in England. Stakeholders have, however, been excluded from subsequent discussions on management and implementation of the areas and initial research suggests they have become disenfranchised and uncertain of the future. Q methodology provides a novel, semi-quantitative approach to revealing stakeholder perspectives in this area and was used to assess current perceptions and acceptance of MPAs in the Devon & Severn region, south-west England. Q surveys were conducted with stakeholders that were actively involved in, or knowledgeable about the MCZ process (n = 24) where they sorted 42 statements into a fixed frequency distribution ranging from those ‘least like they think’ to those ‘most like they think’. Centroid analysis revealed 3 factors for interpretation: (1) Pro-conservation, characterised by views that conservation should be prioritised; (2) Pro-fisheries, characterised by concerns that we already have protected areas in place without fully developed management plans and we need to be certain that they work before implementing more; and (3) ‘win-win’, characterised by a belief that MPAs can meet both fisheries and conservation objectives. Use of the method was successful, with stakeholders who have already been heavily involved with research expressing interest in it compared to more traditional survey techniques, suggesting it could help in cases of stakeholder fatigue. Full methods and results will be presented, along with the implications of the research for management and policy.

Stephenson has suggested that Q method is of particular relevance for investigating individuals’ subjectivity on a single case basis. Nevertheless this methodologi-
cal option is not the most widely implemented in social sciences research. The point we are going to make in this paper is that single cases analysis can be as rich as multi-case analysis. The empirical investigation focuses on the use/non-use of mobile services, particularly those available on mobile phones or on small tablets. We contrast the results obtained on two individuals: one is reluctant to use mobile services on her mobile phone and the other would hardly live without his phone. By choosing two opposite cases, and developing appropriate conditions of instruction, we can picture a nuanced view of mobile services appropriation. In the domain of technology use and acceptation, Brangier et alii (2010) suggest that two main research traditions coexist: the operational acceptation tradition and the social acceptation tradition. While the first tradition insists builds upon ergonomics where the usability, ergonomic criteria and model of interaction are central, the second traditional pinpoints the role of social processes that underlie the introduction, creation, use, misuse and abandon of technologies. All these approaches are relevant in the case of mobile services. A complimentary stance is offered by studies dedicated to the digital divide that promote research efforts to technology non-use. A growing attention to technology non-adoption and non-use is now emerging. Mobile services represent a growing part of our daily life as it applies to many sectors: education, health, government, companies, and individuals. Yet, research dedicated to mobile internet and services is still scattered (Gerpott and Thomas, 2014). The need for a research initiative that would embrace both use and non-use attitudes and behaviours appears clearly. The present research intends
to document both facets by using the single case study approach. The research design explores the subjectivity of one non-user of mobile services and mobile internet and the subjectivity of one heavy user. Both participants were submitted to the same 9 conditions of instruction. The conditions of instruction were elaborated in order to reflect the diversity of mobile services and to gather projective opinion. The q-sample is based on 29 statements. The contrasting analysis is based on two separate q-factor analysis. For both cases, three distinct factors are extracted. The heavy user’s subjectivity is structured around three dimensions. The first one reflects his vision of mobile services and technologies, the ex-ante and ex-post opinion are on the same factor meaning that the person holds a stable view. In this view, pre-visualisation services, Google glass and future generation are present. For the non-user the personal vision is associated with qr-codes and Google glass. The second view of the heavy user is strictly associated with m-payment, just as for the non-user. The third view of the heavy-user is associated with qr-codes. The non-user has a bipolar factor that opposes future generations’ vision to the parents’one. The meaning of each factor will be presented in the full version of the paper.

This paper attends to and addresses the relationship between Q methodology and the current discourse within the interpretive human sciences with a focus on the cultural dimension in communication studies. While Q shares some intellectual affinity with the so-called linguistic/cultural turn, fundamental epistemological and ontological departures position the subjective
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