

demand; a plan is based on key issues determined on the basis of widespread consultation.

References

Veal, A.J. (2002) *Leisure and Tourism Policy and Planning*, Wallingford: CABI Publishing.

A.J. VEAL

PLANNING (OUTDOOR RECREATION)

PLANNING in outdoor recreation, as with other types of planning, broadly describes a process for selecting a desired future, from many possible futures, and determining the actions needed to achieve that future. Planning involves sequencing actions, assigning resources to implement those actions, and MONITORING to ensure that actions are implemented and the desired future is achieved. Outdoor recreation planning involves explicit choices that often include multiple, competing, and conflicting opportunities for recreation and leisure, while recognizing and minimizing various impacts associated with those choices.

The basic tenet of outdoor recreation planning is to provide a diverse range of high-quality recreational opportunities, subject to identified constraints. Planning processes generally are led by technically trained specialists, who engage, to varying degrees, the stakeholders whose interests and VALUES are affected by their decisions. The level of stakeholder involvement can vary from cursory attempts at information collection to direct DECISION-MAKING authority, representing a fundamental shift in the POWER held by various stakeholders and planning technicians.

Typically, outdoor recreation planning is driven by legal mandates, user conflicts, or a perceived need for change, and is often guided by value judgements associated with outdoor recreation and leisure experiences.

Although outdoor recreation planning processes have evolved since the 1960s, many continue to rely on models that function poorly and exacerbate contentious situations. Innovative techniques incorporating multi-stakeholder involvement in process design, monitoring, and EVALUATION have been applied with positive results. In these processes, planners function as much as facilitators as technical and legal experts, pro-

moting the engagement of stakeholders who are guided by and use multiple forms of knowledge. However, these innovations continue to lack broad institutional support, with impediments often the result of institutional design itself. Planning associated with outdoor recreation activities now operates at multiple temporal and spatial scales extending from small groups of local stakeholders to international policies and treaties affecting global constituencies.

In the United States, public land planning (the focus of most outdoor recreation planning) grew out of Progressive Era policies of the early twentieth century and emphasized technical expertise and a utilitarian philosophy to problem-solving. Professional planners were thought to hold the technical expertise to solve socially problematic challenges; they were considered apolitical and able to represent the broad PUBLIC INTEREST. This planning style incorporated a rational-comprehensive approach to problem-solving that viewed planning as a linear process of deciding OBJECTIVES, choosing alternative actions, and implementing them while privileging scientific data over other forms of knowledge. As outdoor recreation gained popularity in the 1960s with innovations in outdoor recreation technologies and an increasing population with a disposable income, so did the need for formalized planning processes.

A series of legislative changes, notably the *National Environmental Policy Act* (1969), sought to address the deficiencies of Progressive Era planning models requiring greater public access to information and involvement. GOVERNMENT agencies were given discretion as to the design and implementation of outdoor recreation planning on public lands with many continuing to apply the rational-comprehensive model.

However, this model functions poorly in circumstances that involve multiple and competing goals and scientific disagreement on cause-and-effect relationships. In many contemporary recreation settings, users are often diverse and sometimes in CONFLICT in their outdoor recreation and leisure use and needs. Many outdoor recreation situations also include values associated with spiritual, ethical, or aesthetic characteristics, topics not usually subject to scientific and technical analysis. Such diverse interests complicate planning processes as do legal mandates, political wrangling, and concerns of biodiversity CONSERVATION. Value-based conflicts are

complex and difficult to measure or moderate, so the ability of professional planners to represent diverse public interests is limited.

Concerns about the appropriateness of the rational-comprehensive planning model have been expressed in academic, government, and private sectors with particular debate regarding its application in public land settings (Borrie *et al.* 1998). Many planning theorists suggest a transactive approach to planning, characterized by dialogue, mutual learning, flexibility, and recognition of many forms of knowledge as a more appropriate model when goals are contested and uncertainty about actions exist (Friedmann 1993). A transactive approach views the public as integral and essential, and affords stakeholders the capacity to listen and share the responsibility for problem definition and solution. Transactive planning processes have produced positive outcomes in outdoor recreation settings that allow stakeholders to develop a mutual understanding of interests, share problem definitions, create ownership in the plan, nurture mutual trust, share agreement on types and use of knowledge, and ultimately build relationships (McCool and Patterson 2000; Stankey *et al.* 1999).

The development of transactive planning models parallels development of new land management paradigms including ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT and adaptive management techniques. Critics of rational-comprehensive planning models note that planning decisions often have unplanned consequences and thus, in the face of considerable uncertainty, institutions need to exhibit flexibility. Yet, the institutional design of many planning processes often contradicts the covenants between agencies and their publics, and works to suppress a transactive approach. Human values towards natural resources are multidimensional and vary over time and space, and outdoor recreation planning needs to acknowledge this dynamism. Flexibility implies responsiveness to the learning engendered by adaptive approaches to planning. If planning is a process for controlling the future in which setting goals and achieving them are part of the same series of actions, the ability to be flexible becomes essential.

Outdoor recreation planning has received considerable attention since the 1970s, particularly with the development of the RECREATION OPPORTUNITY SPECTRUM (ROS) with explicit reference

to recreational demands and conflicts and the LIMITS OF ACCEPTABLE CHANGE (LAC) process in the 1980s. ROS was developed to integrate outdoor recreation planning needs with other uses and values in multiple-use situations. The LAC process incorporates the ROS concept, but includes notions of explicit INDICATORS and standards as well as monitoring. When based on the transactive model, this form of outdoor recreation planning has been successful. A transactive-based process makes the value judgements associated with desired conditions explicit and serves as the foundation for feedback and discussion. In this case, planning becomes a process of group struggle and deliberation about values and goals instead of a process focused solely on actions outside the context of contentious value judgements. The LAC planning process has proven effective as a method of promoting stakeholder involvement and achieving favourable long-term outcomes in complex outdoor recreation planning situations.

Many underlying assumptions in outdoor recreation planning are shaped by the landscape and urban planning literature. Studies in political science have begun to inform outdoor recreation planning, with analysis of civic and participatory forms of democratic governance. This literature suggests that planners must confront six major questions when considering problem solving. First, what criteria guide the selection of alternatives? If values are implicit in recreation use, the mechanisms used to consider and evaluate the needs of stakeholders will drive the decision-making process and ultimately affect the outcome. Second, how will scale mismatches be resolved? Conflict associated with outdoor recreation often spans multiple spatial and temporal scales. Determining appropriate scales is crucial regarding stakeholder inclusion, identifying how impacts are distributed, and sequencing and PROGRAMMING actions. Third, how will different types of knowledge be acknowledged and treated? Recognizing that different types of knowledge are valid and necessary to make decisions about the provision of outdoor recreation opportunities becomes integral to understanding how people communicate and perceive points of view. Integrating different forms of knowledge is a formidable challenge yet essential for relationship building and high-quality planning decisions. Fourth, how will stakeholders be involved? Determinations must be made regard-

ing the accommodation of diverse interests and whether stakeholders will serve as mere observers, or be intimately involved through all stages of the planning process. If outdoor recreation planning involves changing the future, it demands a redistribution of power (away from bureaucracies to affected publics) involved in the design of that future. Fifth, how will uncertainty and RISK be treated? Recognizing that cause-and-effect relationships often are poorly understood, the degree to which uncertainty and risk are considered, and the responsibilities for accepting that risk, become paramount. Last, what personal and financial resources will be required to implement the plan? In the constrained world of planning, determining the costs of various actions and commitment to long-term monitoring and evaluation is an integral component of understanding consequences and successfully implementing a plan.

Planning processes associated with or affecting outdoor recreation and leisure activities are becoming larger in scope and scale involving private, government, and non-government organization co-operation and bilateral, multilateral, or global policies and treaties. International planning efforts affecting outdoor recreation and leisure include the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (1971), UNESCO's World Heritage Convention (1972), the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (1973), the Convention on Biological Diversity (1992), and the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty (1998). Bilateral and multilateral planning efforts include transboundary parks and conservation areas such as the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park in Botswana, Namibia, and South Africa and affect multiple stakeholder groups and ECOSYSTEM types. Other large-scale planning efforts involving government and non-government organization co-operation include the Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE) in Zimbabwe and the Annapurna Conservation Area Project (ACAP) in Nepal. Organizers of these planning efforts have sought to incorporate local stakeholders not only in the decision-making process, but also in benefit sharing, although outcomes associated with these efforts have contained unexpected consequences and their long-term success remains problematic.

A recent trend affecting outdoor recreation planning is the acquisition of land by PRIVATE LAND trusts to conserve biodiversity including land exchanges by international environmental groups such as Conservation International and the Nature Conservancy. Private reserves, such as the Shamwari Game Preserve in South Africa, have been established to provide WILDLIFE-based and WILDERNESS outdoor recreation opportunities. Recognizing that outdoor recreation activities can elicit concern at regional, continental, and even a global scale, outdoor recreation planning will continue to occur and be influenced at this broader level. At present, all Western democracies have mechanisms to involve citizens in environmental planning and decision-making; however, the degree to which these lead to widely accepted or effective plans is varied.

Planning processes that effectively involve stakeholders and result in widely accepted designs of the future have proven difficult to achieve. Effectively involving stakeholders will likely prove increasingly difficult because trends indicate an increase in use of a finite resource amongst a more diverse public. In this context, outdoor recreation planning requires less of an emphasis on engineering solutions and more a focus on learning. Outdoor recreation planning models that apply more dynamic variation in the spatial and temporal scales of analysis and attempt to involve stakeholders in learning-based, collaborative, and creative ways are more likely to resolve the complexities inherent in outdoor recreation-related activities.

References

- Borrie, W., McCool, S.F., and Stankey, G. (1998) 'Protected area planning principles and strategies', in K. Lindberg, M.E. Wood, and D. Engeldrum (eds) *Ecotourism: A Guide for Planners and Managers*, North Bennington, VT: Ecotourism Society, pp. 133-54.
- Friedmann, J. (1993) 'Toward a non-euclidean theory of planning', *Journal of the American Planning Association* 60, 3: 482-5.
- McCool, S.F. and Patterson, M. (2000) 'Trends in recreation, tourism and protected area planning', in W.R. Gartner and D.W. Lime (eds) *Outdoor Recreation Trends*, Wallingford, UK: CABI Publishing, pp. 111-19.
- Stankey, G.H., McCool, S.F., Clark, R.N., and Brown, P.J. (1999) 'Institutional and organizational challenges to managing natural resources for recreation: a social learning model', in T. Burton and E. Jackson (eds) *Leisure Studies at the Millennium*, State College, PA: Venture Publishing, pp. 435-50.

Further reading

- Forester, J. (1989) *Planning in the Face of Power*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Friedmann, J. (1973) *Retracking America*, Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Hudson, B.M. (1979) 'Comparison of current planning theories: counterparts and contradictions', *Journal of the American Planning Association* 45, 4: 387-98.
- Rittel, H.W.J. and Webber, M.M. (1973) 'Dilemmas in a general theory of planning', *Policy Sciences* 4: 155-69.

PAUL R. LACHAPPELLE AND STEPHEN F. MCCOOL

PLATO

The Greek philosopher Plato (c.427-347 BC) emphasized DANCE, physical training, and athletic contests in his seminal accounts of the good life and the just STATE. A noted wrestler in his youth, Plato is said to have competed at the Isthmian Games. On the other hand, Plato was a metaphysical dualist who believed that minds (or souls) and ideas were separate from and absolutely superior to bodies and physical matter. He goes so far as to denigrate the body as an obstacle to true knowledge and to declare that the body should be slave to the mind.

The paradox of Plato's exaltation of the mind and promotion of physical activity may best be resolved by the claim in *Republic* that physical education is primarily for the benefit of the mind or soul. The goal of Plato's athletic programmes is the training of citizens (both male and female) for *arête* or virtue, which he understood as 'health' of the soul. Since *arête* requires the harmonious function of the intellectual, spirited, and appetitive parts of the soul, it stands to reason that the controlled movements demanded by athletics and dance might serve that ideal. Plato was perhaps the first to believe that 'sports build character'.

Further reading

- Plato (1980) *Phaedo (Phaidon)*, trans. G.M.A. Grube, Indianapolis, IA: Hackett.
- Plato (1970) *The Laws (Nomoi)*, trans. Trevor J. Saunders, London: Penguin.
- Plato (1992) *Republic (Politeia)*, trans. G.M.A. Grube, Indianapolis, IA: Hackett Publishing.

HEATHER REID

PLAY

The significance that the notion of 'play' has been accorded over time has varied periodically from the trivial to being the defining characteristic of the human species, if not mammals in general. In 'play' has been seen the source of CULTURE, the fullest potential for the development of the child, the key to learning, the fount of creativity and FANTASY, or, more ordinarily, something that is merely the negative of productive endeavour. The phenomena of play have been studied with a, perhaps ironic, earnest scientific effort in search of its instrumental value for various social technologies (such as education, crime prevention, and the encouragement of innovation) or with a, perhaps fitting, playfulness in celebration of the pervasiveness of the phenomena themselves. The full disciplinary sweep has been engaged in its study from ancient Greek philosophers such as PLATO, to modern historians, anthropologists, developmental psychologists, sociologists, physiologists, evolutionary theorists, and leisure and recreation scholars. As a discrete phenomenon it has been linked to a host of equally puzzling phenomena such as curiosity, imagination, creativity, leisure (with which it has very close definitional links - see below), language, socialization, and 'arousal seeking'. Play, then, has been played with in a variety of ways, for a variety of purposes, by a variety of people, and in relation to a variety of fascinating phenomena.

Two central questions have preoccupied researchers: What is play (and what are its characteristics)? Why do people engage in it? The first has inevitably given rise to many definitions but today most would agree that for an activity to be considered play it must be undertaken actively, be enjoyable to some degree, be freely engaged in, and be motivated by its own intrinsic features and dynamic. Leisure researchers will recognize the similarity of parts of this general definition to that of 'leisure'. As noted by John Neulinger, psychologically, leisure can be said to occur under the circumstances of perceived FREEDOM and intrinsic MOTIVATION. It is a moot point as to when CHILDREN become aware that there are some acts that are not freely undertaken, but, certainly, an important element of child and adult play, on the one hand, and adult leisure, on the other, is that those at both leisure

Encyclopedia of Leisure and Outdoor Recreation

Edited by John M. Jenkins and
John J. Pigram

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 Cataloguing 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