

A Review of Research on the Withdrawal of Rural Homesteads in China

Feiyang Zhou

School of Zhejiang university of Technology, Hangzhou 310023, China

2387376408@qq.com

Abstract. The withdrawal of rural homesteads is of great practical significance to revitalize China's idle homesteads, improve land-use efficiency and promote urban-rural harmonious development. Over the years, scholars have conducted a large number of studies and achieved fruitful research results in the area of rural homestead withdrawal. This paper adopts the literature analysis method and inductive summary method to sort out the current status of existing research from two perspectives of research content and research method, and puts forward the deficiencies of current research.

Keywords: withdrawal of rural homesteads; influential factors; exit mode; compensation for quitting.

1. Introduction

Over the years, due to the priority and rapid development of industrialization, China has long been caught in the developmental dilemma of a dualistic economic structure. In this context, compared with agriculture, the comparative advantages of non-agricultural industries have become more and more obvious, which has resulted in a large number of rural laborers moving to secondary and tertiary industries. The continuing exodus of the rural population has led to the increasingly significant phenomena of idle rural homesteads, empty villages and abandoned fields. At the same time, the phenomenon of "multiple dwellings for one household", caused by historical inheritance and other reasons, is particularly prevalent in rural areas, and it has further aggravated the situation of idle rural residential land. In addition, the massive increase in demand for new land for urban construction in the context of accelerated urbanization, and the enormous pressure on China to strictly abide by the red line of 1.8 billion mu of arable land, have made the withdrawal of rural homesteads particularly important and necessary. At present, the strong contradiction between the low utilization of rural residential land and the shortage of land resources has gradually given rise to an invisible market for the withdrawal of rural homesteads, which is also the objective requirement of the current modernization of China. Considering the subjective willingness of farmers, in recent years, the proportion of non-agricultural income of farmers has been increasing, and a large portion of farmers have purchased houses in cities or townships, and there exists a subjective willingness to withdraw from the homesteads. Therefore, exploring an effective mechanism for the withdrawal of rural homesteads and guiding farmers to realize the orderly withdrawal are not only the objective requirements to promote the re-allocation of rural land resources and improve the efficiency of homestead use, but also the inevitable choices to promote China's urbanization and modernization. At present, many experts and scholars have conducted extensive research on issues related to the withdrawal of rural residential land in China. This paper mainly combs, generalizes and summarizes the existing relevant literature from the aspects of research content and research methodology to grasp the current research progress of homestead withdrawal, and puts forward the shortcomings of the research as well as the future research directions according to the current research situation, aiming at providing theoretical support for the promotion of the orderly withdrawal from rural homesteads.

2. Organization of the Text

2.1. Main research content

2.1.1 The necessity of implementing the withdrawal of rural homesteads

A review of the existing literatures reveals that studies on the necessity of withdrawing rural residential land often take the outstanding problems in the utilization of homesteads under the existing institutional framework as the entry point for analysis. One of the most typical and widely publicized problems is the "extensive idling of residential land and serious waste of land resources". Scholars have given different explanations as to why the problem has arisen. Xuefeng He ^[1] pointed out that policy restrictions such as the household registration system lead to the inability of urban farmers to fully enjoy urban public welfare, coupled with the lack of the ability of farmers to settle in cities, in order to prevent the situation of failure to return to the city, farmers subjectively leave the residential land unused to provide themselves with a "way back to their hometowns". Yingbin Feng and Qingyuan Yang ^[2] indicated that the imbalance between the rapid reduction of rural population caused by a large number of rural laborers going to the cities to work, and the demand for newly-built houses under the influence of the improvement of agricultural households' living standards and changes in the family size, resulted in the opposite evolvement of "people decreasing and land increasing", which led to the excessive homestead per household, thus aggravating the idleness and waste of the residential land. Lixia Tang and Haoran Liu ^[3] believed that, due to the inadequate management of the residential land approval at the grass-roots level and the substantial lack of village planning, the sites for the construction of new houses are chosen arbitrarily, while the old houses are not demolished in accordance with the regulations, appearing the homestead idle phenomenon of "build new but not demolish the old" and "multiple dwellings for one household".

The orderly withdrawal of rural residential land can effectively solve the above problems. Specifically, the necessity of withdrawing from rural homesteads is summarized in the following three points: (1) It helps the efficient and intensive utilization of rural land resources and promotes rural economic development. Lixia Yang et al. [4] pointed out that the withdrawal of homesteads can effectively revitalize a large number of idle rural residential land, meet the demand for land for new industries and new business forms in rural areas, reduce the ineffective and low-end supply of rural land, and solve the problem of inefficient land use. (2) It helps to accelerate the pace of integrated urban-rural development. Balancing urban and rural development requires the interactive development of "urban" and "rural", Jianqiang Fu and Cailing Guo [5] proposed that the withdrawal of residential land will integrate the use of rural land resources and urban resources to achieve the effective allocation and integration of urban and rural resources, to overcome the land system that constrains the development of the economy, and to promote the coordinated development of urban and rural areas. The key to coordinated urban-rural development is "city driving the countryside", and the withdrawal of homesteads can precisely promote urbanization in the form of easing the contradiction between the supply and demand of urban and rural land resources. Yong Zhang and Tingting Bao [6] stated that through the mechanism of homestead withdrawal, the increase in urban construction land is linked to the decrease in rural construction land, thus realizing the spatial transfer of the right to development of residential land. This can expand the space for urban development and ensure the demand for construction land for urbanization, thus effectively promoting the urbanization process and realizing the goal of "city driving the countryside". (3) It helps to increase the welfare level of rural households. Yingbin Feng and Lei Gu [7] found that compensation for quitting in the context of poverty alleviation relocation has the nature of family improvement and policy welfare, which can effectively enhance the well-being of rural households. Fachao Liang and Caiyun Lin [8], by comparing the welfare effect of rural households withdrawing from rural residential land under different patterns, found that the total welfare level of rural households had been improved after the withdrawal of rural residential land under the asset replacement pattern and the index replacement pattern.

2.1.2 Difficulties and factors affecting rural households' withdrawal of homesteads

a. Difficulties in withdrawing from homesteads

Research in the existing literatures on the difficulties of withdrawing from homesteads mainly focuses on the following perspectives: (1) The subject of ownership of rural homesteads is not sound. On the one hand, the subject of ownership is in a virtual position. Junshu Lv and Shuo Zhang [9] pointed out that the owner of the homestead, the rural collective, is a vaguely expressed and ambiguous category, and the ambiguity of the subject will lead to the lack of a clear dominant force in the homestead withdrawal process, which will hinder the withdrawal work. On the other hand, the representative bodies of the subject of ownership and the bodies exercising power are unable to represent public opinion. Dong Han et al. [10] suggested that, governed by self-interested tendency behavior, the grass-roots management institutions in rural areas are generally overstepping or absent, and their decisions and actions are often above the collective, so that the public opinion can not be reflected and the collective interests are damaged. (2) The insufficient incentive mechanism for the withdrawal of homesteads as a result of the incomplete right to the homesteads. Farmers have the right to occupy and use collectively owned land in accordance with the law, while the limited right to dispose of it is confined within the collectives, which means that farmers cannot dispose of and operate the homesteads they have the right to use to generate income [11]. At the same time, considering the gratuitous nature of the acquisition of homesteads and the indefinite nature of the use of homesteads, farmers are even less motivated to withdraw from homesteads [9]. (3) The compensation mechanism for the withdrawal of homesteads is unreasonable. Wenfeng Fu et al. [12] emphasized that the reasonable compensation standard for rural homestead withdrawal is significant in guaranteeing the sharing of land property rights and interests among farmers, and in regulating and motivating the withdrawal behavior of farmers. Qinggui Yang [13] proposed that the current compensation mechanism for the withdrawal of homesteads in China has problems such as compensation standards are generally low and vary widely from place to place, a single form of compensation, large variability of compensation standards, which restricts the effectiveness and sustainability of the rural residential land withdrawal mechanism, to a large extent, affecting the enthusiasm of farmers to withdraw. Zhaolin Wang et al. [14] analyzed the extent of farmers' land revenue loss during the rural homestead withdrawal in Chongqing from the perspective of comparative revenue, and found that the main factor that caused the loss is the low compensation. (4) Traditional concepts. Heqiang Wang [15] stated that the rural labor force exodus has led to the current prevalence of elderly people managing homesteads in rural areas, and the deep nostalgia of the left-behind elderly greatly restricts the withdrawal of homesteads. Cailing Wei et al. [16] believed that traditional concepts such as "attached to the land and unwilling to move" and "fallen leaves return to the roots" as well as the "sense of ancestral home" have lowered the willingness of some of the rural-urban migration to withdraw from homesteads.

b. factors affecting rural households' withdrawal of homesteads

The homestead is the most basic livelihood security for rural households, as well as an important foundation for rural economic and social development and social stability. Guiding the orderly withdrawal of rural residential land is an effective way to solve many problems in the management of homesteads in China. In the process of implementation, farmers as the main body of the right to use homesteads, their will needs to be fully respected [17]. And understand the key factors affecting the rural households to withdraw from homesteads is of great practical significance for the smooth implementation of homestead withdrawal and the effective protection of the legitimate rights and interests of rural households.

From the point of view of the existing literatures, experts and scholars have conducted a large number of studies on the willingness of farmers to withdraw from homesteads and the factors affecting them, which are summarized in the following two dimensions: (1) Qualitative research. Xinhua Zhu [18] believed that the urban-rural differences in the employment system and social security system under the current household registration system have caused an imbalance in resource

allocation and power distribution between urban and rural areas, with the urban population continuing to enjoy the vested interests while the rural population is excluded from sharing resources. Such a differentiated treatment seriously restricts the willingness of farmers to withdraw from the homesteads. Therefore, the strength of the reform of the household registration system is an important factor in influencing the withdrawal of rural households. Qiuqin Zhang et al. [19] analyzed six typical sample areas in Guizhou using statistical analysis, and found that peasants' understanding of the policy, the way of compensation and the expected improvement of living condition had relatively great influence on the willingness to quit homestead. Taking Chongqing as an example, Lianzi Liu and Yue Chen [20] suggested that the homestead ownership policy, deferent urban and rural land market, deferent homestead exit compensation standards, and the lack in incentive mechanism are the main factors influencing the farmers' withdrawal of homesteads. Based on the risk society theory, Hongtao Jin et al. [21] divided the risk perception of farmers' withdrawal of homesteads into three dimensions: security risk, economic risk and psychological risk, and proposed that risk perception generates a significant inhibitory effect on farmers' willingness to withdraw from homesteads. (2) Quantitative research. In quantitative research, based on different perspectives, scholars have used econometric models to empirically analyze a variety of factors affecting farmers' willingness to withdraw from homesteads, and have come to many different conclusions. Based on the perspective of Maslow's needs theory, Yongchao Zhang [22] used Probit econometric analysis model from the perspective of Maslow's demand theory to study the withdrawal of farmers' homesteads in Anyi, Jiangxi and Jianli, Hubei, and concluded that the social security and livelihood factors (characterizing the security needs of farmers), the development opportunity factors and the policy interaction factors (characterizing farmers' social and respect needs) all had a significant impact on the homestead withdrawal, of which the former's impact strength was relatively strong. Using binary logistic regression analysis and multicollinearity diagnosis, Guandong Liu et al. [23] analyzed farmers' withdrawal intention in Guanzhong area from the intergenerational perspective, and found that the influence of personal emotional characteristics on the willingness of farmers to quit was most significant, and the differences between different generations were obvious. Taking the push-pull theory as the analytical framework, Guancheng Guo and Yingmeng Chen [24] constructed a logit model and multiple regression model for empirically analysis, and got the conclusion that the family life cycle is an important factor affecting farmers' choice of homestead exit. Due to differences in family characteristics and family needs, the willingness to exit varies among different types of families, which can be ranked in terms of intensity as follows: stable family < empty nest family < raising family < expanding family < supporting family. Jinhai Yan et al. [25] applied the structural equation model to the analysis of the influence mechanism of psycho-emotional factors in farmers' homestead withdrawal decision-making, and the results showed that farmers' willingness to exit was influenced by a combination of homeland attachment and urban integration, with the former acting as a negative inhibitor and the latter as a positive facilitator. Based on farmer stratum differentiation, Zhaolin Wang et al. [26] applied the preliminary and improved B-Probit estimation model to quantitatively analyze the factors of the homestead withdrawal decision. And the results showed that the withdrawal decision of all classes of farmers was affected by the costs, benefits and risks before and after withdrawal. However, there were large differences in the extent to which different classes of farmers respond to different factors. Farmers in vulnerable class were influenced mainly by social factors such as livelihood and perception when making decisions on land withdrawal, while those in the "out of the land" class were more likely to be influenced by economic factors such as property-based income.

2.1.3 Scheme design of for rural homestead withdrawal

a. Rural homestead withdrawal modes

In recent years, in order to efficiently utilize idle land resources, activate rural resource elements, and promote the integrated development of urban and rural areas, various regions of China have

explored the rural homestead withdrawal mode, which has become a major hot spot of the current academic research on the issue of rural homestead.

First of all, since choosing the rural homestead withdrawal mode needs to be adapted to the local conditions, the modes are different in different regions and have diversified characteristics. Xiaoxia Peng [27] categorized the China rural homestead withdrawal modes mainly into three types: the rural homestead replacement mode, with homestead replacement mode in Shanghai, “two-distribution and two-exchange” in Jiading and “homestead exchange for housing” in Tianjin as the typical ones; the rural homestead acquisition and reserve mode; and the rural homestead “separate-merge courtyard” mode. Xingguo Huang and Zhanqi Wang [28] categorized homestead withdrawal modes into three types according to the different implementation leading parties of homestead withdrawal: government-led mode, enterprise-led mode, and village collective-led mode. Similarly, Weibai Liu and Zhong Li [29] also divided the modes according to the different dominant parties, the difference was that they took the double domination into consideration. So they classified the homestead withdrawal modes into four categories, namely, local government-led mode, market-led mode, village collective-led mode, and dual-led model of local government and village collectives. Changchun Zhang et al. [30] refined and summarized the current rural homestead withdrawal modes and identified four types: urbanized village transformation mode, internal village transformation mode, overall relocation and transformation mode, and central village construction mode. Bilin Xiao et al. [31] divided the rural homestead withdrawal modes into the following four types: urban-rural integrated mode, with the Chengdu-Chongqing “urban-rural integration” model being the most distinctive; urban village and industrial park village mode, with the transformation of Beijing Tangjialing(urban village) and Zhejiang Yiwu Industrial Park (industrial park village) as the typical example; residential land consolidation mode, including joint construction consolidation mode, relocation and consolidation mode and removal of villages and combined residence mode; government-led mode, with the increasing of urban construction land and decreasing of rural residential land mode being the most representative.

Scholars have conducted a large number of theoretical analysis and empirical studies on different modes of homestead withdrawal. (1) Theoretical analysis focuses on examining the applicability and feasibility of different modes. Using text analysis and taking Yiwu City of Zhejiang Province, Yucheng City of Shandong Province, Yicheng City of Hubei Province, and Pingluo of Ningxia the four pilot areas of homestead system reform as case areas, Xiao Lv et al. [32] constructed a two-dimensional policy analysis framework of “policy tools-policy goals” to conduct a comparative analysis of policy tools and practice of homestead withdrawal at the county level, so as to analyze the characteristics and applicability of the homestead withdrawal policy in typical areas. Focused on the homestead withdrawal mode in Chengdu, Sichuan Province, Qihuai Diao [33] theoretically analyzed its five typical modes, namely, “double-renounce” mode, rural land comprehensive consolidation mode, “land ticket trade” mode, monetized compensation mode, and rural homestead acquisition and reserve mode, and evaluated the feasibility, implementation effects, and problems of these modes, for the purpose of continuously promoting the homestead withdrawal. Based on the theoretical framework of “structural-process” perspective, Fachao Liang and Caiyun Lin [34] compares three modes of paid exit in rural homestead in Jinjiang, Fujian Province horizontally and vertically, and analyzed the operational effects and dilemmas of the different modes. After gaining some certainty about the feasibility and applicability of each mode, they made recommendations for optimizing the path of rural homestead withdrawal. (2) Empirical studies have focused on exploring the selection preferences and welfare effects of different modes. Fachao Liang and Lihui Liu [35] applied a multiple logistic model to empirically analyze farmers’ selection preference under different exit modes in Jinjiang, Fujian, and obtained that there was a significant difference in the selection preference under different modes. Huan Li and Anlu Zhang [36] analyzed different farmers’ welfare with exiting modes and dynamic change using fuzzy evaluation method and quantified the influencing factors of welfare by logistic regression, and found that cash and in-kind was a widely acceptable resettlement pattern in terms of welfare improvement.

b. Compensation standard and compensation mode for withdrawing from rural Homesteads

Scientific and reasonable compensation standards and compensation modes for the rural homestead withdrawal are of great significance to the establishment of an effective paid withdrawal mechanism of rural homestead, guide and incentivize farmers to voluntarily withdraw from the residential land, and activate the asset attributes of idle homesteads. Scholars have conducted a great deal of research on them and have achieved remarkable results.

Regarding the compensation standard for the rural homestead withdrawal, scholars have conducted extensive research, and after sorting and summarizing, there are mainly the following three points of view: (1) Compensation for the rural homesteads withdrawal is only for the buildings and other appurtenances on the homesteads. Xiaofeng Xu [37] argued that due to the gratuitousness of the acquisition of homesteads, the government, when compensating for the homestead withdrawal, only needs to consider reasonable compensation for the buildings and other appurtenances on the homesteads, and does not need to take the homesteads themselves into account. (2) Compensation for the withdrawal of rural homesteads includes compensation for the homesteads, and the buildings and other appurtenances on the homesteads. Yuanyuan Guo and Yingbin Feng [38] indicated that compensation should be given to farmers for the withdrawal of rural homesteads on the basis of comprehensive consideration of the homesteads as well as the buildings and other appurtenances on them; since quitting will result in the loss of the farmers' usufructuary rights to the homesteads, farmers should be entitled to compensation for the homesteads themselves, in addition to the ground attachments. (3) Compensation for the withdrawal of rural homesteads should include various aspects. Hu Yinguen et al. [39] estimated the value of rural residential land according to its housing security function, production factor function and uncertainty of future returns, which could provide scientific basis for making reasonable compensation standard. From the perspective of welfare economics, Sigui Xu et al. [40] took the exit cost of the actors and the future value-added gain of the homestead under uncertain conditions as the key to reasonably determine the compensation standard for rural homestead withdrawal, and established a global compensation standard. Dan Liu and Qianwen Gong [41], however, believed that the economic utility of the housing security function, the production and operation function, the economic property function and the emotional inheritance function of the homestead is an important element of the homestead withdrawal compensation value system.

With regard to the compensation modes for the rural homestead withdrawal, "property rights replacement" and "monetary compensation" are the two generally recognized modes. Taking various factors into consideration, scholars have expanded and extended the above two modes, and proposed diversified compensation modes. Ming Chen [42] pointed out that as the core of the compensation policy for the rural homesteads withdrawal, reasonable compensation modes can enhance farmers' willingness to withdraw, and he also recognized the three compensation options of monetary compensation, housing replacement and employment resettlement. After comprehensively considering the improvement of the rural living environment and the multi-level demands of farming households, Yanbo Qu et al. [43] put forward the four homestead withdrawal modes of asset exchange, monetary compensation, exchanging old-age service with homestead, and equity participation with homestead. And they indicated that there were obvious differences in the functions and operational characteristics of different modes, which were adapted to the development needs of different regions and the demand preferences of different groups. Honglin Gong and Minghai Lin [44] argued that the necessity of grasping farmers' heterogeneous characteristics in policy practice requires the adoption of precise and combined compensation modes based on the specific situation of farmers and their willingness, which includes the combinational design of the four compensation modes, namely, housing resettlement, supplementary social security payment, monetary compensation, and employment resettlement. Comprehensively taking into account farmers' demands for homestead property function, housing appeal, enjoying the equalization of public security, stable employment and raising household income, and in order to satisfy the above to the greatest extent, Yong Zhang [45] put forward compensation in the form of monetary compensation, housing compensation, urban social security, employment security, vocational skills training, as well as a combination of them.

2.2. Main research methodology

In terms of research methods, Chinese scholars have mainly used the following three methods in studying the issue of rural residential land withdrawal: the questionnaire survey method of farmers, the statistical and econometric modeling method, and the case study method in sociology.

2.2.1 Questionnaire survey method of farmers

In recent years, the questionnaire survey method of farmers has been widely used in the study of rural homestead withdrawal, such as: analysis on farmers' willingness to exit their homesteads and influencing factors [4, 19, 21-26, 46], research on farmers' selection preference and influence factors of rural residential land withdrawal under different patterns [35], analysis on influencing factors of farmers' compensation willingness to withdraw from rural homesteads [47,48], compensation preference and influencing factors of farmers' rural residential land withdrawal [44,45], research on dilemmas of rural residential land exit [9], research on the welfare effect of rural households withdrawing from rural residential land [4, 8, 36, 49-50] , etc.

2.2.2 Statistical analysis and econometric modeling method

Statistical analysis and econometric modeling are currently the most commonly used research methods in the field of rural homestead withdrawal. By using statistical analysis method to organize and summarize the data obtained from the research, scholars are able to obtain information such as the personal and family characteristics of the sample farmers, the preference and evaluation of the sample farmers on issues related to the homesteads withdrawal, etc. For example, according to the results of the questionnaire survey, Zhanlu Zou et al. [51] learned about the distribution of the sample farmers' gender, age, education and non-farm income share, as well as the essential attributes of their homesteads, and recognized the phenomenon of serious waste of idle homesteads. In practice, statistical analysis is rarely used alone in research, but is usually combined with econometric modeling method. Econometric models that are often used in rural homestead exit studies include probit model [22, 52-53], binary logistic model [24, 51, 54], logit model [24, 55], and structural equation model [46, 56]. Applying econometric models to empirical analysis can effectively grasp the various mechanisms of rural households' homestead withdrawal.

2.2.3 Case study method in sociology

The case study method in sociology refers to the systematic study of one or more cases. In the analysis of a single case or the comparison of multiple cases, the characteristics of the research object can be grasped, and the general laws can be excavated from cases with special characteristics. Nowadays, the case study method is widely used, the reasons are that, on the one hand, due to inter-regional variability, the mechanisms for exiting homesteads in different places are unique, which requires scholars to focus on the geographical differences when conducting relevant research; on the other hand, scholars consider the high cost and difficulty of conducting a study on a nationwide scale. Le Sun et al. [53] took Pidu District, Chengdu City, Sichuan Province, a typical demonstration area for the reform of the homestead system, as a case to analyze the impact of inclusive finance on rural households' homestead withdrawal decisions. Based on the results of the study, they proposed policy references to enhance the level of rural financial inclusion and guide farmers to form a reasonable homestead exit risk perception. Taking the rural homestead alternative replacement mode in Qionglai City, Sichuan Province as an example, Xinyi Liu et al. [57] clarified the impact of the rural homestead withdrawal policy on community resilience, which provides an important practical significance for improving the level of community governance and promoting the rural revitalization strategy. Changwei Wang et al. [58] believed that Shanghai's rural areas are highly representative and special in China, whose development represents the future direction of China's suburban rural areas. Therefore, they took Shanghai as an example to explore suburban farmers' selection preferences for the in-kind compensation and the monetary compensation and the influencing factors in homestead withdrawal. Yinguen Hu et al. [59] took three typical pilots, namely, Jinzhai County, Jizhou District and Yiwu City, as cases to analyze the problems in the operation process of their corresponding

"currency + homestead", "currency + home purchase subsidy" and "currency + asset replacement" modes, so as to provide reference for other regions.

2.3. Review of research

To summarize, from the viewpoint of research content, Chinese scholars have carried out research on various aspects of the rural residential land withdrawal, such as the necessity, difficulties, influencing factors, modes, compensation standards and models of withdrawal, and the breadth and depth of the research content have been improved; the research method presents quantitative and integrated characteristics, and scholars have broken through the previous single qualitative analysis method and try to use the complex and diversified quantitative analysis method to study the issue of homestead withdrawal. Although the research is rich, there are still some shortcomings: (1) In the research on the utilization of homesteads, the concepts of homestead circulation and homestead withdrawal have been mixed up and not carefully distinguished, which is not conducive to the sustainable development of the homestead market.(2) In the research on the willingness to withdraw from homesteads, due to the lack of unanimously recognized and universal indicator system, there is a big difference between different scholars in the selection of influencing factors; at the same time, few scholars have conducted longitudinal studies using time series or panel data, which leads to a lack of research on the shifts in willingness to withdraw caused by time-varying factors such as institutional changes.(3) There is a lack of a unified classification basis and a scientific evaluation system for modes in the study of rural residential land withdrawal modes.(4) In the study of compensation for the homestead withdrawal, on the one hand, China has not yet constructed a unified value system of residential land, which makes the compensation standard more controversial; on the other hand, academics have explored less on the calculation and the source of compensation for the withdrawal of residential land.

References

- [1] Xuefeng He. Homestead, rural revitalization and urbanization. Journal of Nanjing Agricultural University (Social Sciences Edition). Vol. 21 (2021) No. 4, p. 1-8.
- [2] Yingbin Feng, Qingyuan Yang. A review of research on the rural homestead evolution process and its regulation. Resources Science. Vol. 37 (2015) No. 3, p. 442-448.
- [3] Lixia Tang, Haoran Liu. Effective utilization of rural idle homestead: dynamic basis and realization path: based on the observation of Y village in Kunming rural revitalization pilot zone. Journal of Nanjing Agricultural University (Social Sciences Edition). Vol. 23 (2023) No. 2, p. 132-143.
- [4] Lixia Yang, Congmou Zhu, Shaofeng Yuan, et al. Analysis on farmers' willingness to rural residential land exit and welfare change based on the supply-side reform: a case of Yiwu city in Zhejiang province. China Land Science. Vol. 32 (2018) No. 1, p. 35-41.
- [5] Jianqiang Fu, Cailing Guo. The necessity and feasibility analysis of the withdrawal of the right to use rural homestead. Truth Seeking. No. 10(2014), p. 92-96.
- [6] Yong Zhang, Tingting Bao. Analysis of the driving force of rural residential land withdrawal: based on the perspective of push and pull theory. Rural Economy. No. 4(2017), p. 18-23.
- [7] Yingbin Feng, Lei Gu. Analysis on the compensation for farmers' homestead withdrawal from the perspective of welfare economy——also on the effective connection with the rural revitalization strategy. The Journal of Yunnan Administration College. Vol. 25 (2023) No. 2, p. 68-78.
- [8] Fachao Liang, Caiyun Lin. Research on the welfare effect of rural households withdrawing from rural residential land under different patters——a case study of Jinjiang city, Fujian province. Chinese Journal of Agricultural Resources and Regional Planning. Vol. 42 (2021) No. 3, p. 240-248.
- [9] Junshu Lv, Shuo Zhang. The formation factors of “amphibious land occupation” in rural and urban areas, the obstacles of land withdrawal system and policy suggestions——sample analysis based on “hundred village survey”. Reform of Economic System. No. 2(2020), p. 66-73.

- [10] Dong Han, Lida Han, Xie Zhang, et al. Study on the rural homestead buyout programs from the perspective of marketization. *Research of Agricultural Modernization*. Vol. 39 (2018) No. 1, p. 19-27.
- [11] Junshu Lv, Mengyang Shi. The value, dilemma and realization path of farmers' homestead exit. *Academic Exploration*. No. 12(2016), p. 45-49.
- [12] Wenfeng Fu, Jie Guo, Minghao Ou, et al. Research on compensation standard of quitting rural residential land based on opportunity cost. *China Population, Resources and Environment*. Vol. 28 (2018) No. 3, p. 60-66.
- [13] Qinggui Yang. The real expression and institutional response of protection of homestead's rights and interests for peasants settled in city. *Journal of Chongqing University (Social Science Edition)*. Vol. 25(2019) No. 3, p. 147-157.
- [14] Zhaolin Wang, Qingyuan Yang, Na Wang. A study of the protection of farmers' homestead exit revenue in Chongqing: basing on comparative revenue. *China Land Sciences*. Vol.30(2016) No.8, p. 47-55.
- [15] Heqiang Wang. Dilemmas and breakthroughs in the compensated withdrawal of rural homesteads. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*. No.4(2020), p.107-109.
- [16] Cailing Wei, Feixing Lan, Changhuan Gong. "Farmer rationality" and "governmental rationality" for rural homestead quitting: survey and thinking based on the desire for homestead quitting of rural transfer population in Guangxi. *West Forum*. Vol. 30(2020) No. 2, p. 66-72.
- [17] Z Yin. Rethinking the practice of rural residential land rights and its institutional change: based on the perspective of social property rights. *China Rural Survey*. No.4(2014), p.52-62+83.
- [18] Xinhua Zhu. Effect of household registration system on farmers' willingness of exiting from rural housing land. *China Population, Resources and Environment*. Vol. 24(2014) No. 24, p. 129-134.
- [19] Qiuqin Zhang, Haibo Luo, Jinming Yan, et al. Investigation of willingness to quit rural homestead and feasibility evaluation: a case study of sample areas in Guizhou province. *Science and Technological Management of Land and Resources*. Vol. 31(2014) No. 4, p. 6-14.
- [20] Lianzi Liu, Yue Chen. The paid exit mechanism of farmers' homestead in rural areas: the case of Chongqing. *Reform*. No. 10(2015), p. 143-148.
- [21] Hongtao Jin, Qiaona Liu, Qinghua Shi. Research on risk perception, risk attitude, and rural households' withdrawal willingness of homestead: a case study of suburban farmers in Tangshan city, Hebei province. *Research of Agricultural Modernization*. Vol. 44(2023) No. 1, p. 65-76.
- [22] Yongchao Zhang. The impacts of internal demands, external policy factors on household willingness of homestead withdrawal—a survey from the perspective of Maslow's demand theory. *Chinese Journal of Agricultural Resources and Regional Planning*. Vol. 44(2023) No. 3, p. 197-204.
- [23] Guandong Liu, Ketong Hao, Wei Wu. Analysis on the influence of homestead withdrawal intention from the intergenerational perspective: an empirical study based on 1177 questionnaires in Guanzhong Area of Shanxi Province. *Journal of Northwest University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*. Vol. 53(2023) No. 1, p. 72-82.
- [24] Guancheng Guo, Yingmeng Chen. Family life cycle on farmers' willingness to exit rural residential land. *Journal of South China Agricultural University (Social Science Edition)*. Vol. 21(2022) No. 4, p. 23-33.
- [25] Jinhai Yan, Bin Wang, Wenbo Zheng. Homeland attachment, urban integration and rural-urban migrants' willingness to withdraw rural residential land: a survey in Xiamen, Fujian province. *China Land Science*. Vol. 36(2022) No. 1, p. 20-29.
- [26] Zhaolin Wang, Ling Ou, Min Wang, et al. Analysis of influencing factors of homestead withdrawal decision based on farmer stratum differentiation. *Chinese Journal of Agricultural Resources and Regional Planning*. Vol. 43(2022) No. 2, p. 102-112.
- [27] Xiaoxia Peng. Improvement of rural residential land withdrawal mechanism under the perspective of farmers' rights and interests protection. *Rural Economy*. No. 4(2015), p. 9-13.
- [28] Xingguo Huang, Zhanqi Wang. Exploring the model of reuse of rural exiting residential land based on land influencing factors. *World Agriculture*. No. 11(2018), p. 59-64.
- [29] Weibai Liu, Zhong Li. Policy evolution, model comparison and path selection of the reform of residential land system. *Chinese Public Administration*. No. 9(2019), p. 152-154.

- [30] Changchuan Zhang, Zechong Gao, Xin Li, et al. Classification and selection of types of rural homestead withdrawal modes in Hebei province. *Jiangsu Agricultural Sciences*. Vol. 41(2013) No. 4, p. 393-394.
- [31] Bilin Xiao, Daolong Wang, Yinjun Chen, et al. Modes, problems and suggestions for China rural residential land exchange. *Chinese Journal of Agricultural Resources and Regional Planning*. Vol. 32(2011) No. 3, p. 37-41.
- [32] X Lv, P Xue, S D Liu, et al. Comparative study on policy tools and practice of homestead withdrawal at the county level. *Resources Science*. Vol. 43(2021) No. 7, p. 1307-1321.
- [33] Qihuai Diao. Homestead withdrawal: patterns, problems and suggestions——taking Chengdu city, Sichuan province as an example. *Rural Economy*. No. 12(2015), p. 30-33.
- [34] Fachao Liang, Caiyun Lin. Operation mechanism, mode comparison and path optimization of rural homestead withdrawal with compensation in economically developed area. *China Rural Survey*. No. 3(2021), p. 34-37.
- [35] Fachao Liang, Lihui Liu. Research on farmers' selection preference and influencing factors of rural residential land withdrawal under different patterns——empirical analysis based on Jinjiang city, Fujian province. *Chinese Journal of Agricultural Resources and Regional Planning*. Vol. 41(2020) No. 9, p. 128-135.
- [36] Huan Li, Anlu Zhang. The measurement and dynamic changes of farmers' welfare before and after rural homestead withdrawal——an empirical analysis of 201 farmers in the homestead reform pilot, Deqing county. *Journal of Agrotechnical Economics*. No. 7(2019), p. 79-70.
- [37] Xiaofeng Xu. Study on exit mechanism for rural homestead land in the district of increase or decrease link on urban and countryside construction land——case in Ezhou city, Hubei province. Master's degree, Huazhong Agricultural University, China, 2012. p. 72.
- [38] Yuanyuan Guo, Yingbin Feng. Study on the compensation system of farmers' homestead withdrawal——under the background of poverty alleviation and relocation. *Chinese Journal of Agricultural Resources and Regional Planning*. Vol. 41(2020) No. 2, p. 58-65.
- [39] Yingen Hu, Man Zhang, Xiyun Wei, et al. Measuring the compensation for quitting rural residential land: take rural area of Shangqiu city as a case. *China Land Sciences*. Vol. 27(2013) No. 3, p. 29-35.
- [40] Sigui Xu, Ge Song, Shanlin Huang, et al. The economic compensation for quitting rural residential land. *Chinese Journal of Agricultural Resources and Regional Planning*. Vol. 38(2017) No. 5, p. 141-146.
- [41] Dan Liu, Qianwen Gong. Calculation method of compensation criteria for farmers' voluntary withdrawal from homestead under the perspective of functional value. *Journal of China Agricultural University*. Vol. 25(2020) No. 12, p. 173-183.
- [42] Ming Chen. Compensation preference and heterogeneity sources of homestead withdrawal of farming households: based on choice experiment method. *Resources Science*. Vol. 43(2021) No. 7, p. 1467-1478.
- [43] Yanbo Qu, Yifan Chai, Weiya Zhu, et al. Archetype analysis of rural homestead withdrawal patterns based on the framework of "diagnosis-design-outcome". *Resources Science*. Vol. 43(2021) No. 7, p. 1293-1306.
- [44] Honglin Gong, Minghai Lin. The impact of farmers' heterogeneous characteristics on compensation preferences for homestead withdrawal——based on research data from Dazu and Fuling. *Rural Economy*. No. 2(2019), p. 31-38.
- [45] Yong Zhang. The aspiration, appeals and guidance of migrant workers' withdrawal from rural homestead. *Academic Journal of Zhongzhou*. No. 3(2018), p. 45-50.
- [46] Jun Cai, Lei Zhang, Hongwei Yuan, et al. Influencing factors of farmers' homestead withdrawal behavior intention based on improved TAM Framework. *Resources Science*. Vol. 44(2022) No. 5, p. 899-912.
- [47] Yong Zhang, Changsheng Peng, Tingting Bao. Investigation and enlightenment of rural residential land utilize and farmers' withdrawal and compensation willingness: based on the questionnaire of 821 households in Anhui province. *Scientific and Technological Management of Land and Resources*. Vol. 34(2017) No. 2, p. 9-19.
- [48] Hengzhou Xu. Compensation for quitting rural residential land and its influential factors based on farmers' willingness to accept: a case study of Linqing city in Shandong province. *China Land Sciences*. Vol. 26(2012) No. 10, p. 75-81.

- [49] Pengfei Sun, Kai Zhao, Yanan Wang. Effect of dependency burden on the change of the farmers' welfare before and after quitting rural residential land——based on the regulating effect of human capital in education. *Journal of Agrotechnical Economics*. No. 11(2021), p. 113-129.
- [50] Chengming Liu, Kunpeng Wang, Minghao Ou. Study on the welfare level of farmers' exiting from homestead and living in concentration from the perspective of farmers' differentiation. *Resources and Environment in the Yangtze Basin*. Vol. 29(2020) No. 3, p. 748-757.
- [51] Zhanlu Zou, Huaibin Cai, Yu Zhang, et al. Effects of cognitive bias on farmers' willingness to rural residential land withdrawal: an empirical study based on 880 sample farmers in Guangdong province. *China Land Science*. Vol. 37(2023) No. 3, p. 59-70.
- [52] Limin Rong, Meiqiu Chen, Ting Zhang, et al. Farmers' willingness to withdraw the over-occupied rural residential land in different locational villages: an empirical analysis of 131 villages, 21 counties in Jiangxi province. *China Land Science*. Vol. 37(2023) No. 3, p. 71-79.
- [53] Le Sun, Shaofeng Yuan, Congmou Zhu. Effect of inclusive finance on farming households' homestead exit: A case of 401 households in the pilot area of Chengdu city. *Resources Science*. Vol. 43(2021) No. 11, p. 2342-2355.
- [54] Yu Zhang, Meng Sun, Xiaowen Jin. Influence of endowment effect and ratchet effect on the homestead withdrawal behavior of farmers. *Journal of Arid Land Resources and Environment*. Vol. 35(2021) No. 9, p. 53-59.
- [55] Dawei Xing, Jinhai Xu, Huasheng Zeng, et al. Risk perception, social trust and willingness of farmers to exit homestead——based on the data from a survey of 418 rural households in Yangzhou, Jiangsu province. *Chinese Journal of Agricultural Resources and Regional Planning*. Vol. 43(2022) No. 11, p. 51-60.
- [56] Wenbin Zhang, Ruone Wang, Yijie Wang, et al. Rural idle homestead withdrawal intention and obstacles under the background of rural revitalization: From the perspective of farmer's homestead values. *Journal of Arid Land Resources and Environment*. Vol. 36(2022) No. 12, p. 41-48.
- [57] Xinyi Liu, Yingxin Xu, Yuan Gao, et al. The impact of rural residential land withdrawal policy on community resilience: take the rural residential land alternative replacement mode in Qionglai city, Sichuan province as an example. *China Land Science*. Vol. 37(2023) No. 1, p. 70-79.
- [58] Changwei Wang, Wang Liu, Haiying Gu. Building compensation, monetary compensation and the willingness of suburban farmers to exit homestead. *Journal of Arid Land Resources and Environment*. Vol. 36(2022) No. 2, p. 55-60.
- [59] Yingen Hu, Cong Wang, Chengquan Liao, et al. Study on mode of paid exit in rural homestead under different governance structures——based on three typical pilot projects in Jinzhai, Jizhou and Yiwu. *Resource Development & Market*. Vol. 33(2017) No. 12, p. 1411-1416.