

Geoheritage and Climbing

Subjects: **Geology**

Contributor: Dmitry A. Ruban , Vladimir A. Ermolaev

Geological and geomorphological heritage (geoheritage) is often found in mountain domains that also provide resources for climbing, mountaineering, bouldering, and canyoning. The relevant research is linked to geoconservation, geoeducation, the tourism industry, and tourism opportunities. Several methodologies for assessment of geoheritage and climbing sites are proposed. The world's highest peaks are essential for the relationship between geoheritage and climbing activities.

geoconservation

geotourism

geological resources

1. Introduction

Establishing the heritage value of geological and geomorphological objects contributes to understanding of natural resources, efficient planning of conservation activities, designation of protected areas, and improvement in human–environment relationships via tourism and education. The relevant ideas can be found in the fundamental works by Bentivenga et al. [1], Brilha et al. [2], Brocx and Semeniuk [3], Dowling and Newsome [4], Gordon [5], Gray [6], Henriques and Brilha [7], Henriques et al. [8], Pescatore et al. [9], Prosser [10], Prosser et al. [11], Reynard and Brilha [12], Šrba et al. [13], Thomas [14], and Wimbledon and Smith-Meyer [15]. Simultaneously, new issues, including those related to sustainability, arise together with the growth of societal awareness and exploitation of geological and geomorphological heritage (geoheritage). Particularly, some (if not many) peculiar landforms provide excellent opportunities for climbing activities, climbing sites boast exceptional visibility of rocks in cliffs, and climbing as a sport/recreation activity produces significant anthropogenic pressure on unique geological environments. Multiple relationships and feedback mechanisms exist in these cases.

Deciphering the above-mentioned issues relevant to geoheritage and climbing activities is not only interesting in a scientific sense due to the complexity of these issues, but it is also practically important. In particular, these issues are closely linked to geotourism development. Three lines of evidence in support of this statement are as follows. First, this tourism direction has become global and continues to grow [4][16][17]. Apparently, climbing activities can enrich the experience of geotourists and contribute to geoheritage accessibility. Second, geotourism requires attention to sustainability issues [7][8][18][19][20][21][22]. If coupled with climbing activities, it challenges sustainable development due to the above-mentioned environmental impact of humans. Third, geotourism development is strongly related to the international geopark movement [7][23][24][25][26][27][28][29]. Although geoheritage lies at the “core” of geoparks, functioning of the latter cannot be restricted to only geotourism and conservation procedures. These establishments should use their potential and infrastructure to allow environmentally responsible exploitation

of natural resources to satisfy their visitors and to support local communities. Climbing seems to be a highly plausible option for many geoparks.

2. Basic Terms and Ideas

2.1. Geoheritage

Geoheritage includes “pure” geological heritage and geomorphological heritage, i.e., the entity of unique features of the Earth’s crust that can be employed for the purposes of science, education, and tourism (cf. [30]). Although unique geomorphological features constitute a special type of geological heritage [31], studies of the former have become a significant and somewhat individual research direction [32] (see also Coratza and Hoblea in [12]), and are sensible to consider with a kind of separation from pure geological heritage studies. Geoheritage has different types and forms [11][30]. The former refers to the general essence of unique geological phenomena, and these are geomorphological, sedimentary, igneous, metamorphic, stratigraphical, palaeontological, palaeogeographical, mineralogical, tectonic, economical, engineering, pedological, geochemical, geocryological, geothermal, cosmogenic, hydro(geo)logical, geohistorical (or geoexploration), and complex types (the latter means the co-occurrence of two and more types). The forms include (but are not limited to) natural outcrops and landforms, quarries and mines (and entire deposits), road cuttings, mineral and fossil museum collections, and geological exhibits. Geoheritage requires conservation (geoconservation), which includes a broad spectrum of activities and formal procedures, including evaluation, monitoring, maintenance (also cleaning), protection, and promotion of unique geological and geomorphological features.

Geoheritage can be understood, very broadly, as essential characteristics of the unique geological environment. In this case, it is closely related to the idea of geodiversity [2][6][33][34][35][36][37][38][39]. However, of special importance are localities exhibiting geoheritage that are officially designated. Two main types of such localities are geosites and geoparks. The former are relatively small objects or areas representing unique phenomena (cf. [30]). These also include geomorphosites displaying peculiar landforms and/or geomorphological processes [32][40][41] (see also Coratza and Hoblea in [12]). Geoparks are areas specially designated for geoheritage exploitation for the purposes of tourism, education, and science, as well as for their conservation [7][23][24][25][26][27][28][29] (see also Brilha in [12]). These can be linked to single geosites with outstanding importance, several geosites, geodiversity hotspots, and geographical/geological domains boasting a concentration of geoheritage. Many geoparks tend to join national and international networks, including the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Global Geopark network [7] and the European Geoparks network [29]. Geosites and, in particular, geoparks are the key destinations for geotourists, and actual geotourism growth [4][5][7][13][16][17] has become the logical outcome of the extensive geoheritage exploration and the official designation of its manifestations.

In fact, geoheritage and geotourism are understood to have certain differences in the research community. Geoheritage can be restricted to only those unique features that are the subject of geoconservation. However, geoheritage seems to be also important as a resource for science, education, and tourism, and often its utility for these purposes creates its value and argues for the necessity of geoconservation. Such a broad, resource-based

vision is preferred in this paper. Geotourism can be understood as a broad range of activities linked to the natural environment. If so, it can exploit geoheritage together with other components of the environment. A narrower understanding of geotourism restricts it to those activities that are based on unique geological and geomorphological features, that is, those linked to the geological and geomorphological environment. To avoid confusion, such a vision of geotourism is preferred.

2.2. Climbing Activities

Mountainous geographical domains often host many high-angle slopes ("walls") that are linked to peaks, cliffs, and river valleys. Such slopes are ideal for (almost) extreme tourism, sport, and outdoor recreation activities that are very generally known as climbing, but can be also defined using several other terms (e.g., mountaineering (=alpinism) is the main alternative term for rock climbing, but climbing is preferred provisionally as the main generic term in this paper). Millions of more or less trained visitors to mountains are involved in these activities on an annual basis (rock climbing is paired now by indoor climbing).

Rock climbing usually means "conquering" notable peaks and cliffs (at least, reaching high points), often with a preference for challenging routes and non-trivial solutions; these activities can be linked to tourism, sport, and outdoor recreation [42], and they require some physical training [43][44][45], risk-taking and pleasure satisfaction [46][47][48][49], and specific geographical vision [50]. Rock climbing also exerts a significant anthropogenic pressure on the environment, although the degree of this pressure depends on different parameters and conditions, and remains debatable [51][52][53][54][55]. Mountaineering is a slightly more general term referring to the broader spectrum of tourism, sport, and recreation activities in mountainous domains; essentially, it refers to the same activities as climbing, although emphasizing the outdoor character of these activities [42][56]. The on-line bibliographical database Scopus includes >320 papers mentioning rock climbing in their titles and >380 papers mentioning mountaineering (state as at mid-May, 2020; some of these papers deal with geoheritage, but the majority do not). In the literature, mountaineering is often treated in regard to industry and society [57][58][59] and places [60][61], but chiefly to personalities (physiology and emotions) [62][63][64][65][66][67][68][69][70][71].

Environmental effects are also documented [72][73]. Two other activities that are related to climbing are bouldering and canyoning. The former means short-distance, but difficult, route climbing on big boulders (megaclasts in geological terminology) or relatively small landforms (e.g., hillocks) with steep slopes. Bouldering is more a sport or outdoor recreation activity than tourism. In the literature, this activity is discussed in regard to human physiology and psychology [74][75][76], and the landscape context [77] and environmental effects of bouldering are also documented [78][79]. Bouldering sites also facilitate finding peculiar geological objects such as megaclasts [80]. Canyoning is a kind of adventure tourism in difficult-to-access river valleys (chiefly, these are canyons and gorges) [81][82][83][84]. Partly, it is based on climbing, and steep slopes constitute its main resource. Development of canyoning is also related to the issues of risk-taking and safety [85][86].

Climbing activities are strongly related to sustainability. On one hand, they challenge the latter via an increase in the anthropogenic pressure on natural environments [51][52][53][54][55][72][73][78][79]. On the other hand, these

contribute to sustainable development via generating additional income and jobs, planning improvement, social and political stability, etc. [87][88][89]. However, the role of extreme/adventure tourism in the achievement of sustainability should not be exaggerated [90][91][92]. Moreover, local sustainability is a factor in the development of climbing activities (e.g., [87]).

References

1. Bentivenga, M.; Cavalcante, F.; Mastronuzzi, G.; Palladino, G.; Prosser, G. Geoheritage: The Foundation for Sustainable Geotourism. *Geoheritage* 2019, 11, 1367–1369.
2. Brilha, J.; Gray, M.; Pereira, D.I.; Pereira, P. Geodiversity: An integrative review as a contribution to the sustainable management of the whole of nature. *Environ. Sci. Policy* 2018, 86, 19–28.
3. Brocx, M.; Semeniuk, V. The ‘8Gs’-a blueprint for Geoheritage, Geoconservation, Geo-education and Geotourism. *Aust. J. Earth Sci.* 2019, 66, 803–821.
4. Dowling, R.; Newsome, D. (Eds.) *Handbook of Geotourism*; Edward Elgar: Cheltenham, UK, 2018.
5. Gordon, J.E. Geoheritage, geotourism and the cultural landscape: Enhancing the visitor experience and promoting geoconservation. *Geosciences* 2018, 8, 136.
6. Gray, M. *Geodiversity: Valuing and Conserving Abiotic Nature*; Wiley-Blackwell: Chichester, UK, 2013.
7. Henriques, M.H.; Brilha, J. UNESCO Global Geoparks: A strategy towards global understanding and sustainability. *Episodes* 2017, 40, 349–355.
8. Henriques, M.H.; Castro, A.R.S.F.; Félix, Y.R.; Carvalho, I.S. Promoting sustainability in a low density territory through geoheritage: Casa da Pedra case-study (Araripe Geopark, NE Brazil). *Resour. Policy* 2020, 67, 101684.
9. Pescatore, E.; Bentivenga, M.; Giano, S.I.; Siervo, V. Geomorphosites: Versatile tools in geoheritage cultural dissemination. *Geoheritage* 2019, 11, 1583–1601.
10. Prosser, C.D. Our rich and varied geoconservation portfolio: The foundation for the future. *Proc. Geol. Assoc.* 2013, 124, 568–580.
11. Prosser, C.; Murphy, M.; Larwood, J. *Geological Conservation: A Guide to Good Practice*; English Nature: Peterborough, UK, 2006.
12. Reynard, E.; Brilha, J. (Eds.) *Geoheritage: Assessment, Protection, and Management*; Elsevier: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2018.

13. Štrba, L.; Kolackovská, J.; Kudelas, D.; Kršák, B.; Sidor, C. Geoheritage and geotourism contribution to tourism development in protected areas of Slovakia—theoretical considerations. *Sustainability* 2020, 12, 2979.
14. Thomas, M.F. New keywords in the geosciences—Some conceptual and scientific issues. *Rev. Inst. Geol. Sao Paolo* 2016, 37, 1–12.
15. Wimbledon, W.A.P.; Smith-Meyer, S. (Eds.) *Geoheritage in Europe and Its Conservation*; ProGEO: Oslo, Norway, 2012.
16. Hose, T.A. 3G's for modern geotourism. *Geoheritage* 2012, 4, 7–24. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
17. Olafsdottir, R.; Tverijonaite, E. Geotourism: A systematic literature review. *Geosciences* 2018, 8, 234.
18. Chakrabarty, P.; Mandal, R. Geotourism mapping for sustainability: A basin oriented approach. *Geoj. Tour. Geosites* 2018, 21, 174–185. [Google Scholar]
19. Jorgenson, J.; Nickerson, N. Geotourism and Sustainability as a Business Mindset. *J. Hosp. Mark. Manag.* 2016, 25, 270–290. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
20. Marlina, E.; Herawan, T. Geotourism concept development in the basis of environment sustainability, socioculture, and natural science wealth: A case study in Indonesia. *J. Environ. Manag. Tour.* 2020, 11, 145–158. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
21. Pásková, M. Can indigenous knowledge contribute to the sustainability management of the aspiring rio coco geopark, Nicaragua? *Geosciences* 2018, 8, 277. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
22. Štrba, L.; Kršák, B.; Sidor, C. Some comments to geosite assessment, visitors, and geotourism sustainability. *Sustainability* 2018, 10, 2589.
23. Catana, M.M.; Brilha, J.B. The role of UNESCO global geoparks in promoting geosciences education for sustainability. *Geoheritage* 2020, 12, 1. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
24. Ding, H.; Li, X.; Dai, J.; Xue, Y. Spatial distribution of UNESCO global geoparks in China and its influencing factors. *Int. J. Des. Nat. Ecodynamics* 2020, 15, 47–55. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
25. Eder, F.W.; Patzak, M. Geoparks-geological attractions: A tool for public education, recreation and sustainable economic development. *Episodes* 2004, 27, 162–164. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
26. Farsani, N.T.; Coelho, C.; Costa, C. Geotourism and geoparks as novel strategies for socio-economic development in rural areas. *Int. J. Tour. Res.* 2011, 13, 68–81. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
27. Mc Keever, P.J.; Zouros, N. Geoparks: Celebrating earth heritage, sustaining local communities. *Episodes* 2005, 28, 274–278. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef] [PubMed]

28. Rosado-González, E.M.; Sá, A.A.; Palacio-Prieto, J.L. UNESCO Global Geoparks in Latin America and the Caribbean, and their contribution to agenda 2030 sustainable development goals. *Geoheritage* 2020, 12, 36. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

29. Zouros, N. The European Geoparks network. *Episodes* 2004, 27, 165–171.

30. Habibi, T.; Ponedelnik, A.A.; Yashalova, N.N.; Ruban, D.A. Urban geoheritage complexity: Evidence of a unique natural resource from Shiraz city in Iran. *Resour. Policy* 2018, 59, 85–94.

31. Ruban, D.A. Quantification of geodiversity and its loss. *Proc. Geol. Assoc.* 2010, 121, 326–333.

32. Reynard, E.; Coratza, P.; Giusti, C. Geomorphosites and Geotourism. *Geoheritage* 2011, 3, 129–130.

33. Brocx, M.; Semeniuk, V. Geodiversity and the ‘8Gs’: A response to Gray & Gordon (2020). *Aust. J. Earth Sci.* 2020, 67, 445–451. [Google Scholar]

34. Gonçalves, J.; Mansur, K.; Santos, D.; Henriques, R.; Pereira, P. A Discussion on the quantification and classification of Geodiversity indices based on GIS methodological tests. *Geoheritage* 2020, 12, 38. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

35. Gray, M.; Gordon, J.E. Geodiversity and the ‘8Gs’: A response to Brocx & Semeniuk (2019). *Aust. J. Earth Sci.* 2020, 67, 437–444. [Google Scholar]

36. Knight, J. Evaluating geological heritage: Correspondence on Ruban, D.A. ‘Quantification of geodiversity and its loss’ (PGA, 2010, 121(3): 326-333). *Proc. Geol. Assoc.* 2011, 122, 508–510. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

37. Read, Q.D.; Zarnetske, P.L.; Record, S.; Dahlin, K.M.; Costanza, J.K.; Finley, A.O.; Gaddis, K.D.; Grady, J.M.; Hobi, M.L.; Latimer, A.M.; et al. Beyond counts and averages: Relating geodiversity to dimensions of biodiversity. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.* 2020, 29, 696–710. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

38. Ruban, D.A. How diverse should be geodiversity? Reply to Knight “Evaluating geological heritage” (Proc. Geol. Assoc. (2011)). *Proc. Geol. Assoc.* 2011, 122, 511–513. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

39. Thomas, M.F. A geomorphological approach to geodiversity—Its applications to geoconservation and geotourism. *Quaest. Geogr.* 2012, 31, 81–89.

40. Chrobak, A.; Witkowski, K.; Szmenda, J. Assessment of the educational values of geomorphosites based on the expert method, case study: The Bialka and Skawa rivers, the Polish Carpathians. *Quaest. Geogr.* 2020, 39, 45–57. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

41. Santos, D.S.; Reynard, E.; Mansur, K.L.; Seoane, J.C.S. The specificities of Geomorphosites and their influence on assessment procedures: A methodological comparison. *Geoheritage* 2019, 11, 2045–2064.

42. Seifert, L.; Wolf, P.; Schweizer, A. (Eds.) *The Science of Climbing and Mountaineering*; Routledge: London, UK, 2018.

43. Giles, L.V.; Rhodes, E.C.; Taunton, J.E. The physiology of rock climbing. *Sports Med.* 2006, **36**, 529–545. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

44. MacKenzie, R.; Monaghan, L.; Masson, R.A.; Werner, A.K.; Caprez, T.S.; Johnston, L.; Kemi, O.J. Physical and physiological determinants of rock climbing. *Int. J. Sports Physiol. Perform.* 2020, **15**, 168–179. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

45. Siegel, S.R.; Fryer, S.M. Rock climbing for promoting physical activity in youth. *Am. J. Lifestyle Med.* 2017, **11**, 243–251.

46. Delle Fave, A.; Bassi, M.; Massimini, F. Quality of experience and risk perception in high-altitude rock climbing. *J. Appl. Sport Psychol.* 2003, **15**, 82–98. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

47. Langseth, T.; Salvesen, Ø. Rock climbing, risk, and recognition. *Front. Psychol.* 2018, **9**, 1793. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

48. Llewellyn, D.J.; Sanchez, X. Individual differences and risk taking in rock climbing. *Psychol. Sport Exerc.* 2008, **9**, 413–426. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

49. Llewellyn, D.J.; Sanchez, X.; Asghar, A.; Jones, G. Self-efficacy, risk taking and performance in rock climbing. *Personal. Individ. Differ.* 2008, **45**, 75–81.

50. Kulczycki, C. Place meanings and rock climbing in outdoor settings. *J. Outdoor Recreat. Tour.* 2014, **7–8**, 8–15

51. Clark, P.; Hessl, A. The effects of rock climbing on cliff-face vegetation. *Appl. Veg. Sci.* 2015, **18**, 705–715. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

52. Covy, N.; Benedict, L.; Keeley, W.H. Rock climbing activity and physical habitat attributes impact avian community diversity in cliff environments. *PLoS ONE* 2019, **14**, e0209557. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

53. Dagan, D.T.; Sharp, R.L.; Walendziak, N. Longitudinal variation in rock climbing impacts in the Red River gorge area of the Daniel Boone national forest. *J. For.* 2019, **117**, 9–12. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

54. Holzschuh, A. Does rock climbing threaten cliff biodiversity—A critical review. *Biol. Conserv.* 2016, **204**, 153–162. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

55. Lorite, J.; Serrano, F.; Lorenzo, A.; Cañadas, E.M.; Ballesteros, M.; Peñas, J. Rock climbing alters plant species composition, cover, and richness in Mediterranean limestone cliffs. *PLoS ONE* 2017, **12**, e0182414.

56. Musa, G.; Higham, J.; Thompson-Carr, A. (Eds.) *Mountaineering Tourism*; Routledge: London, UK, 2015.

57. Apollo, M. The true accessibility of mountaineering: The case of the High Himalaya. *J. Outdoor Recreat. Tour.* 2017, 17, 29–43. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

58. Bainbridge, S. Romantic writers and mountaineering. *Romanticism* 2012, 18, 1–15. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

59. Lenglet, M.; Rozin, P. Institutional work in high-altitude mountaineering: Rope-fixing, the ‘Everest brawl’ and changes in sherpa actorhood. *Res. Sociol. Organ.* 2019, 58, 229–249.

60. Hunt, R. Historical geography, climbing and mountaineering: Route setting for an inclusive future. *Geogr. Compass* 2019, 13, e12423. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

61. Klein, K.L. A vertical world: The eastern Alps and modern mountaineering. *J. Hist. Sociol.* 2011, 24, 519–548.

62. Allen-Collinson, J.; Crust, L.; Swann, C. Embodiment in high-altitude mountaineering: Sensing and working with the weather. *Body Soc.* 2019, 25, 90–115. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

63. Bahaeloo-Horeh, S.; Assari, S. Students experience self-esteem improvement during mountaineering. *Wilderness Environ. Med.* 2008, 19, 181–185. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef] [PubMed]

64. Bott, E. Big mountain, big name: Globalised relations of risk in Himalayan mountaineering. *J. Tour. Cult. Chang.* 2009, 7, 287–301. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

65. Clarke, C. Endeavour, altitude and risk: Reflections on a lifetime of mountaineering and exploration. *J. Med. Biogr.* 2012, 20, 130–135. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

66. Crust, L. Personality and mountaineering: A critical review and directions for future research. *Personal. Individ. Differ.* 2020, 163, 110073. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

67. Duits, R. Mountaineering, Myth and the Meaning of Life: Psychoanalysing alpinism. *J. Philos. Sport* 2020, 47, 33–48. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

68. Faullant, R.; Matzler, K.; Mooradian, T.A. Personality, basic emotions, and satisfaction: Primary emotions in the mountaineering experience. *Tour. Manag.* 2011, 32, 1423–1430. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

69. Gugglberger, M. Wanda Rutkiewicz—crossing boundaries in women’s mountaineering. *Sport Soc.* 2017, 20, 1059–1076. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

70. Loewenstein, G. Because it is there: The challenge of mountaineering... for utility theory. *Kyklos* 1999, 52, 315–343. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

71. Pomfret, G. Mountaineering adventure tourists: A conceptual framework for research. *Tour. Manag.* 2006, 27, 113–123. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

72. Cullen, R. Himalayan mountaineering expedition garbage. *Environ. Conserv.* 1986, 13, 293–297. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

73. Purdie, H.; Kerr, T. Aoraki Mount Cook: Environmental change on an iconic mountaineering route. *Mt. Res. Dev.* 2018, 38, 364–379.

74. Karg, N.; Dorscht, L.; Kornhuber, J.; Luttenberger, K. Bouldering psychotherapy is more effective in the treatment of depression than physical exercise alone: Results of a multicentre randomised controlled intervention study. *BMC Psychiatry* 2020, 20, 116. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef] [PubMed]

75. Medernach, J.P.J.; Kleinöder, H.; Lötzerich, H.H.H. Fingerboard in competitive bouldering: Training effects on grip strength and endurance. *J. Strength Cond. Res.* 2015, 29, 2286–2295. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

76. Schwarz, L.; Dorscht, L.; Book, S.; Stelzer, E.-M.; Kornhuber, J.; Luttenberger, K. Long-term effects of bouldering psychotherapy on depression: Benefits can be maintained across a 12-month follow-up. *Heliyon* 2019, 5, e02929.

77. Ness, S.A. Bouldering in Yosemite: Emergent signs of place and landscape. *Am. Anthropol.* 2011, 113, 71–87.

78. Tessler, M.; Clark, T.A. The impact of bouldering on rock-associated vegetation. *Biol. Conserv.* 2016, 204, 426–433. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

79. Van der Merwe, J.H.; Joubert, U. Managing environmental impact of bouldering as a niche outdoor-climbing activity. *South Afr. J. Res. Sport Phys. Educ. Recreat.* 2014, 36, 229–251.

80. Ruban, D.A. Finding coastal Megaclast deposits: A virtual perspective. *J. Mar. Sci. Eng.* 2020, 8, 164.

81. Hardiman, N.; Burgin, S. Canyoning adventure recreation in the Blue Mountains World Heritage Area (Australia): The canyoneers and canyoning trends over the last decade. *Tour. Manag.* 2011, 32, 1324–1331. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

82. Perrin, C.; Mounet, J. L’insertion de l’offre de canyoning dans l’industrie touristique: Une étude comparative entre le massif des Bauges et le Vercors. *Loisir Soc.* 2004, 27, 143–172. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

83. Perrin, C.; Mounet, J.-P. The sporting organization of canyoneering at one location: The Furon canyon. *Sci. Mot.* 2006, 57, 79–103. [Google Scholar]

84. Suchet, A.; Jorand, D. Les usagers des parcours naturels de canyoning et de la structure artificielle canyoning park (France): Une approche socio-culturelle. *Loisir Soc.* 2007, 30, 417–441.

[Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

85. Ballesteros Peña, S. Evaluation of adherence to safety practices in the practice of canyoning in Sierra de Guara (Huesca, Spain). *Arch. Med. Deporte* 2013, 30, 91–95. [Google Scholar]
86. Brandão, A.; Marques, A.N.A.; Pereira, J.; Coelho, E.; Quaresma, L. Development of a tool to analyze risk perception in canyoning using a delphi technique. *J. Phys. Educ. Sport* 2018, 18, 1028–1034. [Google Scholar]
87. Magadan-Díaz, M.; Rivas-García, J. Sustainable tourism in mountain protected areas of asturias: An analysis from tourists' perceptions and profiles. *Sustain. Dev. Mt. Territ.* 2019, 11, 459–474. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
88. Maikhuri, R.K.; Rana, U.; Rao, K.S.; Nautiyal, S.; Saxena, K.G. Promoting ecotourism in the buffer zone areas of Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve: An option to resolve people—policy conflict. *Int. J. Sustain. Dev. World Ecol.* 2000, 7, 333–342. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
89. Peršolja, B. Mountaineering, not hillwalking. *Geogr. Obz.* 2017, 64, 4–9. [Google Scholar]
90. Erhard, A. Mt. Kenya—Observations of mountaineering tourism and its economic benefits. *Erde* 2000, 131, 161–177. [Google Scholar]
91. Johnston, B.R.; Edwards, T. The commodification of mountaineering. *Ann. Tour. Res.* 1994, 21, 459–478. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
92. Steinicke, E.; Neuburger, M. The impact of community-based afro-alpine tourism on regional development. *Mountain Res. Dev.* 2012, 32, 420–430.

Retrieved from <https://encyclopedia.pub/entry/history/show/2849>