created mechanisms that meaningfully contributed to social development in their respective countries, and during their respective generations. In each case it was evident that large-scale contributions to educational philanthropy fostered social and economic justice. The impacts of philanthropy on educational programs and reforms will likely deepen as philanthropy burgeons in both China and the U.S. As discussed, there are a number of similarities and differences among the contexts, inputs, processes, and products of these eight cases reviewed. Future studies might focus on the specific similarities or differences found in this study to systematically examine philanthropic behaviors or the overall development of philanthropy in the U.S. and China. In short, educational philanthropy holds great promise for reducing opportunity gaps and economic inequality, by providing the key to success for future generations.

Table 1: CIPP Model of Contemporary Cases

	Context	Input	Process	Product
Bill Gates	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Co-Founder of Microsoft.</li> <li>2. Stepped down from all positions at Microsoft for philanthropy in 2014.</li> <li>3. Established Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation in 2000.</li> <li>4. Focuses primarily on health, development, education, and policy and advocacy.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In 2013, the Foundation had assets of \$41 billion, and awarded \$3.3 billion grant, making it the largest foundation in the United States.</li> <li>2. In 2002, started the Small Schools of Choice Initiative (SSCI), designed to prepare underserved students for success in American demanding economy. A \$51-million initiative over time.</li> </ol>	SSCI: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Schools were established in particularly struggling communities.</li> <li>2. Grant was distributed through 7 intermediary organizations.</li> <li>3. Provided policy guidance, and funding for research pertaining to the initiative.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Over 80% of the new small schools of choice had attendance rates higher than district averages.</li> <li>2. Students in the new schools also made progress in ELA (English as a second language).</li> <li>3. By 2008, the graduation rate for SSCs rose to 73%, which was roughly 25% more than the schools they had replaced.</li> </ol>
Michael Bloomberg	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Founder of Bloomberg, LP. and former mayor of New York City.</li> <li>2. As of 2013, had donated over \$3 billion to philanthropy.</li> <li>3. In 2006, established the Bloomberg Philanthropies (BP), emphasizes public health, environment, education, government innovation, and arts and culture.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In 2013, BP had \$5.4 billion assets and distributed \$204 million worth of grants.</li> <li>2. In education, BP focuses on higher education. He donated more than \$1.1 billion to his alma mater, Johns Hopkins University.</li> <li>3. In 2014, BP established Collegepoint, to help enroll high-achieving and low-income students into top universities.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Grants to Johns Hopkins University: allowed the university to create infrastructure for learning and research, and provide financial aid.</li> <li>2. Collegepoint: Since 2014, pledges to donate \$10 million for college advisors, high quality online content for college applicants, and support the technology tools to strengthen relationships between students and advisors.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Grants to Johns Hopkins University: Improve learning environment for students, and provide 20% of all needs-based undergraduate financial aids.</li> <li>2. Collegepoint: The initial goal is to raise that percent of targeted students' enrollment into top universities to half of that population. Currently, the percent was one-third.</li> </ol>
Dezhi Lu	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A successful investor.</li> <li>2. A scholar, with a Doctorate of Ethics.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In 2008, established the Huamin Foundation with an endowment of ¥200 million RMB. Focuses on education, elder care, and youth employment, as well as research on philanthropic theory.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Devote himself to theoretical innovation and practical exploration of philanthropy, particularly a distinct Chinese form of modern philanthropy.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Argue that the positive desire in the development of capital is the spirit of capital. The spirit utilizes capital to serve the majority of the society -- Collective Sharing of Capital.</li> </ol>

	<p>3. Publish books and articles examining the relationship between capital, philanthropy, and collective sharing.</p>	<p>2. In 2014, Lu donated roughly ¥70 Million RMB to support philanthropy. The sum of his contributions is over ¥500 million RMB.</p> <p>3. In 2008, established the Huamin Employment Assistance Project (HEAP) with the goal of reducing employment barriers and education inequality amongst low-income college graduates</p>	<p>2. In 2008, HEAP partnered with colleges to provide financial assistance and training workshops for students. In 2009, HEAP adjusted its training workshops based on individual needs, and has provided internship opportunities since 2010. Over time, HEAP has become a comprehensive program.</p>	<p>2. Contributed ¥136 million RMB to support HEAP, providing financial assistance to 30,160 students, and training and employment support to 65,000 students from 2008 to 2014.</p> <p>3. In 2013, Huamin Foundation allotted roughly \$25 million RMB to support these programs, ranked 5<sup>th</sup> place amongst private foundations in China.</p>
Bing Wang	<p>1. One of first practitioners in securities market in China in 1990s.</p> <p>2. Funded Dingtian Asset Management in 2000.</p>	<p>1. Establish Ai You Foundation in 2004, and served as the chairperson of the board since then. It was one of first private foundations created by entrepreneurs in China.</p> <p>2. In 2014, the foundation had an asset of ¥233 million RMB, received ¥211 million donation, and spent ¥162 million RMB.</p> <p>3. The Foundation focused on health care for low-income children, and capacity building for charitable organizations in China.</p>	<p>1. Health care: Ai You Young Heart Project (AYYHP), launched in 2006, focused on congenital heart diseases (CHD). In 2011, launched projects to support low-income children with Leukemia and autism.</p> <p>2. Educational support and capacity building: In 2013, launched Ai You Philanthropy+ (AYP+), utilizes venture philanthropy to provide support to charitable organizations.</p>	<p>1. Since 2006, AYYHP has provided assistance to 26,609 children, making it the world's largest surgical treatment project for low-income children with CHD.</p> <p>2. Since 2013, AYP+ has supported 30 organizations, and shows great promise. For example, one of 2013 grantees, noticed that both the fund and the number of employees had doubled over the course of one year.</p>

## Reference

- Acs, Z. J. (2013). *Why Philanthropy Matters: How the Wealthy Give, and What It Means for Our Economic Well-Being Hardcover*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Ai You Foundation. (2015). Ai You Foundation Annual Report, 2014. *Ai You Foundation*. China: Beijing.
- Arnsberger, P., Ludlum, M., Riley, M., & Stanton, M. (2008). A history of the tax-exempt sector: An SOI perspective. *Statistics of Income Bulletin*: 105-134.
- Ball, S. J. (2008). *The Education Debate: Policy and Politics in the Twenty-First Century*. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.
- Barbaro, M. (2013). \$1.1 Billion in Thanks from Bloomberg to Johns Hopkins. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from [http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/27/nyregion/at-1-1-billion-bloomberg-is-top-university-donor-in-us.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/27/nyregion/at-1-1-billion-bloomberg-is-top-university-donor-in-us.html?_r=0)
- Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. (2003). \$51 million Grant from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to Support Small Dynamic High Schools to Boost Student Achievement. Seattle, Washington: *Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation*.
- Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. (n.d.). What We Do. Seattle, Washington: *Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation*.
- Bishop, M. & Green, M. (2009). *Philanthrocapitalism: How Giving Can Change the World*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Press.
- Bloom, H.S., Thompson, S. L., & Unterman, R. (2010). Transforming the High School Experience: Executive Summary. Washington, DC: *Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation*.
- Bloomberg, M. (2001). *Bloomberg by Bloomberg*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Bloomberg Philanthropies. (2014). Bloomberg Philanthropies Launches New Initiative to Help High-Achieving, Low- and -Moderate Income Students Apply to and Enroll in Top Colleges and Universities. Retrieved from <http://www.bloomberg.org/press/releases/bloomberg-philanthropies-launches-new-initiative-help-high-achieving-low-moderate-income-students-apply-enroll-top-colleges-universities/>
- Bloomberg Philanthropies. (2015). Enrolling High-Achieving, Low- and Moderate-Income Students into Top Colleges and Universities. Retrieved from <http://www.bloomberg.org/program/education/collegepoint/>
- Breen R., & Jonsson, J. O. (2005). Inequality of opportunity in comparative perspective: Recent research on educational attainment and social mobility. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 31, 223-243.
- Carnegie, A. (1889). *The Gospel of Wealth*. Chicago, Illinois: Applewood Books.
- Carnegie Corporation of New York. (n.d.). Andrew Carnegie's Story. New York, New York: *Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Retrieved from <https://www.carnegie.org/interactives/foundersstory/#/>
- Chernow, R. (1998). *Titan: The Life of John D. Rockefeller, Sr.* Random House LLC.
- China Charity Information Center. (2015). *Giving China 2014*. Retrieved from <http://www.cncf.org.cn/Public/Uploads/user/20150919/1442657103128346.pdf>
- China Foundation Center. (n.d.). Data Base on Foundation Spending. Retrieved from <http://data.foundationcenter.org.cn/data/DataList.aspx>.
- China Philanthropy Times. (2008). The philanthropic structure with 100-billion donation. Retrieved from <http://www.gongyishibao.com/zhuancsdh/special/news1.html>
- Chow, Q. G. (2008). Xiong Xiling's Educational Thinking in Philanthropy. *Hunan Normal University Science Education Journal*, 4, 20-26.
- Clark, M., & Huang, C-C. (2015). Capital and philanthropy: Donations from the wealthy in China and the United States. *The China Nonprofit Review*, 7 (2): 247 – 263.
- Curtis, S. (2014). Gates: A History at Microsoft. London, United Kingdom: *The Telegraph*.
- Dabla-Norris, E., Kochhar, K., Suphaphiphat, N., Ricka, R., & Tsounta, E. (2015). Cause and Consequences of Income Inequality: A Global Perspective. International Monetary Fund.
- Deng, G. (2014). Donations from Wealthy People in China. Distinguished Scholar Lecture Series, Huamin Research Center, School of Social Work, Rutgers University, New Jersey: New Brunswick. October 30.
- (2015a). Introduction to Philanthropy. Shandong, China: Shandong People's Publishing House. (In Chinese).
- (2015b). The influence of elite philanthropy on NGO development in China. *Asian Studies Review*, 39 (4): 554-570.
- Ernst, J. W. (ed.) (1994). *Dear Father, Dear Son: Correspondence of John D. Rockefeller and John D. Rockefeller, Jr.* New York, NY: Fordham University Press.
- Forbes. (2015a). America's 50 Top Givers. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/top-givers/>
- Forbes. (2015b). Forbes 400. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/forbes-400/list/>
- Foundation Center. (n.d.). Top 100 U.S. Foundations by Asset Size. Retrieved from : <http://foundationcenter.org/findfunders/topfunders/top100assets.html>

- Foundation Center. (2015). Profile of Bloomberg Philanthropies. Retrieved from <https://fdo.foundationcenter.org/grantmaker-profile?key=BLOO422>
- Gates, B. (2009). Annual Letter: 2009. Seattle, Washington: *The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation*.
- Geiger, R. L. (2002). *History of Higher Education Annual*. (22). New Jersey: Transaction Publisher.
- Greene, J.P. & Winters, M.A. (2005). Public High School Graduation and College-Readiness Rates: 1991-2002. New York, New York: *Manhattan Institute for Policy Research*.
- Giving USA, (2015). Giving USA 2015 – Annual Report on Philanthropy for the year 2014. Chicago, IL: Giving USA foundation.
- Hatch, M. E., & Rigby, E. (2015). Laboratories of (In)equality? Redistributive Policy and Income Inequality in the American States. *Policy Studies Journal*, 43(2), 163-187.
- Hess, F. M., & Henig, J. R. (2015). *The New Education Philanthropy: Politics, Policy, and Reform*. Boston, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Hofstadter, R. (1944). *Social Darwinism in American thought: 1860-1915*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Huamin Foundation. (2013). Huamin Foundation 2012 Annual Report. Huamin Foudnation. Beijing, China.
- (2015). Huamin Foundation 2014 Annual Report. Huamin Foudnation. Beijing, China.
- Huang, C-C., Deng, G., Wang, Z., & Edwards, R. L. (Eds.) (2013). *China's Nonprofit Sector: Progress and Challenges*. New Jersey: Transaction Publisher.
- Hurun Report. (2015). 2014 Hurun Philanthropy List. Retrived from <http://www.hurun.net/CN/HuList.aspx>
- Kim, N. (2009). River control, merchant philanthropy, and environmental change in nineteenth-century China. *Journal of the Economic & Social History of the Orient*, 52(4/5): 660-694.
- Kuznets, S. (1955). Economic growth and income inequality. *The American Economic Review*, 45:1, 1-28.
- Lai, D., Tian, Y., & Meng, D. (2011). Differences between the employment of higher education students from the cities and the countryside and the fairness of higher education. *Chinese Education and Society*, 44(1), 3-26.
- Link, W. A., & Link, S. J. (2012). *The Gilded Age and Progressive Era: A documentary reader*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Liu, Z. (2013). Charitable thought and practice of Xiong Xiling – Evidence from Xiangshan orphanage. *Heilongjiang Chronicles*, 8, 15.
- Luo, Z. (2015). Dezhi Lu: Collective Sharing of Capital. China Philanthropists. 2015, June Issue. Beijing, China.
- Nasaw, D. (2006). *Andrew Carnegie*. London, United Kingdome: Penguin Press.
- Noss, A. (2014). Household Income: 2013. American Community Survey Briefs. United States Census Bureau. Washington, D.C.
- Quinn, R., Tompkins-Stange, M., & Meyerson, D. (2014). Beyond grant making: Philanthropic foundations as agents of change and institutional entrepreneurs. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43 (6), 950-968.
- Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Purnick, J. (2010). *Mike Bloomberg: Money, Power, Politics*. New York, NY: Public Affairs.
- Reckhow, S., & Snyder, J. W. (2014). The expanding role of philanthropy in education politics. *Education- al Researcher*, 43(4), 186-195.
- The Rockefeller Archives. (n.d.). *Rockefeller Related Organizations: The China Medical Board of New York, INC*. Retrieved from <http://www.rockarch.org/collections/rockorgs/cmbny.php>
- Saez, E., & Zucman, G. (2014). Wealth Inequality in the United States since 1913: Evidence from Capitalized Income Tax Data. NBER Working Paper 20625.
- Saltman, K. (2010) *The Gift of Education: Public Education and Venture Philanthropy*. Basingstroke, United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Synergos. (2015). Global Philanthropists Circle. Retrieved from <http://www.synergos.org/philanthropistscircle/>.
- Shao, Q. (2004). *Culturing modernity: The Nantong model, 1890-1930*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Shi, L., Li, S., Sato, H., & Sicular, T. (2013). *Rising inequality in China: Challenges to a harmonious society*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Shieh, S., & Deng, G. (2011). An emerging civil society: The impact on the 2008 Sichuan earthquake on grassroots associations in China. *The China Journal*, 65: 181-194.
- Shufflebeam, D. L. (1983). *The CIPP model for program evaluation*. In G.F. Madaus, M.S. Scrien, & D. L. Shufflebeam, *Evaluation Models: Viewpoints of Educational and Human Services Evaluation*, vol. 6, pp 117-141.
- Stiglitz, J. (2012). *The Price of Inequality*. New York: Norton.
- (2015). *The Great Divide*. New York: Norton.
- Thelin, J., & Trollinger, R. (2014) *Philanthropy and American Higher Education*. New York, New York: Palgrave MacMillan USA.
- United Nations. (2013). *Inequality Matters: Report of the World So-*

- cial Situation 2013. Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations. New York, USA.
- Urban Institute. (2012). *The nonprofit sector in brief: Public charities, giving, and volunteering, 2012*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- U. S. Trust. (2014). The 2014 U.S. Trust Study of High Net Worth Philanthropy. *Lily Family School of Philanthropy, Indiana University*. Retrieved from <http://www.philanthropy.iupui.edu/files/research/2014ustrustfinalreport.pdf>
- Wall, J.F. (1970). *Andrew Carnegie*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wang, X., Liu, F., Nan, F., Shao, X., & Zhang, X. (2015). Giving in China: An emerging nonprofit sector embedded within a strong state. In P. Wiepking & F. Handy (Eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Philanthropy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.354-368.
- Watkins, W.H. (2001). *The White Architects of Black Education: Ideology and Power in America, 1865-1954*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Xie, Y. & Zhou, X. (2014). Income inequality in today's China. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(19): 6928-2933.
- Zeng, G. L. (2011). Comparison of Zhang Jian and Xiong Xiling in Philanthropy. *Science, Economy, and Society*, 3: 58-63.

華民研究中心  
Huamin Research Center

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey  
School of Social Work  
390 George Street, Room 503  
New Brunswick, NJ 08901  
848-932-7520, ext. 28256  
[socialwork.rutgers.edu/huamin](http://socialwork.rutgers.edu/huamin)