ONLY "REAL DIVERS" USE NEW YORK'S GREAT LAKES[1]

Sharon L. Todd
Assistant Professor, Recreation & Leisure Studies,
SUNY Cortland, P.O. Box 2000,
Cortland, NY 13045.

Abstract: Great Lakes divers pride themselves in being hardy, tough, and robust in order to dive under innately challenging environmental conditions, suggests qualitative focus group data collected from New York SCUBA divers. Since Great Lakes participants tend to dive in both fresh and saltwater, dive three or four seasons a year, belong to dive clubs, and subscribe to dive magazines more often than other divers, it was hypothesized that these segments of divers would report lower degrees of constraints. In 1999, a total of 869 New York State divers returned mail surveys (37% response rate). Divers with Great Lakes experience did report significantly lower constraint levels for 7 of 11 factors than divers who had not used these lakes. All other hypothesized relationships were also supported; divers using both fresh and saltwater tended to experience constraints to a lower degree (differing significantly on 6 factors), as did year-round divers (10 factors), dive club members (6 factors), and magazine subscribers (7 factors), with one exception: magazine subscribers experienced higher degrees of constraint for conflict with other users. These results suggest that Great Lakes divers are able to negotiate perceived constraints more successfully than other types of divers, supporting the notion that they are a hardier and more robust "breed." In addition, dive clubs and magazines also seem to be associated with lower levels of constraint, suggesting their socializing, supportive, and educational influence on divers.

[1] This paper is the result of research funded by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration award #NA46RG0090 to the Research Foundation of State University of New York for New York Sea Grant. The U.S. Government is authorized to produce and distribute reprints for governmental purposes notwithstanding any copyright notation that may appear hereon. The views expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of NOAA or any of its sub-agencies.

Introduction

Self-Contained Underwater Breathing Apparatus (SCUBA) divers, tourism professionals, and community developers are concerned with the use of New York's Great Lakes, where increased interest in diving has been credited to the presence of well-preserved shipwrecks and better water clarity. However, a number of factors may be inhibiting, limiting, or causing divers to cease participation. As viewed by Crawford, Jackson, and Godbey (1991), these leisure constraints can be hierarchically arranged at different levels (intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural). Although constraints potentially affect leisure preferences and participation, they can be overcome or reduced; in theory, one level must be absent or negotiated before the next is faced.

In previous work, Todd and Graefe (2000) established a relationship between level of diving development and perceived constraints. First, Todd (2000) combined two theories (Bryan's 1979 theory of specialization, and Stebbins' 1992 concept of "serious leisure" and amateur/professional growth) to operationalize level of development as a single measure. A curvilinear relationship was established between a self-selected category and seven key variables. Mean index scores for equipment owned, knowledge, experience level, perceived skill, frequency of participation, commitment, and amateur/professional growth tended to increase from beginners to experts and then decrease for post-experts. Todd and Graefe (2000) then established a second curvilinear relationship: the mean degree and number of perceived constraints was highest for beginner SCUBA divers, steadily declined to experts, and then increased again for post-experts.

Diving inherently presents constraints related to intrapersonal physical health (e.g., strength to carry heavy specialized gear), the interpersonal necessity for partners (e.g., a diving buddy), and structural training (e.g., certification). Additionally, the Great Lakes innately lack warm water temperatures, tropical views of colorful reefs or exotic fish, and easy access. In fact, qualitative data collected from six focus groups of New York Great Lakes Region divers suggest that Great Lakes divers pride themselves in being hardy, tough, and robust in order to dive under such conditions. One diver noted that a very small

percentage of people actually stay diving in the Northeast. "Down in Florida, dive shops are in every shopping mall. Here you've got to be more interested in it, have more dedication, to overcome the lack of ease to dive. Here you get cold, dirty water and shorter seasons; you could dig a hole in the ice, but you've really got to be dedicated!" In addition, an observer recorded the following: "These particular divers seemed to pride themselves on being hearty. Divers here also don't seem to be as timid personality-wise as those who dive only in the Caribbean. One diver, referring to diving in the Caribbean, asked, 'If it was that much easier, would we want to do it?' He believes there is a real attraction to the risk, difficulty, thrill and challenge of diving here in the North." Another diver summed it up by noting that resort divers (characterized as traveling to the Bahamas or the Caribbean to dive once or twice a year) are just not "real" divers.

Also touted by key informants was the influence of socializing structures (e.g., dive clubs and magazines) to help divers overcome various constraints. Focus group data included the following observations and direct quotes: After 5 to 20 dives, a diver is competent. This is where the industry fails people: there are no programs after the initial certification. There is where clubs fit in, by offering advanced courses and certifications to overcome basic skills. "You develop to a certain point and then you're ready to move on." The club helps hone skills and investigate other areas. Shops offer courses, but clubs offer opportunities for trips to let you "get wet and see what's out there." In order to keep developing, you need to stay involved with an organization. Development "fizzles" when you can't get a group together to go with, can't find a place to go, can't get organized about what to dive for, etc.

In a related study, Todd and Graefe (2002) examined differences in environmental beliefs, ascriptions of responsibility, and management preferences for underwater cultural resources among various groups of SCUBA divers. They found that segmenting divers based on type of water (salt versus freshwater), previous diving experience in New York's Great Lakes, dive club membership, and dive magazine subscription revealed different sensitivities to environmental beliefs and management preferences. Specifically,

Table 1. — Chi-square results: Level of development by previous diving experience in New York's Great Lakes.

Count Column %	Has Gone Diving in NY's Great Lakes during Lifetime		Row Total
	Yes	No	
Beginner	60 (11.7)	138 (41.3)	198 (23.4)
Intermediate	143 (27.9)	124 (37.1)	267 (31.5)
Advanced	193 (37.6)	57 (17.1)	250 (29.5)
Expert	72 (14.0)	5 (1.5)	77 (9.1)
Post-expert	45 (8.8)	10 (3.0)	55 (6.5)
Column Total	513 (60.6)	334 (39.4)	847 (100.0)

Number of missing observations: 22
Chi-square = 155.76 (p<.001)

Table 2. — Chi-square results: Type of water by previous diving experience in New York's Great Lakes.

Count Column %	Has Gone Diving in NY's Great Lakes during Lifetime		Row Total
	Yes	No	
Freshwater Only	117 (22.5)	85 (26.4)	202 (24.0)
Saltwater Only		69 (21.4)	69 (8.2)
Both Fresh & Saltwater	403 (77.5)	168 (52.2)	571 (67.8)
Column Total	520 (61.8)	322 (38.2)	842 (100.0)

Number of missing observations: 27
Chi-square = 131.50 (p<.001)

saltwater divers tended to be significantly more environmentally conscious and supportive of invasive management actions; divers who had used New York's Great Lakes were more critical of government support, less environmentally conscious, and less supportive of invasive management actions; and dive club members and dive magazine subscribers held stronger beliefs about governmental management of underwater resources.

Table 3. — Chi-square results: Number of seasons by previous diving experience in New York's Great Lakes.

Count / Column %		Has Gone Diving in NY's Great Lakes during Lifetime: Yes	Has Gone Diving in NY's Great Lakes during Lifetime: No	Row Total
Number of Seasons Gone Diving in Typical Year	1	142 (27.6)	191 (58.6)	333 (39.6)
	2	99 (19.2)	77 (23.6)	176 (20.9)
	3	152 (29.5)	33 (10.1)	185 (22.0)
	4	122 (23.7)	25 (7.7)	147 (17.5)
Column Total		515 (61.2)	326 (38.8)	841 (100.0)

Number of missing observations: 28
Chi-square = 113.79 (p<.001)

Therefore, based on previous research and focus group comments, the purpose of this study was to investigate whether various types of divers differed significantly in terms of their levels of perceived constraints. Specifically, divers who had gone diving in New York's Great Lakes were compared to those who did not have previous experience in these bodies of water. In contrast to other divers, it was found that Great Lakes participants were more likely to have reached higher levels of development (38% advanced, 14% expert, and 9% post-expert compared to just 17%, 2% and 3% in the same respective categories for non-Great Lakes divers - see Table 1), dive in both fresh and saltwater (Table 2), dive three or four seasons a year (Table 3), belong to dive clubs (Table 4), and subscribe to dive magazines more often (Table 5).

However, since New York's Great Lakes divers were not exclusive to these categories, perceived constraints were also compared among those segments of divers. It was hypothesized that divers who are New York's Great Lakes-experienced, use both fresh and saltwater, dive four seasons, are club members and magazine subscribers would report experiencing lower degrees of constraints than other divers.

Methods

Data were gathered using two methods: focus group interviews and a mail survey. In June 1999,

Table 4. — Chi-square results: Club membership by previous diving experience in New York's Great Lakes.

Count / Column %		Has Gone Diving in NY's Great Lakes during Lifetime: Yes	Has Gone Diving in NY's Great Lakes during Lifetime: No	Row Total
Currently Member of Dive Club(s)	Yes	199 (38.9)	57 (17.2)	256 (30.4)
	No	313 (61.1)	274 (82.8)	587 (69.6)
Column Total		512 (60.7)	331 (39.3)	843 (100.0)

Number of missing observations: 26
Chi-square = 44.55 (p<.001)

Table 5. — Chi-square results: Magazine subscription by previous diving experience in New York's Great Lakes.

Count / Column %		Has Gone Diving in NY's Great Lakes during Lifetime: Yes	Has Gone Diving in NY's Great Lakes during Lifetime: No	Row Total
Currently Subscribes to Dive Magazine(s)	Yes	245 (47.6)	101 (30.9)	346 (41.1)
	No	270 (52.4)	226 (69.1)	496 (58.9)
Column Total		515 (61.2)	327 (38.8)	842 (100.0)

Number of missing observations: 27
Chi-square = 23.00 (p<.001)

six focus groups were interviewed in five locations across New York's Great Lakes Region: Buffalo/ Niagara Falls, Rochester, Syracuse, Oswego, and Clayton (2 groups). At each location, a key informant assembled 4 to 12 divers representing a wide range of levels of diving development. Using an established protocol, a series of six questions was asked; resulting discussion (lasting approximately 90 minutes) was tape-recorded. Major themes were extracted from this data to aid in the development of a written questionnaire, containing sections measuring diving experience, self-evaluation, diving motivations, diving in the previous year, constraining factors, diving expenditures, underwater environmental concerns, diving socialization, and demographic information.

Table 6. — Results of factor analysis of constraint items (principal components extraction, varimax rotation).

CONSTRAINT CATEGORY • Factor Name *Sample Items*	Total Number of Items	Eigen value	Proportion of Variance Explained	Mean Scale Importance Score1	Cronbach's Alpha
INTRAPERSONAL CONSTRAINT FACTORS	14		29.2%		
• Personal discomfort *Uncomfortable in the water and/or diving* *Lack of confidence, skill, knowledge, and/or experience* *Claustrophobia, fear, panic, and/or disorientation*	7	12.31	23.2%	1.42	.88
• Health problems *Health problems (asthma, diabetes, eyesight, ringing in ears)* *Age (too old)* *Lack of physical strength, stamina, conditioning*	6	2.08	3.9%	1.45	.81
• Burnout	1	1.13	2.1%	1.38	--
INTERPERSONAL CONSTRAINT FACTORS	11		9.8%		
• Conflict with other users *Interference from boaters/jetskiers* *Interference from fishermen* *Dive sites too crowded with other divers*	4	2.54	4.8%	2.55	.87
• Dive partner interference *Uncomfortable with dive buddy's behavior or skill* *Instructor's use of poor teaching techniques* *Can't find people to dive with*	4	1.36	2.6%	1.94	.73
• Family interference *Lack of on-site activities for non-diving spouses/children* *Lack of support/approval from family and/or friends* *Family obligations*	3	1.28	2.4%	2.53	.74
STRUCTURAL CONSTRAINT FACTORS	25		31.7%		
• Accessibility *Lack of/cost of charter boats* *Lack of shore diving access* *Fees (entrance, docking, launching)*	8	4.21	8.0%	2.29	.84
• Water/weather conditions *Poor visibility/water clarity* *Currents and/or tides* *Bad weather (chop, wind, cloudy/overcast)*	5	2.88	5.4%	2.68	.85
• Lack of attractive features *Lack of shipwrecks in water depths I'm comfortable diving in* *Lack of pristine/protected dive sites* *Lack of interesting natural features (rock formations, fish)*	4	1.94	3.7%	2.30	.84
• Equipment issues *Equipment not working/in need of repair* *Cost of purchasing/renting equipment* *Equipment doesn't fit comfortably, is too heavy, or is bulky*	5	1.77	3.3%	1.93	.73
• Lack of time *Lack of free time* *Other hobbies/recreation/leisure activities* *Paid employment obligations*	3	1.18	2.2%	3.62	.51

[1] Values are mean scores on a 7-point scale ranging from does not hinder me at all (1) to stops me completely (7).

Table 7. — Constraint factors analyzed by New York's Great Lakes experience.

		Has Gone Diving in NY's Great Lakes during Lifetime		
Factor(n=842)	Total (n=520)	Yes (n=349)	No t-value[1]	
INTRAPERSONAL CONSTRAINTS	1.43	1.36	1.55	4.17**
Personal discomfort	1.43	1.32	1.58	4.98**
Health problems	1.44	1.39	1.54	2.53*
Burnout	1.38	1.37	1.41	0.57
INTERPERSONAL CONSTRAINTS	2.32	2.29	2.37	1.12
Family interference	2.53	2.51	2.55	0.39
Dive partner interference	1.95	1.80	2.15	4.50**
Conflict with other users	2.53	2.61	2.46	1.41
STRUCTURAL CONSTRAINTS	2.47	2.31	2.69	6.14**
Accessibility	2.30	2.21	2.42	2.41*
Water/weather conditions	2.69	2.43	3.07	6.69**
Lack of attractive features	2.31	2.19	2.47	2.96**
Equipment issues	1.94	1.71	2.27	7.43**
Lack of time	3.62	3.56	3.71	1.64

Values are mean scores on a 7-point scale ranging from does not hinder me at all (1) to stops me completely (7).

[1] t-values are a result of independent t-tests (*p<.05, **p<.01).

This 16-page questionnaire was then mailed to a sample of 2850 New York State divers. To generate this sample, a database of approximately 6700 addresses was complied from various sources, including a national certifying, a statewide organization, a dive symposium, a dive shop, a non-profit organization, and four dive clubs. Addresses were stratified by major regions across the state. Since primary emphasis from the funding agency (New York Sea Grant Institute) was placed on contacting divers closest to the Great Lakes, all names from some regions were included, while a random selection process was used for other regions. The first mailing took place in October 1999, followed at two-week intervals by reminder postcards and a second survey mailing to non-respondents.

For purposes of this study, respondents were asked to rank 53 diving-related constraints on a 7-point scale ranging from does not hinder me at all (1) to stops me completely (7). In previous work, factor analysis (principal components method of extraction, varimax rotation) reduced 50 of these constraints into 11 factors (explaining 62% of the variance and having acceptably high Cronbach's alpha scale reliabilities). As shown in Table 6, three of these factors were intrapersonal in nature: personal discomfort (containing 7 items), health problems (6), and burnout (1); three factors were interpersonal: conflict with other users (4), dive partner interference (4), and family interference (3); and five factors were structural: accessibility (8), water/weather conditions (5), lack of attractive features (4), equipment issues (5), and lack of time (3). Three individual items were dropped from subsequent analysis due to low factor loadings and lack of congruity/reliability with emerging themes.

For independent variables, previous experience diving in New York's Great Lakes (an area operationally defined as the two Great Lakes that border New York State: Erie and Ontario, plus the two rivers that feed into them: the Niagara and St. Lawrence) was dichotomously coded as "yes" or "no." The variable type of water was created by recoding where respondents had gone diving during their lifetimes into three categories: freshwater only, saltwater only, or both fresh and saltwater. Respondents were also asked to identify which seasons they dive during a typical year; counts resulted in categories ranging from one to four seasons. Both current memberships in dive clubs and current subscriptions to dive magazines were also dichotomously coded ("yes" or "no").

One-way analysis of variance was used to determine if a difference existed among mean scores for each constraint factor by type of water as well as by number of seasons.

To compare the differences between mean scores for each pair of diver categories or segments, Tukey's Honestly Significant Differences (HSD)

Table 8. — Constraint factors analyzed by type of water.

Factor	Total only (n=202)	Type of Water Gone Diving in during Lifetime: Freshwater only (n=69)	Saltwater (n=571)	Both waters (n=842)	F-value[1]	# of differences detected
INTRAPERSONAL CONSTRAINTS	1.43	1.54a	1.50ab	1.39b	4.07*	1
Personal discomfort	1.43	1.60a	1.52ab	1.35b	8.61**	1
Health problems	1.44	1.47	1.53	1.43	0.60	n.s.
Burnout	1.38	1.41	1.24	1.39	0.98	n.s.
INTERPERSONAL CONSTRAINTS	2.32	2.44	2.23	2.28	2.30	n.s.
Family interference	2.53	2.61	2.55	2.51	0.42	n.s.
Dive partner interference	1.95	2.21a	1.92ab	1.83b	9.06**	1
Conflict with other users	2.53	2.53	2.32	2.57	0.86	n.s.
STRUCTURAL CONSTRAINTS	2.47	2.51ab	2.76a	2.40b	5.82**	1
Accessibility	2.30	2.34	2.41	2.25	0.79	n.s.
Water/weather conditions	2.69	2.50a	3.54b	2.64a	15.21**	2
Lack of attractive features	2.31	2.14a	2.67b	2.31ab	3.79	1
Equipment issues	1.94	2.34a	2.10a	1.76b	23.37**	2
Lack of time	3.62	3.81a	3.54ab	3.56b	3.01*	1

Values are mean scores on a 7-point scale ranging from does not hinder me at all (1) to stops me completely (7).

[1] F-values are a result of one-way analysis of variance (*p<.05, **p<.01); means with different superscripts are significantly different at the .05 level using Tukey-HSD post hoc test.

Table 9. — Constraint factors analyzed by number of seasons.

Factor	Total (n=842)	Number of Seasons Gone Diving during Typical Year: One (n=327)	Two (n=172)	Three (n=180)	Four (n=143)	F-value[1]	# of differences detected
INTRAPERSONAL CONSTRAINTS	1.43	1.54a	1.50a	1.30b	1.24b	10.19**	4
Personal discomfort	1.43	1.58a	1.48ab	1.27b	1.15c	14.69**	3
Health problems	1.44	1.51ab	1.55a	1.33bc	1.30c	4.72**	3
Burnout	1.38	1.39	1.39	1.35	1.40	0.11	n.s.
INTERPERSONAL CONSTRAINTS	2.32	2.39a	2.39a	2.40a	2.03b	5.44**	3
Family interference	2.53	2.65a	2.48ab	2.64a	2.23b	3.36*	2
Dive partner interference	1.95	2.10a	2.11a	1.80b	1.55b	10.83**	4
Conflict with other users	2.53	2.48ab	2.59ab	2.82a	2.36b	3.04*	1
STRUCTURAL CONSTRAINTS	2.47	2.67a	2.65a	2.33b	1.93c	31.09**	5
Accessibility	2.30	2.37a	2.49a	2.30a	1.85b	8.55**	3
Water/weather conditions	2.69	3.05a	2.95a	2.42b	1.89c	30.26**	5
Lack of attractive features	2.31	2.52a	2.48ab	2.18bc	1.80c	10.83**	3
Equipment issues	1.94	2.24a	2.07a	1.67b	1.36c	29.98**	5
Lack of time	3.62	3.73a	3.83a	3.53ab	3.28b	5.89**	2

Values are mean scores on a 7-point scale ranging from does not hinder me at all (1) to stops me completely (7).

[1] F-values are a result of one-way analysis of variance (*p<.05, **p<.01); means with different superscripts are significantly different at the .05 level using Tukey-HSD post hoc test.

was used as a post hoc test if the F-value was significant ($p < .05$). Independent t-tests were used to compare mean scores of each constraint factor for the dichotomous categories of previous New York's Great Lakes diving experience, club membership, and magazine subscription.

Results

By January 2000, 869 of 2360 deliverable surveys were returned for a 37% response rate. A non-respondent bias check conducted by phone revealed that non-respondents did not differ significantly in level of development, number of

Table 10. — Constraint factors analyzed by dive club membership and dive magazine subscription.

Factor	Total (n=842)	Currently Belongs to Any Dive Clubs/Organizations: Yes (n=256)	No (n=587)	t-value[1]	Currently Subscribes to Any Dive Magazines: Yes (n=346)	No (n=496)	t-value[1]
INTRAPERSONAL CONSTRAINTS	1.43	1.35	1.47	2.38*	1.31	1.52	4.40**
Personal discomfort	1.43	1.31	1.47	2.71**	1.29	1.52	4.21**
Health problems	1.44	1.39	1.47	1.28	1.33	1.52	3.39**
Burnout	1.38	1.32	1.41	1.29	1.31	1.43	1.77
INTERPERSONAL CONSTRAINTS	2.32	2.27	2.34	0.93	2.30	2.33	0.55
Family interference	2.53	2.48	2.55	0.67	2.40	2.62	2.21*
Dive partner interference	1.95	1.70	2.04	4.15**	1.80	2.05	3.20**
Conflict with other users	2.53	2.68	2.48	1.77	2.72	2.42	2.90**
STRUCTURAL CONSTRAINTS	2.47	2.23	2.55	4.86**	2.33	2.54	3.27**
Accessibility	2.30	2.08	2.38	3.26**	2.24	2.31	0.90
Water/weather conditions	2.69	2.50	2.75	2.39*	2.58	2.73	1.48
Lack of attractive features	2.31	2.03	2.41	3.74**	2.30	2.29	0.02
Equipment issues	1.94	1.57	2.08	6.31**	1.57	2.17	8.01**
Lack of time	3.62	3.54	3.65	1.17	3.42	3.75	3.56**

Values are mean scores on a 7-point scale ranging from does not hinder me at all (1) to stops me completely (7).

[1] t-values are a result of independent t-tests (*p<.05, **p<.01).

years spent diving, education level, age, or gender; however, significantly fewer non-respondents than respondents were certified or active divers.

While 80% of the respondents were male, the average diver was 43 years old, highly educated (i.e., 75% had attended college), and fairly affluent (i.e., 50% earned at least $60,000 in household income). Nearly 60% of the respondents had gone diving in New York's Great Lakes during their lifetimes. While only 8% of the respondents dove in saltwater only, one-quarter were freshwater divers only, and two-thirds had used both environments. Although 40% typically dove just one season per year, the other 60% were approximately equally distributed among two (21%), three (22%), and four seasons (17%). Only 30% belonged to dive clubs, and 40% subscribed to at least one dive magazine. However, as previously noted, divers with New York's Great Lakes experience were significantly more likely to dive in both fresh and saltwater than other divers (78% vs. 52% - refer back to Table 2), dive during three or four seasons a year (53% vs. 17% - Table 3), belong to dive clubs (40% vs. 17% - Table 4), and subscribe to dive magazines (48% vs. 31% - Table 5).

When examining descriptive statistics of the dependent variables, constraint scores were found to be generally low on the 7-point scale, averaging just 1.4 for all intrapersonal constraints, 2.3 for interpersonal constraints, and 2.5 for structural constraints. As shown in Table 7, however, divers with Great Lakes experience reported significantly lower constraint levels for 7 of the 11 factors than divers who had not used these lakes.

Hypothesized relationships were supported by all other analysis as well. When compared by type of water, divers differed significantly on 6 of the 11 constraint factors. Although results varied, divers using both fresh and saltwater tended to experience constraints to a lower degree than freshwater-only or saltwater-only divers (Table 8). Freshwater-only divers recorded significantly higher mean scores for four factors (personal discomfort, dive partner interference, equipment issues, and lack of time), while saltwater-only divers (who perhaps qualified as "vacation-only" or "resort divers," previously referred to as not "real" divers by focus group members) yielded significantly higher scores for water/weather conditions and lack of attractive features.

The most discriminating variable was number of seasons, where year-round divers recorded the lowest levels of constraints for 10 of the 11 factors (see Table 9). Dive club members and magazine subscribers also reported lower constraints than non-members and non-subscribers for 6 and 7 factors, respectively, with one exception: magazine subscribers experienced higher degrees of constraint for conflict with other users (Table 10).

It is interesting to note that one factor, burnout, never differed among any diver segments and was consistently rated low among all divers. On the other hand, the three factors labeled personal discomfort, dive partner interference, and equipment issues were the most sensitive constraints; diver segments differed significantly on these factors across all analysis (Great Lakes experience, type of water, number of seasons, club membership, and magazine subscription).

Conclusions and Implications

These results suggest that Great Lakes divers (who tend to use both fresh and saltwater, dive four seasons, are club members and magazine subscribers more so than other divers) are able to negotiate perceived constraints more successfully than non-Great Lakes divers. Thus, the notion that Great Lakes divers are a hardier and more robust "breed" is supported. In addition, dive clubs and magazines also seem to be associated with lower levels of constraint, suggesting their socializing, supportive, and educational influence on divers. Interestingly, conflict-related constraint is the only exception. Magazine subscribers rate this constraint significantly higher, suggesting that this particular medium could be communicating or educating divers in a way that propagates negative perceptions of boaters, jetskiers, fishermen, and high concentrations of other divers.

These results could help important socializing agents (e.g., dive shop owners, instructors, club organizers, dive magazine editors, charter boat operators, tourism and community planners and developers) identify various segments of divers who could benefit most from possible strategies to adapt or overcome various structural, interpersonal, and intrapersonal constraints. By doing so, all participants' experiences, progress, and growth in diving could be facilitated. However, if marketing the Great Lakes to new users is a goal, socializing agents need to remember that these divers may need to be "toughened up" since, after all, only "real" divers use New York's Great Lakes!

References

Bryan, H. (1979). Conflict in the great outdoors (Bureau of Public Administration Sociological Studies No. 4). Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama.

Crawford, D., Jackson, E., & Godbey, G. (1991). A hierarchical model of leisure constraints. Leisure Sciences, 13, 309-320.

Stebbins, R. A. (1992). Amateurs, professionals, and serious leisure. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Todd, S. L. (2000). SCUBA diving in New York's Great Lakes: From novice to professional (New York Sea Grant Institute Completion Report). Cortland: Department of Recreation & Leisure Studies, SUNY Cortland.

Todd, S. L., & Graefe, A. R. (2000). SCUBA diving in New York's Great Lakes: The relationship between level of development and perceived constraints. In Book of abstracts: 8th International Symposium on Society and Resource Management (Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-497, p. 315). Portland, OR: USDA, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station.

Todd, S. L., & Graefe, A. R. (2002). Environmental beliefs, ascriptions of responsibility, and management preferences for underwater cultural resources: Differences among segments of SCUBA divers. In Book of abstracts: Global Challenges of Parks and Protected Area Management Symposium (p. 76). Fort Collins: Colorado State University.

Pages 211-218 in:

Murdy, James, comp., ed. 2004. **Proceedings of the 2003 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium**. Gen. Tech. Rep. NE-317. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Research Station. 459 p.

Contains articles presented at the 2003 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium. Contents cover planning issues, communications and information, management presentations, service quality and outdoor recreation, recreation behavior, founders' forum, featured posters, tourism and the community, specialized recreation, recreation and the community, management issues in outdoor recreation, meanings and places, constraints, modeling, recreation users, water-based recreation, and recreation marketing.

Published by:

USDA FOREST SERVICE
11 CAMPUS BLVD SUITE 200
NEWTOWN SQUARE PA 19073-3294

July 2004

For additional copies:

USDA Forest Service
Publications Distribution
359 Main Road
Delaware, OH 43015-8640
Fax: (740)368-0152

Visit our homepage at: **http://www.fs.fed.us/ne**