

# 公益

PHILANTHROPIC STUDIES

2015年第1辑 总第5辑

主编 朱健刚 林 猛 | 中山大学中国公益慈善研究院主办

## 社会建设的中国道路

陆 璇 林文漪：社会组织法律意识和契约精神

郭 超：少有人走的道路：搭建非营利治理与民主的桥梁

江明修 吴正中：中国国际非政府组织协力治理策略初探

唐 昊：社会转型背景下中国邻避运动的成因与趋势

# 公益

PHILANTHROPIC STUDIES

2015年第1辑 总第5辑

主编 朱健刚 林 猛 | 中山大学中国公益慈善研究院主办

## 社会建设的中国道路

陆 璇 林文漪：社会组织法律意识和契约精神

郭 超：少有人走的道路：搭建非营利治理与民主的桥梁

江明修 吴正中：中国国际非政府组织协力治理策略初探

唐 昊：社会转型背景下中国邻避运动的成因与趋势

## 图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

公益. 2015 年. 第 1 辑 / 朱健刚, 林猛主编. —北京: 中国社会科学出版社, 2015. 8

ISBN 978 - 7 - 5161 - 6476 - 1

I. ①公… II. ①朱… ②林… III. ①慈善事业—中国—文集  
IV. ①D632. 1 - 53

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2015)第 152598 号

---

出版人 赵剑英  
责任编辑 凌金良 陈 彪  
特约编辑 李登贵  
责任校对 郝阳洋  
责任印制 张雪娇

---

出 版 中国社会科学出版社  
社 址 北京鼓楼西大街甲 158 号  
邮 编 100720  
网 址 <http://www.csspw.cn>  
发 行 部 010 - 84083685  
门 市 部 010 - 84029450  
经 销 新华书店及其他书店

---

印刷装订 北京金瀑印刷有限公司  
版 次 2015 年 8 月第 1 版  
印 次 2015 年 8 月第 1 次印刷

---

开 本 710 × 1000 1/16  
印 张 13  
插 页 2  
字 数 205 千字  
定 价 49.00 元

---

凡购买中国社会科学出版社图书,如有质量问题请与本社联系调换

电话:010 - 84083683

版权所有 侵权必究

中山大学中国公益慈善研究院主办

# 公益 (2015 年第 1 辑)

Philanthropic Studies

总第 5 辑

社会建设的中国道路

主 编 朱健刚 林 猛  
编 委 应 星 晋 军 陶 林 韩俊魁 贾西津  
袁同凯 安子杰 陆德泉 郭 超 郑广怀  
林 猛 胡小军 周飞舟 毕向阳

学术顾问委员会主任

蔡 禾 中山大学社会学与人类学学院

学术顾问委员会成员 (以下按姓氏首字母排序)

邓启耀 中山大学传播与设计学院教授  
高丙中 北京大学社会学系教授  
郭于华 清华大学社会学系教授  
江明修 台湾政治大学公共行政学系教授  
麻国庆 中山大学社会学与人类学学院教授  
Michael Buroway 加州大学伯克利分校社会学系教授  
潘 毅 香港理工大学应用社会科学系副教授  
渠敬东 中国社会科学院社会学所研究员  
沈 原 清华大学社会学系教授  
孙立平 清华大学社会学系教授  
王振耀 北京师范大学中国公益研究院教授

编辑部 林 猛 刘海娟

# 卷首语

朱健刚

在未来五年，甚至更长的时间，中国的国家战略将集中在实现国家治理能力和治理体系的现代化，其中一个关键的要件是需要社会组织有能力和渠道参与到国家治理的转型中来。如何在一党领导的政治体制中激发社会组织的活力，而又实现多元共治的秩序，这是我们理解的国家推行社会建设战略的本来含义。然而，社会建设的中国道路不仅体现在这种自上而下的党的战略的推行，中国道路还同时体现在市场建设过程中社会不断发生的自组织和自我裂变。从20世纪90年代开始，首先是官办社会组织的复兴，之后是各种草根社会组织、国际组织如雨后春笋般涌现，活跃在扶贫、济困、助学、环保、妇女、劳工等领域。在过去的20多年间，我们见证了这些社会组织在服务领域上的扩展，行动方式的多样化探索以及组织的民间化、专业化和主流化趋势。而公民社会在其中始终是最重要的理论支持。

在最近的五年中一个最显著的变化是，社会组织和政府的关系发生了重要的转化。政府不再将自组织的民间社会当然地视为对自己政权合法性的挑战和威胁，而是将社会组织看作社会建设当中重要的一环。2012年，党的“十八大”报告正式确立了社会建设作为五位一体的国家建设的重要部分，社会组织由于为普通公民提供了参与社会事务的空间，成为社会治理现代化的关键领域。然而，我们同时也看到，人们对于公民社会组织的担忧和惧怕仍然存在，这条社会建设的中国道路仍然荆棘丛生，大道之上仍有无数艰难险阻。

正是有鉴于此，中山大学中国公益慈善研究院在2013年举办了一

次题为“社会建设的中国道路”的主题研讨会，旨在沟通两岸四地非营利组织研究机构的联系，将多年来辛勤耕耘于中国社会建设理论建构与实务发展的学者们齐聚在一起，分析中国公民社会发展的态势，讨论社会建设的中国道路，以便为社会建设新理论范式的构建、社会组织的发展策略、政府社会管理创新实践活动做出贡献。而本期辑刊的专题论文，主要即来源于此。

众多学者不约而同地将目光聚焦到中国独有的制度环境对公民社会的影响，以及民间组织在这一环境下所探索的生存策略。贾西津根据一项国际通行的“公民社会指数”对中国公民社会发展的总体态势做了评估，在2005年和2012年两轮数据比较的基础上，作者指出了中国公民社会发展的不均衡特征，其中价值和影响维度上较为成功，而结构和环境因素则不甚理想。更为重要的是作者指出，虽然跨越了七年的时间，其间经历了许多的事件和发展，但在总体发展阶段中国公民社会并无明显的推进。而陈秋政对成都非政府组织的田野调查，也证实了中国非政府组织发展中普遍存在的“低度政治，服务优先”的模式。与这一模式相呼应的是，在强大的行政主导之外，民间组织也十分注意在议题上自我设限，以此求得发展。

这样一种适应现行制度的发展模式为民间组织赢得了相当的发展空间，尤其是那些专注于教育、扶贫等低政治敏感性领域的民间组织，通过有效的策略、良好的网络和长期的工作而实现了自己的企业责任。陈定铭等研究的田家炳基金会即是一例。但另一方面，它也会在其他方面引起一些值得重视的问题，对良好的社会治理有所妨碍。唐昊很精当地将当前的制度环境概括为国家嵌入市场、正式规则废弃、社会疏离国家，它所造成的公民组织的缺乏为中国的邻避运动塑造了独特的面貌。也正是基于这种考虑，中国的邻避运动虽不同于标准意义的社会运动，却不失为社会建设的一种积极成分，推动着制度的变革。而江明修研究的国际NGO组织协力治理也让我们看到全球化背景下，国际NGO组织的卷入模式。

在中国的现实问题之外，在理论建构方面，辑刊特别约请了美国知名的公益慈善学专家戴维·霍顿·史密斯为本刊撰写了一篇英文特稿，对个人志愿行为提供了一种跨学科视角的理论分析，相信对国内刚刚起

步的公益慈善学研究会有所帮助。公民社会理论无疑是中国众多社会组织兴起背后重要的理论基础，然而公民社会理论因为其概念的舶来性也在中国的思想界和实务界引起不同甚至难以调和的分析。马剑银在他的《Civil Society：在现实与话语之间》一文中对公民社会的争论进行了尖锐的分析，对排斥公民社会和把公民社会视为政治对抗的观点都进行了批评，探讨了回归社会建设意义的公民社会的价值。而毫无疑问，新近出版的《公民社会基础读本》展示了体现这一思路的社群主义的公民社会的理论脉络。本期辑刊也对此贡献出一篇书评。

总的来说，社会建设的中国道路的挑战在于急速的经济和社会转型，使得社会矛盾日益严重突出，而原有体制由于缺乏有效的法治改革，使得既得利益集团不断生产出“转型陷阱”，让以民主和法治为基础的改革经常摇摆不定。在社会转型的重要时刻，民间社会在自我调节和适应中常常可以扮演重要的角色。社会矛盾依靠政治化的维稳机制已经难以控制，社会矛盾需要多方参与的现代社会治理机制，它依赖在社会领域内实现政府、市场与社会组织的多元共治。在这个意义上，重塑民间社会的自我管理功能，找到一条可行的社会建设的中国道路，将会有利于形成持续的自助、互助与他助的文化机制，从而化解社会矛盾，形成三个部门间的良性互动。愿这个梦想能够照进现实，让社会建设成为国家治理转型的重要引擎。

# 目 录

卷首语 ..... 朱健刚(1)

## 特约论文

An Interdisciplinary Theory of Individual Volunteering and Why So Few  
Researchers Have Tested It ..... David Horton Smith(3)

## 公共评论

社会的法律意识和契约精神 ..... 陆璇 林文漪(29)

打造未来:社区基金会在中国的角色 ..... 珍妮·霍奇森(42)

少有人走的道路:搭建非营利治理与民主的桥梁 ..... 郭超(46)

Civil Society:在现实与话语之间

——从迈克尔·爱德华兹《公民社会》一书说起 ..... 马剑银(52)

## 专题论文

中国国际非政府组织协力治理策略初探 ..... 江明修 吴正中(63)

社会转型背景下中国邻避运动的成因与趋势 ..... 唐昊(82)

中国公民社会指数:2005—2012 ..... 贾西津(97)

成都非政府组织议题网络及参与组织之组成分析 ..... 陈秋政(109)

非营利组织推动内地教育事业之社会网络分析

——以香港田家炳基金会为例 ..... 陈定铭 魏伊婕 曾韵洁(130)



## 译介与书评

社区服务站运动 ..... 罗伯特·费希尔(155)

公民社会:社群主义与自由主义的对话

——评《市民社会基础读本》..... 朱健刚(164)

## 研究综述

塞涅卡善施伦理思想的研究价值及现状 ..... 刘海娟(171)

## 公益研究动态

国内动态 ..... (191)

中山大学中国公益慈善研究院动态 ..... (193)

---

# 特约论文

---



# An Interdisciplinary Theory of Individual Volunteering and Why So Few Researchers Have Tested It

David Horton Smith<sup>①</sup>

**【Abstract】** Philanthropy includes non-coerced (voluntary) giving of time (volunteering) as well as giving money, things, and blood or body organs to help other individuals or charities outside one's household. The author has been developing an interdisciplinary, general theory of individual volunteer activity for several decades. An overview of the latest version is presented briefly, with references to fuller versions and also to literature reviews bearing on the value and validity of the theory. Some possible reasons are presented why so few researchers have tested the theory adequately in the past. The two most important reasons seem to be (1) the intrinsically interdisciplinary nature of the variables needed and especially (2) the social structural barriers to interdisciplinary theory posed by the existing social science academic disciplines. ARNOVA can help, as can ISTR and ICSERA.

---

① David Horton Smith 是美国非营利学 (Nonprofit Research) 的创始人, 参与创办了美国非营利与研究学会 (Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Actions, 简称 ARNOVA) 和美国《非营利与志愿研究季刊》(Nonprofit and Voluntary Sectors Quarterly, 简称 NVSQ), 曾担任中山大学中国公益慈善研究院研究总监。——编者注

**【 Keywords 】** Philanthropy, Interdisciplinary theory, Individual volunteering

Philanthropy includes non-coerced (voluntary) giving of time (usually termed “volunteering”) as well as similar giving of money, things, and blood or body organs to help other individuals or charities outside one’s household. The author has been developing an interdisciplinary, general theory of volunteering for several decades (Reddy and Smith 1972, 1973a, b; Smith 1964, 1966a, 1973a, 1975, 1980a, b, c, 1981, 1983b, 1985b, 1994, 1997a, b, c, 2000a, b, 2004, 2010a, b, 2012 c, d, g, h, i; Smith and Baldwin 1972b; Smith with Dixon 1973; Smith and Reddy 1972a, b, c; Smith and Theberge 1987; Trow and Smith 1983). Much other research and theory by Smith and his colleagues that is cited in the references must be seen as a larger context for the theory of volunteering.

In the past, Smith’s focus has been only on formal volunteer activity—volunteering in contexts where the individual views the activity as mainly the performance of an expected role in some group or organization (a more formalized group). The latest version of this distinctively “Interdisciplinary Theory of Individual Volunteering” (ITIV) is broader in scope, attempting to explain the whole range of volunteering, from highly formalized to totally non-organized contexts. For simplicity of exposition here, this spectrum of degrees of formalization of contexts is dichotomized into two segments, formal and informal volunteering.

The ITIV is still in a preliminary form, rather than a fully specified form with appropriate weights for major independent variables (or variable clusters) in relation to various key types of dependent volunteering variables. In this form, the ITIV is a comprehensive sensitizing theory, rather than a full-fledged explanatory-predictive theory. A sensitizing theory indicates what variables are essential to take into account, with only rough indications of independent variable weights. The ITIV is an empirically grounded theory, derived inductively by abstracting from prior research [e. g., Glaser and Strauss 1999

(1967) ]. At a later stage of its development, the ITIV may be formulated as a deductive theory from definitions and axioms, leading to postulates and hypotheses of varying degrees of confirmation.

The most distinctive feature of the ITIV is its attempt at comprehensive coverage of nearly all of the relevant types of variables for understanding volunteering, both independent and dependent. This feature is expressed in its label as "Interdisciplinary". One very basic contention of the ITIV is that its proper use results in substantially greater explanation of error variance than less comprehensive models. Obviously, the ITIV urges the use of multivariate statistics that permit some interpretation of proportional-reduction-of-error-variance, even if only a pseudo -  $R^2$ . Such heightened explanatory power will be one key test of ITIV's value and validity.

Volunteering can only be properly understood by using a comprehensive set of variables, both independent and dependent. The range of such variables is sketched below.

## **THE RANGE OF DEPENDENT VARIABLES TO BE INCLUDED**

The dependent variable of volunteering is often misunderstood. Too often researchers and even theorists mistake the part for the whole. When volunteering has been studied in the past, the focus has largely been on formal volunteering. Some researchers define volunteering as requiring a formal, group context. This is unnecessarily restrictive. There is much theoretical leverage to be gained from studying volunteering in a continuum of contexts in terms of degree of formal organization vs. informality/lack of organization.

Formal volunteering (FV) can be usefully defined as activity by an individual that is seen as beneficial to one or more other people outside that person's family, that is usually done with no payment for services (at the least, without full remuneration of its economic value), that is done without coercion

(by “free will” or voluntarily, to some significant extent), and that is done in some formally organized or semi-organized/group context.

Informal volunteering (IV) has all of the above characteristics except a formally organized context. IV is thus activity by an individual that is seen as beneficial to one or more others outside one’s family, that is usually done with no payment for services (at the least, without full remuneration of its economic value), that is done without coercion (by “free will” or voluntarily, to some significant extent), but that is done by an individual who does not see himself or herself as performing a role in some existing group or organization.

Note that IV does not require others to be present physically in the situation, although this is usually the case. A person can be attempting to help another person (e. g., a neighbor) by doing grocery shopping without the intended recipient of helping being physically present. Similarly, FV can be done whether or not other people are physically present. The key distinction between FV and IV is whether or not the volunteer/person thinks of himself or herself as playing an expected role for some group or organization when doing the activity—and this actually varies along a spectrum/continuum.

The author argues elsewhere (Smith 2012g) that IV is part of human informal sociality activities, which are the frequently overlooked “invisible glue” that holds society together and form the basis of social order. Without substantial informal volunteering, social relations in a society become strained and alienating. The essence of volunteering, FV or IV, is attempted helping of other persons outside one’s family. If one cannot count on others beyond one’s family to provide at least some modest and temporary kinds of help in a given society, the fabric of social capital and social bonds in that society is very weak. Totalitarian dictatorships foster such uncivil societies or non-voluntary societies.

The helping that volunteering involves can be very narrowly focused on one or a few others, whether neighbors, friends, or co-members of a grassroots association. Alternatively, the targets of benefits in helping can be a much broader set of people—one’s community, society, humanity as a whole, or the

local or broader ecology of the earth and its atmosphere.

Another aspect of mistaking the part for the whole in prior research and theory is that, when dealing with formal volunteering, some have focused only on activity in volunteer service programs or, alternatively, only on membership or activity in voluntary/membership associations. The implicit assumption has been that either alone was the only type of important volunteer role, when both are important.

The present author (Smith 1975, 1994) and many others have in the past considered both types of formal volunteering as functionally equivalent, when reviewing the literature on volunteering. Musick and Wilson (2008) dismiss association volunteering and only study service program volunteering. Yet there are some clear differences in the meaning and explanation of these two related types of FV. Going forward, we need to clearly distinguish these important differences in the organized context of formal volunteering as well as their similarities.

Association volunteering involves far more autonomy and power for the volunteer than does service program volunteering, for instance. Volunteers in associations have significant power, and working together, they can even replace the leadership of an association. This is not true in volunteer programs. Another example of such differences between program service volunteering and associational volunteering is the observed tendency for males to participate more in membership associations and for females to participate more in volunteer service programs. However, many other patterns of explanatory variables are the same or quite similar for the two major types of formal volunteering. For instance, the "Active-Effective Character" cluster of variables has substantial explanatory power in both types of context.

Prior research on FV has also been limited in the scope of participation measures used simultaneously in any given study. The vast majority of research attention has been given to a few possible measures out of a much larger potential set. For instance, in the past most attention by far has focused on the number of association memberships (actually, membership types, usually),



active ( vs. passive ) membership, and involvement in a service volunteer program. Only quite recently has there been research on the intensity of participation, duration of participation, decisions to stop( exit) volunteering, and actual exit from volunteer roles or participation. Re-joining the same or a similar formal volunteer role/group and lifespan patterns of volunteering have received only minimal attention.

There has also been relatively little research attention to the relationships of volunteering to various other forms of giving( money, blood, organs, things/ objects) and to other forms of socio-culturally-approved leisure activities such as political participation, friendship activities, neighboring, leisure/sports/ recreation participation, etc. Smith( 1969, 1980c; 2012i) has shown that there is in fact a clustering of such socio-culturally-approved leisure activities, which includes volunteering but is much broader in scope. This “ Leisure General Activity Pattern” has important conceptual and methodological implications for understanding any one of its component types of socio-culturally-approved leisure activities, such as FV, IV, giving money, giving blood or organs, etc. ( Smith 2012i).

A summary list of the types of volunteering that need to be studied simultaneously as dependent variables, and their interrelations analyzed, includes but is not limited to the following( which are not mutually exclusive) :

- Informal volunteering
- Formal volunteering
- Associational volunteering
- Service program volunteering
- Official membership in an association
- Active membership in an association
- Formal/official leadership in an association
- Informal/unofficial leadership in an association
- Entry into volunteering
- Intensity of volunteering( e. g. , hours per week or month)
- Duration of volunteering in time units( e. g. , number of months served)