

# Spatiotemporal forest and land cover change in Türkiye: The role of economic factors in driving environmental transformations

Gökhan Şen<sup>a,\*</sup> 💿, Emre Aktürk<sup>a</sup> 💿

**Abstract:** Industrial advancements, urbanization, climate change, economic developments, and numerous other factors significantly influence land use preferences, subsequently causing changes in land cover. However, these changes are not homogeneus at the country scale. In this study, we aim to determine the total and provincial-based land cover changes in Türkiye between 2006 and 2018 and the impacts of macroeconomic variables on these changes. The land cover status for 2006 and 2018 and the changes occurring during this period were determined according to the Coordination of Information on the Environment (CORINE) system. For this purpose, five land cover classes were used. Correlation analysis was utilized to identify relationships between macroeconomic variables and cover changes and regression analysis was used to develop models aiming to predict future changes in land cover based on macroeconomic variables. Research findings indicate that 5.31% of forest areas, 2.9% of agricultural areas, and 7.19% of shrub and/or herbaceous vegetation associations have been converted to other uses. During this period, forest cover increased in 38 provinces in Türkiye, decreased in 41 provinces, and remained unchanged in two provinces. The province with the highest percentage increase in forest areas was Iğdır, at 19.98%, while the province with the most significant percentage decrease in forest areas was Ordu, at 0.62%. There was a statistically significant negative correlation between changes in forest areas and certain macroeconomic factors; gross domestic product (-0.310), number of automobiles (-0.308), number of motor vehicles (-0.326), and the number of buildings according to the building use permit (-0.287). **Keywords:** Land use, Macroeconomic factors, CORINE, Türkiye

# Türkiye'de orman ve arazi örtüsü değişimi: çevresel dönüşümlerin yönlendirilmesinde ekonomik faktörlerin rolü

Özet: Endüstriyel gelişmeler, kentleşme, iklim değişikliği, ekonomik gelişmeler ve diğer birçok faktör arazi kullanım tercihlerini önemli ölçüde etkileyerek arazi örtüsünde değişikliklere neden olmaktadır. Ancak bu değişimler ülke ölçeğinde homojen değildir. Bu çalışmada, Türkiye'de 2006-2018 yılları arasında toplam ve il bazında arazi örtüsü değişimlerinin ve makroekonomik değişkenlerin bu değişimler üzerindeki etkilerinin belirlenmesi amaçlanmaktadır. 2006-2018 yıllarına ait arazi örtüsü durumu ve bu dönemde meydana gelen değişimler Çevresel Bilginin Koordinasyonu (CORINE) sistemine göre belirlenmiştir. Bu amaçla beş arazi örtüsü sınıfı kullanılmıştır. Makroekonomik değişkenler ve örtü değişiklikleri arasındaki ilişkileri belirlemek için korelasyon analizi ve makroekonomik değişkenlere dayalı olarak arazi örtüsünde gelecekteki değişiklikleri tahmin etmeyi amaçlayan modeller geliştirmek için regresyon analizi kullanılmıştır. Araştırma bulguları, orman alanlarının %5,31'inin, tarım alanlarının %2,9'unun ve çalı ve/veya otsu bitki birliklerinin %7,19'unun diğer kullanımlara dönüştürüldüğünü göstermektedir. Bu dönemde Türkiye'de 38 ilde orman alanları artmış, 41 ilde azalmış, 2 ilde ise değişmemiştir. Orman alanlarının yüzde olarak en fazla arttığı il %19,98 ile Iğdır, en fazla azaldığı il ise %0,62 ile Ordu olmuştur. Orman alanlarındaki değişim ile gayrisafi yurtiçi hasıla (-0,310), otomobil sayısı (-0,308), motorlu taşıt sayısı (-0,326) ve yapı kullanım iznine göre bina sayısı (-0,287) arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir negatif korelasyon belirlenmiştir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Arazi kullanımı, Makro-ekonomik faktörler, CORINE, Türkiye

## 1. Introduction

Anthropogenic activities have caused changes to approximately three-quarters of the Earth's land surface over the last millennium despite numerous studies aiming to protect ecosystems at both global and local levels (Luyssaert et al., 2014; Arneth et al., 2019; Isinkaralar et al., 2024). In particular, the rapid increase in demand for raw materials following the Industrial Revolution has led to humans' destruction of natural resources, the effects of which are currently being experienced in climate change (Walter et al., 2003; Emmott, 2013). As a result, monitoring land cover status, its spatiotemporal change dynamics and identifying the causes of this transformation have gained significant importance in current research (Winkler et al., 2021).

Forests, as one of the most critical ecosystems on terrestrial surfaces, play a vital role for humans and other living organisms due to their products and services (FAO, 2010). In addition to these characteristics, forests are central to efforts to achieve the goals outlined in the Paris Agreement to combat climate change (Grassi et al., 2017). However, numerous studies have shown that forest ecosystems are significantly degraded or endangered in many parts of the world (Winkler et al., 2021). Understanding the changes in these resources and the human impacts that largely influence them is crucial for protecting and managing forest resources

- <sup>A</sup> a Kastamonu Üniversitesi, Orman Fakültesi, Orman Mühendisliği Bölümü, Kastamonu
- <sup>@</sup> \* **Corresponding author** (İletişim yazarı): gsen@kastamonu.edu.tr
- Received (Geliş tarihi): 03.05.2024, Accepted (Kabul tarihi): 06.06.2024



**Citation** (Attf): Şen, G., Aktürk, E., 2024. Spatiotemporal forest and land cover change in Türkiye: The role of economic factors in driving environmental transformations. Turkish Journal of Forestry, 25(2): 176-189. DOI: <u>10.18182/tjf.1478110</u> and their biodiversity. As a result of human interventions, the dominant land cover and/or land use type in an area can be transformed into a different type, leading to consequences such as deforestation, desertification, habitat fragmentation, biodiversity loss, and ultimately, global warming (Noss, 2001; Sherbinin et al., 2007). This can also reduce environmental services (Lele and Joshi, 2009).

Identifying the specific human factors at play is crucial for planning appropriate measures, while the causes of land cover changes are generally human-induced. Population status, structure, migration, population change, countries' socio-economic goals, development strategies, implemented policies, and social and economic structures can significantly impact land cover. Additionally, agricultural policies and practices are particularly influential in driving changes in land cover (Winkler et al., 2021). In Türkiye, a shift from agriculture to the service sector and industrialization began in conjunction with the development push initiated in the 1980s (Kaştan, 2016). Rural-to-urban migration that started after this period led to rapid changes in the natural structure of cities. These changes have primarily affected forests and agricultural fields for the purpose of settlement and industrialization, particularly in the urban peripheries. In contrast, rural areas have experienced a decline in livestock and agricultural activities due to depopulated villages, leading to the reforestation of these areas (Toksoy et al., 2011; Şen et al., 2018).

Determining the changes in land cover due to anthropogenic and natural factors is particularly important for environmental studies. In this context, numerous studies have been conducted worldwide, including in Türkiye (Turner et al., 1993; Lambin et al., 2003; Sen et al., 2015; Sen and Güngör, 2018; Akturk and Guney, 2021; Roy et al., 2022; Dogan et al., 2023; Lagarias and Stratigea, 2023; Zeren Cetin et al., 2023; Işınkaralar, 2024). These studies have gained momentum and diversified with advancements in geospatial computing and remote sensing techniques (Wulder et al., 2018). Initial studies on the land cover were primarily focused on determining the cover of the Earth's surface or monitoring changes over specific time intervals. However, over time, these studies have evolved to concentrate on identifying the causes of these changes, enabling predictions of potential futufre changes (Huang et al., 2020). In such research, the focus is often on local and small-scale land cover change study sites. In contrast, some of the most influential factors in land cover change are a country's social, economic, cultural, and other characteristics, which vary significantly between countries. In this context, conducting studies at a national scale to examine land cover changes, determine the influential factors, and identify the relationships between them is important for management planning and future projections.

Another important consideration is the fact that the social, economic, cultural, and other variables within countries are not homogeneously distributed. Countries are divided into subunits based on various characteristics (Açıkgöz, 2011). In this regard, provinces emerge as units that can distinguish areas with similar features and provide accurate data. Thus, examining land cover change at the provincial level, encompassing the entire country, and investigating the influencing factors will yield valuable results. A literature review reveals a limited number of studies conducted in this scope.

In light of the reasons mentioned above, this study aims to investigate the impacts of economic variables on land cover changes in Türkiye between 2006 and 2018 and to identify predictive models that can foresee potential changes in land cover due to these economic variables. The outcomes of this research hold the potential to significantly contribute to the understanding of land cover change dynamics and their underlying driving factors, ultimately benefiting decisionmakers in predicting land cover changes, thereby promoting the conservation of forest resources and related natural resources, establishing a balance in resource use, and informing planning and project development in related areas. Moreover, the findings of this study will provide a valuable reference for future research on land cover change and its connections with socio-economic factors, fostering the development of more targeted and effective management strategies. Additionally, the predictive models obtained from this study can serve as a foundation for further research in similar countries, enhancing the applicability and value of the findings for a broader range of contexts. Overall, this study addresses a crucial gap in the existing literature and aims to advance our understanding of the complex relationship between land cover change and economic factors, paving the way for more sustainable and informed land management practices.

# 2. Materials and Methods

### 2.1. Study area

Türkiye is located at the confluence of Asia, Europe, Africa, and the Middle East, between the latitudes of  $36^{\circ}$  - $42^{\circ}$  north and longitudes of  $26^{\circ}$  -  $45^{\circ}$  east (Figure 1). Among the region's countries; it is one of the largest in terms of area and population. The country, forming a peninsula, is surrounded by the Black Sea to the north, the Aegean Sea to the west, and the Mediterranean Sea to the south. Türkiye is predominantly characterized by mountainous terrain, with limited plains and coastal areas. About a quarter of the country's surface is elevated above 1,200 meters, with steep slopes prevalent across the nation and flat or gently sloping lands comprising only one-sixth of the total area.

The study area's climate is diverse, significantly influenced by the presence of seas to the north, south, and west, as well as the mountains that cover most of the country. Certain regions exhibit the Mediterranean climate's characteristic maximum winter precipitation, and summer droughts are prevalent. However, due to Türkiye's elevation, winters tend to be substantially colder than those typically encountered in Mediterranean climates, resulting in notable temperature variations between the winter and summer months (Sensoy et al., 2008).

Owing to its strategic position as a bridge between three continents, its location on crucial migration routes, its unique topographic features and varied climatic patterns, and its position at the intersection of distinct floristic regions (Euro-Siberian, Mediterranean, and Irano-Turanian), Türkiye is recognized as one of the world's most vital gene centers in terms of plant biodiversity (Aksoy et al., 2014). According to the Angiosperm Phylogeny Group (APG) system, the Turkish Flora comprises 11707 taxa, including 11466 native, 171 foreign, and 70 agricultural plants. Moreover, 3649 of these plant taxa are endemic to Türkiye, yielding an endemism rate of 31.8%. Recent investigations have increased these figures,

demonstrating that 12975 of the 374000 plant taxa documented globally (Christenhusz and Byng, 2016) are present within Türkiye's borders. The number of endemic plant taxa stands at 4157 (Özhatay et al., 2013; 2015; 2017; 2019), and the endemism rate has been updated to 32%. These values are anticipated to continue their upward trajectory with each new study (Karaköse, 2020).

# 2.2. Dataset & CLC change analyzing

The Coordination of Information on the Environment (CORINE) Land Cover (CLC) products provide land cover data for the European continent at a 100-meter spatial resolution for five different years (1990, 2000, 2006, 2012, and 2018) (Copernicus Land Monitoring Service, 2020). Initiated by the European Union in 1985, the primary aim of this project was to establish a standardized land cover dataset for environmental research across European countries (Heymann et al., 1994).

CLC offers users 44 distinct land cover classes within five main categories, enabling a detailed examination of changes between these numerous classes (Bossard et al., 2000). The 'Land Cover Classification Project' was launched in 1988 as part of the adaptation process with the European Union, making Türkiye one of the European countries included in the CLC products (Ateşoğlu, 2016). Since the first CLC product release, these datasets have been widely used and continue to be employed in various studies in Türkiye (Vural et al., 1997; Ikiel et al., 2013; Ateşoğlu, 2016; Sari and Özşahin, 2016;

Konukçu et al., 2017; Aktürk et al., 2020; Akturk and Guney, 2021). The frequent use of CLC products in academic research can be attributed to their free access, providing information on numerous sub-land cover classes, and data availability at an acceptable spatial resolution of 100 meters. In this study, the 2006 and 2018 CLC products were used due to the variety of land cover classes they provide and their coverage of the study area. Using these datasets enables an in-depth investigation of land cover changes in Türkiye and contributes to understanding the driving factors behind these shifts. Although data from the CLC for the years 1990 and 2000 are available for the study area, they were not included in the study due to the unavailability of all relevant economic data for these periods. Furthermore, the CLC data for the year 2012 is not deemed suitable for use in the study, in order to avoid an increase in data processing capacity and an increase in the temporal coverage time.

Geographical operations for this study were performed using ArcMap version 10.8.1. First, spatial alignment was ensured, and all CLC raster and province borders vector datasets used in the study were transformed into the ETRS89 LAEA geographic coordinate system. Then, the cell resolutions of the CLC maps were kept constant at 100 meters, and the level 3 CLC land cover classes were recategorized according to the study objectives and grouped under six main classes based on the study's purposes (Table 1).



Figure 1. National country and city boundaries of the study area

CORINE Level 1	CORINE Level 3	Re-categorized Class
	111 - Continuous urban fabric	AS
	112 - Discontinuous urban fabric	AS
	121 - Industrial or commercial units	AS
	122 - Road and rail networks and associated land	AS
	123 - Port areas	AS
Artificial surfaces	124 – Airports	AS
7 Intilletal Surfaces	131 – Mineral extraction sites	AS
	132 – Dump sites	AS
	132 – Dump sites	AS
	141 Green urban areas	AS
	141 - Ofech urban areas	AS
	211 Non-imigated amble land	AS
	211 – Non-Irrigated arable land	AA
	212 – Permanentily irrigated land	AA
	213 – Rice fields	AA
	221 – Vineyards	AA
	222 – Fruit trees and berry plantations	AA
Agricultural areas	223 – Olive groves	AA
	231 – Pastures	SH
	241 – Annual crops associated with permanent crops	AA
	242 – Complex cultivation patterns	AA
	243 - Land principally occupied by agriculture, with significant areas of natural vegetation	AA
	244 – Agro-forestry areas	AA
	311 - Broad-leaved forest	FA
	312 – Coniferous forest	FA
	313 – Mixed forest	FA
	321 – Natural grasslands	SH
	322 – Moors and heathland	SH
Forest and semi	323 – Sclerophyllous vegetation	SH
natural areas	324 – Transitional woodland-shrub	SH
	331 – Beaches, dunes, sands	OS
	332 – Bare rocks	OS
	333 – Sparsely vegetated areas	OS
	334 - Burnt areas	OS
	335 – Glaciers and perpetual snow	OS
	411 – Inland marshes	W
	412 - Peat hors	W
Wetlands	421 - Salt marshes	W
Wettands	422 - Salines	W
	422 – Saintes	W W
	425 - Intertidal Itals	vv XV
	511 – Water Courses	vv W
Watan hadi	512 – water boures	VV XX 7
water bodies	521 – Coastal lagoons	VV XX 7
	522 – Estuaries	W
	523 – Sea and ocean	W

Table 1. CLC Level 1 and Level 3 land cover classes and their new re-categorized classes according to the aims of the study (AS: Artificial surfaces, AA: Agricultural areas, FA: Forest Areas, SH: Shrub and/or herbaceous vegetation associations, OS: open spaces, W: Wetlands)

In addition to the spatial change analysis of land cover classes, temporal transitions between cover types were also examined. These changes were conducted based on the land cover classes specified in Table 1, taking the years 2006-2018 as a reference. Furthermore, Türkiye's annual deforestation rate was determined at the national and provincial levels. Although this rate can be calculated using several formulas (Liu et al., 1993; FAO, 1995; Menon and Bawa, 1997; Armenteras et al., 2006; Lele and Joshi, 2009), the widely used Formula (1) (Puyravaud, 2003) was employed in this study. That is:

$$r = \left(\frac{l}{t_2 - t_1} ln \frac{A_2}{A_1}\right) * 100 \tag{1}$$

where P is the percentage of forest loss per year, and A1 and A2 are the amount of forest cover at time t1 and t2, respectively.

2.3. Analysis of macro-economics factors-land cover change relations

As specified in the study objectives, macroeconomic factors causing land cover change between 2006 and 2018 were determined by identifying macroeconomic variables. In determining these economic variables that could affect land cover change, attention was given to the availability of data for the relevant years for each province provided by the Turkish Statistical Institute or other institutions. If data for the relevant year were unavailable, data from the nearest one or two years were used. Within this scope, 18 variables were identified for use in the analyses. These include (1) plant production value (1000 TL/year) (PPV), (2) production quantity of cereals and other plant products (tons/year) (PQ), (3) total cultivated agricultural land size (year/hectares (ha)) (CAL), (4) production quantity of greenhouse vegetables and fruits (year/tons) (PGV), (5) the number of large livestock (NLL), (6) total value of animal products (TL) (VAP), (7)

number of small livestock (NSL), (8) gross domestic product (GDP) (TL), (9) GDP per capita (TL) (GDPC), (10) the number of automobiles (NA), (11) number of motor vehicles (NM), (12) the number of motor vehicles per capita (NMC), (13) total electricity consumption per capita (kWh) (TEC), (14) number of buildings according to occupancy permits (BOP), (15) number of buildings according to construction permits (BCP), (16) export revenues (TL) (ER), (17) export revenues per capita (TL) (ERC) (TUİK, 2023), and (18) development levels of provinces (DLP) (STB, 2023).

A correlation analysis was applied to reveal the relationship between the changes in land cover and the economic factors that influenced these changes between 2006 and 2018. If the correlation value is between (+-)0.00-0.25, the correlation level is very weak, between (+-) 0.26-0.49 weak, between (+-) 0.50-0.69 moderate, between (+-) 0.70-0.89 high, and between (+-) 0.90-1.00 it is considered very high (Özdamar, 2002; Büyüköztürk, 2010). The analysis used 12 dependent and independent variables (economic variables) mentioned above. The dependent variables in the correlation analysis are the changes in artificial surfaces (AS), agricultural areas (AA), forest areas (FA), shrub and/or herbaceous vegetation associations (SH), open spaces with little or no vegetation (OS), and wetlands (W) land cover classes between 2006 and 2018 and their values per square kilometer (psq).

The stepwise method from multiple regression techniques was employed in the analysis aimed at estimating the changes in land cover due to economic variables (Özdamar, 2002; Büyüköztürk, 2010). Independent variables that did not show a normal distribution and had multicollinearity issues were removed from the analysis. The first 15 independent variables and the 12 dependent variables mentioned above were used in the modeling.

# 3. Results and Discussion

As a results of this study, produced land cover maps of Türkiye for the years 2006 and 2018 are given in Figure 2, and the area-based land cover results are shared in Table 2 below. According to the results, the total area of Türkiye's the FA class in 2018 was 11522103 ha. This area represents approximately 15% of Türkiye's total land area. Between 2006 and 2018, the AS class experienced an increase of 20.42% (263461 ha), the AA class grew by 0.15% (47716 ha), the SH class increased by 0.87% (169176 ha), and the W class expanded by 4.39% (76932 ha). Conversely, the FA class decreased by 0.96% (111932 ha), and the OS class declined by 3.78% (445353 ha).

Changes in LULC and transitions between land use classes between 2006-2018 are presented in Figure 3 and Table 3, and the provincial basis is presented in Table 4.



Figure 2. 2006 and 2018 land cover maps of Türkiye and its cities derived from CLC.

Table 2. Area coverage of fand cover classes for 2000 and 2018 and cover change within 12 year	Table 2.	Area coverage of	of land cover	classes	for 2006	and 2018 and	cover change	within 12	vears
--	----------	------------------	---------------	---------	----------	--------------	--------------	-----------	-------

		Area (	ha)	Change $(0/)$
		2006	2018	Change (%)
	Artificial Surfaces (AS)	1290342	1,553805	20.42
	Agricultural areas (AA)	32017143	32064930	0.15
	Forest Areas (FA)	11634050	11522103	-0.96
LULC Classes	Shrub and/or herbaceous vegetation associations (SH)	19531874	19701165	0.87
	Open spaces with little or no vegetation (OS)	11775822	11330566	-3.78
	Wetlands (W)	1750661	1827620	4.39
	Total	77999892	78000189	



Figure 3. Forest Areas (FA) land cover class change map of Türkiye from 2006 to 2018

Table 3. The change matrix of land cover classes for Türkiye from 2006 to 2018

								201	8						
		AS		AA		FA		SH		OS		W		Total	
		Area (ha)	%												
	AS			44678	3.46	2779	0.22	19013	1.47	5112	0.40	4589	0.36	76171	5.90
	AA	205151	0.64			118151	0.37	400597	1.25	137402	0.43	66429	0.21	927730	2.90
2006	FA	23724	0.20	148781	1.28			422723	3.63	15834	0.14	7186	0.06	618248	5.31
	SH	78759	0.40	552007	2.83	365842	1.87			377078	1.93	30123	0.15	1403809	7.19
	OS	29138	0.25	211538	1.80	18396	016	718173	6.10			15696	0.13	992941	8.43
	W	286	0.02	18442	1.05	1148	6.22	12479	0.71	12162	0.69			44517	2.54

Table 4. City-level status of the land cover classes for 2006 and 2018 based on CLC

	Land Cover Change (ha)							Transition matrix of Land Cover Classes (ha)							Deforestation				
City	AS	AA	FA	SH	OS	W	FA-AS	FA-AA	FA-SH	FA-OS	FA-W	AS-FA	AA-FA	SH-FA	OS-FA	W-FA	No Change	rate (for FA) (%)	Coastal or Not
Adana	7888	-22720	183	13274	-2554	3929	1001	4155	25275	566	1309	130	10978	20424	885	72	1250598	0.006	+
Adıyaman	2359	317	629	-2334	-860	-111	15	92	217	53	0	0	107	792	104	3	703011	0.514	-
Afyonkarahisar	3009	1885	2009	-8296	948	445	163	335	1561	128	2	18	394	3674	111	1	1361346	0183	-
Ağrı	3971	6420	0	-6214	-4666	517	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1075077	0.000	-
Aksaray	1143	5354	135	-1909	-6462	1739	0	8	116	1	0	0	3	238	19	0	727829	0.504	-
Amasya	929	451	964	5724	-8385	317	144	1189	3830	434	37	6	1243	4989	353	7	531150	0.061	-
Ankara	17618	-11524	303	8743	-17846	2706	13	287	2245	48	4	17	270	2558	53	2	2473675	0.018	-
Antalya	6896	-1734	-4585	-573	-2001	1997	983	3333	29939	2138	413	126	2965	28566	526	38	1914548	-0.069	+
Ardahan	1232	10454	253	-5327	-2175	-4413	76	97	588	38	0	1	56	945	48	0	464332	0.069	-
Artvin	589	-2485	-315	3144	-3642	2730	272	1775	4261	411	89	174	1928	3964	406	12	710223	-0.008	+
Aydın	2794	2378	-5753	2591	-2661	651	142	1342	7173	37	30	43	713	2090	115	10	782250	375	+
Balıkesir	7504	-3068	-5109	-1155	231	1597	1103	3410	14152	35	344	40	2976	10843	53	23	1394204	-0.106	+
Bartın	355	-883	399	115	-1	15	162	1118	426	2	35	15	1777	331	2	17	228511	0.027	+
Batman	1201	803	1145	22517	-25676	10	1	12	282	14	0	0	78	1281	95	0	415167	1.204	-
Bayburt	200	-719	83	33673	-33630	393	0	71	221	69	0	1	40	337	66	0	331010	0.060	-
Bilecik	-313	6280	-899	-1003	-4325	260	352	2724	3693	16	47	42	2277	3589	25	0	385597	-0.052	-
Bingöl	1304	-1427	4095	-4977	63	942	129	340	2726	538	71	6	595	6508	770	20	771055	0.337	-
Bitlis	1336	1099	-12520	17987	-7715	-187	49	160	13651	1758	22	3	164	2061	889	3	789941	-1.228	-
Bolu	2006	-1411	-109	-1777	61	1230	200	1641	2771	39	46	31	1457	3061	35	4	812697	-0.002	-
Burdur	2120	1235	-3938	2475	-2599	707	203	490	7795	106	66	7	437	4132	122	24	694162	-0.255	-
Bursa	7664	2027	-8539	-2606	-188	1642	1329	7086	8109	90	353	65	2720	5608	17	18	1036093	-0.197	+
Çanakkale	1067	1699	-7187	2997	-9	1433	233	2259	14500	21	307	48	1753	8296	11	25	942955	-0.177	+
Çankırı	1788	-976	809	6551	-8462	290	70	128	1194	96	62	0	211	1993	153	2	727288	0.078	-
Çorum	951	451	579	-2703	-6780	7502	143	2049	1823	188	204	8	1129	3591	257	1	1191319	0.023	-
Denizli	3142	1134	-1396	2011	-4576	-315	36	2527	15714	217	75	21	2273	14574	296	9	1148009	-0.042	-
Diyarbakır	6881	5053	209	-12161	-514	532	0	69	546	89	4	0	43	814	60	0	1453932	0.081	-

Table 4 continued

#### Turkish Journal of Forestry 2024, 25(2): 176-189

		Lan	d Cover (	Change (l	na)					Transitio	n matrix	of Land	Cover Cla	sses (ha)				Deforestation	
City	AS	AA	FA	SH	OS	W	FA-AS	FA-AA	FA-SH	FA-OS	FA-W	AS-FA	AA-FA	SH-FA	OS-FA	W-FA	No Change	rate (for FA) (%)	Coastal or Not
Düzce	1518	-1727	-788	865	1	131	63	526	936	1	8	5	644	94	0	3	244393	-0.055	+
Edirne	1911	1075	607	-4629	-137	1173	29	605	2368	82	77	4	546	3204	0	14	595170	0.099	-
Elazığ	2555	6430	992	955	-10365	-567	2	40	225	41	19	4	295	969	45	6	901333	0.537	-
Erzincan	3558	-3877	-2998	3420	-954	851	58	465	4884	798	2	1	402	2309	495	2	2390649	-0.202	-
Erzurum	3518	167	-1454	7666	-10609	712	37	887	4603	37	5	16	975	3061	56	7	1349033	-0.083	-
Eskişehir	10449	-25537	1183	10733	2925	268	104	261	1138	20	4	68	515	2114	13	0	622438	0.426	-
Gaziantep	2255	-1966	-973	13240	-12391	-165	8	162	1602	440	4	0	135	979	126	3	1127010	-0.214	-
Giresun	2779	-2252	-117	4643	-5408	355	148	4377	1919	146	14	10	3421	2863	189	4	671246	-0.005	+
Gümüşhane	944	-3457	10027	-6438	-2009	933	215	456	1483	227	194	9	2277	9798	515	3	634503	0.672	-
Hakkari	1294	4577	3764	18930	-27906	-650	0	338	1974	669	0	0	74	6270	401	0	628335	1.523	-
Hatay	1712	1653	-6266	3729	-1220	420	229	2866	6171	73	12	42	653	2367	46	1	529485	-0.372	+
Iğdır	1118	3370	350	-2408	-1637	-779	0	0	0	1	0	0	33	307	2	9	351335	19.982	-
Isparta	2242	799	1543	-2685	-2351	452	297	754	3835	130	66	20	364	5831	384	26	869866	0.116	-
İstanbul	14164	-4247	-1075	-8850	37	-29	6946	1369	5275	33	230	693	1078	10801	13	193	498524	-0.041	+
İzmir	5851	-2245	-12741	10382	-2275	1028	950	2192	21795	193	48	233	2570	9390	221	23	1124985	-0.447	+
Kahramanmaraş	5396	-5111	7716	-1008	-9533	2540	66	1417	3733	111	127	5	2365	10552	210	38	1397440	0.356	-
Karabük	889	-2965	653	1389	-50	84	144	758	3333	33	122	4	2696	2272	34	37	397336	0.024	-
Karaman	865	1641	4719	7792	-22449	7432	10	445	1680	582	635	4	423	7435	209	0	777816	0.754	-
Kars	3850	859	-555	-5300	935	255	0	86	1224	34	0	3	36	729	21	0	963091	-0.150	-
Kastamonu	1499	8095	2568	-8907	-3618	363	446	6996	4835	297	41	24	5687	9175	264	33	1258314	0.031	+
Kayseri	5996	10415	-825	-17756	840	1330	88	127	1480	313	71	0	362	816	76	0	1596848	-0.290	-
Kırıkkale	1465	-1825	132	3578	-3479	129	0	48	301	5	0	0	40	439	7	0	465521	0.086	-
Kırklareli	714	146	7399	-9746	-107	1594	67	717	2284	11	37	5	672	9793	8	37	624957	0.305	+
Kırşehir	718	-395	111	-700	-1821	2087	2	39	81	8	3	1	44	189	2	8	641282	0.092	-
Kilis	409	-218	238	156	-568	-18	0	28	49	0	1	0	31	272	14	0	136250	0.602	-
Kocaeli	3579	3761	-8974	1410	-65	289	690	5512	7105	0	55	55	1386	2939	2	6	313187	-0.597	+
Konya	9592	9845	8239	-44194	19100	-2582	85	577	3836	175	13	8	710	12008	188	11	3889023	0.686	-
Kütahya	3436	18480	-1812	-5748	-14941	585	666	3500	6773	105	68	59	2122	6893	224	2	1094072	-0.047	-
Malatya	2088	2521	-219	-5704	719	595	18	86	388	47	0	0	28	251	41	0	1160180	-0.169	-
Manisa	3773	536	-14054	8410	497	838	392	3266	17646	60	66	44	2225	5027	72	8	1284202	-0.512	-
Mardin	3498	-8611	-74	-19215	24573	-166	0	32	100	0	0	0	1	57	0	0	805825	-0.259	-
Mersin	8571	2177	-44160	50486	-18314	1240	1044	7012	72435	584	134	120	9681	26443	790	15	1358465	-1.119	+
Muğla	2980	-6255	-8841	16257	-5217	1076	819	2041	17595	181	98	188	3232	8027	380	66	1208272	-0.167	+
Muş	2711	-3557	-2936	4949	-9764	8597	7	85	4835	168	6	0	92	1789	284	0	812093	-0.755	-
Nevşehir	2636	-4669	0	-1458	2374	1117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	526608	0.000	-
Niğde	2937	6962	-161	-19858	10021	99	18	54	532	50	0	0	73	371	49	0	670706	-0.177	-
Ordu	602	14166	-12709	-2053	-283	277	229	17641	3669	34	23	84	5244	3523	32	4	539345	-0.620	+
Osmaniye	2610	-2157	-2776	2586	-315	52	239	2229	5456	37	48	12	1576	3575	38	32	311678	-0.209	-
Rize	159	1476	-1690	2887	-2728	-104	27	1963	654	32	30	1	497	464	24	30	374826	-0.083	+
Sakarya	5699	-6979	1061	-235	-425	879	282	3299	2594	8	49	13	3389	3863	0	28	45/510	0.050	+
Samsun	1551	12620	-8315	-3443	-3389	976	214	16867	2350	228	401	58	6727	4548	315	97	920268	-0.211	+
Surt	1506	6491	-833	-6045	-2063	944	0	345	1429	219	0	0	42	986	132	0	552403	-0.165	-
Sinop	5941	4591	2664	26774	-40746	776	83	650	4344	595	1	9	827	6978	520	3	2648775	0.196	+
Sivas	1483	-4057	2211	1795	-3974	2542	389	2246	5560	39	606	26	4699	6230	62	34	536214	0.063	-
Şanlıurfa	10/93	12404	863	6878	-34457	3520	0	10	18	1	0	2	21	745	124	0	1840244	4.949	-
Şırnak	2947	2631	2121	-6294	-14/8	91	.7	30	2383	125	0	1	13	3787	866	0	668382	0.314	-
Tekirdağ	3183	1904	3801	-11269	-107	2488	108	1171	905	3	48	14	458	5552	8	4	594754	0.447	+
Tokat	4916	8895	-2100	-6634	-5155	/8	430	9076	6529	325	/5	2	5008	/946	1351	25	931468	-0.056	-
Trabzon	1419	-426	-731	1425	-1516	-171	139	3128	1509	1000	4	28	2594	1418	2001	5	448266	-0.034	+
Tunceli	-21	-5726	3755	34382	-34526	2136	82	609	6567	1090	17/2	8	1084	8088	3081	14	682059	0.199	-
∪şaĸ	2415	-5066	1/31	1259	-487	148	199	1029	2941	60	11	6	1282	4580	94	9	525039	0.1/4	-
van	4101	-10/33	-87	59669	-53508	643	470	10	189	25	0	0	89	33	15	0	1955614	-0.381	-
raiova	956	338	-2634	1157	10516	203	4/9	1015	2103	210	13	21	264	688	0	3	/2905	-0.499	+
rozgat	3245	13065	-354	-86/5	-10516	3235	57	12/4	1/19	219	1	12	003	1368	8/2	12	1309635	-0.023	-
Zonguldak	854	-338	-288	-6	- 7	/1	293	1368	543	2	24	52	1199	3/1	1	13	328490	-0.031	+

\*Area based calculations are given in hectares.

As shown in Table 3, and Figure 3 between 2006 and 2018, 0.2% (23724 ha) of FA class converted to AS class, 1.28% (148781 ha) to AA class, 0.14% (15834 ha) to OS class, and 3.63% (422723 ha) to SH class. The highest conversion rate occurred from FA to SH classes, indicating structural degradation of forests. The subsequent significant change occurred due to deforestation for agricultural land conversion, aimed at generating higher income.

Regarding AA class, 0.64% (205151 ha) of AA converted to AS land cover class, 0.37% (118151 ha) to FA class, 1.25% (400597 ha) to SH class, and 0.43% (137402 ha) to OS class. The primary reason for AA class transitions to FA and SH classes can be attributed to the transformation of agricultural lands back to forest areas due to rural-to-urban migration.

During the same period, 0.4% (78759 ha) of SH class converted to AS class, 2.83% (552007 ha) to AA class, 1.87% (365842 ha) to FA class, and 1.93% (377078 ha) to OS class. Since the SH class is much easier to convert into agricultural land, approximately four times more area was converted to the AA class than the FA class.

In addition, 1148 ha of W class area changed to FA class within the same period. If this trend continues, it could exacerbate future water shortages resulting from climate change. When examining coastal and non-coastal regions, forest areas increased by 25.9% in coastal regions while decreasing in the others. In non-coastal provinces, forests increased by 55.6% and dropped in the rest. These results indicate a higher rate of forest decline in coastal regions, with tourism being a significant contributing factor.

Between 2006 and 2018, the most substantial increase in AS occurred in Aydin (17618 ha), Usak (14164 ha), and Rize (10,793 ha). Only two cities experienced a decrease in AS: Diyarbakir (313 ha) and Ordu (21 ha).

Similar results were found in a study conducted in Mount Bambouto Caldera in Cameroon. Between 1980 and 2016, croplands increased by 4%, settlements by 0.43%, and bare lands by 5.7%, while savanna/grassland areas decreased by 4.4% and natural forests by 5.8%. The study highlights an increasing trend in bare lands, buildings, and agricultural lands due to anthropogenic activity, with a decline in savannas and dense woody vegetation. The primary cause is the increased use of land resources, particularly the conversion of grasslands and natural forests to agricultural areas, settlements, and agroforestry (Toh et al., 2018).

Another study in Tanzania found a decreasing trend in forests, shrublands, and wetlands from 1990 to 2016. Between 1990 and 2010, forest areas decreased by 2752 km<sup>2</sup>,

with 56% of these forests converting to shrublands, 23.2% to grasslands, and 18.9% to agricultural lands. Between 2010 and 2016, forest areas decreased by 377 km<sup>2</sup>, with 39.5% converting to grasslands, 30.5% to shrublands, and 27.0% to agricultural lands. However, from 2010 to 2016, 1359 km<sup>2</sup> of shrubland areas were converted back to forests. During the same period, 72.6% of wetlands were converted to grasslands and 18.9% to agricultural lands, resulting in a decrease of 705 km<sup>2</sup> (Msofe et al., 2019).

When examining Table 4, between 2006 and 2018, the top three provinces with the highest deforestation rates were seen Bitlis (-1.23%), Mersin (-1.12%), and Muş (-0.76%) respectively. The top three provinces with the highest afforestation rates were Iğdır (19.98%), Şanlıurfa (4.95%), and Hakkari (1.52%). The deforestation rate in Türkiye during the same period was -0.08%. In addition, the deforestation rate in 63% of all provinces (54 provinces) was higher than the national average. Between 2006 and 2018, the percentage of provinces with increasing forest areas was 47% (38 provinces), decreasing forest areas was 51% (41 provinces), and unchanged forest areas were 2% (2 provinces).

Between 2000 and 2021, the global tree cover loss was calculated as 11% (WRI, 2023). According to FAO data, the global deforestation rate between 2015 and 2020 was 10 million ha per year (0.25%) (FAO, 2022). In this context, Türkiye's situation appears relatively favorable. However, when comparing our findings with data from the General Directorate of Forestry (GDF), which manages Türkiye's forests, it is stated that forest areas increased by 1.7 million ha between 2004 and 2020 (GDF, 2020). This contradicts this study's findings. The discrepancy may be attributed to GDF's definition of forested areas, which considers both productive and degraded areas together and does not include forest losses due to mining, tourism, and construction within the official forest area boundaries (Plieninger et al., 2016).

### 3.1. Impacts of macro-economic factors on land cover change

In Türkiye, significant transformations have occurred in rural and urban areas after the development of industrialization and tourism, particularly in the post-1980 period. Especially after incentives provided by the government, excessive and irregular construction in the provincial centers and increased income levels led to higher utilization and degradation of natural resources (Çekirge, 2013; Dokuyucu, 2023). Forests, in particular, have been structurally damaged and spatially reduced due to various reasons, such as construction, clearing land for agriculture, usage as fuel, illegal logging, opening up to tourism, and mining (Şen and Toksoy, 2006; Şen, 2022).

Looking at the changes in the Turkish average of macroeconomic variables that we believe could be effective in this transformation between 2006 and 2008, the value of plant production increased by 191.9%, the production amount of cereals and other plant products increased by 49.1%, greenhouse vegetable, and fruit production increased by 80.6%, the number of large cattle increased by 57%, the value of animal products increased by 106%, the number of small cattle increased by 43%, the GDP (\$) increased by 44.3%, the GDP per capita (\$) increased by 23.5%, the number of automobiles increased by 101.9 percent, the number of motor vehicles per capita increased by 74.3%, and the total electricity

consumption per capita (kWh) increased by 56.4%. In contrast, it was determined that the entire cultivated agricultural land decreased by 14.2%, the number of buildings according to the building permits decreased by 8.5%, export revenues (\$) decreased by 41.6%, and export revenues per capita (\$) decreased by 35.8%.

A correlation analysis was conducted to determine whether the changes in macroeconomic indicators were effective on land cover. The results of correlation analyses at the provincial level and per square kilometer between the changes in land cover and the changes in macroeconomic variables during the 2006-2018 period are presented in Table 5.

According to the results of the correlation analysis conducted for the 2006-2018 period (Table 5), the following relationships have been identified between the macroeconomic variables and the spatial changes in the provinces:

- In agricultural land (AS), statistically significant positive relationships were found with the values of plant production (0.506: moderate intensity), production amounts of cereals and other plant products (0.360; weak intensity), the number of large cattle (0.548: moderate intensity), greenhouse vegetable and fruit production (0.315: weak intensity), total animal product value (0.288: weak intensity), the number of small cattle (0.442: weak intensity), Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (moderate intensity), the number of automobiles (0.589: moderate intensity), the number of motor vehicles (0.624: moderate intensity), export revenues (0.506: moderate intensity), and export revenues per capita (0.267: weak intensity). A statistically significant negative relationship was found with the change in the total cultivated agricultural land (-0.422: weak intensity).
- In residential areas (AA), a statistically significant positive relationship was found with the change in total animal product value (0.228: weak intensity), and a statistically significant negative relationship was found with the change in export revenues per capita (-0.228: weak intensity).
- In forest areas (FA), statistically significant negative relationships were found with the change in Gross Domestic Product (-0.310: weak intensity), the number of automobiles (-0.308: weak intensity), the number of motor vehicles (-0.326: weak intensity), and the number of buildings according to building usage permits (-0.287: weak intensity).
- In wetlands (W), no statistically significant relationship was found between the spatial changes and macroeconomic variables.
- In open and green spaces (OS), statistically significant positive relationships were found with the change in total animal product value (0.02), Gross Domestic Product (0.037: very weak intensity), the number of buildings according to building usage permits (0.035: very weak intensity), export revenues (0.011: very weak intensity), and export revenues per capita (0.009: very weak intensity).
- In the spatial changes of agricultural land (AS) per square kilometer, statistically significant positive relationships were found with export revenues (0.346: weak intensity) and export revenues per capita (0.333: weak intensity).

- In the spatial changes of residential areas (AA) per square kilometer, a statistically significant negative relationship was found with the change in the number of buildings according to building usage permits (-0.222: very weak intensity).
- In the spatial changes of forest areas (FA) per square kilometer, statistically significant positive relationships were found with the number of buildings according to building usage permits (0.223: very weak intensity) and the number of buildings according to building permits (-0.254: very weak intensity), while a statistically significant negative relationship was found with the change in total electricity consumption per capita (-0.223: very weak intensity).
- In the spatial changes of wetlands (W) per square kilometer, statistically significant positive relationships were found with the change in total electricity consumption per capita (0.228: very weak intensity) and the change in export revenues per capita (-0.257: very weak intensity), while a statistically significant negative relationship was found with the change in total animal product value (-0.292: very weak intensity).
- •In the spatial changes of open and green spaces (OS) per square kilometer, no statistically significant relationship was found with the changes in macroeconomic variables.

The changes occurring in Artificial Surfaces (AS) generally increase in parallel with the value increases of economic variables at the provincial level. This could particularly be associated with the augmentation of housing stock and infrastructure due to economic development. Conversely, the same increase in AS demonstrates an inverse relationship with the amount of cultivated agricultural land. Additionally, migrations caused by urbanization and the aging of the rural population could be factors reducing the amount of cultivated agricultural land.

The change in the amount of animal products, directly proportional to changes in agricultural areas, is significant as it reveals the intertwined nature of agriculture and animal husbandry. The complementarity of these two sectors is vital for planning efforts to prevent the reduction of agricultural areas.

When we examine the variables where meaningful relationships are found between changes in forest areas and economic indicators, they are generally related to Gross Domestic Product (GDP), automobiles, and buildings, all of which are indicators of affluence. This pattern of behavior is prevalent worldwide and is similarly observed in Türkiye. As people's income increases, they have built more roads and buildings. Furthermore, when commercial structures, Renewable Energy Resources (RES), Hydroelectric Power Plants (HPS), and particularly highways constructed for transit transportation are added to the mix, it becomes inevitable to mitigate impacts on forests. This is because, in general, new tourism, energy, and other governmentsupported investments are primarily implemented in forested areas owned by the state.

Table 5. Correlation analysis results between land cover changes (2006-2018) and macroeconomic variables

Land change   N   81     Cordicicin 5			PPV	PO	CAL	PGV	NLL	VAP	NSL	GDP	GDPC	NA	NAC	NMV	NMVC	TEC	ROL	BCb	ER	ERC	DLP
change   cordicion   cordicion   cordicion   cordicion   condicion   <	Land cover	Ν	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81
Second Sig C-scaled Sig C-scaled Correlation Correlation Correlation Sig C-scaled Sig C-scaled Correlation Correlat	change																				
Sig. (2-raile)   0   0.00	AS	Correlation Coefficient	0.506	0.360	-0.422	0.315	0.548	0.288	0.442	0.683	0.075	0.589	-0.013	0.624	-0.186	0.014	0.419	0.152	0.506	0.267	0.093
And		Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0.001	0	0.004	0	0.009	0	0	0.504	0	0.91	0	0.097	0.898	0	0.177	0	0.016	0.408
Sig. (2-ailed)   0.317   0.717   0.776   0.799   0.28   0.046   0.086   0.115   0.944   0.735   0.944   0.874   0.316   0.507   0.10   0.01   0.02   0.066   0.161   0.012   0.087   0.031   0.018   0.037   0.326   0.13   0.136   0.277   0.106   0.02   0.126   0.115   0.326   0.131   0.107   0.026   0.018   0.021   0.021   0.021   0.021   0.021   0.021   0.031   0.024   0.035   0.011   0.022   0.039   0.032   0.040   0.001   0.024   0.039   0.032   0.031   0.017   0.010   0.010   0.017   0.019   0.032   0.193   0.032   0.115   0.024   0.035   0.037   0.031   0.012   0.035   0.031   0.017   0.010   0.012   0.023   0.036   0.021   0.035   0.012   0.035   0.035   0.012   0.035   0.012   0.035   0.012	AA	Correlation Coefficient	0.113	0.041	-0.032	0.029	0.121	0.228	0.192	-0.019	-0.177	-0.008	-0.038	0.008	-0.018	-0.113	0.075	0.166	-0.184	-0.228	0.006
Correlation Confficient Sig. (2-unied)   0.006   0.011   0.011   0.010   0.027   0.006   0.016   0.011   0.010   0.027   0.006   0.010   0.027   0.010   0.027   0.010   0.027   0.010   0.027   0.010   0.027   0.010   0.027   0.010   0.024   0.020   0.021   0.021   0.024   0.020   0.031   0.017   0.010   0.021   0.010   0.024   0.020   0.031   0.017   0.010   0.021   0.011   0.011   0.021   0.021   0.015   0.031   0.017   0.010   0.021   0.011   0.011   0.011   0.011   0.011   0.011   0.011   0.011   0.011   0.011   0.011   0.011   0.011   0.011   0.011   0.010   0.011		Sig. (2-tailed)	0.317	0.717	0.776	0.799	0.28	0.04	0.086	0.868	0.115	0.944	0.735	0.944	0.874	0.316	0.507	0.139	0.101	0.04	0.956
Sig. (2-tailed)   0.064   0.056   0.15   0.32   0.442   0.793   0.68   0.005   0.061   0.003   0.247   0.362   0.009   0.344   0.074   0.264   0.155     SH   Coefficient   0.01   0.024   0.035   0.019   0.003   0.025   0.03   0.047   0.021   0.055   0.033   0.061   0.034   0.034   0.031   0.015   0.031   0.017   0.019   0.038   0.055   0.038   0.015   0.021   0.047   0.021   0.056   0.03   0.057   0.838   0.436   0.090   0.525   0.93   0.667   0.856   0.611   0.071   0.762   0.858   0.436   0.211   0.021   <	FA	Correlation Coefficient	-0.207	-0.066	0.161	-0.112	-0.087	-0.03	-0.047	-0.31	-0.188	-0.308	-0.057	-0.326	0.13	0.103	-0.287	-0.106	-0.2	-0.126	-0.16
Correlation   -0.01   -0.02   0.09   0.11   -0.07   -0.01   -0.03   -0.02   0.08   -0.01   -0.04   -0.05		Sig. (2-tailed)	0.064	0.56	0.15	0.32	0.442	0.793	0.68	0.005	0.094	0.005	0.614	0.003	0.247	0.362	0.009	0.344	0.074	0.264	0.155
Sig. (2-tailed) Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)   0.93   0.834   0.398   0.322   0.493   0.863   0.575   0.858   0.436   0.909   0.525   0.93   0.676   0.856   0.631   0.617   0.791   0.762   0.895     OS   Coefficient Sig. (2-tailed)   0.586   0.975   0.405   0.111   0.082   -0.259   0.018   0.232   0.195   0.124   0.203   0.098   0.132   0.234   0.076   0.885   0.49   0.111   0.009   0.125   0.124   0.056   0.124   0.035   0.49   0.111   0.009   0.125   0.124   0.056   0.102   0.076   0.010   0.017   0.102   0.056   0.102   0.076   0.007   0.102   0.057   0.102   0.057   0.102   0.011   0.003   0.021   0.007   0.012   0.026   0.034   0.012   0.012   0.012   0.012   0.012   0.016   0.177   0.122   0.021   0.012   0.012   0.012	SH	Correlation Coefficient	-0.01	-0.024	0.095	0.112	-0.077	-0.019	-0.063	-0.02	0.088	-0.013	-0.072	-0.01	-0.047	-0.021	-0.054	-0.056	-0.03	-0.034	-0.015
Correlation Coefficient Sig. (2-tailed)   0.061   -0.04   -0.094   -0.181   0.082   -0.259   0.018   0.232   0.195   0.124   0.203   -0.098   0.132   0.234   0.078   0.283   0.29   0.012     W   Corefficient Sig. (2-tailed)   0.586   0.975   0.405   0.107   0.464   0.02   0.87   0.037   0.081   0.054   0.271   0.069   0.386   0.241   0.035   0.49   0.101   0.009   0.11   0.009   0.11   0.009   0.012   0.055   0.012   0.055   0.012   0.057   0.007   0.012   0.051   0.012   0.051   0.012   0.051   0.012   0.051   0.012   0.075   0.012   0.017   0.012   0.051   0.017   0.012   0.051   0.017   0.012   0.051   0.033   0.021   0.077   0.012   0.014   0.017   0.012   0.012   0.017   0.012   0.012   0.016   0.033   0.021   0.013 <t< td=""><td></td><td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td><td>0.93</td><td>0.834</td><td>0.398</td><td>0.322</td><td>0.493</td><td>0.863</td><td>0.575</td><td>0.858</td><td>0.436</td><td>0.909</td><td>0.525</td><td>0.93</td><td>0.676</td><td>0.856</td><td>0.631</td><td>0.617</td><td>0.791</td><td>0.762</td><td>0.895</td></t<>		Sig. (2-tailed)	0.93	0.834	0.398	0.322	0.493	0.863	0.575	0.858	0.436	0.909	0.525	0.93	0.676	0.856	0.631	0.617	0.791	0.762	0.895
Sig. (2-tailed Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)   0.586   0.975   0.405   0.107   0.464   0.02   0.87   0.037   0.081   0.054   0.271   0.069   0.386   0.241   0.035   0.49   0.011   0.009   0.915     W   Correlation Correlation Correlation Correlation   0.004   0.03   0.021   0.025   0.199   0.230   0.029   0.025   0.249   0.025   0.033   0.025   0.033   0.025   0.033   0.025   0.033   0.025   0.037   0.12   0.011   0.017   0.125   0.011   0.015   0.022   0.044   0.011   0.025   0.033   0.025   0.017   0.026   0.	OS	Correlation Coefficient	0.061	-0.004	-0.094	-0.181	0.082	-0.259	0.018	0.232	0.195	0.215	0.124	0.203	-0.098	0.132	0.234	0.078	0.283	0.29	0.012
Correlation Coefficient   0.319   0.241   0.256   0.19   0.23   0.089   0.154   0.186   0.143   0.249   0.236   0.249   0.012   0.056   0.102   0.07   0.007   0.012     ASpect   Correlation Coefficient   0.004   0.03   0.021   0.075   0.039   0.43   0.17   0.097   0.025   0.034   0.025   0.533   0.646   0.633   0.647   0.485   0.494   0.077   0.102   0.077   0.122   0.044   0.633   0.646   0.333   0.249   0.077   0.115   0.259   0.277   0.404   0.461   0.002   0.004   0.005   0.033   0.033   0.046   0.209   0.079   0.087   0.115   0.116   0.115   0.122   0.044   0.461   0.002   0.004   0.017   0.126   0.017   0.116   0.116   0.183   0.022   0.014   0.116   0.116   0.122   0.044   0.017   0.121   0.012   0.016		Sig. (2-tailed)	0.586	0.975	0.405	0.107	0.464	0.02	0.87	0.037	0.081	0.054	0.271	0.069	0.386	0.241	0.035	0.49	0.011	0.009	0.915
Sig. (2-tailed Correlation   0.004   0.03   0.021   0.039   0.43   0.17   0.097   0.202   0.025   0.034   0.025   0.533   0.561   0.533   0.553   0.533   0.952   0.914     AS <sub>psq</sub> Correlation   0.098   0.052   -0.079   0.13   0.1   0.077   0.096   0.208   0.210   0.174   0.001   0.177   0.122   0.094   0.083   0.364   0.333   -0.225   0.044     AS <sub>psq</sub> Correlation   0.035   0.647   0.485   0.249   0.373   0.494   0.349   0.062   0.073   0.12   0.994   0.115   0.259   0.277   0.404   0.461   0.002   0.002   0.044     Correlation   0.0967   0.579   0.661   0.697   0.579   0.661   0.499   0.438   0.27   0.267   0.518   0.322   0.044   0.046   0.674   0.19   0.533   0.952   0.617   0.592   0.617   0.592   <	W	Correlation Coefficient	0.319	0.241	-0.256	0.199	0.23	0.089	0.154	0.186	0.143	0.249	0.236	0.249	-0.072	0.102	0.056	-0.102	0.07	-0.007	0.012
ASps   Correlation Coefficient   0.098   0.052   -0.079   0.13   0.1   0.077   0.096   0.208   0.201   0.177   -0.127   0.122   0.094   0.083   0.346   0.333   -0.225     ASps   Sig. (2-tailed)   0.383   0.647   0.485   0.249   0.333   0.062   0.073   0.12   0.994   0.115   0.259   0.277   0.404   0.461   0.002   0.002   0.044     AAps   Coefficient   0.095   0.633   0.066   0.064   0.029   0.079   0.087   0.124   0.125   0.073   0.111   -0.188   -0.087   -0.222   -0.048   -0.175   -0.216   -0.066     Coefficient   0.096   0.579   0.769   0.573   0.061   0.481   0.438   0.27   0.267   0.518   0.322   0.046   0.464   0.19   0.053   0.223   0.223   0.223   0.224   0.144   0.193   0.099   0.223   0.223   0.224		Sig. (2-tailed)	0.004	0.03	0.021	0.075	0.039	0.43	0.17	0.097	0.202	0.025	0.034	0.025	0.523	0.364	0.617	0.363	0.533	0.952	0.914
	$AS_{psq}$	Correlation Coefficient	0.098	0.052	-0.079	0.13	0.1	0.077	0.096	0.208	0.201	0.174	0.001	0.177	-0.127	0.122	0.094	0.083	0.346	0.333	-0.225
AAps Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)   0.005   -0.03   0.03   0.006   0.064   0.09   0.079   -0.087   -0.124   -0.125   -0.073   -0.111   -0.188   -0.087   -0.222   -0.048   -0.175   -0.216   -0.066     Sig. (2-tailed) Correlation Coefficient   0.967   0.579   0.769   0.575   0.611   0.481   0.438   0.27   0.267   0.518   0.322   0.904   0.442   0.466   0.674   0.119   0.053   0.592     FAps Coefficient   0.082   0.078   0.045   0.017   0.059   0.027   0.187   0.194   0.193   0.020   0.223   0.224   0.464   0.674   0.19   0.053   0.592     Sig. (2-tailed)   0.469   0.445   0.645   0.716   0.909   0.598   0.469   0.457   0.081   0.095   0.081   0.084   0.384   0.384   0.384   0.384   0.384   0.384   0.384   0.384   0.384   0.384   0.384   0.384		Sig. (2-tailed)	0.383	0.647	0.485	0.249	0.373	0.494	0.394	0.062	0.073	0.12	0.994	0.115	0.259	0.277	0.404	0.461	0.002	0.002	0.044
Sig. (2-tailed) Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) Sig. (2-tailed) (2-tailed) 0.967 0.579 0.769 0.954 0.573 0.061 0.481 0.438 0.27 0.267 0.518 0.322 0.094 0.442 0.466 0.674 0.119 0.053 0.592   FA <sub>peq</sub> Sig. (2-tailed) Correlation Coefficient Sig. (2-tailed) 0.469 0.468 0.645 0.716 0.909 0.592 0.017 0.206 -0.027 0.187 -0.194 0.193 -0.059 0.223 0.223 0.224 0.146 0.019 0.022   Shp <sub>peq</sub> 0.469 0.468 0.645 0.716 0.909 0.592 0.142 -0.019 0.131 0.001 0.144 -0.011 0.045 0.455 0.022 0.144 0.019 0.228 0.14 -0.001 0.126 0.257 -0.061   Shp <sub>peq</sub> Correlation Coefficient 0.408 0.474 0.55 0.949 0.008 0.207 0.87 0.244 0.994 0.22 0.041 0.213 0.992 0.266 0.021 0.93   Shp <sub>peq</sub> 0.101 0.116 -0.	AA <sub>psq</sub>	Correlation Coefficient	0.005	-0.063	0.033	0.006	0.064	0.209	0.079	-0.087	-0.124	-0.125	-0.073	-0.111	-0.188	-0.087	-0.222	-0.048	-0.175	-0.216	-0.06
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Sig. (2-tailed)	0.967	0.579	0.769	0.954	0.573	0.061	0.481	0.438	0.27	0.267	0.518	0.322	0.094	0.442	0.046	0.674	0.119	0.053	0.592
Sig. (2-tailed) Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) 0.469 0.486 0.645 0.716 0.909 0.598 0.496 0.065 0.81 0.095 0.083 0.084 0.38 0.045 0.045 0.022 0.194 0.866 0.842   Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) 0.093 0.078 0.081 0.007 0.022 0.12 0.019 0.131 0.001 0.144 0.011 0.042 0.228 0.14 -0.001 0.126 0.257 -0.061   Sig. (2-tailed) 0.408 0.488 0.474 0.55 0.949 0.088 0.247 0.87 0.244 0.994 0.2 0.923 0.712 0.441 0.213 0.992 0.262 0.021 0.59   Correlation Coefficient 0.101 0.116 -0.047 0.107 -0.028 0.197 -0.054 0.021 -0.115 -0.041 -0.097 -0.088 0.022 -0.048 0.012 -0.044 0.012 -0.041 0.012 0.028 0.044 0.021 -0.041 0.097 -0.088 0.024 0.018 0.012 0.024	FApsq	Correlation Coefficient	0.082	0.078	-0.052	0.041	-0.013	-0.059	-0.077	0.206	-0.027	0.187	-0.194	0.193	-0.099	-0.223	0.223	0.254	0.146	0.019	0.022
Correlation OSP <sub>peq</sub> Correlation Coefficient Sig. (2-tailed)   0.093   0.078   0.081   0.076   0.092   0.122   0.142   0.019   0.131   0.001   0.142   0.001   0.126   0.257   0.061     SH <sub>peq</sub> Coefficient Coefficient Sig. (2-tailed)   0.408   0.488   0.474   0.55   0.949   0.008   0.242   0.994   0.20   0.923   0.712   0.041   0.213   0.992   0.262   0.021   0.993     OSP <sub>peq</sub> Coefficient Sig. (2-tailed)   0.101   0.116   -0.047   0.007   -0.054   0.021   -0.115   -0.041   -0.097   -0.088   0.024   0.023   0.712   0.041   0.213   0.992   -0.064   -0.12   0.031     OSP <sub>peq</sub> Coefficient Sig. (2-tailed)   0.101   0.117   -0.028   0.121   0.027   0.016   0.191   0.157   0.147   0.215   0.203   0.055   0.045   0.045   0.045   0.045   0.045   0.045   0.045   0.166   0.171 <td></td> <td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td> <td>0.469</td> <td>0.486</td> <td>0.645</td> <td>0.716</td> <td>0.909</td> <td>0.598</td> <td>0.496</td> <td>0.065</td> <td>0.81</td> <td>0.095</td> <td>0.083</td> <td>0.084</td> <td>0.38</td> <td>0.045</td> <td>0.045</td> <td>0.022</td> <td>0.194</td> <td>0.866</td> <td>0.842</td>		Sig. (2-tailed)	0.469	0.486	0.645	0.716	0.909	0.598	0.496	0.065	0.81	0.095	0.083	0.084	0.38	0.045	0.045	0.022	0.194	0.866	0.842
Sig. (2-tailed) Correlation Coefficient 0.408 0.488 0.474 0.55 0.949 0.008 0.207 0.87 0.244 0.994 0.2 0.923 0.712 0.041 0.213 0.992 0.262 0.021 0.59   OS <sub>psq</sub> Correlation Coefficient 0.101 0.116 -0.047 0.107 -0.028 0.197 -0.054 0.021 -0.015 -0.041 -0.097 -0.008 0.02 -0.028 -0.148 0.992 -0.064 -0.129 0.043   Sig. (2-tailed) 0.37 0.302 0.68 0.342 0.801 0.78 0.634 0.854 0.308 0.719 0.391 0.945 0.861 0.805 0.187 0.415 0.572 0.25 0.704 0.181 0.127 0.811 0.127 0.811 0.127 0.811 0.127 0.811 0.127 0.811 0.127 0.811 0.127 0.811 0.127 0.811 0.127 0.811 0.127 0.811 0.127 0.811 0.127 0.811 0.127 0.811 0.127 0.811 0.127 0	SHpsq	Correlation Coefficient	-0.093	-0.078	-0.081	-0.067	-0.007	-0.292	0.142	-0.019	0.131	0.001	0.144	-0.011	0.042	0.228	0.14	-0.001	0.126	0.257	-0.061
Correlation Coefficient   0.101   0.116   -0.047   0.002   -0.054   0.021   -0.115   -0.041   -0.097   -0.028   -0.148   0.092   -0.064   -0.129   0.043     OSpsq Coefficient   0.37   0.302   0.68   0.342   0.801   0.078   0.634   0.854   0.308   0.719   0.391   0.945   0.861   0.805   0.187   0.415   0.572   0.25   0.704     Wpsq   0.012   0.659   0.064   0.127   0.166   0.191   0.157   0.147   0.215   0.203   0.059   -0.084   0.076   0.181   0.127   0.081     Wpsq   0.012   0.659   0.064   0.182   0.187   0.162   0.191   0.054   0.172   0.069   0.598   0.635   0.437   0.433   0.259   0.433	1 1	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.408	0.488	0.474	0.55	0.949	0.008	0.207	0.87	0.244	0.994	0.2	0.923	0.712	0.041	0.213	0.992	0.262	0.021	0.59
Sig. (2-tailed)   0.37   0.302   0.68   0.342   0.801   0.78   0.634   0.854   0.308   0.719   0.391   0.945   0.861   0.805   0.187   0.415   0.572   0.25   0.704     W <sub>psq</sub> 0.279   0.05   -0.203   0.204   0.227   0.166   0.191   0.157   0.147   0.215   0.153   0.203   0.059   -0.005   0.084   0.076   0.181   0.127   0.081     0.012   0.659   0.068   0.042   0.138   0.087   0.162   0.191   0.054   0.172   0.069   0.598   0.435   0.437   0.439   0.166   0.259   0.473	OSpsq	Correlation Coefficient	0.101	0.116	-0.047	0.107	-0.028	0.197	-0.054	0.021	-0.115	-0.041	-0.097	-0.008	0.02	-0.028	-0.148	0.092	-0.064	-0.129	0.043
Wpsq   0.279   0.05   -0.203   0.204   0.227   0.166   0.191   0.157   0.147   0.215   0.153   0.203   0.059   -0.005   0.084   0.076   0.181   0.127   0.081     Wpsq   0.012   0.659   0.068   0.042   0.138   0.087   0.162   0.191   0.054   0.172   0.069   0.598   0.963   0.457   0.499   0.106   0.259   0.473	1-4	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.37	0.302	0.68	0.342	0.801	0.078	0.634	0.854	0.308	0.719	0.391	0.945	0.861	0.805	0.187	0.415	0.572	0.25	0.704
""psq   0.012   0.659   0.068   0.042   0.138   0.087   0.162   0.191   0.054   0.172   0.069   0.598   0.457   0.499   0.106   0.259   0.473	w		0.279	0.05	-0.203	0.204	0.227	0.166	0.191	0.157	0.147	0.215	0.153	0.203	0.059	-0.005	0.084	0.076	0.181	0.127	0.081
	•• psq		0.012	0.659	0.068		0.042	0.138	0.087	0.162	0.191	0.054	0.172	0.069	0.598	0.963	0.457	0.499	0.106	0.259	0.473

Significance level: p≤0,05

184

Similar results have been observed in various other studies. A study conducted in Thailand noted that the transition from subsistence farming to manufacturing and service sectors, mainly due to tourism development in the context of agricultural and economic development, has lifted many people from poverty to the middle-income level. This has, in turn, helped maintain the forest cover at approximately 31-32%, thus staving off deforestation. However, it is also mentioned that forested areas have decreased due to the expansion of agricultural activities, particularly rubber plantations. However, it is anticipated that a decline in rubber prices could potentially lead to an increase in forest areas again (Trisurat et al., 2019). In the changes in land use that occurred in Tanzania between 1990 and 2016, economic variables, such as increasing market demand and price incentives for agriculture and forestry products, is stated to have been influential (Msofe et al., 2019). In another study conducted in India, it is asserted that the fundamental challenges faced by the country's environmental resources are, in many ways, connected to poverty and economic growth. In rural fields of India, the per capita agricultural land has declined from 0.638 ha in 1950-51 to 0.271 ha in 1998-99, while the per capita forest area has shrunk from approximately 0.113 ha to 0.071 ha. These figures are considerably low by global standards. It is reported that in India, 270 million people in rural areas rely on forests for their livelihood, and forests provide these individuals with employment and income. This high dependence has led to the unsustainable exploitation of forests and, ultimately, their degradation (Nagdeve, 2007). These findings demonstrate that land cover or land use changes are closely related to economic changes. However, these relationships vary depending on the conditions of countries, societies, and settlements.

# 3.2. Formulating land cover change prediction models for land use policies

The formation of land use policies necessitates the reliable collection of existing inventory data and the importance of predictive models based on these data in planning. In this context, change models have been developed for each land use class in this study, taking macroeconomic variables as a basis to determine possible changes in LULC. Regression analysis results (Tables 6, 7, 8, 9) and developed equations are given below.

According to the regression analysis results, the prediction model between the change in AS in 2006-2018 and macroeconomic variables (Formula 2) is as follows;

According to the regression analysis results, the prediction model between the change in FA in 2006-2018 and macroeconomic variables (Formula 3) is as follows;

 $\begin{aligned} FA_{Change} &= -760.727 - 0.015 PGV_{Change} \left( R2:0.165, p < 0.000 \right) \ (3) \\ According to the regression analysis results, the prediction model between the change in AS in 2006-2018 and macroeconomic variables (Formula 4) is as follows; \\ SH_{Change} &= 9894.689 + 0.063 \ CAL_{Change} + 0.02 \ PGV_{Change} - \end{aligned}$ 

 $101164.432 \text{ (R2:}0.227, p<0.000) \tag{4}$ 

			ANOVA						Model Summary	
	Model	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the estimate
	Regression	445922446.758	1	445922446.758	93.998	0.000	0.737	0.543	0.538	2178.062
1	Residual	374772402.131	79	4743954.457						
	Total	820694848.889	80							
	Regression	554389637.530	2	277194818.765	81.190	0.000	0.822	0.676	0.667	1847.747
2	Residual	266305211.359	78	3414169.376						
	Total	820694848.889	80							
	Regression	589274932.033	3	196424977.344	65.356	0.000	0.847	0.718	0.707	1733.624
3	Residual	231419916.856	77	3005453.466						
	Total	820694848.889	80							
	Regression	618576957.411	4	154644239.353	58.149	0.000	0.868	0.754	0.741	1630.781
4	Residual	202117891.477	76	2659445.940						
	Total	820694848.889	80							
	Regression	633145961.429	5	126629192.286	50.638	0.000	0.878	0.771	0.756	1581.345
5	Residual	187548887.459	75	2500651.833						
	Total	820694848.889	80							
	Regression	644801572.895	6	107466928.816	45.212	0.000	0.886	0.786	0.768	1541.732
6	Residual	175893275.994	74	2376936.162						
	Total	820694848.889	80							
	Regression	657668675.129	7	93952667.876	42.070	0.000	,0.895	0.801	0.782	1494.401
7	Residual	163026173.760	73	2233235.257						
	Total	820694848.889	80							

Table 6. Regression analysis results between change in AS in 2006-2018 and macroeconomic variables

Significance level: p≤0,05

Table 7. Regression analysis results between change in FA in 2006-2018 and macroeconomic variables

		1	Anova						Model summary	
	Model	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	R	R	Adjusted R	Std. error of the
								square	square	estimate
	Regression	562759772.125	1	562759772.125	15.557	0.000	0.406	0.165	0.154	6014.419
1	Residual	2857685182.566	79	36173230.159						
	Total	3420444954.691	80							

Significance level: p≤0,05

#### Turkish Journal of Forestry 2024, 25(2): 176-189

Table 8. Reg	ression analy	sis results between	change in	SH in 2006-2	2018 and macro	economic variables
	/					

		-	Anova					Mod	el Summary	
	Model	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig	D	R	Adjusted	Std. error of
	Wodel	Sulli of squares	ui	Mean square	Г	Sig.	K	Square	R square	the estimate
	Regression	2027043486.606	1	2027043486.606	11.896	0.001	0.362	0.131	0.120	13053.572
1	Residual	13461263724.381	79	170395743.347						
	Total	15488307210.988	80							
	Regression	2855120028.686	2	1427560014.343	8.814	0.000	0.429	0.184	0.163	12726.505
2	Residual	12633187182.301	78	161963938.235						
	Total	15488307210.988	80							
	Regression	3521166465.115	3	1173722155.038	7.552	0.000	0.477	0.227	0.197	12466.652
3	Residual	11967140745.873	77	155417412.284						
	Total	15488307210.988	80							

Significance level: p≤0,05

Table 9. Regression analysis results between change in OS in 2006-2018 and macroeconomic variables

	Anova					Model Summary				
	Model	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the estimate
1	Regression	636074576.769	1	636074576.769	4.977	0.029	0.243	0.059	0.047	11304.602
	Residual	10095728502.219	79	127794031.674						
	Total	10731803078.988	80							
2	Regression	1236610472.905	2	618305236.453	5.079	0.008	0.339	0.115	0.093	11033.279
	Residual	9495192606.083	78	121733238.540						
	Total	10731803078.988	80							

Significance level: p≤0,05

According to the regression analysis results, the prediction model between the change in OS in 2006-2018 and macroeconomic variables (Formula 5) is as follows;

$OS_{Change} = -12729,241 + 97427,412$	NAC <sub>Change</sub> - 0,033
CAL <sub>Change</sub> (R2:0,115, p<0,008	(5)

No statistically significant relationship was found between the change in AA and macroeconomic variables.

The AS change model has shown the highest success in modeling land cover changes based on provinces. Upon examination of the models, it is mainly determined that the increase in grains and other plant species leads to a decrease in AS areas. In the change of forest areas, the decrease in undergrowth fruit and vegetable production was found to be influential. Indeed, forest areas are generally decreasing.

Various studies are being conducted to predict the future status of land uses depending on socio-economic variables. In this context, a simulation for Beijing predicts that in a rapid development scenario between 2010-2020, a 60.7% reduction in water areas could lead to a water shortage in Beijing, construction land would increase by 31.4% primarily from cultivated land, waters, and unused land, while the changing trend of forests and pastures would be lower. In a scenario where a dominant cultivated land protection policy is observed, it is anticipated that forest areas would increase slightly, the increase rate of construction area would be 17.2%, water areas would decrease by 20.9%, and cultivated areas would decrease by 11% (Han et al., 2015). A predictive study in the United States estimates that by 2030, developed use areas will increase by approximately 70 million acres, and the most significant percentage will be deflected from forests. The primary reason for this is stated to be the increase in population and personal incomes (Alig and Plantinga, 2004).

The study results also show that FA and SH areas, which are concentrated in rural areas, will decrease, especially with the increase in agricultural activities.

#### 4. Conclusions

The findings of this study demonstrate that land cover in Türkiye underwent substantial alterations between 1998 and 2018, with a noteworthy change of approximately 30.6%. Regrettably, this transformation has been characterized by a significant expansion of artificial surfaces (AS) and a decline in forest areas (FA), a development that is cause for concern. While the increase in shrubland (SH) areas can be considered positive, the rise in water bodies in Türkiye, in light of climate change and the consequent reduction in water resources, can also be interpreted favorably. During times of prevalent food crises, the importance of agricultural lands is continually escalating. Hence, converting these lands into artificial surfaces or open spaces (OS) indicates potential deficiencies in management and planning. Notably, recent regulations permitting construction in non-forest and agricultural lands suggest that such degradation may persist in the future. This situation necessitates prompt and efficient policy intervention.

This research underscores the need for a comprehensive and sustainable land use policy. It calls for new measures that can effectively minimize the loss of critical resources such as agricultural lands, forests, and water bodies. Such a policy should involve strategic planning and management that prioritize the conservation of these critical land use classes while facilitating economic development. Moreover, it is essential to mitigate pressures, particularly from the construction, mining, and energy sectors, on these vital areas. This could be achieved through more rigorous regulation of these sectors and the implementation of sustainable practices, as well as through the promotion of alternative or less damaging land use models. In the face of rapid economic development and population growth, our study further implies that efficient land use practices can provide a practical path to achieve a balance between ecological sustainability and economic development. As we move forward, it becomes increasingly crucial to understand and consider the impacts of macroeconomic factors on land cover changes to facilitate better-informed decision-making processes in land use planning and policy.

In conclusion, this research is a pertinent reminder of the urgent need for careful consideration and strategic planning in land use policies to protect our vital land resources from further degradation. The interplay between land use, socioeconomic factors, and sustainability is complex and dynamic, underscoring the need for ongoing research and proactive management in this important area.

# References

- Açıkgöz, Ö., 2011. Urban, urban community and the urban sociology. Istanbul Journal of Sociological Studies 35:57-83. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/100952 Accessed: 13 October 2023
- Aksoy, N., Tuğ, N.G., Eminağaoğlu, Ö., 2014. Türkiye'nin vejetasyon yapısı. In: Türkiye'nin doğal-egzotik ağaç ve çalıları (Ed: Akademik, U.), T.C. Orman ve Su İşleri Bakanlığı Orman Genel Müdürlüğü, Ankara, pp. 54-68.
- Aktürk, E., Altunel, A.O., Kara, F., 2020. Investigation of the 18year status and changes of mixed stands in Europe. Journal of Bartin Faculty of Forestry 22(3):929-938. https://doi.org/10.24011/barofd.744832
- Akturk, E., Guney, K., 2021. Vegetation cover change analysis of phytogeographic regions of Türkiye based on CORINE land cover datasets from 1990 to 2018. Kastamonu University Journal of Forestry Faculty 21(2):150-164. https://doi.org/10.17475/kastorman.1000406
- Alig, R.J., Plantinga, A.J., 2004. Future forestland area: Impacts from population growth and other factors that affect land values. Journal of Forestry 102(8):19-24. https://doi.org/10.1093/jof/102.8.19
- Arneth, A., Barbosa, H., Benton, T. et al., 2019. IPCC special report on climate change, desertification, land degradation, sustainable land management, food security, and greenhouse gas fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems. Summary for Policy Makers. Geneva, Switzerland Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).
  - https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/sites/4/2020/06/SRCCL \_SPM\_Revised\_Draft\_2.15\_pdf.pdf\_Accessed: 03\_November 2023
- Armenteras, D., Rudas, G., Rodriguez, N., Sua, S., Romero, M., 2006. Patterns and causes of deforestation in the Colombian Amazon. Ecological indicators 6(2):353-368. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2005.03.014
- Ateşoğlu, A., 2016. Investigation of accuracy of CORINE 2006 land cover data used in watershed studies. Journal of the Faculty of Forestry Istanbul University 66(1):173-183. https://doi.org/10.17099/jffiu.21070
- Bossard, M., Feranec, J., Otahel, J., 2000. CORINE Land Cover Technical Guide: Addendum 2000. Copenhagen, Denmark: European Environment Agency (EEA). https://is.muni.cz/el/sci/podzim2013/Z0131/um/ technical guide addenum.pdf Accessed: 12 August 2023
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., 2010. Data Analysis Handbook for the Social Sciences. PagemAkademi, Ankara, Turkey.
- Christenhusz, M.J., Byng, J.W., 2016. The number of known plants species in the world and its annual increase. Phytotaxa 261(3):201-217. http://dx.doi.org/10.11646/phytotaxa.261.3.1
- Copernicus Land Monitoring Service, 2020. CORINE land cover. https://land.copernicus.eu/paneuropean/corine-land-cover Accessed: 24 April 2023
- Çekirge, S., 2013. The effect of industrialization on urbanization: The case of Kırıkkale. Master's thesis, Institute of Social Sciences, Kirikkale University, Kırıkkale.

- Dogan, S., Kilicoglu, C., Akinci, H., Sevik, H., Cetin, M., 2023. Determining the suitable settlement areas in Alanya with GISbased site selection analyses. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 30(11):29180-29189. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-24246-4
- Dokuyucu, E., 2023. Türkiye'de yaşanan iç göçlerin kentsel politikalara etkisi. Journal of Academic Projection 8(1):1-26. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/beuiibfaid/issue/76518/1162743
- Emmott, S., 2013. Ten billion. Knopf Doubleday Publishing, New York.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), 1995. Forest resources assessment 1990: global synthesis. FAO forestry Paper, 124:1-44. https://www.fao.org/3/v5695e/v5695e00.htm Accessed: 24 October 2023
- FAO, 2010. Global Forest Resources Assessment, 2010. Main Report. FAO Forestry Paper #163.244 Rome, Italy. https://www.fao.org/3/i1757e/i1757e.pdf Accessed: 24 October 2023
- FAO, 2022. The State of the World's Forests 2022. Forest pathways for green recovery and building inclusive, resilient and sustainable economies. Rome, FAO. https://doi.org/10.4060/cb9360en Accessed: 17 August 2023
- General Directorate of Forestry (GDF), 2020. Türkiye forest asset 2020. Orman ve Su İşleri Bakanlığı Orman Genel Müdürlüğü, Ankara. https://www.ogm.gov.tr/tr/ormanlarimizsitesi/TurkiyeOrmanVarligi/Yayinlar/2020%20T%C3%BCrkiy e%20Orman%20Varl%C4%B1%C4%9F%C4%B1.pdf Accessed: 17 November 2023
- Grassi, G., House, J., Dentener, F. et al.,2017. The key role of forests in meeting climate targets requires science for credible mitigation. Nature Climate Change 7(3):220-226. https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate3227
- Han, H., Yang, C., Song, J., 2015. Scenario simulation and the prediction of land use and land cover change in Beijing, China. Sustainability 7(4):4260-4279. https://doi.org/10.3390/su7044260
- Heymann, Y., Steenmans, C., Croissille, G., Bossard, M. 1994. Corine Land Cover — technical guide. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259295513\_Corine\_L and\_Cover\_Technical\_Guide\_Part\_I Accessed: 24 December 2023
- Huang, Y., Yang, B., Wang, M., Liu, B., Yang, X., 2020. Analysis of the future land cover change in Beijing using CA–Markov chain model. Environmental Earth Sciences 79(2):60. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-019-8785-z
- Ikiel, C., Ustaoglu, B., Dutucu, A.A., Kilic, D.E., 2013. Remote sensing and GIS-based integrated analysis of land cover change in Duzce plain and its surroundings (north western Turkey). Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 185(2):1699-1709. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-012-2661-6
- Işınkaralar, Ö., 2024. Spatio-temporal change of the morphology in west corridor development region of Ankara city and 2022-2039 growth estimation. Megaron, 19(1), 51–60. https://doi.org/10.14744/megaron.2024.85226
- Isinkaralar, O., Isinkaralar, K., Ambade, B., 2024. Assessment of societal health risks: Spatial distribution and potential hazards of toxic metals in street dust across diverse communities. Water, Air, & Soil Pollution, 235(5), 302. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11270-024-07104-6
- Karaköse, M., 2020. Honaz (Denizli) orman planlama Birimi'nin damarlı bitkileri. Turkish Journal of Forestry 21(1):43-54. https://doi.org/10.18182/tjf.596878
- Kaştan, Y., 2016. Inside the republican period of migration movements in Turkey. Journal of International Social Research 9(42):692-700.
  - https://eds.p.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=1&sid=8&5cf0eb-1fc8-4b09-9065-0f1d57783b45%40redis

- Konukçu, F., Albut, S., Altürk, B., 2017. Land use/land cover change modelling of Ergene River Basin in western Türkiye using CORINE land use/land cover data. Agronomy Research 15(2), 435-443. https://agronomy.emu.ee/wpcontent/uploads/2017/03/Vol15nr2\_Konukcu.pdf#abstract-5087 Accessed: 19 December 2023
- Lagarias, A., Stratigea, A., 2023. Coastalization patterns in the Mediterranean: a spatiotemporal analysis of coastal urban sprawl in tourism destination areas. GeoJournal, 88, 2529–2552. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-022-10756-8
- Lambin, E.F., Geist, H.J., Lepers, E., 2003. Dynamics of land-use and land-cover change in tropical regions. Annual Review of Environment and Resources 28(1):205-241. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.energy.28.050302.105459
- Lele, N., Joshi, P.K., 2009. Analyzing deforestation rates, spatial forest cover changes and identifying critical areas of forest cover changes in North-East India during 1972–1999. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 156:159-170. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-008-0472-6
- Liu, D.S., Iverson, L.R., Brown, S., 1993. Rates and patterns of deforestation in the Philippines: application of geographic information system analysis. Forest Ecology and Management 57(1-4):1-16. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-1127(93)90158-J
- Luyssaert, S., Jammet, M., Stoy, P. et al., 2014. Land management and land-cover change have impacts of similar magnitude on surface temperature. Nat. Clim. Change 4:389–393. https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2196
- Menon, S., Bawa, K.S. 1997. Applications of geographic information systems, remote-sensing, and a landscape ecology approach to biodiversity conservation in the Western Ghats. Current science 73(2):134-145. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24098267 Accessed: 27 November 2023
- Msofe, N.K., Sheng, L., Lyimo, J., 2019. Land use change trends and their driving forces in the Kilombero Valley Floodplain, Southeastern Tanzania. Sustainability 11(2):505. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11020505
- Nagdeve, D.A., 2007. Population growth and environmental degradation in India. International Institute for Population Sciences. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Arvind-Singh21/post/What\_is\_the\_role\_of\_population\_growth\_in\_env ironmental\_degradation\_today/attachment/5ace505ab53d2f63c 3c53e8d/AS%3A614293645041712%401523470426916/down load/b36014d3dabbdd474f0bc73bb8a2e4fb1a62.pdf Accessed: 14 August 2023
- Noss, R.F., 2001. Beyond Kyoto: Forest management in a time of rapid climate change. Conservation Biology 15(3):578-590. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1739.2001.015003578.x
- Özdamar, K., 2002. Multivariate Statistical Analysis II (4th ed.). Kaan Kitabevi, Eskişehir, Turkey
- Özhatay, N., Kültür, Ş., Gürdal, B., 2013. Check-list of additional taxa to the Supplement Flora of Turkey VI. Journal of Faculty of Pharmacy of Istanbul University 43:33-82. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/iujfp/issue/582/5854 Accessed: 19 August 2023
- Özhatay, N., Kültür, Ş., Gürdal, B., 2015. Check-list of additional taxa to the Supplement Flora of Turkey VII. Journal of Faculty of Pharmacy of Istanbul University 45:61-86. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/iujfp/issue/25584/269882 Accessed: 19 August 2023
- Özhatay, N., Kültür, Ş., Gürdal, B., 2017. Check-list of additional taxa to the supplement flora of Turkey VIII. Istanbul Journal of Pharmacy 47:31-46.

https://doi.org/10.5152/IstanbulJPharm.2017.006

Özhatay, N., Kültür, Ş., Gürdal, B., 2019. Check-list of additional taxa to the supplement flora of Turkey IX. Istanbul Journal of Pharmacy, 49(2):105-120. https://doi.org/10.26650/IstanbulJPharm.2019.19037

- Plieninger, T., Draux, H., Fagerholm, N., Bieling, C., Bürgi, M., Kizos, T., Verburg, P.H., 2016. The driving forces of landscape change in Europe: A systematic review of the evidence. Land use policy, 57, 204-214. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2016.04.040
- Puyravaud, J.P., 2003. Standardizing the calculation of the annual rate of deforestation. Forest ecology and management, 177(1-3):593-596. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-1127(02)00335-3
- Roy, P.S., Ramachandran, R.M., Paul, O. et al., 2022. Anthropogenic land use and land cover changes—A review on its environmental consequences and climate change. Journal of the Indian Society of Remote Sensing, 50(8):1615-1640. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12524-022-01569-w
- Sari, H., Ozsahin, E., 2016. Spatiotemporal change in the LULC (Landuse/Landcover) characteristics of Tekirdag Province based on the CORINE (Thrace, Türkiye). Fresenius Environmental Bulletin 25(11):4694-4707 https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Aysun-Kop/publication/322570988\_PRELIMINARY\_STUDY\_FOR\_ UTILIZATION\_OF\_SOME\_INVASIVE\_AQUATIC\_PLANT S\_AS\_RAW\_MATERIAL\_FOR\_AQUACULTURE\_FEEDS/li nks/5a608318aca272328103d389/PRELIMINARY-STUDY-FOR-UTILIZATION-OF-SOME-INVASIVE-AQUATIC-PLANTS-AS-RAW-MATERIAL-FOR-AQUACULTURE-FEEDS.pdf#page=243 Accessed: 25 October 2023
- Şen, G., 2022. Population-Forest Interaction. In: Ecological, Economic and Political Assessments on Türkiye's Forests and Forestry (Ed: Şen, G., Güngör, E.), Duvar Publishing, New York, USA, pp:2-29
- Sen, G., Bayramoglu, M.M., Toksoy, D., 2015. Spatiotemporal changes of land use patterns in high mountain areas of Northeast Turkey: a case study in Maçka. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 187:1-14. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-015-4727-8
- Şen, G., Güngör, E., 2018. Analysis of land use/land cover changes following population movements and agricultural activities: a case study in northern Turkey. Applied Ecology and Environmental Research 16(2):2073-2088. http://dx.doi.org/10.15666/aeer/1602\_20732088
- Şen, G., Güngör, E., Şevik, H., 2018. Defining the effects of urban expansion on land use/cover change: a case study in Kastamonu, Turkey. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 190:1-13. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-018-6831-z
- Şen, G., Toksoy, D., 2006. Türkiye'de Nüfus orman ilişkisi. Ormancılıkta Sosyo-Ekonomik Sorunlar Kongresi, p.108-117, Ilgaz, Çankırı. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/338745384\_Turkiye' de Nufus Orman Iliskisi Accessed: 19 November 2023
- Sensoy, S., Demircan, M., Ulupinar, Y., Balta, I., 2008. Climate of Türkiye. Turkish State Meteorological Service https://www.mgm.gov.tr/FILES/genel/makale/13\_turkiye iklimi.pdf Accessed: 21 August 2023
- Sherbinin, A.D., Carr, D., Cassels, S., Jiang, L., 2007. Population and environment. Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour. 32:345-373. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.energy.32.041306.100243
- TC Sanayi ve Teknoloji Bakanlığı (STB), 2023. Socio-Economic Development Ranking Research Reports (SEGE), https://www.sanayi.gov.tr/merkezbirimi/b94224510b7b/sege/il-sege-raporlari Accessed: 10 August 2023
- Toh, F.A., Angwafo, T.E., Ndam, L.M., Antoine, M.Z., 2018. The socio-economic impact of land use and land cover change on the inhabitants of Mount Bambouto Caldera of the Western Highlands of Cameroon. Advances in Remote Sensing 7(01):25. https://doi.org/10.4236/ars.2018.71003
- Toksoy, D., Ayaz, D., Şen, G., Özden, S., 2011. Forest–villager Relationship in Eastern Black Sea Region. Artvin Çoruh Üniversitesi Orman Fakültesi Dergisi, 6(1):79-85. https://ofd.artvin.edu.tr/tr/pub/issue/2255/29715 Accessed: 15 December 2023

188

- Trisurat, Y., Shirakawa, H., Johnston, J.M., 2019. Land-use/landcover change from socio-economic drivers and their impact on biodiversity in Nan Province, Thailand. Sustainability 11(3):649. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11030649
- Turner, B.L., Moss, R.H., Skole, D.L., 1993. Relating land use and global land-cover change; IGBP Report 24, HDP Report 5; International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme: Stockholm, Sweden.
  - http://www.igbp.net/publications/reportsandscienceplans/report sandscienceplans/igbpreports124.5.950c2fa1495db7081e19d3. html Accessed: 30 August 2023
- Turkish Statistical Institute (TUİK) (2023) Statistical data portal. www.tuik.gov.tr Accessed: 24 October 2023
- Vural H, Dinç U, Öztürk N (1997) Sayısal uydu verileri yardımıyla arazi kullanım haritaları hazırlanmasının doğu akdeniz örneğinde araştırılması. III. Uzaktan Algılama ve Türkiye'deki Uygulamaları Semineri. Uludağ-Bursa. https://www.tufuab.org.tr/uploads/files/articles/sayisal-uyduverileri-yardimiyla-arazi-kullanim-haritalarinin-dogu-akdenizkiyi-orneginde-a-1658.pdf Accessed: 19 November 2023
- Walter V. Reid, Harold A. Mooney et al (2003) Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and Ecosystems and human wellbeing, A framework for assessment. The United Nations Environment Programme and World Resources Institute. https://www.millenniumassessment.org/documents/document.3 56.aspx.pdf Accessed: 11 November 2023

- Winkler K, Fuchs R, Rounsevell M, Herold M (2021) Global land use changes are four times greater than previously estimated. Nature communications, 12(1):2501. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-22702-2
- World Resources Institute (WRI), 2023. Forest Pulse: The Latest on the World's Forests https://research.wri.org/gfr/latest-analysisdeforestation-trends Accessed: 30 December 2023
- Wulder MA, Coops NC, Roy DP, White JC, Hermosilla T (2018) Land cover 2.0. International Journal of Remote Sensing 39(12):4254-4284.
- https://doi.org/10.1080/01431161.2018.1452075
- Zeren Cetin I, Varol T, Ozel HB, Sevik H (2023) The effects of climate on land use/cover: a case study in Turkey by using remote sensing data. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 30(3):5688-5699. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-22566-z