

Encyclopedia of Leisure and Outdoor Recreation

Edited by John M. Jenkins and
John J. Pigram

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute: Publication # 542

CITATION: Cole, David N. 2003. Degradation. In: Jenkins, John and Pigram, John (eds.) Encyclopedia of leisure and outdoor recreation. Routledge: London: 103-105.

Article 4

All governments and institutions should preserve and create barrier free environments – be they social or natural – where people have time, space, facilities and opportunity to express, celebrate and share leisure.

Article 5

Collective and individual endeavours be permitted to maintain the freedom and integrity of leisure.

Article 6

All Governments enact and enforce laws and policies designed to provide leisure for all.

Article 7

All private and public sectors remove the threats to the diversity and quality of leisure experiences caused by the local, national and international consequences of globalization.

Article 8

All private and public sectors remove the threats to the abuse and misuse of leisure by individuals, that is, deviant and criminal behaviour, which results from local, national and international forces.

Article 9

All private and public sectors ensure that a better understanding of the consequences of globalization for leisure through a coherent program of ongoing research and education.

Article 10

All private and public sectors ensure the dissemination of information on the costs and benefits to leisure from the several and profound forces of globalization.

The São Paulo Declaration awaits implementation. In 2001, a UNESCO Participation Programme grant was awarded to World Leisure to promote the Declaration and to disseminate its ideas and philosophy. In order to achieve any status as a formal, enforceable proclamation the Declaration must become a law of a nation through either direct legislation or adoption by a NATION-STATE of a United Nations Declaration

(such as the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*).

Reference

World Leisure website: www.worldleisure.org.

Further reading

Jonson, P. (2000) 'From vision to action: the need to implement the principles of the Sao Paulo Declaration on Leisure and Globalization', in M.C. Cabeza (ed.) *Leisure and Human Development*, Bilbao: University of Deusto, pp. 41–9.

PAUL T. JONSON

DEGRADATION

In the context of leisure, degradation refers to a decline in quality resulting from recreational use. It implies both a change in condition and a judgement that the change is adverse and undesirable. The concept is fundamental to recreation management because maintaining quality is a critical management objective. Much recreation management involves PLANNING for and implementing actions designed to minimize degradation associated with recreation use. Degradation of three types of attributes – environmental quality, experiential quality, and the quality of facilities – commonly occurs in recreation areas. The degree of concern about these three types of degradation varies with the type of recreation area, particularly the extent to which recreation is RESOURCE-BASED RECREATION.

Examples of environmental quality degradation (see IMPACTS, PHYSICAL) include loss of vegetation and exposure of soil resulting from recreational activities, such as TRAMPLING, horse-riding, driving, biking, picnicking, and camping. Such activities also result in soil compaction and accelerated erosion. Recreation can adversely affect animal populations and water quality as well. Concern about the degradation of environmental quality is greatest in places where recreational DEMAND is high and OBJECTIVES stress the protection of natural conditions.

The quality of facilities – such as TRAILS, playing fields, and toilets – can also be degraded. Facilities are designed to be used but they usually require maintenance. Inadequate maintenance can be a common cause of degradation. Degradation can also result if use exceeds the capacity

for which the facility was designed, or if the type of use the facility receives is inappropriate. Vandalism also contributes to degradation. Facility degradation is likely to be the primary concern in urban areas and in recreation areas that emphasize SPORT.

Finally, the quality of the recreation experience can be degraded. Direct degradation of the experience by recreation can occur, for example, where CONGESTION and CROWDING result from too much use or where CONFLICT results from the intermingling of incompatible uses (e.g. motorized and non-motorized users). Recreation use can also indirectly degrade experience quality, where degradation of the ENVIRONMENT or of facilities results in a reduction in experience quality.

In addition to denoting any adverse change, the term 'degradation' is also used to describe the relationship between existing conditions and standards of quality. In this sense, degradation means to decline to a state in which environmental, experiential, or facility quality is below acceptable standards of quality. In concept, some decline in quality can be accepted, as long as conditions do not decline to the point where they are considered to be degraded. This requires that someone makes a judgement about how much adverse change is acceptable before the environment, experience, or facilities is considered degraded. The implication is that a degraded state is not acceptable and, therefore, management will undertake actions that will assure that standards are met and degradation does not occur. This concept provides the basis for several popular recreation planning frameworks, such as LIMITS OF ACCEPTABLE CHANGE (LAC), Visitor Impact Management (VIM), and VISITOR EXPERIENCE AND RESOURCE PROTECTION (VERP).

There are important policy implications of the distinction between degradation referring to any decline in quality versus its referring to decline below some standard. For example, it is commonly stated that WILDERNESS in the United States is to be managed according to a policy of non-degradation. However, different interests interpret this policy in varied ways. Some define degradation as any change. They believe that management should ensure that no place in wilderness EXPERIENCES a decline in environmental or experiential quality over time, regardless of increasing population and recreation demand or the DESIRE to concentrate use and impact. Others

define degradation as decline to an unacceptable state. They believe that some adverse change can be accepted, as long as conditions remain in compliance with standards.

Other countries and agencies use terms synonymous with degradation in similar ways. For example, the revised (2001) Management Policies of the NATIONAL PARK SERVICE in the United States state that recreational activities may be allowed only to the extent that they do not cause impairment or derogation of resources. Although any decline in the quality of resources can be considered impairment or derogation of resources, most people interpret this policy to mean that some decline is acceptable, as long as resource quality does not decline to an unacceptable state. Increasingly, planners and managers understand that this interpretation means that they must develop standards for acceptable resource conditions. Many are struggling with the challenge of making such critically important but subjective judgments.

To detect degradation – either a change in quality or a decline in quality to an unacceptable state – MONITORING is necessary. Monitoring to detect degradation of environmental and facility quality is more straightforward than monitoring of experiential quality because the attributes being monitored are more tangible and unchangeable. For example, the degradation of trails can be monitored by periodically measuring the depth of eroded trail. The amount of degradation occurring in any unit of time is simply the difference between measurements at those two times, with the total degradation being the difference between the measure and no erosion at all. However, even for environmental and facility quality, it is challenging to select attributes that are the most influential determinants of quality, and it is difficult to decide on standards.

Monitoring experiential quality is made especially challenging by the varied definitions of quality of different recreationists and by its changeable nature. For example, many have attempted to monitor experiential quality by assessing the SATISFACTION of visitors. Frequently, they find that satisfaction levels remain consistently high, even though the nature of the recreation experience changes and, with it, the recreational clientele. This suggests that experiential quality can only be defined within the

context of particular recreational opportunity types (see RECREATION OPPORTUNITY SPECTRUM).

Further reading

Hammit, W. and Cole, D. (1998) *Wildland Recreation: Ecology and Management*, second edn, New York: Wiley.

DAVID N. COLE

DEINDUSTRIALIZATION

Deindustrialization is a process that has been under way for some years in mature developed economies. It describes the decline in the industrial or manufacturing part of the economy in terms of economic significance and employment opportunities. A graphic result of this is the example of the geographical area of the United States of America around Detroit. This was once known as the 'Steel Belt', but became known instead as the 'Rust Belt' because of the long-term decline in manufacturing and the fact that many factories were lying idle.

The relationship between deindustrialization and leisure is threefold. First, as economies grow they enter a post-industrial age when the SERVICE sector, of which leisure is a significant activity, expands at a faster rate than the industrial sector, which is therefore to some extent displaced. Second, the globalization of production means that it is often profitable to locate manufacturing in DEVELOPING COUNTRIES where labour is cheaper. This applies equally to the manufacturing of leisure goods with, for example, MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS such as Nike locating production of trainers in countries such as China. Third, the development of leisure is often seen as a way in which areas that are in decline because of deindustrialization may be regenerated. Governments may pursue a policy of 'boosterism' in which INVESTMENT in leisure facilities is encouraged either through direct state investment or through offering subsidies to promote private investment. Such projects may include ARTS centres, sports facilities, and leisure PARKS. They provide stimulation to the local economy during the construction and the running phases, and may act as a catalyst for further inward investment. A multiplier effect can occur where a virtuous circle of economic regeneration is set in motion. New employment provides extra spend-

ing, which, in turn, creates further jobs and spending.

Further reading

Vaughan, D.R., Farr, H., and Slee, R.W. (2000) 'Estimating and interpreting the local economic benefits of visitor spending: an explanation', *Leisure Studies* 19, 2: 95-118.

JOHN TRIBE

DELPHI METHOD

The Delphi method is an iterative, consensus-building research process. It was used in 1948 to improve betting scores at horse races, and then refined as a FORECASTING tool to predict changes in military technology. The Rand Corporation developed the process for collecting and analysing information on particular issues from groups of experts (Illinois Institute of Technology n.d.). Delphi applications have since expanded to include problem-solving, DECISION-MAKING, long-range PLANNING, and analysis. The technique is now widely and successfully used in the social domain, for determining policy options, corporate OBJECTIVES, and QUALITY OF LIFE issues.

The Delphi method offers a useful tool for leisure and outdoor recreation research. It permits better exchanges of scientific, technical, and practical information, drawn from current knowledge and experience of a panel of experts, than might be afforded by literature searches. Delphi panels are usually convenience samples of knowledgeable people, rather than random samples of experts.

Delphi compares favourably to other techniques of obtaining group opinion and expert judgement. Delphi is distinguished by structured communication (of two, sometimes three, communication rounds) co-ordinated by a facilitator; anonymity of participants' comments; with feedback to the panel after each stage of the process, and a statistical and narrative group result (Webler *et al.* 1991).

Delphi method limitations, especially in developing future scenarios, emphasize the potential for manipulation by the facilitator (Sackman 1974). Other shortcomings include the length of time the process takes to build consensus, errors in forecasting, panel selection and compliance, panel attrition (e.g. death, illness, loss of interest,

First published 2003
by Routledge
11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE
Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group

© 2003 Routledge

Typeset in Times by Taylor & Francis Books Ltd
Printed and bound in Great Britain by TJ International Ltd, Padstow,
Cornwall

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted
or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic,
mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter
invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any
information storage or retrieval system, without permission in
writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Encyclopedia of leisure and outdoor recreation / edited by John M.
Jenkins and John J. Pigram.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Leisure-Encyclopedias. 2. Outdoor recreation-Encyclopedias.

I. Jenkins, John M. (John Michael), 1961- II. Pigram, J.J.J.

GV11.E55 2004

790'.03-dc22 2003058529

ISBN 0-415-25226-1