Rural Elites, Peasant Household Organization and Peasant Household Entrepreneurship—Based on the Research Database of "One Hundred Villages and One Thousand Households" for Rural Revitalization in Jiangxi Province (2021)

Dongdong Ge[1], Xiaolan Kang[1, 2]
[1]College of Economics and Management, Jiangxi Agricultural University, Nanchang 330045, China
[2]Research Center of Agriculture, Rural Areas and Farmers, Jiangxi Agricultural University, Nanchang 330045, China

Abstract:

Based on the research Database of "One Hundred Villages and One Thousand Households" for Rural Revitalization in Jiangxi Province, probit and mediating effect models were used to empirical study on the influence of rural sages and peasant household organization on peasant household entrepreneurship and analyze the heterogeneity of rural elites on peasant household entrepreneurship, the results show that village sages can promote farmers' entrepreneurship; The influence of behavioral resource support and thought support on farmers' entrepreneurship is positive and significant, while the influence of entrepreneurial environment support on farmers' entrepreneurship does not pass the significance test. Through the mediating effect of farmers' organization, the villagers' organization plays a mediating role in "villagers' organization and farmers' entrepreneurship". In the heterogeneity analysis of township elites, the assistance of action resources and thought to farmers' entrepreneurship is consistent with the results, while the assistance of entrepreneurial environment to farmers' entrepreneurship does not pass the significance test. Therefore, we should encourage rural sages to support farmers' entrepreneurship in different ways to promote rural revitalization.

Keywords: Rural elites, Organization of peasant households, Peasant household entrepreneurship, Rural revitalization.

I. INTRODUCTION

Talent is the foundation for national revitalization and the guarantee for rural revitalization.

Rural prosperity depends on the growth of talented people, and rural revitalization is inseparable from the support of talented people. Compared to traditional farmers, such agricultural talents can better concentrate capital, technology and land, and ultimately promote industrial prosperity, which is the basic premise for solving rural problems [1].

Rural elites are an important part of talents. Township elites include not only the elites who go out to study, go into politics and do business, but also the local elites who stay in the countryside from beginning to end and have both political integrity and ability. Such talents possess rich social and political capital, and have the ability to provide political and economic support for themselves and farmers' entrepreneurship [2].

Rural elites play an indispensable role in peasant household entrepreneurship. First of all, as the representative of advanced productive forces, the advanced way of thinking and advanced management concept play a subtle guiding effect in farmers. Secondly, as the "leading geese" of entrepreneurship and prosperity, the rural elites can guide the surrounding farmers to become rich and play a leading role. Finally, township sages serve as a bridge between the government and the masses and play a connecting role [3].

On the basis of theoretical analysis and from the perspective of farmers, this paper empirically examines the influence and mechanism of the organization of rural elites and farmers on farmers' entrepreneurship and provides countermeasures and suggestions for the prosperity of agricultural industry in rural revitalization by using 444 survey data from "Jiangxi Rural revitalization" Research database of "One Hundred Villages and one Thousand Households" (2021).

II. RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS: THE FUNCTION PATH OF RURAL ELITES

2.1 Direct Effects: Three ways

This article will follow villager farmer entrepreneurship is defined as: actively into the local rural economic, social and cultural construction of outside school, politics, business and other elite groups and local elites, through the study of the industry of rural investment faoug or establishing industry project helped village, and to improve the probability of entrepreneurial farmers as well as the process of creating jobs to drive the surrounding people to get rich.

The first way, supply of resources. Supply resources include social capital, economic capital, political capital and other resources that can promote farmers' entrepreneurship. Under the background of serious loss of rural young and middle-aged labor force, farmers generally lack new ideas and still follow the old life style and development concept, let alone the lack of all kinds of capital to promote their entrepreneurship. Township elites not only bring capital and technology, but also a grand and orderly industrial development system, which enables farmers to improve their own operating ability, but also have smoother information channels and wider interpersonal relationships to promote entrepreneurship of farmers [4].

The second way, change your mind. Under the influence of the urban-rural dual structure, rural households' migrant work and non-agricultural employment become normal, and most rural households do not have their own entrepreneurial ideas, which ultimately leads to a low probability of entrepreneurship [5].Follow villager includes not only external resources supply, also including the entrepreneurial ideas and advanced management idea of modern industry, and have strong ability of risk resistance, easy to use modern thought to change traditional smallholder farmers management and resource management blurred thoughts, such as using commercial thinking the farmers to cultivate entrepreneurial ability and cooperation spirit, the formation of rural industry chain of his effect [6],It is beneficial to improve the resource value of the village, maximize the utilization of resources, fully activate the value of the village, and collect the benefits of the whole village.

The third way, improve the environment. Entrepreneurial environment is the sum of all kinds of factors that entrepreneurs must use and face in the process of entrepreneurship [7].The quality of entrepreneurial environment affects the overall situation and entrepreneurial performance of a region, and even is the basis and premise for the development and expansion of entrepreneurial activities [8].Social progress accelerates the flow of population, and the inherent highly stable and closed environment in rural areas no longer exists. In the absence of the guidance of rural elites, farmers are often scattered, and the entrepreneurial environment of farmers is poor. The external environment has a significant impact on farmers' entrepreneurship [9].Through policy preaching, positive guidance, strengthening farmers' basic education, strengthening the concept of market and legal system, rural elites effectively create a superior entrepreneurial soft environment for farmers.

Based on the above analysis, research hypothesis H1 is proposed: rural elites have a positive and significant impact on farmers' entrepreneurship.

2.2 Indirect Effects: the Mediating Effect of Farmer Organization

The organization of peasant households is the process of unifying the production and operation of peasant households to form new agricultural operation subjects, including leading enterprises, professional large households, agricultural cooperatives, etc. The organization of farmers has increasingly become a bridge between the government and small farmers, the best intermediary for small farmers to enter the big market, and also promotes the transformation from individual effect to group effect [10].In the process of entrepreneurship, individual farmers have the characteristics of high risk, instability, poor ability to resist pressure, and individual can not form economies of scale, which directly promote the formation of peasant household organization. In the group effect, the organization of farmers can reduce the transaction costs of farmers [11], effectively deal with the contradiction between small farmers and the big market [12], and promote agricultural technological innovation [13], adjust the agricultural structure [14], and stimulate the entrepreneurial potential of farmers. In the initial stage of farmers' entrepreneurship, they need a certain supply of resources in terms of economy and skills, and rural elites provide support for farmers' entrepreneurship from various aspects. Individual support is often very limited, and the success rate of entrepreneurship is low. Moreover, the organization of farmers can also enable farmers to seek a place in the market [15].The development and expansion of the organizational scale of some farmers can not be separated from the support of rural elites [16], and the new operating subjects formed by the organizational scale of farmers have an important impact on the entrepreneurial behavior of farmers. For example, the organization of farmers will affect the entrepreneurial stability, the availability of entrepreneurial opportunities and entrepreneurial resources of farmers [17].Moreover, the economic, political and technical support provided by the rural elites has partially flowed into the new business entities of peasant households, and further influenced the entrepreneurial behaviors of peasant households through these new business entities [18].In reality, farmers have a variety of entrepreneurial behaviors. In the process of entrepreneurship, the diversity of entrepreneurial behaviors of farmers is not only reflected in the rural elites, but also reflected in the organization of farmers. In the case of the same way of rural elites, the different new business subjects caused by the organization of peasant households will also lead to the different entrepreneurial behaviors of peasant households.

Based on this, research hypothesis H2 is proposed: farmer organization plays an intermediary role between rural elites and farmer entrepreneurship.

III. EMPIRICAL TEST

3.1 Data Source

The data in this paper are from the research conducted by the research group and the research group from June to September 2021. Questionnaires were distributed to farmers mainly during the summer vacation when they participated in the rural revitalization research. After pre-survey, questionnaire confirmation and comprehensive survey, a total of 700 questionnaires were distributed, and 656 were effectively recovered, with a questionnaire recovery rate of 93.7%. The survey covers jiangxi province. According to the verification requirements of this paper, 444 valid questionnaires were finally used. The investigation content mainly involves the village information, industry prosperity, life and so on.

3.2 Variable Selection and Description

Explained variable. Entrepreneurial behavior of farmers (Y). Entrepreneurial behavior refers to farmers' new career choice, new mode of operation or upgrading of original mode of production. Farmers' non-agricultural operation or expansion of production scale in production can be regarded as entrepreneurship [19].The entrepreneurial behavior of farmers is taken from the questionnaire survey "whether they have returned home to start a business". When farmers answer "yes", the value is assigned to 1; otherwise, it is 0.

Core explanatory variable. First, rural elites (X). As mentioned above, township elites drive people around to become rich and influence farmers' entrepreneurial behaviors through economy and skill training. Or part of the resources flow into the organization of farmers in the process of new business subjects, and then affect the entrepreneurial behavior of farmers. If there is a village sage who makes people rich, then X=1; otherwise, X=0. Second, there are differences in the ways of influencing farmers' entrepreneurial behavior. Combined with the actual situation, the way of helping villagers is divided into three aspects: action resources, thought and entrepreneurial environment. If township sages influence farmers' entrepreneurial behaviors from three aspects of action resources, thought and entrepreneurial environment, then X1, X2 and X3=1; Conversely, X1, X2, X3=0.

Intervening variable. Peasant household organization is an intermediate variable to be tested. Since the research object of this paper is the entrepreneurial behavior of farmers, the organization of farmers may have a certain impact on the entrepreneurial behavior of farmers. With the organization of farmers (X4), leading agricultural enterprises, professional cooperatives and new agricultural service subjects are supported by the organization of farmers, realizing vertical integration and large-scale service [20]. Therefore, the variable "whether to participate in agricultural cooperatives" is selected. When participating in agricultural cooperatives, X4=1; otherwise, X4=0.

Control variables. Not only the rural elites, but also the organization of farmers will affect the entrepreneurial behavior of farmers, and other factors may also affect the entrepreneurial behavior of farmers. To this end, in addition to introducing the individual characteristic variables of farmers, farmers' employment characteristics, physical health characteristics and social characteristics are also introduced. Specifically, individual characteristics include: gender, age, education level, whether the village cadres four variables. The employment characteristics of farmers include: whether they are engaged in non-agricultural work is a variable. Physical health characteristics include: physical health status as a variable. Social characteristics include the number of wechat friends as a variable. Therefore, this paper adds these variables into the empirical analysis, in order to expect that after controlling the individual characteristics, farmers' employment characteristics, physical health characteristics and social characteristics, the influence of rural elites on farmers' entrepreneurial behavior is still robust.

The specific definition, assignment and descriptive statistical results of each variable are shown in Table I.

TABLE I. Descriptive statistical analysis

VARIABLE	VARIABLE NAME	SYMBOL	DEFINITION AND ASSIGNMENT	MEAN	STD.ERR
EXPLAINED VARIABLE	Farmer's entrepreneurial behavior	Y	0=NO；1=YES	0.18	0.02
CORE EXPLANATORY VARIABLE	Rural elites	X	0=NO；1=YES	0.41	0.02
	Action resource support	X_1	0=NO；1=YES	0.26	0.02
	Mind power	X_2	0=NO；1=YES	0.30	0.02
	Entrepreneurial environment	X_3	0=NO；1=YES	0.95	0.01
INTERVENING VARIABLE	Organization of peasant households	X_4	0=NO；1=YES	0.20	0.02
CONTROL VARIABLES	Gender	X_5	0=NO；1=YES	0.56	0.02
	age	X_6	Continuous variables	49.29	0.63
	Level of education	X_7	1=Primary school；2=Junior high school；	1.84	0.04

			3=High school and above		
	Whether village cadres	X_8	0=NO；1=YES	0.15	0.02
	Off-farm work	X_9	0=NO；1=YES	0.61	0.02
	Physical condition	X_{10}	1=unhealthy ；2=general；3=health	2.64	0.03
	Number of wechat friends	X_{11}	Continuous variables	269.03	0.02

3.3 Model Selection

As the explained variable "entrepreneurial behavior of peasant households" is a dichotomous variable, which is specifically shown as normal distribution, and some control variables are continuous variables, the probit model is adopted to analyze the factors affecting "entrepreneurial behavior of peasant households", and the model expression is as follows:

$$Y = X_i \beta + \mu_i \tag{1}$$

In Formula (1), are the explained variables for decisions made by observation values 1 and 0; X_i is explanatory variable, including the selection of object data attributes and subject attributes; β is the parameter to be estimated; μ is a random interference term.

$$Y = c + \sum_{i=1}^{4} \alpha_i X_i + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \beta_i L_i \tag{2}$$

Where is the explained variable, c is the constant term, X_i(i =1), β_i(i =1... 7) represent the explanatory variables of villager and control variables respectively, α_i(i =1... 4), β_i(i = 1... 7) Respectively represent the parameters to be estimated for each characteristic explanatory variable.

In order to explore the mediating effect of farmer organization, this paper uses the mediating effect model to test the mediating effect of farmer organization on village elites and farmer entrepreneurial behavior. Construct the following regression model:

$$Y_i = V_1 + a_i T_i + b_{1i} X_{1i} + \varepsilon_{1i}$$
$$M_i = V_2 + c_i T_i + b_{2i} X_{2i} + \varepsilon_{2i}$$
$$Y_i = V_3 + d_i T_i + e_i M_i + b_{3i} X_{3i} + \varepsilon_{3i}$$

Where, I represents different peasant households, Y represents entrepreneurial behavior of peasant households, T represents the township elites variable, M represents the organizational variable of peasant households, X is the control variable, and V is the constant term and ε is the random interference term. The probit model was used to regression the three equations.

IV. RESULT ANALYSIS

4.1 Baseline Regression Result

In this paper, Stata16 software is used to conduct probit regression analysis on the entrepreneurial intention of rural elites and farmers, and the results are shown in Table II.

Rural elites significantly affected farmers' entrepreneurial behavior. In model 1, only township elites were included, and the regression coefficient was 0.558, which passed the significance test at 1% level. The results showed that under other conditions unchanged, township elites had a significant impact on farmers' entrepreneurial behavior. Model 2 and model 3 and model 4, 5, in turn, to join the individual characteristics, farmers would be features, physical health and social variables, the model of regression coefficients remain at around 0.558, both through the 1% level of significance test, shows that follow villager has a significant positive influence on farmer entrepreneurship, consistent with the above theoretical analysis, validate the H1 hypothesis. The possible reason is that the various resources brought by the villagers' return to their hometowns promote the development of rural industries, and also produce entrepreneurial vents, thus promoting farmers' entrepreneurship, and ultimately affecting farmers' entrepreneurial behavior.

TABLE II. Regression results of rural elites on farmers' entrepreneurial behavior

VARIABLE	MODEL 1		MODEL 2		MODEL 3		MODEL 4		MODEL 5	
	Coef	Std.err	Coef	Std.err	Coef	Std.err	Coef	Std.err	Coef	Std.err
RURAL ELITES	0.558***	0.100	0.540***	0.103	0.579***	0.105	0.591***	0.105	0.589***	0.105
GENDER			-0.014	0.107	-0.028	0.108	-0.022	0.108	-0.024	0.109
AGE			-0.002	0.004	-0.006	0.004	-0.004	0.005	-0.003	0.005
LEVEL OF EDUCATION			0.061	0.075	0.092	0.076	0.074	0.077	0.050	0.078

WHETHER VILLAGE CADRES			0.473^{***}	0.134	0.501^{***}	0.135	0.465^{***}	0.136	0.453^{***}	0.136
OFF-FARM WORK					-0.330^{***}	0.115	-0.331^{***}	0.116	-0.341^{***}	0.116
PHYSICAL CONDITION							0.181^{**}	0.090	0.179^{**}	0.091
NUMBER OF WECHAT FRIENDS									0.001	0.001
CONSTANT TERM	1.186	0.071	1.281	0.287	0.975	0.310	1.503	0.407	1.554	0.409
PSEUDO R^2	0.038		0.058		0.068		0.073		0.078	

*, **, ***Significant at the level of 10%, 5% and 1%, respectively

4.2 Heterogeneity Analysis Results

Therefore, from the perspective of heterogeneity, stata16 software was further used to test the influence of action resource, thought and entrepreneurial environment on farmers' entrepreneurial behavior. The results are shown in Table III.

The help of action resources positively affects farmers' entrepreneurial behavior. According to the regression results of Model 1 and Model 2 in Table III, the assisted variable of action resources has a significant positive impact on farmers' entrepreneurial behavior at 1% level. The results show that when other variables remain unchanged, action resources help promote farmers' entrepreneurship, which is consistent with the above theoretical analysis. The possible reason is that, as described above, farmers follow the old concept of life and development and lack entrepreneurial capital. The villagers bring not only economy and technology to the countryside, but also an orderly industrial development system, which is conducive to the entrepreneurial behavior of farmers. On the other hand, before the assistance of action resources, the resources among farmers are stable and matched; when action resources are assisted, they generate external stimulus and new resource allocation [21], and farmers convert action resources into entrepreneurial resources to promote farmers' entrepreneurship.

Thought help positively affects farmers' entrepreneurial behavior. In table III, the return of model 1 and model 2, according to the results of thinking power at the 1% level has a significant positive influence on farmer entrepreneurship, is consistent with the above theoretical analysis, the possible reason is that follow villager entrepreneurial ideas and advanced management concept, easy to use modern thought to change traditional small business ideas, to farmers to instill commercial thinking, Thus promoting peasant household entrepreneurship.

The influence of entrepreneurial environment on farmers' entrepreneurial behavior failed to pass the significance test. Entrepreneurial environment has a positive influence on farmers' entrepreneurial behavior, but the influence is small, with a coefficient of 0.454, which fails to pass the significance test. May be the reason is that entrepreneurship is wide and as diverse as follow villager, and survey data involved in the business environment power problem is less, the questions in the questionnaire is not enough to fully describe the entrepreneurial environment on their entrepreneurial behavior and the effect of future entrepreneurial environment on their entrepreneurial behavior should be further investigated the influence of different ways. However, generally speaking, at the macro level, the return of rural elites improves the entrepreneurial environment to a certain extent, changes farmers' attitude towards entrepreneurship from passive to active, and contributes to their entrepreneurial activities and the improvement of entrepreneurial efficiency [22].

The influence of control variables on farmers' entrepreneurial behavior is different. Whether the village cadres to farmers entrepreneurial behavior is positively significant at the 5% level, may be the reason for that village cadres of social capital, economic capital is generally higher than the ordinary farmers, thought also tend to be ordinary farmers is relatively liberal, can more easily come into contact with the home business follow villager, thereby better drive outside investment, entrepreneurship probability is higher than ordinary farmers. Whether or not they engage in non-agricultural work has a significant negative impact on the entrepreneurial behavior of rural households at the level of 10%. Most of the groups engaged in non-agricultural work are migrant workers, while most of the beneficiaries are rural farmers, so the entrepreneurial behavior of rural farmers in the village is higher than that of migrant workers. Physical health has a positive and significant impact on farmers' entrepreneurial behavior at 1% level, which may be because healthy farmers tend to have more experience in entrepreneurship, and the entrepreneurial risk is lower than that of unhealthy farmers. Gender, age, education level and number of wechat friends failed to pass the significance test, the possible reason being that the respondents in the questionnaire survey had certain homogeneity in terms of personal characteristics, so the results were not significant.

TABLE III. Heterogeneity regression results

VARIABLE	MODEL 1		MODEL 2	
	COEF	STD.ERR	COEF	STD.ERR
ACTION RESOURCE SUPPORT	0.442^{***}	0.130	0.456^{***}	0.123
MIND POWER	0.355^{***}	0.131	0.350^{***}	0.122
ENTREPRENEURIAL ENVIRONMENT	0.454	0.171		
GENDER	0.022	0.123		
AGE	0.006	0.005		
LEVEL OF EDUCATION	0.121	0.086		
WHETHER VILLAGE CADRES	0.260^{*}	0.154	0.301^{**}	0.145
OFF-FARM WORK	-0.114^{*}	0.131	-0.126^{*}	0.116
PHYSICAL CONDITION	0.310^{***}	0.119	0.316^{***}	0.108
NUMBER OF WECHAT FRIENDS	0.001	0.001		
CONSTANT TERM	2.714	0.171	2.080	0.306
PSEUDO R^2	0.107		0.082	

*, **, ***Significant at the level of 10%, 5% and 1%, respectively

4.3 Mediating Effect Test

In order to further explore the mechanism of follow villager of farmer entrepreneurship above theoretical analysis, points out that some of the resources provided in rural elites into organized farmers produce new operators, may affect farmers entrepreneurial behavior, based on this, draw lessons from existing research results, using step wise regression method to test "rural elites - farmers organized - farmer entrepreneurship" this path.

Table IV shows the test results of the mediating effect of peasant household organization on rural elites and peasant household entrepreneurial behavior. The probit model is used for regression analysis in the first, second and third steps. In the first step, the entrepreneurial behavior of peasant households was taken as the explained variable, the rural elites as the core explanatory variable, and the remaining control variables were added, while the organization of peasant households did not add explanatory variables. The results showed that the rural elites passed the significance test at 1% level. In the second step, farmers' organization was used as the explained variable, and rural elites were used as the core explanatory variable, plus other

control variables. The results showed that villagers' organization passed the significance test at 1% level, indicating that villagers' organization could improve the level of farmers' organization. In the third step, the entrepreneurial behavior of farmers was taken as the explained variable, and rural elites, organization of farmers and other control variables were added. The results showed that rural elites passed the significance test at 1% level, while the organization of farmers passed the significance test at 1% level, indicating that rural elites and organization of farmers had a significant impact on the entrepreneurial behavior of farmers. Baron's mediating effect test method shows that farmer organization plays a mediating effect in the "rural elites--farmer organization -- farmer entrepreneurship behavior", and hypothesis H2 is confirmed.

TABLE IV. Test results of the mediating effect of peasant household organization

VARIABLE	THE FIRST STEP		THE SECOND STEP		THE THIRD STEP	
	DEPENDENT VARIABLE: ENTREPRENEURIAL BEHAVIOR OF FARMERS		DEPENDENT VARIABLE: PEASANT HOUSEHOLD ORGANIZATION		DEPENDENT VARIABLE: ENTREPRENEURIAL BEHAVIOR OF FARMERS	
	COEF	STR.ERR	COEF	STR.ERR	COEF	STR.ERR
RURAL ELITES	0.558***	0.100	0.632***	0.098	0.499***	0.103
ORGANIZATION OF PEASANT HOUSEHOLDS	——	——	——	——	0.370***	0.117
OTHER VARIABLES	Control variables		Control variables		Control variables	
CONSTANT TERM	1.186	0.071	1.130	0.069	1.247	0.075
PSEUDO R^2	0.038		0.047		0.049	

4.4 Robust Test

In order to test the robustness of the results, this paper uses propensity score matching (PSM) to re-evaluate the influence of rural elites on farmers' entrepreneurial behavior. In this paper, core matching is selected as the main matching method, and radius matching and K near matching are taken as the reference group. The results are shown in Table V. The treatment group is entrepreneurial farmers with rural elites, and the control group is entrepreneurial

farmers without rural elites. As can be seen from the results in Table V, the difference between the three matching results is small, and all of them pass the significance level test of 1%, and the effect direction is consistent with the significance level, indicating that the results are robust. Therefore, the research results obtained in this paper are not different due to the different matching methods used in the research, indicating that the empirical results of villagers' entrepreneurial behavior are robust.

TABLE V. The processing effect of rural elites on farmers' entrepreneurial behavior under different matching methods

VARIABLE NAME	MATCHING METHOD		TREATED	CONTROL	ATT	STR.ERR	T
FARMER'S ENTREPRENEURIAL BEHAVIOR	Nuclear match	unmatch	0.265	0.118	0.147	0.026	5.74***
		match	0.250	0.151	0.099	0.029	3.45***
	K nearest neighbor matching	unmatch	0.265	0.118	0.147	0.026	5.74***
		match	0.250	0.127	0.123	0.032	3.81***
	Radius of a match	unmatch	0.265	0.118	0.147	0.026	5.74***
		match	0.250	0.148	0.102	0.029	3.40***

In order to ensure the reliability of the estimation results of propensity score matching, the matching results should also meet the requirement of equilibrium hypothesis. Generally speaking, the standardization deviation of the covariable of each variable after model matching should be controlled within 10%. Therefore, in order to test the reliability of the treatment results, the hypothesis of balance between each variable of the treatment group and the control group should be verified, as shown in Table VI. Compared with before matching, the standardization deviation of each covariable in the post-matching treatment group (with township elites) and the control group (without rural elites) is reduced to less than 10%, proving that the sample difference between the treatment group and the control group is basically eliminated after matching, satisfying the balance hypothesis test. The above analysis is consistent with the matching results of propensity score, which further proves that the research conclusions of this paper are robust.

TABLE VI. Balance test results of treatment group and control group

VARIABLE NAME		MEAN		STR.ERR	T TEST	
		TREATED	CONTROL		T	P
GENDER	unmatch	0.646	0.506	28.7	4.19	0.000***
	match	0.628	0.605	4.7	0.63	0.531
AGE	unmatch	49.254	49,316	-0.5	-0.07	0.946
	match	49.017	50.692	-2.6	-1.71	0.087*
LEVEL OF EDUCATION	unmatch	1.950	1.772	22.8	3.37	0.001***
	match	1.901	1.797	9.4	1.82	0.069**
WHETHER VILLAGE CADRES	unmatch	0.177	0.133	12.1	1.79	0.074**
	match	0.163	0.151	3.2	0.42	0.676
OFF-FARM WORK	unmatch	0.657	0.570	17.9	2.62	0.009***
	match	0.640	0.622	3.6	0.47	0.636
PHYSICAL CONDITION	unmatch	2.613	2.650	-5.6	-0.83	0.408
	match	2.628	2.512	-9.6	2.13	0.033**
NUMBER OF WECHAT FRIENDS	unmatch	312.51	239.11	10.9	1.58	0.114
	match	293.8	254.49	5.8	0.73	0.466

V. CONCLUSION AND ENLIGHTENMENT

This paper empirically and theoretically analyzes the influence of township sages on farmers' entrepreneurial behavior. Based on 444 survey data from "jiangxi rural revitalization" survey database of "one hundred villages and one thousand households" (2021), the research finds that :(1) township sages promote farmers' entrepreneurial behavior; The effect of action resource support and thought support on farmers' entrepreneurship is consistent with the result, while the effect of entrepreneurial environment support on farmers' entrepreneurship does not pass the significance test. (2) Township elites indirectly and significantly affect farmers' entrepreneurial behavior through the mediating effect of farmer organization, indicating that farmer organization plays a mediating role in "township elites and farmers' entrepreneurial behavior". Therefore, we should encourage local sages to support farmers' entrepreneurship in different ways to promote rural revitalization.

First of all, we should fully recognize the fact that the villagers have a positive impact on

farmers' entrepreneurial behavior, and provide good conditions and environment for the villagers to help farmers to start their own businesses, forming a virtuous cycle of "attracting villagers to return home -- villagers to drive development -- good entrepreneurial environment -- attracting villagers to return home". However, it should also be noted that the village sage's help is not simply "capital to the countryside", but also ideological aspects of the countryside. "Capital to the countryside" is not just for profit. The village xian power to profit as the purpose at the same time, has a strong market orientation. From the individual point of view, the individual differences between farmers also led to the differences between the entrepreneurial farmers and village cadres, whether engaged in non-agricultural work, and physical health of farmer entrepreneurship, the influence of the lead to follow villager returning funds, technology and other resources provided by the different peasant households, the result of venture is different, so follow villager should have certain targeted. At the same time, only a few farmers have started their own businesses and are influenced by local elites. Therefore, the scope of influence should be expanded to guide farmers who have real entrepreneurial intention but lack certain resources to start their own businesses.

REFERENCE

[1] Buehren N, Goldstein MP, Molina E, et al. (2017) The impact of strengthening agricultural extension services: evidence from Ethiopia (English). Social Science Electronic Publishing

[2] Harun R (2018) Entrepreneurial Intention among Rural Community. A Case Study of Kurdistan Regional Government

[3] Chen Y, Fan Z, Gu X, et al. (2018) Arrival of Young Talents: The Send-down Movement and Rural Education in China. GLO Discussion Paper Series

[4] Qi J, Li W, Wang Z, et al. (2021) Measurement and Path Selection of Rural Development Level in Enclave Areas: A Case Study of Jingyuan County, Gansu Province. Sustainability 13(17):9904

[5] Vasiljevic Z, Dedeic P (2011) The public-private partnership: unutilized development potential of rural areas. Economics of Agriculture

[6] Tang Z, Zhao L, Zhou X (2020) A Study on the Key Factors of Labor Migration and Willingness to Return to Rural Areas Using ANP: A Case Study of Western China. Revista De Cercetare Si Interventie Sociala 69:337-348

[7] Beaudoin JM, Lebel L, Bouthillier L (2011) Agricultural and Forestry Entrepreneurship: Learning from the Experience of an Aboriginal Community in Canada

[8] Khan MA, Zubair D, Rathore K, et al. Impact of Entrepreneurial Orientation Dimensions on Performance of Small Enterprises: Do Entrepreneurial Competencies Matter? Social Science Electronic Publishing

[9] Pierre A, Friedrichs YV, Wincent J (2014) Entrepreneurship in Society: A Review and Definition of Community-Based Entrepreneurship Research. Springer International Publishing

[10] Trebbin A (2014) Linking small farmers to modern retail through producer organizations – Experiences with producer companies in India. Food Policy 45(4):35-44

[11] Zakić N, Vukotić S, Cvijanović D (2014) Organisational models in agriculture with special reference to small farmers. Economics of Agriculture 61(1):225-237

[12] Jiao Y, Chen C, Hu B (2018) Farm size and production efficiency in Chinese agriculture: output and profit. China Agricultural Economic Review 11: CAER-05-2018-0082

[13] Abebaw D, Ghaile M (2013) The impact of cooperatives on agricultural technology adoption: Empirical evidence from Ethiopia. Food Policy 38(2):342-354

[14] Maertens M, Velde KV (2017) Contract-farming in Staple Food Chains: The Case of Rice in Benin. World Development 95:73-87

[15] Slangen L (1996) How to Organise Nature Production by Farmers. European Review of Agricultural Economics 24(3-4):508-529

[16] Chowdhury JR (2021) Elite Status, Market Linkages, and Contributions to Collective Goods: Evidence from a Survey and Public Goods Experiments. Journal of Development Studies (4): 1-17

[17] Gijselinckx C, Bussels M (2015) Farmers' Cooperatives in Europe: Social and Historical Determinants of Cooperative Membership in Agriculture. Annals of Public & Cooperative Economics 85(4):509-530

[18] Wang FY, Wu XB, Sun WX (2016) Analysis of influencing factors of the driving effect of new agricultural business entities in agricultural entrepreneurship-Based on survey data analysis of 713 new agricultural business entities in Hubei Province. Arid Land Resources and Environment 30(10): 33-39

[19] Cheng Y, Luo D (2009) Farmers' Entrepreneurship Choices under Credit Constraints-An Empirical Analysis Based on the Survey of Chinese Farmers. China Rural Economy (11): 25-38

[20] Liu Q (2021) The construction of small farmers' organization path based on the spontaneous perspective. Agricultural Economics (05): 82-83

[21] Katz Jerome A (1993) The Dynamics of Organizational s Emergence: A Contemporary Group Formation Perspective. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice 17(2):97-101

[22] Xiao ZY, Lin S (2008) Research on Macao's Entrepreneurship Environment. China Soft Science (07):77-82