Khuc et al 2018 – if poverty rates increase, so did deforestation and degradation in VN. Poverty is strongly associated with income, land, and literacy. Income associated with agriculture, literacy, migration. Agriculture associated with skill, infrastructure. Concluding that higher income and lower poverty could reduce deforestation and degradation. Rural livelihood improvement contributes to a reduction in forest loss. Also found that population density was positively associated with deforestation.

Linkie et al 2018. Increased affluence across Asia is correlated with increasing wildlife trade.

Bonilla-Bedoya et al 2019 – local socioeconomics, including poverty, influence LUC.

Ceddia 2019 – increases in inequality promotes agricultural expansion. Income inequality effect is larger than wealth and land inequality.

Ceddia et al 2015 – recognition of indigenous and local peoples’ forest rights has positive effect on land-sparing (agric intensification)

Fox & Volger 2005 – LUC in mountain areas of SEA will be driven by national-level policies and local economic drivers which encourage moving from traditional swidden agriculture to commercial monoculture.

Gatto et al 2015 – urban and rural population density was important for driving forest loss (agricultural expansion) depending on whether it was for rubber or for oil palm. Rubber is labour intensive, so rural populations need to be high to provide labour. But oil palm is not so labour intensive, so no incentive to switch from rubber to oil palm in highly populated rural areas. Demand for agric products from increasing urban populations also drive land conversion.

Gaughan et al 2009 – forest loss around Angkor driven by small-scale agricultural expansion and charcoal production for the booming tourism industry.

Gong et al 2013 – urban forests in China fragmentation driven by urban structure change, industry-related economic boom, increased in-migration. Increased income of city residents drove reforestation of forest fragments.

Hought et al 2012 – deforestation in northwest Cambodia largely driven by small-holder agricultural expansion for subsistence crops (initially because of migrants returning to the area post-conflict), expansion of cash crop production (cassava). Exposure of smallholder economies to volatile cassava market had severe consequences for livelihoods and food security. Privatisation of forest resources via agricultural expansion has the potential to further disenfranchise already marginalised groups e.g., female-headed households, by reducing access to NTFPs including food, medicine, shelter, and income.

Geist & Lambin 2002 – underlying causes of tropical deforestation include: demographic factors (migration, pop den, pop distribution), economic factors (markets, commercialisation, urbanisation), policy and institutional factors (property rights), cultural factors (attitudes, values, beliefs, individual household behaviour). Proximate (direct) causes – infrastructure extension (transport, markets, settlements, public services), agricultural expansion (permanent cultivation, shifting cultivation, cattle, colonisation), wood extraction (commercial, fuel, poles, charcoal).

Geist & Lambin 2003 – tropical deforestation is caused by interplay between economic, institutional, social, and demographic variables. Poverty was previously assumed to be the main driver of deforestation, and that there were therefore win-win policies like agricultural intensification through technology that would both reduce poverty and thus reduce deforestation – they rarely worked. Poverty is a factor linked to many other, more fundamental causes rather than a single variable causing deforestation. In a meta-analysis they found 16 poverty-related issues that were associated with ultimate causes of deforestation, including resource-poor farming, survival economies, food deficit, land scarcity, low income, and marginalisation. These were more often found in Asian case studies. Majority of the poverty-related cases were also associated with human population dynamics, and with pro-deforestation government policies.

Lomborg 2001 – makes lots of claims about how deforestation is linked to poverty. Lots of landless poor people, with no land tenure or governance.

Kong et al 2019 – in northwest Cambodia there are a bunch of direct and indirect drivers of LUC and forest loss since 1975. In terms of socioeconomics – clearance for subsistence agriculture, repatriation of KR, in-migration, refugee repatriation. Living conditions improved between 2006 and 2015, probably because of increasing incomes from crops, but also potentially because of increased access to credit. The LUCC in the Northwest of Cambodia is not a simple cause-effect relationship related to maize and cassava expansion, but rather a complex dynamic associated with different proximate causes and underlying factors interacting on different temporal and spatial scales.

Krishnadas et al 2019 – high human population density reduces forest cover, even around PAs.SO do roads.

Liu et al 2016 – in more urban area, population pressure, economic growth, and fruit and cash crop consumption are primary drivers of forest loss and fragmentation. In non-urban area, increases in incomes, fruit consumption, infrastructure and tourism development drive forest loss and fragmentation. Forest loss and fragmentation in rapidly developing areas are largely influenced by socioeconomic changes and human demands.

Van Den Hoek et al 2014 – village level socioeconomic drivers and institutional factors, and household decision-making processes are typically most relevant to LUC at the local level.

Mannan et al 2019 – LUC in Pakistan driven by combination of socioeconomic, environmental, and geographic factors.

Mena et al 2006 – investigations into LUC are limited because of a lack of understand of how socioeconomic factors affect land use. LUC can be influenced by household life cycles i.e., changes in consumption and labour. Studies in developing countries should also focus on local social and economic factors involved in population and social change. When population density is low, main drivers will be local policies, commercial agriculture, and subsidies are factors. Local development – infrastructure, urbanisation, and extractive practices will drive deforestation. Results found population pressure and the road network drove deforestation. Deforestation rates increases with increasing urbanisation, until a threshold is reached, after which rates decrease. Complex relationship between education and deforestation. In this study, less poverty created more deforestation. the rate of deforestation is driven by roads, demographic factors, education, infrastructure, hired labor, and topographic characteristics. SCALE IS IMPORTANT. Effect directions change at different scales.

Newman et al 2014 – greater socioeconomic wealth led to greater deforestation in Jamaica. Reforestation was greater further away from markets and towns, and in areas with lower wealth. Considerable temporal variation in the effect of drivers, including employment, pop den, age structure, and wealth.

Nguyen et al 2017 – farmers land use decision-making influenced by livelihoods and physical-economic conditions. Thailand and VN

Onojeghuo & Blackburn 2011 – population dynamics and poverty were unable to explain patterns of forest change in the Niger Delta. It was policies and oil and gas exploration that were the main determinants.

Redo et al 2012 – shows that at a regional scale (Central America), socioeconomics (Human Development Index) explained patterns of deforestation. The least developed countries had higher rates of deforestation, whereas more developed countries had lower deforestation.

Rowcroft 2008 – Drivers of deforestation in the Mekong basin (and more generally) are complex and multi-faceted. land use change can cause socioeconomic tension – i.e., LUC can affect socioeconomics, rather than the other way around. Understanding the causes and consequences of LUC important for sustainability and finding best practice. Greater insight into the complex interactions of these changes over time should enable decision makers to formulate more appropriately targeted policy interventions, leading to more sustainable watershed management practices. Roads can be strong driver of deforestation, but the causal links can also be complex – roads may be built because an area has been cleared. Three levels of change – agents of change (farmers, miners, loggers), immediate causes of change (social, political, economic, institutional forces that drive agents decisions), underlying causes of change (population growth, globalisation, climate change, government policy)

Dasgupta et al 2005 – population pressure important driver in Cambodia, poverty important in Laos.

Shrestha et al 2018 – various demographic, socioeconomic, biophysical, political, cultural, and technological drivers stimulate the activity of the agents.

Xu et al 2019 – socioeconomic and biophysical factors equally important for driving forest loss in mainland SEA. Main drivers in Cambodia – livestock, economy, urbanisation and population, terrain, soil, and water.

Zeb et al 2019 – Pakistan – forest clearance was for agriculture, livestock, and orchards. Families with more members and fewer physical assets were more likely to clear land for agricultural expansion. Families with more member employed off-farm were less likely to clear. For poor households, fuelwood was largest part of income. Social factors such as education, ethnicity, and forest ownership were not important factors.