



Review

An Analysis of Rural Revitalization from the Perspective of Sharing Economy

Teng Li ^{a,b,*}, Deyi Zhou ^a^a College of Economics & Management, Huazhong Agricultural University, Wuhan 430070, China^b Faculty of Behavioral and Social Sciences, University of Groningen, Groningen 9712 TG, Netherlands

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article history:

Received 09 February, 2022

Received in revised form 24 February, 2022

Accepted on 26 February, 2022

**Corresponding author:*

Teng Li

liteng@webmail.hzau.edu.cn

Copyright:

©2022 by the authors. Licensee RDP.

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the creative commons attribution (CC By license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>))*Publisher's Note:*

RDP stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

ABSTRACT

Rural revitalization has been promoted in the national development strategy in China, which shows that the central government attaches great importance to issues regarding agriculture, rural areas, and farmers. Relying on the current opportunities for urban-rural resource integration and using the new ideas of the sharing economy, it is possible to explore more modes of implementation of the rural revitalization strategy. At present, China's rural revitalization is facing the development dilemma of small-scale farmers' diseconomies of scale, incomplete land reform, and conflicts with urbanization. We propose to improve the construction of rural spiritual civilization through agricultural specialization and the cultivation of new professional farmers. By improving the existing rural land system and transferring land at a low cost, it is possible to promote urban industrial and commercial capital to the countryside. At the same time, through developing community-supported agriculture and attracting urban intellectual resources, a modern rural revitalization development model of resource sharing will eventually be established.

Keywords: Sharing economy, Rural revitalization, Land reform, China

1. Introduction

The 19th National Congress of the Communist Party of China in 2017 formally put forward the strategy of rural revitalization and the general requirements for building new rural areas with “thriving businesses, pleasant living environments, social etiquette and civility, effective governance, and prosperity”, which have become the key starting point for the development of the country's agriculture, rural areas, and farmers in the future (Yang et al., 2021; Zhou et al., 2020). It has long been the status quo of China's rural society that agriculture is the basic industry, farmers account for the vast majority, and rural areas are numerous and scattered (Chen et al., 2018). From the perspective of the new era, socialism with Chinese characteristics is gradually becoming stronger. At the same time, if China is to be strong, the countryside must be strong. From the perspective of new contradictions, the principal social contradiction has become the contradiction between the people's ever-growing needs for a better life and unbalanced and inadequate development. The biggest imbalance at present is the imbalance between urban and rural

areas, and the biggest insufficiency is the insufficiency of rural development (Tan, 2020; Wang et al., 2020). From the new reality, the development logic of rural agricultural modernization is still unclear, and the input of industrial factors is too much and ineffective. Therefore, the rural revitalization strategy is imperative to realize the mutual promotion of land, capital, and knowledge by taking the road of urban-rural integrated development.

At present, most of the research on rural revitalization focuses on the level of policy interpretation and strategy overview. Some studies have emphasized the deployment highlights of rural revitalization in the report of the 19th National Congress of the Communist Party of China (Zeng et al., 2021). Some discuss the historical evolution of the idea of rural revitalization from the perspective of sociology (Li et al., 2018). More research is to theoretically explain the content, meaning, and institutional design of rural revitalization (Zhang et al., 2021; Zheng et al., 2018). The literature rarely analyzes the development dilemma and realization path of rural revitalization from the perspective of sharing economics. The main reason is that the

strategy has been proposed for a short period, related concepts need to be clarified, and there is no successful actual case or experience to follow. This paper tries to provide a new perspective to re-examine the problem of rural revitalization, and helps to find a better development model for rural development. The relevant results of this paper may provide some inspiration for the implementation of policies and the promotion of urban-rural industrial integration. Recently, with the development of third-party payment technology and the Internet industry, the sharing economy represented by shared bicycles, Didi taxis, and co-working has risen rapidly, opening new ways for urban-rural integration. Rural revitalization is destined to depend on the existing production factors in cities, and the integrated development of urban and rural areas must also require the flow and integration of resources (Irwin et al., 2010; Rabinovitch, 2019). The sharing here is to divide and trade the ownership of idle urban resources, actively develop and utilize rural ecological resources and surplus manpower, seek coordination and cooperation, share development dividends, and create a better life.

2. An Analysis of the Sharing Economy

2.1. The connotation and characteristics of the sharing economy

The founder of the sharing economy, Robin Chase, started the first sharing enterprise Zipcar in the United States in 1999. She believes that “sharing the excess resources owned by individuals to others and obtaining benefits in a certain sense is the sharing economy” (Chase, 2015). Simply put, the sharing economy is a platform economy. However, with the cooperation with big data, cloud computing, the Internet of Things, and other technologies, the content, and role of the sharing economy have changed and developed at this stage. Zieba and Durst (2018) point out that the core is not the so-called “sharing”, but the expansion of “cooperation” in the human society and economy (Zieba & Durst, 2018). Liu (2017) defines the sharing economy as an open exchange system that is supported by Internet technology, based on network platforms, and formed by the trust as a link to share the right to use individual idle resources

(Gen-rong, 2017). Zheng (2017) regards the sharing economy as a new way of thinking and resource allocation model based on Internet technology, which focuses on alleviating the contradiction between supply and demand (Zheng, 2017). Based on previous research, the definition of the sharing economy in this paper is that the ownership of idle resources is divided and traded in different ways, to develop rents that people have too much and do not use enough. We believe that the essence of the sharing economy is to share idle resources. The sharing economy has a long history, and the previous leasing and second-hand markets all have the characteristics of the sharing economy. According to different shared factors, the sharing economy can be divided into equipment sharing, manpower sharing, and land sharing. The means of sharing are mainly the reorganization of the process, the exchange of information, and the matching of different needs.

The sharing economy is a creative economy based on knowledge. The traditional economy relies on natural resources, whose quantity is limited and whose occupancy determines the income of individuals. This is a possessive traditional economy, where individuals strive to maximize private value through the monopoly of scarce resources. It emphasizes competition and isolation between individuals, mainly in the real estate economy, mineral economy, and agricultural economy. As a creative economy, the sharing economy takes knowledge as its foundation. Through institutional and technological innovations, the quality and quantity of social supply will be greatly increased under the given level of resource supply. Since the innovation space of knowledge is infinite, the resources on which the sharing economy depends are also infinite. An important form of the sharing economy is to realize the social value of idle resources. Among them, the most successful case is Airbnb, which establishes cooperation between tourists and homeowners who rent out vacant houses, revitalizes idle housing assets, and creates a traveling home rental community that is different from traditional hotel services (Guttentag, 2019). At present, the sharing economy mostly creates value through the close interaction and cooperation between producers and between producers and

consumers and is in a mode of cooperative competition.

The sharing economy originates from excess possession and underutilization of assets (Hossain, 2020). In the past, scarcity anxiety led people to possess far more than they needed. In the current society of excess manpower and excess goods, ownership and use rights are highly separated, and many items owned by consumers are rarely used, which creates the possibility of time segmentation of ownership. The sharing economy is essentially an economy that emphasizes the right to use or use-value. With the help of the Internet platform, the right to use is transferred to multiple parties, improving the efficiency of resource use to create value, and finally realizing the socialization of total factor productivity.

The efficiency condition for the establishment of the sharing economy is that the benefits brought by sharing are greater than the transaction costs, which are made possible by the abundance of property in modern society and the high-speed dissemination of information (Mont et al., 2020). In addition, while the sharing economy that shares existing properties can generally succeed, such as Didi taxis and shared houses, any sharing of newly purchased properties, such as shared bicycles, is bound to fail. The reason is that the sharing of newly purchased properties will weaken the existing ownership (such as the misplacement of bicycles), and the sharing of existing properties is to improve the efficiency of the use of goods without weakening the property rights, which is a Pareto improvement. Of course, the system of newly purchased shared assets can also survive, provided that the assets are expensive enough and the benefits of sharing are large enough. For example, the rental car in the United States is very developed, which is a specially purchased shared asset, and the legal system, personnel quality, and delivery inspection are also very good. The key to the success is that the transaction cost of sharing is low, and the ownership of the shared property is less weakened by shared use.

2.2. The value of the sharing economy

First, the sharing of cheap capital can drive the input of an expensive labor force. As the

highly developed social productivity has reached an unprecedented level, goods are relatively surplus and cheap (Messner et al., 2021). At the same time, labor prices continue to rise, and the personal idle time of the public is increasing. Idleness and the declining price of equipment and unemployment and rising costs of manpower lead to rapid change in the relative price of these two factors. The sharing economy is to use relatively abundant cheap shared assets to drive the use of relatively expensive idle labor force to create new added value. In essence, goods and assets grab the rent of labor factors. The reason why the shared material assets can drive the elements of labor under the sharing economy is that in consumers' minds, their time is often divided into two psychological accounts. One is the market account, which pursues market valuation; the other is the non-market account, which does not enter the pricing system. In the mode of sharing economy, consumers use other people's assets to serve themselves with the labor time of their non-market accounts; labor price is overlooked, resulting in overuse.

Second, the sharing economy promotes the progress of public welfare undertakings. Postmodern society is a pluralistic society, where the meaning of life has been redefined, and the traditional concepts of consumption and production, cost and income have been subverted. Contemporary society is undergoing a profound social transformation, which is marked by sufficient resources and scarce meanings (Scoones et al., 2019). Everyone is eager to seek the meaning of life, and they live for the meaning they identify with. Because there are differences in the understood meanings, costs can be transformed into profits and waste can also be regarded as a resource. For all activities organized based on interest, all the resources used are free, even at a negative price, and the cost of human and material resources can be ignored. Human resources begin to transform from the production side to the consumption side. The resources displayed in front of mankind seem infinite, which undermines the traditional concept of resources. In today's society, a significant reconstruction is that the division standard of social status is transformed from the possession of the traditional property to the contribution to social progress and public welfare

undertakings. Many rich people turn the traditional legacy of family members into care for the whole society, making many enterprises or individuals willing to donate and share their private resources (material and human resources) for public welfare. It can be said that one form of sharing economy is the public welfare economy, love economy, and gratitude economy.

Third, the marginal cost of information exchange is almost zero, allowing the match of more diversified supply and demand of goods and services. The Internet era provides technical support for personalized and diversified demand and supply. More and more small enterprises and consumers have joined the ranks of market transactions, and the previously useless idle goods and services have assumed market value. At the same time, with the rapid development of science and technology, the depreciation of goods has accelerated, and many goods, especially digital products, have depreciated even before becoming useless. Sharing slows down the value loss with time. The sharing economy is a process of de-intermediation and re-intermediation (Zhilai, 2016), which greatly shortens the supply chain and enables the sustainable use of goods and services in different spaces.

3. Realistic Dilemmas of Rural Revitalization

3.1. Social reality of the small-scale farming economy

From China's 4000 years of farming history to the current era of rural revitalization, the basic economic characteristics of Chinese villages have always been the small-scale peasant economy of "867 m² per capita and less than 6660 m² per household" (Fei, 2008; He et al., 2020). The plight of small-scale farmers is the diseconomy of production and transaction scales. Each single farming household is too weak to face the market shocks or maintain basic production conditions. The marketing ability of small farmers is weak, and their products can only be sold locally, often with a large amount of surplus. On the other hand, there are many unmet needs in cities. Under the background of globalization where China's small farmers must compete with foreign

mechanized agriculture, difficulty in selling farm products will be more common. Nor can this problem be solved by the newly emerging e-commerce of agricultural products, which is still too small to change the big picture of the supply and demand of China's agricultural products. Small-scale agriculture is one of the most important problems in the current agricultural situation in China. The result of not conducting large-scale and specialized operations is low efficiency and high cost (Lu & Gao, 2021). Lack of economies of scale in rural areas results in incomplete services, limiting career development space and creating a monolithic, static and knowledge-poor environment. In addition, the social reality of the small-scale farming economy is an important source of food insecurity (Zhilai, 2016). Many scattered individual farmers have become a difficult point in food safety supervision.

3.2. Obstacles to the reform of the land system

China's land system has been private ownership for a long time. Since most of the land is owned by farmers and labor, capital and land are integrated, generally ensuring that the tiller has his own land and the durability of China's agriculture. It has been proved to be an efficient system in thousands of years of practice and has been followed as such for a long time (Bryan et al., 2018). After 1949, China carried out land reform (Almond et al., 2019). After the short realization of land equalization, we quickly rolled out the cooperative movement and socialist transformation. Rural land was under collective ownership, and land and labor were separated. After 30 years of exploration and practice, it had been proved that collective land ownership was not conducive to stimulating farmers' labor enthusiasm (Ji et al., 2021; Zhou et al., 2020). Then, the rural contract responsibility system recombined, to a limited extent, labor and land for the second time, which greatly brought out farmers' enthusiasm and became the key point for the success of China's rural reform. However, this reform is not complete and, up to today, it has gradually evolved into the separation of ownership, contracting rights, and management rights. This seemingly clear definition of property rights is still a very

vague “expedient”, leaving sequelae to China's long-term economic and social development and restrained capital investment, as reflected mainly in the following aspects: (1) The fuzzy land property rights led to the game of land rent division and rent dissipation among different levels of governments, village collectives and farmers in land acquisition. (2) Because farmers do not have land ownership, the compensation in land acquisition is not compensation for land, but compensation for aboveground buildings and investment, which leads to the unique phenomenon of “planting houses” in China. (3) With the increase in labor price, the previous small land management system is becoming more and more inefficient (He et al., 2020), but since farmers cannot trade or transfer their land, a lot of land has become idle under the wave of urbanization. Scattered residence leads to difficulties in the management of domestic and production waste. Domestic waste such as plastics, glass, and batteries threaten the safety of rural land. (4) Although the Chinese government has designed the separation of contracting rights and management right in the land system to make the land flow, it only makes the short-term combination of land, labor, and capital while laying the groundwork for the rent-seeking and infringement of future landowners (contractors), thus inhibiting the interaction and integration of various factors of production.

Land economy (ownership economy, occupation economy, and rent-seeking economy) and sharing economy (knowledge economy, use right economy, and rent creation) coexist in China, especially in rural areas. The current rural land system is the biggest obstacle to the sharing economy. The protection of farmers by the harmonious society policy indirectly encourages the occupation economy and rent-seeking behavior. Many farmers occupy the land without using it. Once there is a proposed land flow, they will ask for prices indiscriminately or even repeatedly.

3.3. Conflict between rural revitalization and urbanization

With a large population, China is not rich in farming land. It is especially scarce on plains and, therefore, is not suitable for large-scale

agricultural mechanization, making the country fewer comparative advantages in agriculture (Yan et al., 2019). The general trend is for the population to concentrate in large cities to undertake industrial production (Oliver et al., 2020). As two isolated geographical units, urban and rural areas have developed different socio-economic forms. The essence of urbanization is to attract, with higher income, rural resources to cities, where the population density, the utilization efficiency of public resources and infrastructure, and the diversity and creativity are all higher. Therefore, if the phenomenon of farmers staying in the countryside and returning home to start businesses is widespread, it goes against the basic logic of urbanization and globalization.

The Ministry of Agriculture has repeatedly stressed that industrial and commercial capital is not allowed to go to the countryside. Its original intention is to prevent urban industrial and commercial capital from swallowing farmers' land and making farmers lose their livelihood, as occurred in the tragedy “sheep eating men”. However, careful analysis will find that this is a new discrimination policy based on registered residents restricting the free flow of factors. The government overestimates the value of rural resources that are hardly profitable in today's agricultural products oversupply. Chinese farmers are the most rational and productive group. The reason why they abandon their land just shows that the land value is very low. Policy regulations not only limit the flow of urban capital and technology but also limit the scope of farmers' land transfer. Instead of protecting farmers' interests, the policy indeed damages them. Industrial and commercial capital entering the countryside can bring new ideas and technologies, improve rural infrastructure, hire a rural labor force, rent rural land, and promote urban-rural integration. The advantages outweigh the disadvantages for farmers.

4. The Path to Achieving Rural Revitalization

The great difference between the degree of commercialization and marketization of urban and rural factors leads to obvious differences in their development. Agriculture-based rural

revitalization should focus on promoting the integrated development of primary, secondary, and tertiary industries. In particular, promoting new-type urbanization and improving factor productivity will help farmers transfer from inefficient agricultural sectors to more efficient non-agricultural industries and cities (Bhattamishra & Barrett, 2010; Jingyong, 2016).

4.1. Specialize agricultural operation and cultivate new professional farmers

The key to the rural revitalization strategy lies in “people”. The development of China's agriculture ultimately depends on specialization, large-scale operation, and professional new farmers to build loyal customer groups through large-scale production, a big logistics industry, and stable market channels. To reduce the cost of social management, one way is to concentrate farmers, that is, urbanization, and the other is to lessen the population of farmers, that is, to transfer some farmers to other industries and develop large-scale farming. With the continuous progress of the social economy and farming technology, capital becomes cheaper and cheaper, and labor is relatively more and more expensive, which makes the capital-labor ratio decline (Tarasuk et al., 2020). Adam Smith has given enough arguments to prove that specialization is the basis of technological innovation and efficiency improvement (Smith & Smith, 1987). Farmers must become specialized professionals. In the past, a farmer undertook on a par both farming and non-farming work, and a small farmer often planted a variety of different crops with low production efficiency.

The mass entrepreneurship and innovation activities encouraged by the Chinese government are to promote college students to come out of the traditional classroom and promote knowledge learning through project practice. A new professional farmer is a modern agricultural practitioner. They take agriculture as their occupation, have corresponding professional skills, and their income mainly comes from agricultural production and reaches a considerable level (Kontogeorgos et al., 2014; Zhao et al., 2019). When college students go to the countryside, they can observe rural production and life

more closely, find innovative projects with practical significance, cultivate their feelings for the countryside through rural life, and prepare the main force for new professional farmers in the future. Conversely, when rural people go to the city to work or visit their relatives, their rural houses are idle. At the same time, urban people have free time. They are depressed in the polluted and crowded city, willing to go to the open land of the countryside to breathe fresh air and stretch the distorted and suppressed human nature, which promotes the rise of shared rural housing. Some villages with geographical characteristics can combine local traditional handicrafts with urban free artists to build rural cultural and creative bases, which can also drive the sales of agricultural products and the employment of the idle labor force. China has entered the elderly society.

More and more elderly people retire at the age of about 60. Many people have been engaged in occupations they are not interested in for the sake of livelihood. They have had a farm dream hidden in their hearts for a long time. If this part of manpower and capital are combined with rural education and idle land, the fitness time of the elderly can be used for farming, The energy of raising pets can be used for breeding and education, and the funds for purchasing health products can be used for purchasing rural local products. The knowledge of retired engineers and scientists can be combined with backward rural education to not only devote themselves to human love but also make life more valuable in their later years. At present, China has developed a mature local creation system in Taiwan, which features city artists’ “participation” and “cooperation” instead of “guidance and intervention” (Lee et al., 2018). With “activity” as the design method, city artists invite local villagers to join in the thinking and creation of the development mode fitting for the local conditions. Through urbanized thinking and localized design, mutual benefits and symbiosis are achieved and the development of urban and rural areas is integrated.

4.2. De-emphasize land ownership, promote industrial and commercial capital to invest in the countryside

The core of the rural revitalization strategy is “land”. The most potential areas for the development of China's sharing economy are rural areas, and the most potential industries are land-related industries, such as agricultural land circulation, real estate, etc (Liu, 2018). The transfer of rural land by urban residents is beneficial to farmers. Limiting the scope of land transfer will reduce the available value of the land. The original intention of the central government's restriction on the transfer of industrial and commercial capital to rural land may be to protect the livelihood of farmers, to prevent farmers from selling land for temporary needs, and finally becoming landless farmers, affecting social stability (Huang & Du, 2018).

However, this assumption is worth deliberating. First, the wider the flow range, the more intense the competition, and the higher the value of the land. Limiting the scope of land circulation itself reduces the value of land, which is essentially damages farmers. Secondly, some “landless” farmers who have transferred land have not become the root of social unrest like the refugees in history. The key to the above assumption is that our mode of thinking still stays in the agricultural society. The current society has reached the stage of industrial society and knowledge society. The amount of land is no longer the most important factor of production nor the major reason for the income gap. At the same time, society also employs outside agriculture. Non-agricultural employment accounts for most of the total employment, while agriculture can only employ a few people. Farmers are rational agents who are born and raised on the land. They have more rational judgments than outsiders about their business ability, labor status, long-term plans, land value, and the worthiness of land circulation.

At present, the rural economy is mainly a traditional economy (Sarker et al., 2018). Anxiety and insecurity lead to excessive possession and insufficient use, with a large amount of real estate and land being idle. To develop from a possession economy to a

creative sharing economy, it needs zero cost or low-cost land transfer. To prevent the occupation of farmland without use, or the use of farmland for industry and commerce, the government can implement land taxes. Similarly, the regulation of the urban real estate economy should gradually rely on tax to promote the development of urban real estate from an occupation economy to sharing economy. Urban renewal and renovation have produced a large amount of construction waste and household waste, many of which can be reused, but these items are treated as waste due to their huge volume and high transportation cost. The information-sharing of our logistics capacity is not enough, and there are still many empty trucks on the road. If this part of the capacity is developed and utilized, it will greatly help reuse the waste generated by urban renewal and construction, and greatly reduce the cost of rural construction.

In addition, much second-hand equipment, such as outdated production facilities in urban factories, can be used for rural repair and manufacturing and scientific and technological inventions. At present, the development in this area is far from enough. The bottleneck is that the idle logistics from the city to the countryside have not been developed. Chinese cities not only have many idle capitals but also have modern business concepts and are familiar with urban logistics and business models. Agriculture in the future is an era of big business, big logistics, and big brands. Only those who know more about consumers and integrate into the big business circle can survive (Goyal et al., 2018). Allowing land to flow in a wider range is not only conducive to the increase of rural land value and the protection of farmers' interests, but also allows a better combination of land, capital, and knowledge, creates more employment opportunities and social wealth, and is conducive to farmers' local employment. When urban residents transfer land to rural areas, it is inevitable to hire local people to provide services, make up for the lack of local communication and transportation infrastructure, and bring the new concepts, aesthetics, market information, business modes, and technology of the city to rural areas.

4.3. Community supported agriculture

The most important thing to establishing an urban-rural community is to integrate urban and rural industries, break the barriers of segregation, gradually realize the two-way flow and optimal allocation of various production factors, and realize the rational division of labor between urban and rural areas. At present, the development of urban-rural industrial integration in China is still in its infancy (Yang et al., 2021). There are obstacles in the design and implementation of systems and mechanisms such as land policies, agricultural subsidies, and industrial policies. We must speed up the establishment and improvement of policies regarding urban-industrial development and “agriculture, rural areas, and farmers” so that citizens and villagers can participate in the process of the whole industrial chain and can share the dividends brought by the development of urban-rural integration. We should take the development of agricultural industrialization as an opportunity, make use of urban advanced production technology and intellectual resources, revitalize the flow of rural land and labor, and develop in the direction of a large-scale, intensive, and modernized agricultural industry. At the same time, we need to explore more diversified industrial development paths according to local conditions in practice. The essence of urbanization is the rise of new industries (with higher profits and driving population agglomeration) (Avtar et al., 2019).

A society without urbanization is a society with zero marginal productivity of labor, since the marginal return of agriculture decreases, and the final return of the new labor force is zero. In the process of urbanization, the relationship between urban and rural societies must be properly dealt with. Despite the potential needs of both urban and rural areas, due to the constraints on thinking caused by the economy of possession over the past thousands of years, various forms of sharing economy do not necessarily occur (Rawski & Li, 2018), and it needs the assistance of some intermediary organizations and platforms to lower the transaction cost of urban-rural interaction so that various idle resources can be effectively combined to better realize the integrated development of urban and rural areas. The essence of community-supported

agriculture is to combine the urban leisure labor force with the rural idle land. Citizens use holidays to engage in agricultural activities in the countryside to exercise or cultivate interest and obtain safe agricultural and sideline products, which in turn drives the employment of the rural labor force. Farmers can help them take care of crops or provide catering services, which in turn drives the employment of the rural labor force. Furthermore, the natural connection and trust between these citizens and urban community citizen groups can help eliminate information asymmetry, establish a short chain of agricultural products, and promote the sales of rural local products. A feasible way is to establish a direct selling chain of agricultural products. Surplus agricultural products can be distributed to citizens as welfare, which in turn can promote citizens' consumption.

Many farmers in rural areas are intelligent and often have good ideas, but they do not have the tools to realize their inventions (such as machine tools, lathes, and cutting machines), while cities have some idle or outdated lathe equipment and tools, as well as intellectual resources such as retired engineers and scientists. By using a large number of idle rural facilities and real estate, we can establish an entrepreneurship center - similar to Sinovation Ventures (chuangxin.com) - the farmers' invention workshop with shared rural facilities and equipment to let farmers realize their invention and entrepreneurship dreams. Mr. Fujita Kazuyoshi of Japan established Oisix ra daichi (<https://en.oisixradaichi.co.jp>, an earth protection association) to advocate organic agricultural operations all over the world (Liu & Walsh, 2019). At present, he also carries out development cooperation with Beijing Fuping School to promote organic agriculture in China and is committed to solving food, agriculture, and environmental problems (Fei, 2008). The fundamental logic of organic agriculture is to establish the trust of producers and consumers. Joining agricultural associations like Oisix ra daichi will not only enable farmers to have a good life and work in rural areas but also improve land and achieve sustainable productivity. At his insistence, organic agricultural products have finally gained a firm foothold. His Oisix ra daichi has become one of the most powerful ecological trust agricultural enterprises in

Japan. Based on this, community supported agriculture (Paul, 2019; Van Oers et al., 2018) and organic agriculture (Meemken & Qaim, 2018) can be another development direction of rural revitalization.

5. Conclusion

As a cooperative economy, the sharing economy needs both or more parties to rational use and protect the shared property, establish the trust chain between citizens and farmers, and finally create a free and equal trading environment. At the same time, the logic of realizing rural revitalization also needs the support of institutional factors. It is worth thinking that the sharing of property use rights may cause gaps in property use and management, which is also the main problem faced by bike-sharing. It is necessary to rely on policy design to bridge the gap in actual management and improve the overall quality of participants. As a hot topic for Chinese scholars, rural revitalization has been constantly discussed. This paper uses the idea of sharing economy to discuss the beneficial enlightenment of sharing economy in rural revitalization and development. Some more feasible opinions and suggestions are put forward, including relying on the current opportunities for integrating urban and rural resources, specializing in agricultural operations, cultivating new types of professional farmers, and transforming and improving the existing rural land system, etc., which are ultimately conducive to the realization of urban-rural integrated development.

Overall, the scale and scope of China's sharing economy have reached an unprecedented level. The sharing economy has created a huge cake for society, and also opens a new path for the implementation of the rural revitalization strategy. In addition, China's rural land system is in urgent need of reform to give farmers more complete land property rights, stimulate the vitality of rural areas again, and promote the accumulation of rural capital and knowledge. Rural society is a kind of blood patriarchal society, and the psychological boundary between insiders and outsiders is very clear. With the rapid development of science and technology and the accelerated transformation of society, the traditional value

system is falling apart. Society and individuals are trying to find the eternal meaning of existence in the loss. Only by subjecting oneself to rational questioning, emancipating from traditional ideas, and correctly positioning self-worth from a larger group perspective can we obtain a moment of peace. Finally, both urban and rural people will go beyond the narrow boundaries of personal gains and losses and family blood, find out the meaning of life in the social community and establish an urban-rural community based on ideas.

Conflict of Interest

Authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Almond, D., Li, H., & Zhang, S. (2019). Land reform and sex selection in China. *Journal of Political Economy*, 127(2), 560-585.
- Avtar, R., Tripathi, S., Aggarwal, A. K., & Kumar, P. (2019). Population–urbanization–energy nexus: a review. *Resources*, 8(3), 136.
- Bhattachamishra, R., & Barrett, C. B. (2010). Community-based risk management arrangements: a review. *World Development*, 38(7), 923-932.
- Bryan, B. A., Gao, L., Ye, Y., Sun, X., Connor, J. D., Crossman, N. D., . . . Yu, D. (2018). China's response to a national land-system sustainability emergency. *Nature*, 559(7713), 193-204.
- Chase, R. (2015). *Sharing economy—reconstructing the new model of future business*. Hangzhou, Zhejiang: Zhejiang People's Publishing House.
- Chen, Y., Wang, G., & Sun, W. (2018). Agricultural status and agricultural development in the rural revitalization strategy. *Issues in Agricultural Economy*, 1, 20-26.
- Fei, X. T. (2008). *Native China*. Beijing: People's Publishing House.
- Gen-rong, L. (2017). *Shared Economy: The Subversion of the Traditional Economic Model*. Economist.
- Goyal, S., Sergi, B. S., & Esposito, M. (2018). *Business development services for micro, small and medium enterprises—*

- literature review of past trends and future directions. *World Review of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*, 14(3), 312-332.
- Guttentag, D. (2019). Progress on Airbnb: a literature review. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*.
- He, S., Wang, D., Zhao, P., Li, Y., Lan, H., Chen, W., & Jamali, A. A. (2020). A review and prospects of debris flow waste-shoal land use in typical debris flow areas, China. *Land Use Policy*, 99, 105064.
- Hossain, M. (2020). Sharing economy: A comprehensive literature review. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 87, 102470.
- Huang, Z., & Du, X. (2018). Holding the market under the stimulus plan: Local government financing vehicles' land purchasing behavior in China. *China Economic Review*, 50, 85-100.
- Irwin, E. G., Isserman, A. M., Kilkenny, M., & Partridge, M. D. (2010). A century of research on rural development and regional issues. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 92(2), 522-553.
- Ji, X., Liu, S., Yan, J., & Li, Y. (2021). Does Security of Land Operational Rights Matter for the Improvement of Agricultural Production Efficiency under the Collective Ownership in China? *China & World Economy*, 29(1), 87-108.
- Jingyong, X. (2016). Supply-side reform in agriculture and improvement in total factor productivity. *Journal of Jishou University (Social Sciences Edition)*, 37(3), 20.
- Kontogeorgos, A., Michailidis, A., Chatzitheodoridis, F., & Loizou, E. (2014). "New farmers" a crucial parameter for the greek primary sector: assessments and perceptions. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 14, 333-341.
- Lee, K., Szapiro, M., & Mao, Z. (2018). From global value chains (GVC) to innovation systems for local value chains and knowledge creation. *The European Journal of Development Research*, 30(3), 424-441.
- Li, Y., Jia, L., Wu, W., Yan, J., & Liu, Y. (2018). Urbanization for rural sustainability—Rethinking China's urbanization strategy. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 178, 580-586.
- Liu, X., & Walsh, J. (2019). Study on development strategies of fresh agricultural products e-commerce in China. *International Business Research*, 12(8), 61-70.
- Liu, Y. (2018). Introduction to land use and rural sustainability in China. *Land Use Policy*, 74, 1-4.
- Lu, J., & Gao, X. (2021). Biogas: potential, challenges, and perspectives in a changing China. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 150, 106127.
- Meemken, E.-M., & Qaim, M. (2018). Organic agriculture, food security, and the environment. *Annual Review of Resource Economics*, 10, 39-63.
- Messner, R., Johnson, H., & Richards, C. (2021). From surplus-to-waste: A study of systemic overproduction, surplus and food waste in horticultural supply chains. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 278, 123952.
- Mont, O., Palgan, Y. V., Bradley, K., & Zvolaska, L. (2020). A decade of the sharing economy: Concepts, users, business and governance perspectives. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 269, 122215.
- Oliver, D. M., Zheng, Y., Naylor, L. A., Murtagh, M., Waldron, S., & Peng, T. (2020). How does smallholder farming practice and environmental awareness vary across village communities in the karst terrain of southwest China? *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 288, 106715.
- Paul, M. (2019). Community - supported agriculture in the United States: Social, ecological, and economic benefits to farming. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 19(1), 162-180.
- Rabinovitch, J. (2019). Global, regional and local perspectives towards sustainable urban and rural development. In *Environmental Strategies for Sustainable Development in Urban Areas* (pp. 16-44). Routledge.

- Rawski, T. G., & Li, L. M. (2018). Chinese history in economic perspective (Vol. 13). University of California Press.
- Sarker, M. N. I., Hossain, M. A., Anusara, J., Chanthamith, B., & Kumar, N. (2018). Practices of low carbon economy in China: Challenges and opportunities for economic development. *Low Carbon Economy*, 9(01), 18.
- Scoones, I., Smalley, R., Hall, R., & Tsikata, D. (2019). Narratives of scarcity: Framing the global land rush. *Geoforum*, 101, 231-241.
- Smith, A., & Smith, A. (1987). The Glasgow Edition of the Works and Correspondence of Adam Smith: VI: Correspondence (Vol. 6). Oxford University Press.
- Tan, M. F. (2020). Research on the Internal Mechanism of Urban-rural Integrated Development to Promote the Implementation of Rural Revitalization Strategy. *Xue Hai*, 4, 1-8.
- Tarasuk, V., Fafard St-Germain, A.-A., & Loopstra, R. (2020). The relationship between food banks and food insecurity: insights from Canada. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 31(5), 841-852.
- Van Oers, L. M., Boon, W., & Moors, E. H. (2018). The creation of legitimacy in grassroots organisations: A study of Dutch community-supported agriculture. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 29, 55-67.
- Wang, Y., Zhang, D., Ji, Q., & Shi, X. (2020). Regional renewable energy development in China: a multidimensional assessment. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 124, 109797.
- Yan, J., Chen, C., & Hu, B. (2019). Farm size and production efficiency in Chinese agriculture: output and profit. *China Agricultural Economic Review*.
- Yang, J., Yang, R., Chen, M.-H., Su, C.-H. J., Zhi, Y., & Xi, J. (2021). Effects of rural revitalization on rural tourism. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 47, 35-45.
- Yang, Y., Bao, W., Wang, Y., & Liu, Y. (2021). Measurement of urban-rural integration level and its spatial differentiation in China in the new century. *Habitat International*, 117, 102420.
- Zeng, X., Zhao, Y., & Cheng, Z. (2021). Development and research of rural renewable energy management and ecological management information system under the background of beautiful rural revitalization strategy. *Sustainable Computing: Informatics and Systems*, 30, 100553.
- Zhang, J., Mishra, A. K., & Hirsch, S. (2021). Market-oriented agriculture and farm performance: Evidence from rural China. *Food Policy*, 100, 102023.
- Zhao, D., Chen, Y., Parolin, B., & Fan, X. (2019). New Professional Farmers' Training (NPFT): A multivariate analysis of farmers' participation in lifelong learning in Shaanxi, China. *International Review of Education*, 65(4), 579-604.
- Zheng, L. (2017). Sharing Economy: Essence, Mechanism, Models and Risks. *International Economic Review*, 6, 45-69.
- Zheng, R., Weng, Z., & Huang, J. (2018). Rural revitalization strategy: Urban-rural integration, factor allocation and institutional arrangements—The implementation of the rural revitalization strategy in the new era and the i-depth promotion of structural reform on the agricultural supply side summit summary. *Agric. For. Econ. Manag.*, 1, 1-6.
- Zhilai, Z. (2016). Research on sharing economy and new business model from the perspective of supply side [J]. *Economic issues exploration*, 6, 15-20.
- Zhou, Y., Li, X., & Liu, Y. (2020). Rural land system reforms in China: History, issues, measures and prospects. *Land Use Policy*, 91, 104330.
- Zhou, Y., Li, Y., & Xu, C. (2020). Land consolidation and rural revitalization in China: Mechanisms and paths. *Land Use Policy*, 91, 104379.
- Zieba, M., & Durst, S. (2018). Knowledge risks in the sharing economy. In *Knowledge management in the sharing economy* (pp. 253-270). Springer.