

Research on Improving the Welfare of Peasant Households with Expropriated Land from the Perspective of Common Prosperity

-- A Case Study of Shexian County, Huangshan City

Xiaojing Wu

School of Finance and Public Administration, Anhui University of Finance and Economics,
Bengbu 233030, China

Abstract

Common prosperity is an essential requirement of socialism and an important feature of Chinese modernization. The goal is to enable everyone to share in the fruits of economic and social development. At present, the problem of unbalanced and insufficient development in our country is still outstanding, and the task of common prosperity is still arduous. Among them, it is a necessary problem to let farmers who are expropriated land share the fruits of economic development and improve their welfare to realize common prosperity. A large number of rural collective land has been expropriated, which has played an important role in promoting the development of urbanization. Meanwhile, it has also brought about changes in the quality of life of farmers whose land has been expropriated. Common prosperity should not only improve their income, but also comprehensively improve the welfare level. Based on the theory of sen feasible ability, plans to build the landless farmers benefit evaluation index system, rapidly to the landless peasants for field survey, data collection, using the fuzzy comprehensive evaluation method evaluating the landless farmers welfare changes direction and change level, further analyses the reason of peasant household welfare changes, improve pertinently the countermeasures of landless farmers welfare In order to further improve the compensation system for land expropriation, let land-lost farmers truly share the fruits of urbanization development, narrow the gap between urban and rural areas, and achieve common prosperity to provide reference.

Keywords

Common Prosperity; Land Expropriation; Farmers Welfare.

1. Introduction

Common prosperity has long been the aspiration of our people. On the road to common prosperity, no one should be left behind." The development of common prosperity theory is increasingly rich and perfect.

Since the reform and opening up, the urbanization development has been increasing constantly, and the non-agricultural employment opportunities have been increasing. The income level and income structure between farmers have gradually become different. Under the present land system in China, the transformation of rural land into urban construction land is mainly realized through land expropriation, and a large number of peasant households whose land is expropriated have come into being. As a comprehensive reflection of farmers' quality of production and life, farmers' welfare also changes with land expropriation. The process of land expropriation is dominated by the government and involves many subjects. The government and each subject have their own interest demands in the process of land expropriation. The government and all subjects will constantly play games in the process of expropriation, and the

weak party, that is, other subjects except the government, will not fully protect their own interests. In the final analysis, this is due to the insufficient participation of the public (Wang Jian et al., 2016). At present, China's collective land collection compensation system is still not comprehensive enough to guarantee the consistency of rights and obligations. The causes of this problem are complex, which are related to both the traditional social concept of private right protection in China and the purpose of formulating relevant normative documents to ensure the smooth implementation of expropriation (Li Yan, 2016). However, in modern society, the number of family farms and land occupied area are increasing, and under the background of rapid urbanization, land expropriation will inevitably involve these areas. Therefore, how to set reasonable compensation standards and properly distribute benefits has become the focus of current research (Liu Linghui et al., 2016).

Land in our country is in the process of urbanization, landless farmers' life there has been a fundamental change, the living standards of the landless farmers decrease is mainly due to the land acquisition and resettlement compensation standard is too low, lack of social security system, land value-added income distribution is not reasonable, so to develop a reasonable land requisition compensation and resettlement farmers policy is very important and urgent (Jin-yun gao, etc., 2016). Rural collective economic organizations, as a unique form of organization in China, play an extremely important role in promoting rural economic development and maintaining rural social stability. The membership rights contained in them are extremely sensitive to the issue of interest distribution in land expropriation (Chen Meiqiu et al., 2018). In the case of less and less urban land supply, agricultural land gradually becomes the main body of land expropriation. In compensation, in addition to compensation for land and labor, the capital input of farmers in the early stage should also be included in the scope of compensation (Xu Zhong et al., 2018). At present, the compensation fee distribution dispute resolution mechanism of rural land requisition in each province and city can be summarized into three types of "administrative type", "direct complaint type" and "multiple type" (Ding national, etc., 2020). In order to ensure the smooth completion of land acquisition and prevent the uneven distribution of benefits, the dispute settlement mechanism needs to be improved and developed. In emergency situations, it is natural for the state to expropriate and requisition private land resources, but the after-action compensation mechanism is not perfect, so it is necessary to establish an emergency land expropriation system (Liu Rui et al., 2020). Land expropriation is actually a layer of sugar coating on bitter medicine for traditional Chinese farmers. Although farmers are dissatisfied, timely compensation can still appease the people (Cai Meina et al., 2020). The market price brought by the market system of collective operational construction land is undoubtedly in conflict with the "area comprehensive land price" of collective land expropriation and compensation, resulting in different land value-added income distribution results in different fields for the same piece of land (Cheng Xueyang, 2020). After land expropriation and demolition, the physical capital is greatly improved, and the total level of livelihood capital of farmers is improved, but the financial capital, human capital and social capital are not significantly improved (Li Mingfeng, 2021). Prior knowledge and in-process negotiation of farmers whose land is expropriated are important links in the process of land expropriation, an important way to ensure the fairness of land expropriation procedures, and a key factor to improve farmers' satisfaction with land expropriation and their welfare level (Fenglei, 2021).

Therefore, from the perspective of common prosperity, based on Sen's feasible ability theory, this paper constructs a theoretical model to evaluate the changes of farmers' welfare before and after land expropriation, and empirically measures the impact of land expropriation on farmers' welfare. On this basis, the influencing factors of welfare change of farmers with land expropriation are analyzed. Finally, combined with the empirical analysis results, this paper puts forward targeted countermeasures to improve the welfare of farmers whose land is

expropriated, in order to provide reference for further improving the compensation system for land expropriation, allowing land-lost farmers to truly share the fruits of urbanization development, narrowing the urban-rural gap, and realizing common prosperity.

2. Theoretical Framework and Research Methods

2.1. Theoretical Framework

Traditional welfare economics aims to promote the egalitarianism of traditional resources and welfare (Liu Xuan, 2018). In the 1860s and 1970s, Amartya Sen criticized the traditional welfare economics and put forward the theory of feasible ability on the basis of it. In essence, feasible ability refers to a kind of freedom, which can realize various possible function combinations by itself. In other words, the feasible ability of an individual directly determines the level of welfare he or she can obtain. According to Sen, it is not advisable to evaluate the welfare level only by material resources, but more important is to measure how much resources can be converted into welfare, namely the efficiency of welfare conversion (Su Huashan, 2017). Therefore, poverty is not only a problem of shortage of resources, but also caused by the lack of individual feasible ability. To realize human development, we should strive to expand their feasible ability and realize freedom. The feasible ability sets of different groups are different. The group with stronger ability has higher efficiency of welfare transformation and more resources. They can choose the type and quantity of resources independently. However, the less capable and relatively disadvantaged groups do not have such freedom and have less access to resources (Yang Tao, 2010). The majority of farmers belong to the latter group, so rural development is relatively slow and farmers are relatively poor. In order to achieve common prosperity, it is necessary to develop rural areas to reduce the gap between urban and rural areas and improve the welfare of farmers, that is, to ensure that their feasible ability is not damaged. According to Sen, welfare is not only material, but also contains immaterial contents. Therefore, he puts forward five instrumental freedoms: political freedom, economic conditions, social opportunities, transparency guarantee and protective guarantee. Since the measurement of welfare in empirical analysis is always based on the evaluation of individual functional activities, this paper selected five aspects of economic status, social security, living conditions, living environment and psychological status as functional indicators of welfare measurement based on the relevant literature and the current situation of farmers who are expropriated land.

2.1.1. State of the Economy

Economic income does not directly refer to welfare level, but today's economy is still one of the most important factors affecting people's quality of life. Before land acquisition, most farmers lived in rural areas and had certain self-producing ability for poultry and vegetables. Once farmers lose their land, they will not only lose a fixed agricultural income, but also reduce their ability to produce food, which will lead to an increase in household expenditure, thus affecting the welfare level of farmers. Therefore, this paper selected four indicators of annual agricultural income, annual non-agricultural income, net income and Engel coefficient to reflect the functional activities of farmers.

2.1.2. The Social Security

Since ancient times, land has been regarded as the foundation of farmers' livelihood. Before land was expropriated, farmers depended on land, which played the role of livelihood security. Land has at least six utilities for farmers, among which the basic livelihood guarantee utility of land has the greatest impact (Wang Keqiang, 2005). At the same time, farmers also obtain social security through social insurance and other ways. After the land is expropriated, the peasants lose their land to survive, and their social security will be missing. Without a source of income, farmers have to go out to work. Employment assistance provided by the government is also an

indispensable guarantee after land acquisition. Therefore, this paper selected four indicators of contracted land area before and after land expropriation, whether to participate in social insurance, the degree of employment difficulty and whether the government provides employment assistance to reflect this functional activity of farmers.

2.1.3. Living Conditions

Before the land acquisition, most farmers lived in rural areas with poor infrastructure, inconvenient transportation and poor housing conditions. Living conditions affect their psychological satisfaction to a large extent (Robeyns, 2003). Generally speaking, after land expropriation, farmers' living conditions such as housing area, location, structure and type will change, which will affect farmers' welfare level to a certain extent. Therefore, this paper selected five indicators of residential area, housing structure, housing decoration degree, housing location and water supply conditions to reflect the functional activities of farmers.

2.1.4. Living Environment

Before land acquisition, the rural areas where farmers live are relatively remote and convenient compared with urban areas, and the garbage can not be treated in time. However, the greening conditions, air quality, noise condition and public security environment are relatively good, and the life is relatively comfortable. However, after land expropriation, the farmland around the residence may be built with various buildings, and the greenery is not as good as before, the air quality is decreased, the noise is increased, and the security is difficult to be guaranteed, which will damage the welfare of the farmers. To evaluate the welfare level of farmers whose land is expropriated is inseparable from the evaluation of their living environment. Therefore, this paper selected six indicators of greening, air quality, noise, public security, garbage disposal and convenience of life to reflect the functional activities of farmers.

2.1.5. Psychological Status

According to Sen, happiness is also an important component of individual well-being. When farmers lose the basic security of land, they will naturally become flustered and anxious, and feel confused about their future life, which greatly affects their welfare level. Moreover, the gradual citizenization of farmers whose land is expropriated will also make it difficult for them to change their new identities and adapt to their new neighbors. Therefore, this paper selects two indicators to reflect the functional activities of farmers: whether the neighbors are harmonious and whether the residents are comfortable.

2.2. Research Methods

Fuzzy comprehensive evaluation method. In the social sciences, many concepts are subjective, vague and difficult to quantify. To solve this problem, Zadeh proposed a fuzzy mathematical method, which is widely used in different fields. Subsequently, more and more scholars introduced this method into the measurement of welfare level (Cerioli et al., 1990; Cheli et al., 1995; Gao Jinyun et al., 2007).

According to Sen, viability is the substantial freedom of a person's ability to pursue the life he values, and welfare is a somewhat ambiguous multidimensional concept. Because of the fuzziness and the complexity of the definition of the welfare level, fuzzy mathematical method has its unique advantages, so this paper uses this method to evaluate the changes of the welfare level of the farmers who are expropriated land.

2.2.1. Set the Welfare Fuzzy Function

The welfare status of farmers whose land is expropriated is expressed as a fuzzy set X , and the welfare content of farmers that may change before and after land expropriation is set as a subset W of X , then the welfare function of the NTH farmer can be expressed as $W^{(n)} = \{x, \mu_w(x)\}$, Among them $x \in X$, $\mu_w(x)$ is the membership degree of x to W , $\mu_w(x) \in [0,1]$. In general, the higher the number, the better the welfare.

2.2.2. Setting the Membership Function

In the process of using fuzzy comprehensive evaluation, the most important step is to determine the membership function $\mu_w(x)$. Determining the membership function depends on the type of indicators and the realistic background of the study. Generally speaking, indicator variables can be divided into three types: dummy dichotomous variables, continuous variables and dummy qualitative variables (Miceli, 2008).

Let x_i be the i th functional subset of the welfare of land-expropriated farmers determined by the primary index x_{ij} , whose primary index is $x_{ij} = [x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ij}]$.

The phenomenon to be expressed by the virtual dichotomous variable is clear. There are only two cases, and its membership function is:

$$\mu_w(x_{ij}) = \begin{cases} 0, & x_{ij} = 0 \\ 1, & x_{ij} = 1 \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

This expression refers to when an individual owns a good or service $x_{ij} = 1$, Membership degree of this index for the i th functional subset $\mu_w(x_{ij}) = 1$, Otherwise, the membership degree $\mu_w(x_{ij}) = 0$.

The membership function of continuous variables is:

$$\mu_w(x_{ij}; a, b) = \begin{cases} 0, & 0 \leq x_{ij} \leq a \\ \frac{x_{ij}-a}{b-a}, & a < x_{ij} < b \\ 1, & x_{ij} \geq b \end{cases} \quad \text{The } a \text{ and } b \text{ as parameters, and } b > a \quad (2)$$

$$\mu_w(x_{ij}; a, b) = \begin{cases} 1, & 0 \leq x_{ij} \leq a \\ \frac{b-x_{ij}}{b-a}, & a < x_{ij} < b \\ 0, & x_{ij} \geq b \end{cases} \quad \text{The } a \text{ and } b \text{ as parameters, and } b > a \quad (3)$$

Equation (2) indicates that the index x_{ij} is positively correlated with the welfare state, that is, the larger the value of x_{ij} , the better the welfare state will be; b is the upper limit of x_{ij} , If $x_{ij} \geq b$, its welfare state is the best. a is the lower limit of this index. If $x_{ij} \leq a$, its welfare status is the worst; The larger the value of the membership function $\mu_w(x_{ij}; a, b)$, the better the welfare state of the farmers whose land is expropriated. On the contrary, Equation (3) shows that x_{ij} is negatively correlated with the welfare status, and the smaller the value of the membership function $\mu_w(x_{ij}; a, b)$, the better the welfare status of the farmers whose land is expropriated.

The dummy qualitative variable is the subjective evaluation of the research object. Suppose there are M subjective evaluations of a variable in the study, and then assign values to these states: $x_{ij} = \{x_{ij}^{(1)}, \dots, x_{ij}^{(m)}\}$, The values are equally spaced, with a larger value indicating a better welfare state. Usually, $x_{ij}^{(1)} < \dots < x_{ij}^{(l)} < \dots < x_{ij}^{(m)}$, and $x_{ij}^{(l)} = l$ ($l = 1, \dots, m$). The membership function of the dummy qualitative variable can be expressed as:

$$\mu_w(x_{ij}; a, b) = \begin{cases} 0, & 0 \leq x_{ij} \leq a \\ \frac{x_{ij}-a}{b-a}, & a < x_{ij} < b \\ 1, & x_{ij} \geq b \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Where a and b are the minimum and maximum values of index x_{ij} .

2.2.3. Calculating Weight

After getting the membership degree of the primary index, it is necessary to add the membership degree of each primary index to a comprehensive index, so it is necessary to calculate the corresponding weight, and determining the weight is another important process of fuzzy comprehensive evaluation. It is generally believed that the weights of each primary index are different. Cheli et al. (1995) proposed the following weight calculation formula:

$$\omega_{ij} = \ln \left[\frac{1}{\mu(x_{ij})} \right] \quad (5)$$

In Equation (5), $\overline{\mu(x_{ij})} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{p=1}^n \mu(x_{ij})^{(p)}$, It represents the mean value of the jTH index in the ith functional subset of n farmers. The advantage of this weight formula is that it can guarantee to give greater weight to the indicator variables with smaller membership, so it can pay more attention to the indicators with lower welfare level when conducting welfare evaluation.

On the basis of obtaining the membership degree and weight of the primary index, the membership degree of each function subset can be calculated. Cerioli et al. (1990) proposed the following summation formula:

$$f(x_{i.}) = \sum_{j=1}^k \overline{\mu(x_{ij})} \times \omega_{ij} / \sum_{j=1}^k \omega_{ij} \quad (6)$$

Where, k means k primary indicators are included in the ith function subset.

3. The Empirical Analysis

3.1. Data Description

The data used in this paper are from the household survey data of land-expropriated farmers in Shexian County, Huangshan City, Anhui Province. The survey was conducted by random sampling. A total of 150 questionnaires were distributed and 136 valid questionnaires were recovered, with an effective rate of 90.67%.

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of the functional indicators of individual welfare. It can be seen that after the land expropriated farmers lost their land, their agricultural income decreased significantly, while their non-agricultural income increased a little, which has a great deal to do with the land expropriated farmers' efforts to maintain life and the government's special employment assistance policies. The Engel coefficient has also improved to some extent, which reflects the change of the lifestyle of the land-expropriated farmers. In general, the economy and social security level of the peasants in Shexian County decreased after they lost their land, but their living conditions, living environment and psychological status were improved to some extent. However, specific empirical analysis is needed to analyze how the overall welfare level of the land-expropriated farmers changes after losing their land.

Table 1. Variable definition and statistical description

Variable types	Variable name	Variable definitions	Before land requisition	After land requisition
The economic situation	Agricultural income	Annual family farm income (yuan)	9077.50	5525.00
	Non-farm income	Annual household non-farm income (yuan)	72890.00	75715.00

	Net income	Annual net household income (yuan)	36141.13	23353.75
	Engel coefficient	Proportion of food expenditure in total expenditure (%)	33.94	34.52
The social security	Contracted land area	Land area contracted by the household (mu)	3.73	1.84
	Social insurance	1= participating, 2= not participating	1.33	1.10
	Ease of employment	1= very easy, 2= relatively easy, 3= average, 4= relatively difficult, 5= very difficult	2.98	2.88
	make-work	1= yes, 2= no	1.58	1.45
Living conditions	Total residential area	Total area of family dwelling (m ²)	155.20	175.25
	Building structure	1= brick and wood, 2= brick and concrete, 3= steel and concrete, 4= other	2.30	2.50
	Degree of house decoration	1= rough, 2= simple, 3= hardcover	2.03	2.15
	Housing location	1= rural, 2= peri-urban, 3= urban	1.50	2.08
	Water supply	1= yes, 2= no	1.25	1.03
Living environment	Greening situation	1= very poor, 2= poor, 3= fair, 4= good, 5= very good	3.28	3.58
	Air quality	1= very poor, 2= poor, 3= fair, 4= good, 5= very good	4.05	3.73
	Noise conditions	1= very poor, 2= poor, 3= fair, 4= good, 5= very good	3.93	3.38
	Public security situation	1= very poor, 2= poor, 3= fair, 4= good, 5= very good	4.00	3.95
	Waste disposal status	1= very poor, 2= poor, 3= fair, 4= good, 5= very good	3.48	3.85
	Convenience of life	1= not convenient, 2= average, 3= convenient	2.18	2.53
Psychological status	neighborhood	1= bad, 2= not so good, 3= fair, 4= OK, 5= good	4.13	4.23
	Comfort of living	1= uncomfortable, 2= fair, 3= comfortable	2.38	2.48

3.2. The Selection of the Maximum and Minimum Value When Determining the Membership Degree of Primary Index

3.2.1. Agricultural Income

According to the actual situation of the survey data, the maximum value 50000 and 0 of agricultural income in Shexian County, Huangshan City before land expropriation were taken as the maximum value and minimum value of agricultural income membership degree before land expropriation. Similarly, take 20000 and 0 as the maximum and minimum values of agricultural income membership after land expropriation.

3.2.2. Non-farm Income

Since the economy of Shexian County, Huangshan City, is not well developed and there are not many opportunities for farmers to engage in non-agricultural employment, according to the actual situation of the questionnaire, 300000 and 320000 are respectively selected as the

maximum values of non-agricultural income membership before and after land expropriation, and 5000 and 5600 are respectively selected as the minimum values of non-agricultural income membership before and after land expropriation.

3.2.3. Net Income

According to the actual situation of the questionnaire, 100000 and 135000 were selected as the maximum value of the membership degree of net income before and after land expropriation. 20160 yuan of the rural subsistence insurance standard of Shexian County in 2019 and 21264 Yuan of the rural subsistence insurance standard of Shexian County in 2021 were selected as the minimum value of the membership degree of net income before and after land expropriation.

3.2.4. Engel Coefficient

According to the criteria proposed by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the Engel coefficient above 59 percent is considered poor, 50 to 59 percent is food and clothing, 40 to 50 percent is moderately prosperous, 30 to 40 percent is rich, and less than 30 percent is the richest. Combined with the actual situation of the sample cities, 60% is selected as the maximum value of Engel coefficient membership degree before and after farmers are expropriated, and 30% is selected as the minimum value of Engel coefficient membership degree before and after farmers are expropriated.

3.2.5. Contracted Land Area

According to the actual situation of the survey data, this paper selected 30 mu and 13 mu as the maximum value of membership degree of contracted land area before and after the calculation of land expropriation, and the minimum value was 0.

3.2.6. Total Residential Area

In 2020, according to the ministry of construction issued 21 indicators, comprehensive construction well-off society live in rural per capita housing area of 40 square meters, therefore this article selects 160 square meters for computing farmers landless around residential area of the maximum membership degree, selecting 60 square meters as computing farmers landless and residential area of the minimum value of membership degree.

3.3. The Evaluation Result of the Change of Welfare Level of the Peasants Who Were Expropriated Land

From the fuzzy evaluation results of welfare level of land-expropriated farmers before and after land loss in Table 2, it can be seen that the welfare level of land-expropriated farmers in Shexian County, Huangshan City is general. The total fuzzy value before and after land loss is around 0.5, and the welfare level has been improved after land acquisition, with the total fuzzy value rising from 0.5006 to 0.5051, but the functional indicators are not the same. The indicators of welfare improvement after land acquisition are non-farm income, Engel coefficient, house structure, house decoration degree, water supply, greening situation, noise situation, garbage disposal situation, living convenience and living comfort. Indicators of reduced welfare level after land expropriation include agricultural income, net income, contracted land area, social insurance, employment difficulty, employment assistance, total residential area, air quality, public security and neighborhood relations. Generally speaking, in addition to the decline of economic indicators, other functional indicators are still rising. This is mainly because farmers lost their main source of economic income after losing their land. After losing their land, the government arranged unified residential communities, and the living environment and conditions were improved to a certain extent.

Table 2. Overall fuzzy evaluation of the welfare level of the land-expropriated farmers before and after losing their land

Objective function	membership	
	Before land requisition	After land requisition
Agricultural income	0.2763	0.1816
Non-farm income	0.2230	0.2301
Net income	0.2565	0.1583
Engel coefficient	0.7251	0.7294
Contracted land area	0.1393	0.1222
Social insurance	0.3250	0.1000
Ease of employment	0.4938	0.4688
make-work	0.5750	0.4500
Total residential area	0.7493	0.6700
Building structure	0.4333	0.5000
Degree of house decoration	0.5125	0.5750
Housing location	0.2500	0.5375
Water supply	0.0250	0.2500
Greening situation	0.5688	0.6438
Air quality	0.7625	0.6813
Noise conditions	0.5938	0.7313
Public security situation	0.7500	0.7375
Waste disposal status	0.6188	0.7125
Convenience of life	0.5875	0.7625
neighborhood	0.8063	0.7813
Comfort of living	0.6875	0.7375
Total ambiguity index	0.5006	0.5051

4. Conclusion and Discussion

4.1. The Research Conclusion

Based on Sen's theory of feasible ability, this paper constructs a theoretical model to measure the welfare level of land-expropriated farmers, and selects fuzzy comprehensive evaluation method to empirically analyze the changes of the overall welfare level of land-expropriated farmers before and after losing their land, and draws a conclusion: First, the current welfare of land-expropriated farmers is still at a low level. Although the welfare level of farmers has been improved after land acquisition, the improvement of welfare status is limited, and the overall fuzzy index shows that the welfare level is still not high enough. Secondly, after the land expropriation, the family economic situation of farmers deteriorates, and the agricultural income decreases while the non-agricultural income situation cannot be improved in time and effectively. The expropriation of farmers' land means that they lose the most basic means of production and stable source of income; At the same time, there has been a shift in lifestyle, which has led to households buying food mainly through the market and earning mainly from non-farm income. Therefore, in order to improve the family economic situation of land-expropriated farmers, it is necessary to take measures to promote the re-employment of land-expropriated farmers and improve their vocational skills training so as to increase their non-agricultural income(Wang Wei, 2013).

4.2. Discussion

Firstly, this paper selected Shexian County, Huangshan City, which is an underdeveloped area. Therefore, the research results can only reflect the changes of welfare level of land-expropriated farmers in this area before and after losing their land. Moreover, due to the limitation of samples, whether the conclusion is universal needs further research and verification. Secondly, land expropriation will cause complex social problems, so the factors affecting the welfare of farmers involve all aspects, and the main factors need to be further studied. Thirdly, based on the theoretical basis of Sen, several policy suggestions are put forward: to establish a sound and smooth interest expression mechanism to enhance the political freedom and transparency of the land-expropriated farmers; Construct a reasonable compensation mechanism for land expropriation to improve the economic conditions of farmers; Improve the employment security system of the peasants who are expropriated land to enhance their human capital to guarantee their employment opportunities; A safe social security mechanism is established to enhance the protective security of land-expropriated farmers (Yang Tao, 2010).

Acknowledgments

Anhui University of Finance and Economics Graduate Research Innovation Fund Project: Research on improving the welfare of peasant households with expropriated land from the perspective of common prosperity-- A case study of Shexian County, Huangshan City(ACYC 2021051).

References

- [1] Wang Jian, Zhang Zeyu. New Public Participation in the Boundary Discussion of Land Expropriation: Based on the analysis of typical land expropriation cases in Taiwan [J]. China land science, 2016, 30 (07): 14-21+32.
- [2] Li Yan. study on expropriation and compensation system of other rights of collective land [J]. China land science, 2016, 30(07): 49-55.
- [3] Liu Linghui, Zheng Yaoqun. China population, resources and environment, 2016, 26(11): 76-82.
- [4] Gao Jinyun, Qiao Rongfeng. Measurement of Farmers' Welfare Change and Cultivation of feasible ability before and after land expropriation: An empirical study based on survey data of four districts in Tianjin [J]. China population, resources and environment, 2016, 26(S2): 158-161.
- [5] Chen Mei-qiu, LIAO Cai-rong, et al. Research on the Realization of the Membership Rights of Rural Collective Economic Organizations -- Based on the "Discussion on the Realization of the Membership Rights of Rural Collective Economic Organizations from the Perspective of Land Expropriation" [J]. China land science, 2018, 32(01): 58-64.
- [6] XU Zhong, Xu Liang, et al. Compensation for land Acquisition, willingness to acquire land and capital input of farmers: A perspective of farmers who have not lost their land [J]. Journal of Rural Economy, 2018 (10): 44-50.
- [7] Ding Guomin, Liu Guichang. Optimization of dispute settlement mechanism of compensation fee allocation for rural land expropriation [J]. Rural Economy, 2020(05): 1-9.
- [8] Liu Rui, Chen Xue. On the construction of emergency land expropriation system in China [J]. China land science, 2020, 34(06): 28-34.
- [9] Cai Meina, Murtazashvili Jennifer Brick, etc. Sugarcoating the bitter pill: compensation, land governance, and opposition to land expropriation in China [J]. The Journal of Peasant Studies, 2020, 47 (6):
- [10] Cheng Xueyang. On the coordination between collective land expropriation and market value-added income distribution [J]. China land science, 2020, 34(10): 28-33.

- [11] Shan A L, WU K N, et al. Performance evaluation of land expropriation system reform in dingzhou city based on effect model [J]. China agricultural resources and regional planning,2018,39(09):239-245.
- [12] Wang Yakun, Zhao Heng, et al. Research on Land Acquisition Procedure from the perspective of Farmers' Rights protection: A Case study of 5 construction projects in Hebei Province [J]. China agricultural resources and regional planning,2019,40(04):161-171.
- [13] GAO B. A masterpiece of promoting the reform of land expropriation system -- Comment on Dr Zhang Peng's "From Land Expropriation to Quasi-Land Expropriation: Principles and Policies" [J]. China land science,2019,33(05):103-104.
- [14] Lu S H, Yao Y T, et al. Farmers' Demands in land expropriation: A big data analysis based on "Local leaders' Message Board" [J]. Issues in Agricultural Economy,2020(07):58-68.
- [15] Wu Yue, Song Yu, et al. Balance of public and private interests and due process in land expropriation [J]. Rural Economy,2020(08):28-36.
- [16] Hu Dawei. A Study on the relationship between land expropriation and collective commercial Construction Land [J]. China land science,2020,34(09):10-16+23.
- [17] Lin Yao Tang. Discussion on legislation of expropriation and compensation of farmers' housing [J]. Rural Economy,2021(04):40-47. (in Chinese)
- [18] [TANG J. From economic policy to social policy: An explanation of the change of land expropriation system. China land science,2021,35(05):1-7.
- [19] Feng Lei, Sun Dan, et al. Farmer participation, procedural fairness and satisfaction with land expropriation: An empirical analysis based on the "1,000 people and 100 Villages" survey in 2019 [J]. China land science,2021,35(03):29-39.
- [20] Ou Shengbin. Research on welfare effect of land expropriation from the perspective of household differentiation [D]. Nanjing Agricultural University,2018.
- [21] Li Mingfeng, Zhang Xin, Yang Chuan, Wu Yue. Research on the Livelihood Situation of rural households with land expropriated in suburban Areas during Urbanization process: A case study of Xinzhou District, Wuhan City [J]. Modern Urban Research,2021(09):117-123.
- [22] Feng Lei, Sun Dan, Yan Jinhai. Farmer participation, procedural fairness and satisfaction with land expropriation: An empirical analysis based on the "1,000 people and 100 Villages" survey in 2019 [J]. China land science,2021,35(03):29-39.
- [23] Su Huashan, Lu Wenhui, Huang Shanshan. Research on the efficiency of Income to Welfare Conversion of Chinese residents: Based on Sen's theory of feasible ability [J]. Contemporary Economic Research,2018(03):66-74.
- [24] Liu Xuan, Qu Xiaoli. An Empirical analysis of the New Generation of Migrant Workers' ability to integrate into cities based on the theory of feasible ability [J]. Adult education,2018,38(02):52-57.
- [25] Yang Tao, Shi Yanhong, Liu Jianhua. Analysis of rights and interests of land-lost immigrants based on feasible ability theory [J]. Rural Economy,2010(08):80-83.
- [26] Wang Keqiang. An Empirical study on the Effect of Land on Farmers' Basic Living Security: A Case study of Jiangsu Province [J]. Journal of Sichuan University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition), 2005 (03):5-11.
- [27] Ingrid Robeyns. Sen's Capability Approach and Render Inequality:Selecting Relevant Capabilities [J]. Feminist Economics,2003,9(2-3).
- [28] Cerioli,A .S.,Zani.A fuzzy approach to the measurement of poverty. Income and wealth distribution, inequality and poverty[J]. Berlin:Springer Verlag,1990.
- [29] Cheli,B. ,A. Lemmi. A“Totally”fuzzy and relative approach to the multidimensional analysis of poverty [J]. Economic Notes,1995,24(1):115-134.
- [30] Gao Jinyun, Qiao Rongfeng, Zhang Anlu. Fuzzy evaluation of Farmers' Welfare Changes before and after rural land urban Transfer: Based on Sen's feasible ability theory [J]. Management World, 2007 (06) : 45-55.
- [31] Miceli,D .Measuring poverty using fuzzy sets[J]. NATSEM: University of Canberr,1998.

- [32] Wang Wei, Ma Chao. Research on Welfare Level of Land-lost Farmers Based on Feasible Ability Theory: A Case study of Yixing and Taicang in Jiangsu Province [J]. Journal of Agricultural Technical Economics, 2013(06):20-31.
- [33] Yang Tao, Shi Yanhong, Liu Jianhua. Analysis of rights and interests of land-lost immigrants based on feasible ability theory [J]. Rural Economy, 2010(08):80-83.