

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.** Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

# UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA  
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

PREVIEW

EFFECTS OF SPATIAL RESOLUTION AND LANDSCAPE STRUCTURE  
ON LAND COVER CHARACTERIZATION

by

Wenli Yang

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of  
The graduate College at the University of Nebraska  
In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements  
For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Major: Geography

Under the Supervision of Professor James W. Merchant

Lincoln, Nebraska

July, 1997

**UMI Number: 9736962**

---

**UMI Microform 9736962**  
**Copyright 1997, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.**

**This microform edition is protected against unauthorized  
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

---

**UMI**  
**300 North Zeeb Road**  
**Ann Arbor, MI 48103**

DISSERTATION TITLE

Effects of Spatial Resolution and Landscape Structure on Land Cover

Characterization

BY

Wenli Yang

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

APPROVED

DATE

Signature

James W. Merchant

Typed Name

Signature

Donald C. Rundquist

Typed Name

Signature

Clinton M. Rowe

Typed Name

Signature

Elizabeth A. Walter-Shea

Typed Name

Signature

Typed Name

Signature

Typed Name

July 17, 1997

July 17, 1997

17 July 1997

July 17, 1997



GRADUATE COLLEGE  
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

# EFFECTS OF SPATIAL RESOLUTION AND LANDSCAPE STRUCTURE ON LAND COVER CHARACTERIZATION

Wenli Yang, Ph.D.

University of Nebraska, 1997

Advisor: James W. Merchant

This dissertation addressed problems in scaling, problems that are among the main challenges in remote sensing. The principal objective of the research was to investigate the effects of changing spatial scale on the representation of land cover. A second objective was to determine the relationship between such effects, characteristics of landscape structure and scaling procedures. Four research issues related to spatial scaling were examined. They included: 1) the upscaling of Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI); 2) the effects of spatial scale on indices of landscape structure; 3) the representation of land cover databases at different spatial scales; and 4) the relationships between landscape indices and land cover area estimations.

The overall bias resulting from non-linearity of NDVI in relation to spatial resolution is generally insignificant as compared to other factors such as influences of aerosols and water vapor. The bias is, however, related to land surface characteristics. Significant errors may be introduced in heterogeneous areas where different land cover types exhibit strong spectral contrast. Spatially upscaled SPOT and TM NDVIs have information content comparable with the AVHRR-derived NDVI. Indices of landscape structure and spatial resolution are generally related, but the exact forms of the

relationships are subject to changes in other factors including the basic patch unit constituting a landscape and the proportional area of foreground land cover under consideration. The extent of agreement between spatially aggregated coarse resolution land cover datasets and full resolution datasets changes with the properties of the original datasets, including the pixel size and class definition. There are close relationships between landscape structure and class areas estimated from spatially aggregated land cover databases. The relationships, however, do not permit extension from one area to another. Inversion calibration across different geographic/ecological areas is, therefore, not feasible. Different rules govern the land cover area changes across resolutions when different upscaling methods are used. Special attention should be given to comparison between land cover maps derived using different methods.

PREVIEW

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Throughout the course of my graduate program, I have had the support of special people without whose help the accomplishment of my doctorate would not have been possible.

My deepest and most sincere thanks must first go to my advisor, Dr. James Merchant, whose guidance and encouragement were instrumental to my study. He spent countless hours listening and providing direction while always allowing me the freedom to explore my own way. He also invested a great deal of time reading and commenting my various manuscripts. He financially supported my entire research through the grants awarded to him by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (grant NAGW-3940) and the USGS/EROS Data Center. I will always regard him as my best mentor.

I own a very special debt of gratitude to Dr. Donald Rundquist, not only because he similarly provided invaluable guidance throughout my entire study but also because he is the professor who brought me to Nebraska. Without him, I would not have had the chance to enter this particular research program.

I am also grateful to the other members in my Supervisory Committee, Dr. Clinton Rowe and Dr. Elizabeth Walter-Shea, who gave their time and expertise in guiding my study. Their constructive comments on both my research proposal and my thesis manuscript served to clarify my thoughts and to improve significantly the dissertation.

Thanks are extended to Dr. Bruce Wylie of the USGS/EROS Data Center who provided the SPOT image classification and worked with me in the Niobrara fields.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the staff and fellow graduate students in CALMIT, the Conservation and Survey Division, and the Department of Geography, although I could not mention each of their names because the people I need to thank are too many.

My greatest debt of gratitude is owned to my parents. They have always selflessly loved



me, supported me and given me constant comfort, no matter how far from home I roam. They always occupy a special place in my heart and my gratitude to them will never be enough.

The person whose constant source of support and encouragement I can never repay is my wife, Kemeng. It is her love that helped me survived this demanding period of my life. She endured more sacrifices than anyone else during my study, especially during our separations and in countless nights and weekends when I was doing research and writing. She gave me more love, patience and motivations than anyone else in helping me to materialize this academic dream. This work is dedicated to you, Kemeng!

PREVIEW

-

## TABLE OF CONTENT

Chapter 1 Introduction .....	1
1.1 Introduction .....	1
1.2 Background .....	3
1.2.1 Scale .....	3
1.2.2 Scale and spatial resolution .....	4
1.2.3 Scaling of remotely sensed data .....	5
1.3 Definition of terms .....	9
1.4 Problem statement and research objectives .....	11
1.5 Structure of the dissertation .....	16
1.6 References .....	18
 Chapter 2 Literature review .....	 22
2.1 Introduction .....	22
2.2 Classification accuracy and spatial resolution .....	23
2.3 Spatial scaling of remote sensing data and classified land cover maps .....	27
2.4 Scaling studies in landscape ecology .....	38
2.5 Summary and comments .....	41
2.6 References .....	44

Chapter 3 Development of multiscale databases .....	50
3.1 Introduction .....	50
3.2 Study areas .....	50
3.3 Remotely sensed data .....	51
3.3.1 TM data .....	51
3.3.2 SPOT data .....	55
3.3.3 AVHRR data .....	58
3.4 Ancillary data .....	61
3.4.1 Ecoregion map .....	61
3.4.2 Other ancillary data .....	62
3.5 Land cover classification .....	63
3.5.1 TM land cover classification and labeling .....	63
3.5.2 SPOT land cover classification .....	64
3.5.3 AVHRR land cover classification .....	65
3.5.4 Accuracy assessment of the land cover classification .....	67
3.6 Creation of multiscale databases .....	68
3.6.1 The "averaging" upscaling procedure .....	68
3.6.2 Upscaling of the TM data .....	70
3.6.3 Upscaling of SPOT data .....	71
3.6.4 Upscaling of AVHRR data .....	71
3.6.5 Upscaling of land cover data .....	72
3.7 Summary .....	74

3.8 References .....	76
Chapter 4 Spatial upscaling of the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index .....	102
4.1 Introduction .....	102
4.2 Data and method .....	105
4.3 Results and analyses .....	110
4.3.1 Difference in NDVI values upscaled using the two methods (results from simulation) .....	110
4.3.2 Difference in NDVI values upscaled using the two methods (results from real images) .....	111
4.3.3 Relationship between NDVI difference and land cover .....	113
4.3.4 Change in image information content .....	115
4.4 Summary and conclusions .....	119
4.5 References .....	121
Chapter 5 Characterizing the effects of spatial resolution on landscape indices: a simulation study .....	138
5.1 Introduction .....	138
5.2 Methods .....	141
5.3 Results and analyses .....	144
5.3.1 Effects of proportional foreground on landscape metrics at full resolution .....	144

5.3.2 Integrated effects of spatial resolution and proportional area on landscape metrics .....	149
5.4 Summary and conclusions .....	155
5.5 References .....	160
 Chapter 6 Spatial upscaling of land cover databases .....	191
6.1 Introduction .....	191
6.2 Data and methods .....	192
6.3 Results and analyses .....	196
6.3.1 SPOT-derived land cover in the Niobrara Preserve and vicinity .....	196
6.3.2 TM-derived land cover in the Lincoln/Omaha study area .....	198
6.3.3 AVHRR-derived 159-class land cover of the conterminous U.S. ....	200
6.3.4 AVHRR-derived 25-class land cover in the conterminous U.S. ....	203
6.3.5 Stratification by ecoregion .....	205
6.3.6 Comparison between the Kappa values and image information content .....	208
6.4 Summary and conclusions .....	211
6.5 References .....	216
 Chapter 7 Spatial upscaling and land cover area estimation: linking land cover to landscape structure .....	245
7.1 Introduction .....	245

7.2 Data and methods .....	247
7.3 Results and analyses .....	253
7.3.1 Change in class area across resolutions: the Niobrara dataset .....	253
7.3.2 Statistical analyses for the Niobrara 17 land cover classes .....	257
7.3.3 Area change for the aggregated 25-class U.S. land cover data .....	260
7.3.4 Statistical analyses for the 25-class U.S. land cover data .....	265
7.3.5 Statistical analysis for the 159-class U.S. land cover data .....	268
7.3.6 Effects of upscaling techniques on land cover representation and on the relationship between land cover area and landscape structure indices .....	271
7.3.7 Change of landscape level indices across resolution .....	278
7.4 Summary and conclusion .....	282
7.5 References .....	286
 Chapter 8 Summary and recommendations for future research .....	 314
8.1 Uniqueness of the study .....	314
8.2 Spatial upscaling of NDVI .....	315
8.3 Effects of spatial resolution on landscape structure indices .....	317
8.4 Upscaling of land cover databases .....	319
8.5 Relationships between land cover upscaling and landscape structure .....	321
8.6 Conclusions and recommendations for future research .....	324
8.7 References .....	329

## Appendix A

Class level landscape structure indices .....	333
---	-----

## Appendix B

Landscape level landscape structure indices .....	334
---	-----

PREVIEW

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1	Locations of the Nebraska study areas .....	79
Figure 3.2	Pseudo color TM composite of the Lincoln/Omaha study area .....	80
Figure 3.3	TM NDVI image in the Lincoln/Omaha study area .....	81
Figure 3.4	Pseudo color SPOT composite of the Niobrara study area (6/7/1994) .....	82
Figure 3.5	Pseudo color SPOT composite of the Niobrara study area (8/24/1994) .....	83
Figure 3.6	SPOT NDVI images in the Niobrara study area .....	84
Figure 3.7	AVHRR Maximum Value Composite NDVI image .....	85
Figure 3.8	Level I ecoregions of the conterminous U.S. ....	86
Figure 3.9	TM-derived land cover map in the Lincoln/Omaha study area .....	87
Figure 3.10	SPOT-derived land cover map in the Niobrara study area .....	88
Figure 3.11	The 25-class AVHRR-derived conterminous U.S. land cover map .....	89
Figure 3.12	The 240m resolution land cover map of the Lincoln/Omaha study area, following the aggregation method .....	90
Figure 3.13	The 480m resolution land cover map of the Lincoln/Omaha study area, following the aggregation method .....	91
Figure 3.14	The 960m resolution land cover map of the Lincoln/Omaha study area, following the aggregation method .....	92
Figure 3.15	The 240m resolution land cover map of the Niobrara study area .....	93



Figure 3.16 The 480m resolution land cover map of the Niobrara study area .....	94
Figure 3.17 The 960m resolution land cover map of the Niobrara study area .....	95
Figure 3.18 The 16km resolution 25-class land cover map of the conterminous United States .....	96
Figure 3.19 The 32km resolution 25-class land cover map of the conterminous United States .....	97
Figure 3.20 The 64km resolution 25-class land cover map of the conterminous United States .....	98
Figure 3.21 The 240m resolution land cover map of the Lincoln/Omaha study area, following the re-classification method .....	99
Figure 3.22 The 480m resolution land cover map of the Lincoln/Omaha study area, following the re-classification method .....	100
Figure 3.23 The 960m resolution land cover map of the Lincoln/Omaha study area, following the re-classification method .....	101
Figure 4.1 Coarse resolution NDVI upscaled using two different methods, results of simulation .....	123
Figure 4.2 Differences between the two NDVI values across the resolutions, results of the Lincoln/Omaha TM image .....	124
Figure 4.3 Difference image between the two TM NDVI at the 480m resolution .....	125
Figure 4.4 Differences image the two SPOT NDVI at the 480m resolution .....	126
Figure 4.5 Percentage of pixels with varying degree of Diff(NDVI) .....	127
Figure 4.6 Differences between the two NDVI values across the resolutions,	

results of the Niobrara SPOT image .....	128
Figure 4.7 Differences between the two NDVI values across the resolutions, results of the AVHRR image .....	129
Figure 4.8 Percentage of pixels having greater than 0.01 Diff(NDVI) changes with the number of land cover classes .....	130
Figure 4.9 Changes in NDVI standard deviation and entropy across the resolutions, the Niobrara SPOT image .....	131
Figure 4.10 Changes in NDVI standard deviation and entropy across the resolutions, the Lincoln/Omaha TM image .....	132
Figure 4.11 Changes in NDVI standard deviation and entropy across the resolutions, the conterminous U.S. AVHRR image .....	133
Figure 4.12 Comparison between the TM NDVI and the AVHRR MVC NDVI .....	134
Figure 4.13 Comparison between the SPOT NDVI and the AVHRR MVC NDVI .....	135
Figure 4.14 Regression between the SPOT NDVI and the AVHRR MVC NDVI, June 1994 .....	136
Figure 4.15 Regression between the SPOT NDVI and the AVHRR MVC NDVI, August 1994 .....	136
Figure 4.16 Regression between the TM NDVI and the AVHRR MVC NDVI, August 1991 .....	137
Figure 5.1 Simulated neutral landscape, circular unit patch ( $p=0.05$ , Res=30m) .....	163
Figure 5.2 Simulated neutral landscape, circular unit patch ( $p=0.20$ , Res=30m) .....	163
Figure 5.3 Simulated neutral landscape, circular unit patch ( $p=0.50$ , Res=30m) .....	164

Figure 5.4 Simulated neutral landscape, circular unit patch ( $p=0.05$ , Res=480m) .....	164
Figure 5.5 Simulated neutral landscape, circular unit patch ( $p=0.20$ , Res=480m) .....	165
Figure 5.6 Simulated neutral landscape, circular unit patch ( $p=0.50$ , Res=480m) .....	165
Figure 5.7 Simulated neutral landscape, square unit patch ( $p=0.05$ , Res=30m) .....	166
Figure 5.8 Simulated neutral landscape, square unit patch ( $p=0.20$ , Res=30m) .....	166
Figure 5.9 Simulated neutral landscape, square unit patch ( $p=0.50$ , Res=30m) .....	167
Figure 5.10 Simulated neutral landscape, square unit patch ( $p=0.05$ , Res=480m) .....	167
Figure 5.11 Simulated neutral landscape, square unit patch ( $p=0.20$ , Res=480m) .....	168
Figure 5.12 Simulated neutral landscape, square unit patch ( $p=0.50$ , Res=480m) .....	168
Figure 5.13 Simulated neutral landscape, dotted unit patch ( $p=0.05$ , Res=30m) .....	169
Figure 5.14 Simulated neutral landscape, dotted unit patch ( $p=0.20$ , Res=30m) .....	169
Figure 5.15 Simulated neutral landscape, dotted unit patch ( $p=0.50$ , Res=30m) .....	170
Figure 5.16 Simulated neutral landscape, dotted unit patch ( $p=0.05$ , Res=480m) .....	170
Figure 5.17 Simulated neutral landscape, dotted unit patch ( $p=0.20$ , Res=480m) .....	171
Figure 5.18 Simulated neutral landscape, dotted unit patch ( $p=0.50$ , Res=480m) .....	171
Figure 5.19 Change in landscape indices with proportional foreground area, CPLS .....	172
Figure 5.20 Change in landscape indices with proportional foreground area, SPLS .....	173
Figure 5.21 Change in landscape indices with proportional foreground area, DPLS .....	174
Figure 5.22 Change in largest patch index (LPI) across resolutions (CPLS) .....	175
Figure 5.23 Change in largest patch index (LPI) across resolutions (SPLS) .....	176
Figure 5.24 Change in largest patch index (LPI) across resolutions (DPLS) .....	177
Figure 5.25 Change in largest patch index (LPI) across $P_i$ levels .....	178

Figure 5.26 Change in mean patch size (MPS) across resolutions (CPLS) .....	179
Figure 5.27 Change in mean patch size (MPS) across resolutions (SPLS) .....	180
Figure 5.28 Change in mean patch size (MPS) across resolutions (DPLS) .....	181
Figure 5.29 Change in patch size standard deviation (PSSD) across resolutions (CPLS) .....	182
Figure 5.30 Change in patch size standard deviation (PSSD) across resolutions (SPLS) .....	183
Figure 5.31 Change in patch size standard deviation (PSSD) across resolutions (DPLS) .....	184
Figure 5.32 Change in landscape shape index (LSI) across resolutions (CPLS) .....	185
Figure 5.33 Change in landscape shape index (LSI) across resolutions (SPLS) .....	186
Figure 5.34 Change in landscape shape index (LSI) across resolutions (DPLS) .....	187
Figure 5.35 Change in mean nearest neighbor distance (MNN) across resolutions (CPLS) .....	188
Figure 5.36 Change in mean nearest neighbor distance (MNN) across resolutions (CPLS) .....	189
Figure 5.37 Change in mean nearest neighbor distance (MNN) across resolutions (CPLS) .....	190
Figure 6.1 The concepts of consistency rate, pixel heterogeneity, and degree of dominance .....	218
Figure 6.2 Changes in consistency rate and Kappa statistics across resolutions, the SPOT-derived land cover data .....	219

Figure 6.3 Heterogeneity of coarse resolution pixels, the SPOT-derived land cover data .....	220
Figure 6.4 Degree of dominance of the majority class, the SPOT-derived land cover data .....	221
Figure 6.5 Changes in consistency rate and Kappa statistics across resolutions, the TM-derived land cover data .....	222
Figure 6.6 Heterogeneity of coarse resolution pixels, the TM-derived land cover data .....	223
Figure 6.7 Degree of dominance of the majority class, the TM-derived land cover data .....	224
Figure 6.8 Changes in consistency rate and Kappa statistics across resolutions, the AVHRR-derived 159-class land cover .....	225
Figure 6.9 Heterogeneity of coarse resolution pixels, the AVHRR-derived 159-class land cover .....	226
Figure 6.10 Degree of dominance of the majority class, the AVHRR-derived 159-class land cover data .....	227
Figure 6.11 Changes in consistency rate and Kappa statistics across resolutions, the AVHRR-derived 25-class land cover data .....	228
Figure 6.12 Heterogeneity of coarse resolution pixels, the AVHRR-derived 25-class land cover data .....	229
Figure 6.13 Degree of dominance of the majority class, the AVHRR-derived 25-class land cover data .....	230

Figure 6.14 Changes in consistency rate and Kappa statistics across resolutions stratified by ecoregions, the AVHRR-derived 159-class land cover .....	231
Figure 6.15 Changes in consistency rate and Kappa statistics across resolutions stratified by ecoregions, the AVHRR-derived 25-class land cover .....	232
Figure 6.16 The heterogeneity of coarse resolution pixels, the AVHRR-derived 159-class land cover in ecoregion #4 .....	233
Figure 6.17 Degree of dominance of the majority class, the AVHRR-derived 159-class land cover in ecoregion #4 .....	234
Figure 6.18 The heterogeneity of coarse resolution pixels, the AVHRR-derived 159-class land cover data in ecoregion #6 .....	235
Figure 6.19 Degree of dominance of the majority class, the AVHRR-derived 159-class land cover data in ecoregion #6 .....	236
Figure 6.20 The heterogeneity of coarse resolution pixels, the AVHRR-derived 25-class land cover in ecoregion #4 .....	237
Figure 6.21 Degree of dominance of the majority class, the AVHRR-derived 25-class land cover data in ecoregion #4 .....	238
Figure 6.22 The heterogeneity of coarse resolution pixels, the AVHRR-derived 25-class land cover data in ecoregion #6 .....	239
Figure 6.23 Degree of dominance of the majority class, the AVHRR-derived 25-class land cover data in ecoregion #6 .....	240
Figure 6.24 Change in AVHRR NDVI standard deviation with spatial resolutions in the four ecoregions .....	241

Figure 6.25 Change in TM and SPOT NDVI standard deviation with spatial resolutions .....	242
Figure 6.26 Regression between Kappa statistics and NDVI standard deviation, AVHRR data .....	243
Figure 6.27 Regression between Kappa statistics and NDVI standard deviation, TM and SPOT data .....	244
Figure 7.1 Changes in class area across resolutions, the SPOT-derived land cover data .....	288
Figure 7.2 Changes in class area across resolutions, the SPOT-derived land cover data .....	289
Figure 7.3 Changes in class area across resolutions, the SPOT-derived land cover data .....	290
Figure 7.4 Changes in class area across resolutions, the AVHRR land cover .....	291
Figure 7.5 Changes in class area across resolutions, the AVHRR land cover .....	292
Figure 7.6 Changes in class area across resolutions, the AVHRR land cover .....	293
Figure 7.7 Changes in class area across resolutions, the AVHRR land cover .....	294
Figure 7.8 Spatial distribution of the dryland cropland and woodland/cropland classes .....	295
Figure 7.9 Spatial distribution of the desert shrubland and shrubland/grassland classes .....	296
Figure 7.10 Consistency rates and Kappa statistics between fine and coarse resolution data and between data derived using different	

upsampling techniques, results of the TM land cover data .....	297
Figure 7.11 Changes in class area across resolutions, following the aggregation method .....	298
Figure 7.12 Changes in class area across resolutions, following the aggregation method .....	299
Figure 7.13 Changes in class area across resolutions, following the aggregation method .....	300
Figure 7.14 Changes in class area across resolutions, following the aggregation method .....	301
Figure 7.15 Changes in class area across resolutions, following the re-classification method .....	302
Figure 7.16 Changes in class area across resolutions, following the re-classification method .....	303
Figure 7.17 Changes in class area across resolutions, following the re-classification method .....	304
Figure 7.18 Changes in class area across resolutions, following the re-classification method .....	305
Figure 7.19 Changes in LPI, MPS, PSSD, and LSI across resolutions, the SPOT-derived land cover data .....	306
Figure 7.20 Changes in DLF, IJI, and CONTAG across resolutions, the SPOT-derived land cover data .....	307