

Beyond the Dockyards: Changing Narratives of Industrial Occupational Cultures in Medway



Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

School of Social Policy, Sociology and Social Research

University of Kent

90,340 words

Emma Pleasant

Abstract

In 1984, Chatham Dockyard in the Medway Towns closed, displacing over 7,000 local workers. Industrial workplaces like the Dockyard, were sheltered spaces for generations of the working-class where they could perform their inherited classed and gendered identities within a sphere that legitimised and encouraged them. When industries closed, the opportunities to develop a craft-based identity lessened. Working class communities, identities and cultures are systematically 'devalued' in normative discourses (Skeggs, 1997; 2004; 2011 Sayer, 2005; Lawler, 2005). In response, working-class people will revalue the spheres that exclude them and forge their own cultural spaces where their identities and norms are 'valued'. One of the many places where this process occurs is in the workplace. In this thesis I explore how deindustrialisation dismantled workplaces like Chatham Dockyard which were protective spaces for working-class 'value' to be reproduced. Based upon forty-six oral history interviews with former workers of Chatham Dockyard and their counterparts undertaking industrial apprenticeships post-closure, this thesis examines the shift in discourses of 'value' altered by deindustrialisation. Predominantly, how these discourses are created, shared and changed in apprenticeships. I show how industrial learning once taught workers the boundaries of respectability in the workplace, and how inherited classed and gendered identities were nurtured as apprentices were moulded into working-class, male craft workers. Today, young people undertaking industrial apprenticeships face a more liminal landscape to their learning marked by precarity and the devaluation of the cultural identity once legitimised through now lost forms of work. I argue that the transformation of apprenticeships in these circumstances enables us to see the manifestation of the 'half-life' of deindustrialisation; the connecting thread and gradual changes that mark the transformation of the industrial past into deindustrial present (Linkon, 2018). By mapping the industrial apprenticeship across pre- and post-closure, I show that industrial cultures still exist and recreate value. Therefore, workplace socialisation and apprenticeships remain important battlegrounds for what becomes 'valued' through working identities.

Acknowledgements and Dedications

This thesis is dedicated to the late Richard Boorman C.Eng., MIMechE. He was a wonderful friend and mentor.



I would also like to thank all the men and women of Chatham Dockyard who shared their stories and expertise with me. As well as the staff and apprentices of Adams, Gillingham and IPS, Chatham who allowed me to disturb their workdays. Of course too, the people of Medway for continuing to share cups of tea and hours of chat with me in the name of research. I hope this does you all justice.

Thanks must also go to my supervisors Professor Tim Strangleman and Dr David Nettleingham whose patience and humour have ensured my survival throughout this process.

On a more personal note, I would like to extend my gratitude to my friends and family for putting up with me complaining that I am tired for three years. Especially Melissa Lloyd for reading countless drafts and listening to incomprehensible ramblings. Finally, Sophie Rowland and Hayley Finnemore, who have made this journey so much fun. I finish this process with a PhD and some new friends.

Contents

Abstract.....	1
Acknowledgements and Dedications.....	2
Contents.....	3
Introduction	4
Chapter One: The Concepts	31
Chapter Two: Before Number 8.....	61
Chapter Three: A Thriving Machine Shop	98
Chapter Four: Dismantling the Frame	133
Chapter Five: Trying to Rebuild.....	170
Chapter Six: Remembering Number 8	208
Conclusion.....	238
Bibliography	252
Appendix A: Sample Information.....	268
Appendix B: Information Sheet.....	270
Appendix C: Consent Form (Over 18s).....	272
Appendix D: Consent Form (Under 18s)	273
Appendix E: Interview Questions (Dockyard)	274
Appendix F: Interview Questions (Post-Dockyard)	276

Introduction

For over 400 years, Chatham in the Medway Towns was home to the Royal Dockyard. In 1984 this all came to an end when the Yard closed its doors and over 7,000 local people were out of work. As the towns had developed around this industry, the Yard was so deeply entrenched within the community that the immediate effects were devastating. Some 30 years later, we are still experiencing the consequences, leaving us in what Sherry Linkon (2018) has described of other former industrial places as a 'half-life' between an industrial past and deindustrial present. The loss of such an engrained part of the local culture gives residents a difficult task of how best to remember this past whilst also ensuring workers today can succeed within the few industries that remain. These generational fractures between those who experienced the Dockyard and those who retain it only through the narratives of others, is a difficult duality to reconcile. There is, however, a legacy through the current workers of industry who navigate this heritage of the Dockyard alongside the landscape of today. This emerges as constructions of a classed and masculine identity that form a definition of 'skill' and subsequently, a cultural community. They then perform these memories and navigate their inherited pasts within the present. They are the living and working legacy of the 400 years of Chatham Dockyard forced into a new set of circumstances.

As one of the largest employers in Medway, the Royal Naval Yard marked the physical, social and cultural landscape affecting the lives of those both within and outside of its walls. Every morning and evening, flurries of bicycles would line the major road that led into and out of the site, Dock Road. This wave of workers was outsized only by the parades of buses that would too navigate the length of the steep road to the three gates of Chatham to collect the workers after their shift and drop them to work in the morning. At Pembroke, Gillingham and Main gate, thousands of workers (largely men), would engulf the streets of Medway with movement and chatter, breaking only to collect cigarettes

and a newspaper. Above them, the air of Chatham was filled with the sounds and smells of the Yard; the wheels, grinders and voices; cut through every three hours by the hooter that would notify all the towns that it was time for a tea break. Within the Yard, the sounds were amplified to almost deafening heights. Alex Routen, a former boilermaker who began his time in Chatham in 1958 at the age of fifteen, remembered the overwhelming sensorial experience of his first day:

There'd be all this noise going on and all this smoke and there'd be other people welding, electric welding, flashes everywhere, sparks flying, you know great big lathes turning erm... so you can imagine the noise and the hub bub.

The Dockyard, like all industrial workplaces, was a space that invaded the senses; engraining itself into the fabric of the workers and the surrounding community.

With its large scope, local employment relied heavily on the Yard. Throughout the 1940s, the war caused the Dockyard employment to peak to around 14,000 in total, 2,000 of which were women (MacDougall, 2012). In 1975, the then secretary of state for defence Mr. Judd reported the intake of entry of craft technician apprentices to be 210 across the year in Chatham Dockyard (HC Deb, 1976). Apprentices therefore made up a large part of Medway's workforce. More so, guided by the Yard, apprenticeships were a dominant pathway for the young people of Kent. Across Medway more broadly, in 1981, roughly 6000 men and women, making up 59% of the skilled workforce, were employed at Chatham Dockyard alone (Lunn and Day, 1999; ONS, 2019b). Physically and sensorially, it was a dominant force that spanned the lifetime of generations of Chatham workers until its eventual closure in 1984.

Announced in 1983, the Dockyard closed a year later after 400 years. The closure of the Yard happened against the backdrop of numerous shutdowns and downsizing that occurred throughout

Kent as well as nationally and internationally. As such, the residents of Medway were not unfamiliar with mass industry loss. Roughly twenty years prior in 1960, Sheppey Dockyard, situated across the river Medway, was shut down. Some of the workers were able to transfer to Chatham but largely, the area suffered from unemployment and as Ray Pahl (1984) described, a large socio-cultural dislocation. With this event in the back of Chatham workers' minds, they knew the realities of the future that would await them. Closure of course would have come sooner if it were not for the Falkland's war in 1982 which delayed the demise of Chatham for another two years. Threats of Chatham's end had also been made since the 1700s as silt built up in the river Medway, making navigation in and out of the river difficult. In response, Chatham was no longer used to base ships and instead became a site focused on building, repairing and maintenance.

Despite these environmental challenges, Chatham had remained for over 400 years. Importantly though, the workers of Chatham Dockyard were under no illusion that their futures were marked with precarity as they had been for hundreds of years. This however did not mean that the eventual closure was anticipated as threats had been so interwoven with the tale of Chatham, the Yard was always expected to survive and overcome any challenges. When it did eventually close, the immediate workforce were left without a job and the culture that they had developed over generations. For their children and grandchildren, it meant that they lacked the same opportunities for an education and skilled craft work that the Medway Towns had been reliant on for so long. Without the Yard and many industries like it, the young people of Medway no longer have the option to undergo the same kind of industrial training that was essential for the craft of their ancestors. Instead, limited spaces remain on apprenticeship programmes in the area with few industries having the resources to train in-house. New companies have emerged in the towns that imitate industrial workplaces with the addition of classrooms, designed to offer this training to multiple industries across Kent. Rather than learning and working in a fixed location or even with a permanent job to move on

to, the young people undergoing apprenticeships in Medway today face a much more precarious landscape for their craft.

After the closure of Chatham Dockyard, the landscape of local employment shifted. In 1991, 1322 men and women were engaged in skilled manual work across Medway, a decrease of 49% from pre-closure (ONS, 2019c). More recently, in 2018, 16,300 men and women engaged in this kind of work (ONS, 2019a). Despite the increase in number, by proportion of local population, there has been a marked decrease in skilled manual work in the area. In 1981, 26% of the population of Medway engaged in skilled manual work (ONS, 2019b), in 1991 this was 16% (ONS, 2019c) and by 2018 this number had fallen to only 9.3% of the local population (ONS, 2019a). As such, there has been a steady decline in this kind of work across the area since the closure of the Yard and many industries like it. The slow pacing however, suggests that the local industry benefitted from the output of skilled workers caused by the Dockyard closure. Nevertheless, as more industries declined, as did the opportunity for training and subsequent employment in skilled trades. Since 2018, Medway council have begun attempts to redevelop the apprenticeship pathways available and between April 2017 and March 2018, 159 new apprentices have started across Medway (Medway Council 2019). Despite this figure being smaller than even the Dockyard's intake alone, the refocus on this kind of training has reopened opportunities for young working-class men and women in the area.

Project Rationale

Being born and raised in the Medway Towns has allowed me to witness the implications of losses such as Chatham Dockyard. As a community, we have experienced the duality to our cultural heritage. Scattered across the streets are nods to the industrial and academic heritage of Chatham; from local poetry competitions on Dockyard life to photos of the Yard emblazoned on the walls of the

local Burger King. Despite this, the material memory of this history is often obscured by the way Chatham is seen today. Largely believed to be the origin of the derogatory term 'Chav', Chatham has become associated with the character of the poverty and criminality that accompany this label. Despite the falsity of the origin, the connotation of 'Chav' is stamped across the area and its residents leaving us with a contention between the perceived glory of the industrial past and the more difficult present reputation. With this contrast though comes an interesting space for researching deindustrialisation and particularly, the effect that this has on the pride of working-class communities and identities. The aim of this thesis is to understand how this shift in the reputation of the working-class community of Medway is experienced by the former workers of Chatham Dockyard and their counterparts in craft training today. Importantly, how these wider changes manifest within the culture of the workers formed primarily through industrial training. Therefore, how working-class pride and the external factors that act upon it, is developed and experienced in industrial workspaces past and present.

By focusing on industrial training *then* and *now*, the research opens an intergenerational dialogue across a seemingly fractured community. This was an essential approach to address the research questions posed of;

1. How do we understand the role of occupational communities throughout processes of deindustrialisation?
2. How is knowledge of the industrial past remembered and transmitted within these processes?
3. How do individuals experience these processes?

Designed for experiences across generations to be explored, the questions offer an understanding of the processes of deindustrialisation through communities, memories and identities. Focusing attention to occupational communities; how they are formed as well as the functions they serve, gives

the scope for each cohort of workers to present their craft identities against the backdrop of wider structural changes.

Methodology

To answer these questions, the research is intergenerational; allowing workers past and present to narrate their work identities; how they were developed and how they have changed. This is achieved through twenty-three oral histories with former Dockyard workers and twenty-three with apprentices undertaking their craft training now and since the Dockyard closed. Utilising oral histories as the methodology to understand the changes of Medway has enabled me to depict the closing as “a factor shaping contemporary working-class ideology and culture” (K’Meyer and Hart, 2009: 156). Oral histories therefore allow the narratives to traverse temporal boundaries and show the past and present to remain influenced by the other. This method gives workers the space to share their own stories in their words which is central when trying to understand how communities are experienced. Sampling was conducted in a twofold manner to gather oral histories that span processes of deindustrialisation. The former workers were approached initially through the Chatham Dockyard historical society, a group consisting of former workers and interested parties who work alongside the Chatham Dockyard historical trust at the heritage site. Despite initial intentions to sample entirely through this group, it became apparent that fewer and fewer workers engaged with the society. For some this was because of age and ill-health which meant that they were unable to make the journey to the site, but for others, their non-membership was in protest to what they perceived as the imposition of the Trust on their collective memory. In the end, only four workers were found from the society. As such, local newspapers and social media groups dedicated to Medway history were more fruitful and through various advertisements, enabled a healthy sample to be drawn of a further seventeen.

The current apprentices were sampled through two local industries, Adams¹ and IPS. Adams is a manufacturing company that train around ten apprentices per year. Adams was suggested to me by former Dockyard workers who believed the site to be the most akin to their experiences of industrial training. I was able to gain access through a school friend who works in the administrative team. With her help, I advertised the project and received around eight responses varied across those still undertaking their apprenticeship and those who had finished within the last decade. The second organisation, IPS, are a local training centre for various industries. They house around thirty apprentices per cohort and offer basic, standardised training. They were first introduced to me by the apprentices at Adams who had completed their first year of training there. Here, I was able to access fifteen young people currently doing their training. These, like in Adams, ranged from first to final year apprentices. Unlike at Adams however, they engaged in various trades from railway engineers to industrial refrigeration engineers. This variety is indicative of how apprenticeships are conducted now as it is more cost effective for industries to outsource their training in this way. Therefore, few who train together will subsequently work together.

In terms of gender, only one female participant was included. This was not intentional but very few females were present at the sites. This however did not present as a problem as the aim of the thesis was not to be exclusionary to women. However, the female participant, Cara Barnard, 18, a control and implementation apprentice at IPS, offered an interesting insight into how masculinity is performed in the workplace. More so, as masculinity in this thesis is treated more conceptually than as a fixed sex identity, this did not present a problem for the sample. Likewise, despite the racial diversity present at both the Dockyard and in current apprenticeship training centres, the sample here was entirely made up of white men and women. This again was not intentional but was the outcome despite attempts to attract wide engagement through advertising on public forums and through

¹ Pseudonym given at company's request.

recommendation. The most recent data on the racial diversity of Medway comes from the 2011 census which shows only 10.4% of Medway's population identifying as BME (KCC, 2013). Unfortunately, no data is available on the race and ethnicity of Dockyard workers although it is commonly known that there was a diverse presence in the unskilled workforce at Chatham. As a result, the discussions here are indicative of the experiences of white workers only and are not designed to be reflective of the more complex intersections of class, race and ethnicity on a workplace identity.

Sampling at Adams was conducted by snowballing as I designed a poster to attract participants which was forwarded to line managers by my contact in HR. The apprentices and apprenticeship tutors were given the email address of my contact to sign up for the research. When the list of participants was compiled, my contact created a schedule of interviews which she shared with myself and the participants and arranged a private room for my use. The contact was tasked with recruitment in this sense as the company were not comfortable allowing me access to work emails or to the site itself unaccompanied. This was explained to be because of the private nature of the work they conduct as well as health and safety concerns. The contact is a friend known for many years and as a former sociology student herself, I had no concerns that she would have biased the sample in anyway. More so, she allowed me full access to discuss with participants, any aspect of their work in a private setting and with the assurance that the company would not seek to view any of the recordings or transcripts.

At IPS, the sampling and recruitment was handled entirely by me as they had less restrictions on where I was able to go on site. I attended IPS across two days to allow me to experience a typical day of an apprentice as well as give me the opportunity to speak to all of the available apprentices. Throughout my time at IPS I observed one classroom setting which was brief as apprentices were in the midst of coursework and therefore spent the days at their computers doing their work. I did however get the chance to discuss the overall NVQ programme with teaching staff. I recruited the

young people by simply approaching them and asking them if they wanted to participate and if they knew of anyone else who also may like to. Most apprentices were happy to talk and I spoke with the majority of those on site across those two days. On the second day I also spoke with Paul Reynolds, a former Dockyard apprentice and current IPS teacher who was recommended by another member of staff. Appendix A offers a more detailed account of the dates and locations of all interviews conducted, including those at the current apprenticeship sites.

Paul Reynolds had an interesting perspective as he had experienced both forms of training directly. Nevertheless, not all those sampled were so easily categorised. Tony Oakes was a former Dockyard worker beginning in 1977, currently at Adams, who also trained apprentices. Tony worked in the supply store at the Dockyard and therefore was not a formal apprentice. This ended up being the case for four of the twenty-three sampled. This however again became fortuitous to note as their similarity in skill level, pride and community indicated the presence of a strong informal training system at the Dockyard that was later confirmed by all workers. More so, Mark Whittaker was never an apprentice at Chatham and never worked there. Instead, he undertook an apprenticeship at Adams in 1977 as a machine tool development apprentice. He approached me at Adams and as he was very keen to take part, I agreed to include him. However, as Mark did not fit the sample I had already outlined, I was not sure how his narrative would factor into the research. Despite this, Mark, Tony and the others who had not done formal apprenticeships, disrupted the boundaries of the research which subsequently showed me how fluid skill can be. Mark's account was still interesting because he decided to join Adams' rather than the Dockyard's apprenticeship scheme. He also still witnessed the closure and the subsequent changes and therefore offered an interesting outsider perspective. Nevertheless, it was the inclusion of these men that challenged my assumptions of the thesis which helped to shape the conceptualisation of work identities and drove the ideas forward.

Focusing the sample on apprentices, despite this not ending up being the case entirely, was done to address the second research question that focuses on memories and transmissions of knowledges. Because apprenticeships are memory work, due to the passing on of formal and informal knowledges across generations (Vickerstaff, 2006), apprenticeships offer a point of comparison for how occupational communities are produced and reproduced. More so, by not restricting the sample by gender or race, the community presented themselves to me in its most dominant form. Therefore, the lack of women or racial diversity across both sample groups suggested the normative form that the craft community took both pre and post closure. Despite the lack of diversity, the sample suggested that the continual ties to the community were most prominent for a particular homogenous group of white working-class men. Of course, this is likely due to the mostly precarious, traditionally unskilled work available to the ethnic minorities in the area and lack of racial diversity present in the skilled trades. Both of these factors would have impacted the feelings of belonging of the non-white Medway residents and Dockyard workers. By not limiting the sample but simply calling for Dockyard apprentices and current apprentices, those who answered were those who recognised themselves to be as such. Hence this self-identification, as I will show throughout the forthcoming discussions, is significant for how skill and community were understood and experienced in the Yard.

The sample also was differentiated by a change in access requirements to apprenticeship programmes across the generations. These differences in the entry qualifications needed means that the chance for those who wholly reject school to get an apprenticeship are limited. The interview process remains the same however, young people still have to rely on predetermined knowledges of craft to get in. This would be the same for the Dockyard apprentices who had to demonstrate knowledge and aptitude to succeed in the entrance exam. Both groups sampled here then are those who have been able to use their inheritances of craft to overcome academic obstacles that block their success. They find pride in craft early on and use this as a motivator to get onto an apprenticeship

programme. Nevertheless, the conditions are much harder for the young people today as they have to have a more well-rounded academic credential of As to Bs to get into the programme. The sample therefore is not a direct like-for-like comparison which is indicative of the broader changes of deindustrialisation; even in their own spaces of value, working-class culture is being diluted and forced out by external narratives of what counts as 'achievement'.

Maintaining this focus on changing experiences, the interview questions were designed to be used as prompts to allow participants to discuss various aspects of their life and work with little direction (see Appendix E and F). This was done to avoid leading the responses and to allow the community to be narrated on their own terms. For the younger workers, the questions required a little more focus as they were less likely to have had to reflect on their lives before in the same way as the older workers. More so, it was important to be more mindful of ensuring questions were open enough to avoid single word answers as the young people were less inclined to be reflexive about their experiences. Nevertheless, the young people were very forthcoming and offered full answers despite any initial concerns that they may not be as receptive. Likewise, the interviews were conducted in their places of education. This had the potential to make them feel restricted in their responses. Luckily, this did not seem to be an issue as we were able to make use of private rooms and I reassured them that our conversations would not be shared with anyone else at the organisation. For the older workers however, interviews took place both at their homes and at the Dockyard. The former was largely done for convenience when travel was difficult. However, the settings of the Yard and the current educational organisations were preferred as they kept the experiences of work and training at the forefront of the worker's minds. Particularly for the older workers who had not visited the site for a number of years, they enjoyed reminiscing about the space and revisiting the site. As such, the interviews were designed to evoke memories of education and work, as well as offer participants a comfortable environment where they could reflect on their experiences. Overall then, the research

was designed and conducted to answer the focus of the three research questions that seek to examine; intergenerational experiences, occupational communities and memories.

Central to this process of constructing and reconstructing the past and present is storytelling. Therefore, oral history was the most appropriate methodology to adopt as it enabled these histories to be remembered and imagined in the language that it is experienced. As a research methodology, oral histories have had quite a contentious reputation. Often, they are accused of being fraught with inconsistencies and inaccuracies. However, embracing the subjectivity enables the stories of the working class to be given the proper positioning within a community's history, something important to understanding classed cultures according to E.P. Thompson (1982[1968]) and Alessandro Portelli (1991; 2005). Therefore, it allows the narratives of the working class to illuminate areas of experience and daily life that once were lost in official history narratives (Mistral, 2003; Smith, 2006). As such, it has been important not to be overcome with recreating an accurate depiction of the Dockyard closure. Instead, the focus has been on attempting to understand the experiences of change which as Portelli (1991: 26) recognises through his oral histories of the memories of the death of Luigi Trastulli, "the real and significant historical fact which these narratives highlight is the memory itself." The constructions of their memories and their imaginings of their community therefore were as central to the narratives as the content itself. Oral history then is as much a conceptual and theoretical tool as a practical one. Insofar that, as Portelli (1991) states, the act of oral history rejects the movement of time as it allows for the narratives to be cemented therefore available to future generations. By rejecting this movement, the narratives of the former Dockyard workers are shown to exist in the present.

To cross the temporal boundaries between the 'past' Dockyard and current industrial apprentices to narrate their experiences, oral histories provide an understanding of the role memory plays in creating communities across time. Therefore, by allowing the workers to reflect on their own

classed and gendered norms that inform their occupational culture as well as their memories/imaginings of the present and future, I have been able to map how they perceive industrial occupations to have changed. Thus, oral histories allow us to examine the form as well as the content. As such, how they reconstruct their work-life and what is important to them and therefore to their occupational identities. Forgetting is an important aspect of this and is much a conceptual tool as remembering as it shows us what is not important to their craft identity and culture. Thus, by encapsulating this sense of a community of memory, or 'mnemonic community' whom engrain both past, present and future cohorts into the collective past and imagined future of class based industrial codes, a wider social identity can be understood that traverses temporal limitations (Mistzal, 2003). By accessing these remembered pasts and imagined futures, I have narrated a story of deindustrialisation and the subsequent impact on industrial cultures that is passed down through the generations and onto the wider community (Casey, 1999), depicting a social identity understood through its own classed terms.

Furthermore, to explore how industrial, classed cultures have developed and redeveloped, it was necessary to facilitate a dialogue across generations to their imagined pasts and futures, allowing a discourse that is sympathetic to nuanced changes in class culture. Thus, by looking to the lived memory of industrial work and the impact of the changing nature of work through oral history, the research developed an understanding of how class and industrial cultures have been remembered and thus "how such a culture... [can be] sustained in a post-industrial world when it is claimed... that working class bound culture reflected industrial work-life" (Theil, 2012: 419). Thereby, through depicting how habitual class memories are experienced, individual historical accounts can allow for reflections on class dispositions; how they were formed and how they are lived today. Through the accounts of their occupational cultures, autobiographical narratives gave insight into how their cultural identities have been formed by industrial socialisation, affected by deindustrialisation and remembered today.

Thus, the subjectivity of oral historical narratives is an important factor for how these shared communities form, as despite the determinism of individual narratives on context, collective memories can provide solidarity and validation (Mistral, 2003). As such, the specificity of each account is important insofar that each specialised narrative has formed the collective whole of the occupational culture I have presented here. More so, as the cohorts share the same social networks within the Medway towns, their identities will be shaped reciprocally by the tradition of industrial labour in the area, thus providing a specific yet locally embedded account of industrial culture in Medway. By examining these narratives through the four temporally unlocked accounts of remembered and imagined, oral histories give the unique subjective perspectives of change spoken in its authentically multifaceted language, maintaining the “complexity of human experience” (K’Meyer and Hart, 2009: 162).

In this way, the project has been driven by the working-class people who are its focus. To reiterate this importance, Lisa McKenzie (2015: 6), who is both an academic and working class, reminds us that:

Anyone who has done qualitative research will know it is very difficult to get a succinct answer from a working-class respondent. It is much easier and more interesting to listen to ‘their story’ from the very beginning, and to see where it goes.

This type of research therefore is intrinsically collaborative as it relies on the community to guide us. Particularly, my relationship with one former apprentice, Richard Boorman, demonstrates this. Richard began in the Dockyard in 1952 as an engine fitter apprentice. He was the first Dockyard worker I encountered when starting the project. He gave me real insight into the inner workings of the heritage society as well as helped in recruitment of other former workers. His stories and suggestions guided the focus of the research as he would listen to me explain ideas from an academic perspective and certainly would put me right if they did not match up the lived experiences of Dockyard life! By

approaching the research in this way, it enabled me to develop a project that was informed by the academic accounts as much as the community. More so, by allowing the former workers to identify the current apprenticeship programmes that they believed were a best representation of Medway's present and future engineering identity, I could trace craft communities in their current form. This was not entirely a reconstruction of the community that the Dockyard experienced, but by following the imagined present and future of their craft community, I developed the story in a way that felt true to its members. Of course, there may have been benefits of researching apprenticeship programmes that the workers felt were not a representation of their community, but I wanted to allow the community to show me their past, present and future, rather than trying to construct a narrative of its form based on my assumptions.

Overall, I made this project as communal as possible. Oral history has long been understood in these terms, as a collaborative endeavour either through the presence of the interviewer (Hesse-Biber and Leavy, 2006; Thompson, 1982[1968]), the dynamics of the social relationship in the room (Thompson, 1988), and the reconstruction of other people's narratives (Ritchie, 2011). However, oral history has the potential to be much more synergic even than this. By allowing the workers to help guide the direction of the thesis, the community had access into the roots of the research. Pushing the boundary between researcher and participant is useful in this way as it gave me a better chance of avoiding mis-constructing their narratives. Keeping the workers involved in guiding the project gave me better access into their community as well as an understanding of what they felt was and was not important which was just as illuminating as what was discussed in the oral histories themselves.

Data analysis was conducted in line with the aims of the research to keep the accounts authentic and allowing the workers to speak for themselves. As such, I attempted to use NVIVO software to code but it did not work for oral history here because of the nature of the programme which required codes to be inputted. Class is often discussed in many ways, using multiple expressions

and nuanced depictions which could not have been anticipated. As such, I instead employed thematic coding, an inductive approach that draws themes from the data rather than imposing them upon it (Guest, MacQueen and Namey, 2012). This was conducted by hand, reading the transcripts, looking at the moments they described as central to their lives. From here, I took the emerging themes and mapped them into a word cloud to depict how the workplace communities were understood. These could then be compared between each other. Throughout this process it was important to keep the oral history accounts in one piece as each account needed to be understood in the context of the broader story that they were a part of. This meant that although themes were uncovered, they were specific to the individual. Nevertheless, by putting them together, I formed a communal history that was made up of life stories which shared similarity. It was these similarities that gave insight into what the communities culture was and is.

When working closely with disenfranchised communities such as the working-class, it is integral to the research process to consider ethical concerns. Predominantly, the three ethical issues that this research posed was; a power imbalance between researcher and participant due to perceived class difference, sampling those under the age of 18 and discussing people's current work without jeopardising their position. Firstly, the potential for a power imbalance between researcher and participant was diminished by my own working-class identity. Particularly as McKenzie (2015) shows in her research, being a member of the community of study enables us to offer a truer depiction of their experiences. As such, the participants were comfortable because of my class identity. This too overcame my gender, something that could have proven an issue when interviewing predominantly men. Throughout the course of the interviews, participants would often begin hesitantly discussing the swearing and general banter of the workplace, worried they would offend me because of their perception of my gender norms. However, after I revealed that I was born and raised in Medway, they relaxed, acknowledging that anything said would likely be familiar to me because of my working-class status. This is in line with how gender is understood more broadly across the thesis; not as a fixed

bodily identity but as a concept and language that is accessible to women. Because of this, the potential for a power imbalance was removed as participants felt comfortable in that they were talking to someone from their own community.

The second consideration made was that of interviewing those who were under the age of 18 and therefore were unable to provide legal consent. To address these concerns, the under 18 participants were sampled through their training centres and therefore contact was initiated through an organisation that also held responsibility for them. More so, a consent form and information sheet was provided for the young people to take home to their parents (see Appendix D). This was all agreed upon by their training providers. In this consent form, it was made clear that due to their age, they would be anonymised in the research (see Appendix A). For those over the age of 18 however, I have made use of their real names and not anonymised any aspect of their accounts (see Appendix B and C). This was an important choice and one supported by all participants who like me, were keen for their stories to be told and maintained in their authenticity. For the workers, they were keen that their histories remain in tact and identifiable to them because they wanted this research to be a true reflection of their community and one that can be passed on. Anonymising them would have distanced them from their accounts, undermining the potential of the research to help restore their communal culture.

This kind of 'sociable method' has been discussed elsewhere as a tool to ensure 'circular communications' in the research project (Sinha and Back, 2014). Highlighting the importance of giving participants a central role in research, Sinha and Back (2014) discover the 'hidden' accounts that can be found when removing the barrier often present in the process of data collection. Centrally too, they advocate for not anonymising participants likened to the method taken here. As they describe, giving participants credit is welcomed by those who want to share their stories; it is the researcher who often has the inhibitions here, not the interviewees. But, by rethinking how we approach telling

the stories of others, we can push forward the boundaries of research and avoid “closing down sociological practice rather than opening it out to new possibilities to challenge the often-damaging ways in which ‘the migrant’ is figured.” (Sinha and Back, 2014: 484). Of course, here they discuss their own research on migrant experiences but the same principle can be applied to the working-class who too suffer from hidden and disfigured representations. Taking this approach however did not mean a disregard for the well being of participants in favour of the aims of the research. As stated, using real names highlights the potential for their work positions to be vulnerable if they undermined their employers. To overcome this, I only worked with organisations that did not ask to see any of the data in raw form. For example, during the research process, one current apprenticeship organisation agreed to be involved and interviews were arranged. However, a few days before I was due to attend, the company requested copies of all transcripts. Despite my protests, they were insistent and as a result, I withdrew from the interviews. Despite the disappointment at losing access to a large and well-known company and the participants, I would not jeopardise those who took part in the research. Therefore, despite the research having clear aims in wanting to be authentic, the safeguarding of participants was key and therefore only they and I saw the raw data, ensuring protection of their jobs.

The thesis has been designed as a narrative in line with the descriptions of the craft community. As such, it does not follow the standard formula and instead, the practical aspects of research are raised when appropriate and when they add to the story being told. With this in mind, discussions of methodology have largely been featured as a practical and theoretical issue in tandem. In chapter six for example, oral history has been discussed as stories which act as tools to share value. This has been given the focus because it was the most central part of the research and most prominent aspect of oral history. Throughout the thesis, discussions of methodology are intertwined to highlight the important theoretical and practical contribution that the research has to our understanding of working-class communities. Chapter six in particular is the most observable in these aims as throughout I discuss the role of oral history in the research and that working-class communities

already rely on sharing memories to reproduce their discourses of value. As I show, tapping into these existing resources allows us to see how communities create and recreate themselves. More so, how us as researchers can assist in this process.

The Number 8 Machine Shop

Central to the research was allowing the workers to act as collaborators and guides in this way. This was important for the conclusions drawn to be as accurate to their communal identities as possible. As such, the thesis' overall structure is led by the account of one participant who shared a memory with me that articulated many of the themes that the other participants also elaborated on. Steered by Stuart Pollitt and supported by the forty-five other voices, the thesis tells the history of Chatham and its contemporary landscape through the remembering of a skeleton frame.

Stuart Pollitt is a former electrical engineer at Chatham Dockyard who began in 1964. We had arranged to meet in early 2017 to discuss his apprenticeship and work life at the Yard. As I pulled up into Stuart's driveway, I was confronted by a large white van emblazoned with 'Rainham Electrics'. Seemingly unremarkable, it surprised me that Stuart was still a practicing tradesman well into his sixties. As I would later find out, his trade is a much bigger part of his identity than just a job, it is intrinsic to his sense of self and therefore, not easily given up. As we went through to the conservatory and began discussing all things Chatham Dockyard, the emotional narrative Stuart unveiled was one of the most striking I had encountered. Seeing a man in his sixties upset and physically distraught over his lost work appeared to me as indicative of how important Chatham Dockyard was to those former workers who sought to share their legacy and their stories.

Stuart's emotional response was triggered by a remembering of a remembering, as he recounted the time he had first re-visited Chatham Dockyard after it had closed in 1984. Stuart told me how he had returned to the old Number 8 machine shop where he had worked from the age of fifteen as a Yard boy. Here, he found out he was going to get a skilled apprenticeship as an electrical engineer that would give him the opportunity for paid work. The machine shop was stripped upon closure, left as a skeleton frame that stands awkwardly amongst the redeveloped former Dockyard buildings that are now shops, pubs, museums and restaurants. It stands as a reminder of a former industry that for many who walk past it every day, is nothing more than an oddity marking the landscape. But for those like Stuart, centuries of life histories lie within that metal skeleton. As Stuart and I continued to speak, he reflected in detail on the scale of industrial loss and he described to me the depth of his bereavement as it became clearer to him. He recalled when he was stood in the middle of that frame watching people walk past and as his memories began to play through his mind, he was reminded of how invisible those histories were today:

I went in there [the frame] and I could actually walk as if I was going to clock in through the big doors but the doors aren't there now cause it's just a skeleton structure, but I was able to walk down the gang way that that chap I told you about swept in my imagination and I could see the bolts where the machines were bolted to the concrete floor and I could pretty well count and know that it was either this set of bolts or that set of bolts when I left there, the machine I was working on was, was sitting there and that's where I stood when I was 16, learning how to work on a turret lathe...and even see where the engravers sat and stuff like this and, but also strangely enough think to myself, and I think this is old boy syndrome isn't it, standing there thinking all these things and then you think about it afterwards that when I was standing there, imagining what it was like and that I was gifted to have been part of it... that all these people around me now, like the likes of yourself or people in the... boiler shop who are going in there shopping, they're not stopping to think of what was going on in there, in the days when it was thriving and had all these machinery sounds and the smells and...all

of the people who are milling about outside of the skeleton building as I'm standing there imagining what it was like and I'm thinking to myself, none of these people know... what I experienced or they're not... seeing what I saw and I'd love there to be a way one day where I can impart that somehow.

Unseen to those passers-by, the machine shop comes alive in Stuart's mind as he immerses himself in his sensory reflections. He remembers the sounds, the smells, the sights, the people and what these experiences were able to give to him from such a young age. But he recalls more than just a loss of work, he recalls a cultural and social phenomenon that has left workers like him and many others resigned to a 'by-gone' past, one that now lacks the opportunities he was afforded. Stuart highlights to us that a pride, a "*gift*" was given to him when he was able to develop skills and cultural codes within an industry that respected them and how now, all of that exists as a memory played out in his mind. Loss is something recurrent in working class life histories (Roberts, 1993), and Stuart's story is exemplary of this tradition. His account is representative of the wider industrial decline that has taken place across Medway and similar communities over the last 40 years whereby, like the frame, their pride has been stripped away.

Overview

To address the proposed questions, the research has been organised to allow for an in-depth case study of a healthy sample split across two generations. Oral history was the most useful methodology for these purposes because they allow narratives to be shared which span across spatial and temporal boundaries as workers' stories occupy multiple time periods and various locations, workplaces and social environments. More so, by presenting the data as a compilation of these narratives, guided by the participants' accounts, I allow for experience to be at the forefront. As the questions are designed to outline how individuals experience larger economic, cultural and social processes such as deindustrialisation, it is important to present their accounts as a timeline alongside

broader changes like closure. As such, the chapters follow the journey of an apprentice pre and post closure; weaving together the stories of individuals to form a larger community that span the boundaries of time, place and industry.

The thesis is made up of thematic chapters that will intertwine current academic literatures with the accounts of the workers as each provide a specific outlook that can help to contextualise the other as well as in some places, provide a critical understanding of accepted knowledges. Throughout, the story will be guided by the skeleton frame Stuart Pollitt introduced to us as the changes the frame has undergone can be utilised as symbolic of the processes that have occurred since the Yard closed. By using the frame as this representational figure of a stripped community, it can not only help us to understand many of the complex processes kickstarted by deindustrialisation, but more so, it shows the merit of engaging with the stories of former and current workers to recognise the changes in working class experiences and occupational communities.

Chapter One: The Concepts Serving as an introduction to the theoretical ideas of the thesis, this chapter will introduce the main discussions around the literary fields that will be engaged with later. Firstly, this chapter will explore the literature on working class identities, how they are formed and shape a communal identity. Here I argue that class is a cultural experience that is performed by individuals. On from this, I outline the works of Bev Skeggs (1997; 2001; 2004; 2011) whose form of 'value' is particularly important to the research. As I show, Skeggs' usage of value is the springboard for discussions of how working-class identities are given legitimacy and more importantly, how that legitimacy is systematically removed in wider, public discourses. As such, the performance of class is shown as a response to this. From this, the 'half-life' is introduced. Another central concept to the forthcoming discussions, I show the 'half-life' as coined by Sherry Linkon (2018) to be an articulation of all the concepts already explored. As such, I frame the 'half-life' as an experience of

deindustrialisation and as a performance of classed identities that shape the contemporary experience of craft communities. Further, I introduce how I have conceptualised 'communities of memory' using the works of Walkerdine (2009; 2010; 2015) and Mistral (2003) to explore how class and masculinity intersect in these experiences. More so, I examine the synergy of literatures on generations and the experiences of oral history to show that the research methodology is already an existing practice within communities of memory to share value and reproduce their culture.

Chapter Two: Before Number 8 To begin the journey through the craft culture of Medway, chapter two will start by examining life before work through pre-socialisation and the apprenticeship programme at Chatham Dockyard. Particularly, I show how a working class and masculine identity is formed and reproduced by young people in anticipation of joining the workplace and its culture. This discussion will highlight in detail how working-class identities are formed and experienced, alongside what masculinity in a working-class community looks like. More so, through cultural iconographies, cultural forms are reproduced outside of the workplace which encourages those with an interest in craft to pursue this kind of education. Finally, I demonstrate the central role of making tools in an apprenticeship and how these engrained young people into a community of memory, reinforcing the boundaries of the community and offering the apprentices a cultural space to find legitimacy in their inherited identities. Through these discussions, I show that craft work and their craft identities were frameworks that provided working class value and pride, offering the workers a shield against wider discourses of devaluation.

Chapter Three: A Thriving Machine Shop In this chapter, I show what work life was like in the Dockyard after the apprentice had finished their training and was fully a member of the craft community. Focusing on the question of why the workers enjoyed their labour, I depict skill to be a conversation of value. As such, showing that skill, its boundaries and negotiations, were central to life

in the Dockyard and how these practices enabled a framework of legitimacy to form. Importantly, the performance of skill in the workplace will be given greater attention both as a bodily practice through the act of making and through tangible form in the objects of craft. Building off from the discussion in the previous chapter of the role of craft making in apprenticeships, I show how this reaches full form in the workplace as vessels to share and reproduce the hegemonic ideal of the skilled worker. Through a discussion of the informal practices at work like rabbits (work not commissioned by the government), I argue that products of skill act as conduits for the skilled identity, giving it recognition and transmission – creating a moral framework for the community. More so, through investment in the objects of craft, the workers imbue their collective spirit and find camaraderie through things. Finally, I explore how the workers articulate their community as a protective shell. Utilising existing accounts of community studies, I argue that the craft community took both a physical and social form that allowed the workers to protect themselves from devaluation.

Chapter Four: Dismantling the Frame Skipping ahead to 1984, chapter four begins by introducing the closure of Chatham Dockyard and its immediate effects. From here, I show how the existing community of apprentices begin their work lives and the conditions in which they must learn which have been shaped by the cultural rupture of deindustrialisation. Focusing upon the encroachment of neoliberal narratives of education, I show the difficult circumstances in which apprenticeship cultures now must form. Particularly focusing on the idea of dismantling, I argue that apprentices must reject some of the inherited codes of their craft community because they do not allow for value to form in the same way that they once could. This will be highlighted by the existence of the Southeastern railway apprentices who act as a ‘haunting’ entity – reminiscent of the past that appears in conflict with the ‘half-life’ culture that the apprentices have formed. Therefore, apprentices are unable to find a communal identity in the same way as the Dockyard apprentices and instead, are much more individualised in their approach to their labour. This manifests in their relationship to dirt and danger

whereby they express a concern about working in a way that encroaches upon the sacred individual body. Overall, I depict how these changes have been spurred by deindustrialisation and the ways that the young people renegotiate their cultural ancestors' identities.

Chapter Five: Trying to Rebuild Chapter five explores how the young people are trying to redefine the discourses of value to allow their newer, half-life identities to attain legitimacy. Beginning once again by outlining the contentious conditions in which they must operate whereby their access to the title of apprentice is complicated, I argue that despite the rejections of some aspects of their inherited identities, some parts remain but are made invisible by their new appearance. I show here that the young people's experiences of school share similarities with the Dockyard workers and therefore, still inherit similar working class and masculine cultural identities. However, because of the more complicated terrain that they must traverse, are unable to reproduce these in a linear and identical form. Instead, they form the 'half-life identity', a heterogenous response to the dissolution of discourses of value and the walls of the community that once protected these frameworks. I argue here that the half-life exists in varying levels and radiation will depend upon the ability to find shelter within the walls of the community when they were stable. To try and attain legitimacy in this half-life form, the young apprentices seek to claim custody of the parameters of the community of skill which requires a negotiation between past and present. This causes contention with the older workers but is a necessary part of the natural order of how communities survive – they must adapt. Overall, I argue here that apprentices are active in their negotiations of their inherited pasts and deindustrial presents to try to reproduce the community despite the cultural barriers that they face.

Chapter Six: Remembering Number 8 In this final chapter, I discuss the role of memory in the forming and renegotiation of a communal identity. Sparked by the loss of an important member of the craft community, Richard Boorman, this chapter addresses the significance of memory and storytelling in

working class communities. Therefore, we re-visit Stuart as he stands in that skeleton machine shop imagining, reflecting with him on what remembering work has meant through this research. Importantly, I engage with debates that attempt to frame workers as 'lost' or relate them to the notion of death. Firstly, showing how we can understand Stuart's remembering of Number 8 as a temporal negotiation to reclaim their visibility that renders them active members of the communities present and future. Secondly, through the spatial remembering that he engages with, I show how life is given to the community via reclaiming spaces of work. Finally, building on from the importance of memory in shaping access to working class value, I reflect on the role of oral history as a conceptual tool, depicting storytelling as a form of sharing and reproducing value. Therefore, the role of memory in trying to reconstruct the communities of value.

Contributions

Throughout, the research looks at deindustrialisation in a broader context of how working-class identities are made and remade. By focusing on the idea of pride at work, discussed more explicitly throughout as 'value', the thesis shows industrial apprenticeships to be spaces of cultural legitimacy. They are communities that form and reform to allow working class people to perform their inherited identities within a sphere that appreciates them. Chatham Dockyard is important to this as its connections with the military and reputation of excellent engineering and industrial training bred a communal identity based upon success and pride. Since the Yard closed in 1984, apprenticeships were limited within the area and only recently have begun to receive more funding and the requirements for new apprentices has similarly expanded across Medway. Therefore, the landscape of apprenticeships and its fluxes demonstrates that shifts spurred by deindustrialisation still impact workers today.

Secondly, the thesis draws on two concepts that demonstrate how workplace and class identities intersect; the 'craft-skill community' and 'half-life community'. Through these two forms, I show how class and gendered identities were once engrained into a communal identity that utilised them at work. Therefore, craft and skill were bound up within these same notions of class and masculinity. The 'craft-skill community' is the articulation of how these identities were legitimately formed and reproduced through industrial training and performed at work. The 'half-life' community instead, engages with the concept introduced by Sherry Linkon (2018) which she uses to explain the continued effects of deindustrialisation. Similarly, this community is formed by the losses caused by industry closure but navigate the inheritances of the craft community against the 'post-industrial' landscape. Latent within these concepts is mass change but through these two manifestations of work communities past and present, I show how these are understood and experienced everyday by the workers. They therefore are the lived experience of structural changes by cultural communities.

Thirdly, by tracing this intergenerationally across pre and post closures, wider structural shifts are narrated through the communities that were altered by them. As such, methodologically this thesis employs oral histories to allow the workers to narrate their work histories and their imaginings of its future. By engaging with four temporal locations of remembered and imagined pasts, presents and futures, memory and imagination are treated as methodological tools to form communities across time. This shows oral history to be limited if restricted to the past alone, instead the futurity of the methodology is central to how we construct the histories of communities through individual narratives.

Chapter One: The Concepts

How can we begin to understand the effects of industry loss on communities? This chapter will unpack this question by exploring the central theoretical themes that can explain the consequences of processes of deindustrialisation. Firstly, how we can understand a classed identity. The work of Bev Skeggs and her conceptualisation of value and processes of valuation is central to this, but I outline how I use value distinctly from but informed by her. Describing it as a discourse, I build on her understanding of the economic and structural experience of class value and processes of devaluation. To understand how value is embedded in work identities, I outline the 'craft-skill community', the framing used in the thesis to explain how value is formed and reproduced in the workplace. This is the accumulation of the cultural experience and expression of class and masculinity performed at work to create and share discourses of value.

To understand how change effects processes of value and devaluation in workplaces, I explore studies of deindustrialisation which highlight the cultural effects of industry loss. Importantly, the 'half-life' as coined by Sherry Linkon (2018), which shows the presence of histories of deindustrialisation today. Drawing all this together, the final section of this chapter shifts the discussion to the broader implications of change to show how communities use memory, generational markers and oral history in their pursuits to find respectability. Overall, outlining the key themes that underpin future discussions; giving a framework for understanding how value manifests at work and is affected by deindustrialisation.

Class and Value

To understand why class, process of value and devaluation are linked, we can look to the trajectory of studies that aimed to illuminate working class life, the focus of which has dramatically shifted through various periods from understanding class as an economic situation to a cultural phenomenon that must be understood through the lived experience. E.P. Thompson (1982[1968]) was one of the first to encourage this approach as he focused upon the values people hold which shape the way they view the world. In this way, a class identity is seen as a set of beliefs to which people adhere which forms how they engage with their surroundings. Nevertheless, this does not mean class does not take a structural form as Thompson (1982[1968]) outlines the importance of understanding the historical context of this outlook meaning that the structural inequalities faced because of class distinctions will necessarily shape their view. As such, class is a reactionary grouping based upon circumstance that fosters a collective positioning. Meaning, a class community comes from “the way these experiences are handled in cultural terms: embodied in traditions, value systems, ideas, and institutional forms” (Thompson, 1982[1968]: 9). Despite this focus on the cultural experiences of class, working class studies briefly began to shift away from this approach and instead focused upon the common economic markers such as occupational status and income. Thus, structural understandings of class were deemed separate from cultural experiences with the former given priority over the latter.

Alongside this came the belief that class is no longer a strong category of meaning for people. Writers such as Dorling (2014) and Rifkin (1995) stated that deindustrialisation disassociates class from work entirely and thus, continued the assumption that class was only understood through material conditions. This leads Dorling (2014: 2) to assert that “class is no longer simply a vertical ranking linked to capital and a system of production in some way.” As such, he suggests that class experiences are not linked to structural positions such as occupations. Once again of course this misses the cultural

experiences of material conditions that E.P. Thompson 1982[1968] incited a decade earlier. However, this common assumption that class can no longer be understood through labour re-opened the debate of how we can understand the working class without industrial work that was believed to be the mark of their character.

Consequently, re-imaginings of the experience of class took precedence. Savage (2005) predominantly found that working class people tend to disassociate from this label and instead prefer to think of themselves as 'ordinary'. Once again, class is disentangled from the experience of work leaving both sociologists and wider understandings with a fuzzier grasp of class positioning. Detachment from this label Savage (2005) believes, is because of the political associations with the term which often come with a sense of shame around what it is to be working class. Jones (2012) however, whilst in agreement about the language of class being disused, found this to be more symbolic of the complexity through which people articulate their class identity as class is an intricate web of structures and practices. However, both Jones (2012) and Savage (2005) express the same occurrence despite suggesting variances. The disassociation with the political connotations of class is linked to the complex experiences of class. Remembering that class is the sum of historical experiences (Thompson 1982[1968]), therefore suggests that people's fuzziness, rather than suggesting structural issues are dissociative from class, instead tells us that it is these structural issues that have led to people wanting to dissociate themselves from class. Rather than class identities fizzling out with the loss of widespread industrial labour therefore, there is an apparent desire to push away from it which highlights a normative morality to how we can understand class.

Class therefore rather than being a reactionary positioning based upon structural inequalities alone is a much more nuanced web based upon value and moral judgements (Sayer, 2005; Skeggs, 2007; Lawler, 2005). Our sense of the self is shaped by a sense of value, who has it and who does not

(Skeggs, 1997). We gain a sense of morality through this value and think of ourselves as 'good' when we are valued (Skeggs, 1997). Multiple accounts have found that the working class are defined by those who 'lack' whether that be 'lacking' access to economic, social or cultural capital (Skeggs 1997, 2007; Lawler, 2005; Sayer, 2005). Importantly, they are deemed to be individual failures for this 'lack' and are therefore devalued in wider discourses. Skeggs (1997) in her studies of working-class women has found that they are ostracised from middle-class women through the sphere of parenting. The working-class mothers are thought to be bad mothers and not respectable because they lack access to certain resources to allow their children the same opportunities as their middle-class counterparts. In this case, the working-class women were held accountable for their lack. With this, comes the experience of shame and resentment which:

Are not just forms of 'affect' but are evaluative judgements of how people are being treated as regards what they value, that is things they consider to have effect on their well-being. They are forms of emotional reason (Sayer, 2005: 48).

The disassociation from the label of class therefore that Savage (2005) and Jones (2012) highlight, stems from this emotional reasoning of shame which as Skeggs (1997) and Sayer (2005) show, is a normative part of the working-class experience.

For Skeggs (1997), class is often experienced in this way, as the 'circuits' of valuation decipher what is respectable or valued, and what is not. Similarly, to Bourdieu's (1984) descriptions of 'taste', she outlines that a benchmark is set for cultural behaviours and material goods. Those who are unable to exhibit these traits are the devalued. As Skeggs (1997) understands it, these frameworks are not fixed and will shift to be exclusionary to the devalued. Skeggs (2001), in another comparable account of working-class women in nightclubs, found that working class women who wore too much make-up were deemed tasteless. Middle-class women also wore make-up but had access to certain knowledges that were required to know what is considered a respectable amount to wear. For working class

women, the circuit of value is constantly moved away from them, reinforcing the notion that they are valueless actors (Skeggs, 2001). Once again, these women are experiencing shame which is both “deeply social” as it stems from our perception of how others view us whether that be real or imaginary, but it also involves a private evaluation of “the self by the self” (Sayer, 2005: 953). The experience of shame therefore is a driving force for how working-class people shape their identities and their communities in response.

Bev Skeggs’ work offers an interesting development in how working-class studies can be explored. Particularly for this research, her discussions around ‘value’ offer a good theoretical framework that explains how working-class people respond to wider market place conditions and the economic shifts such as deindustrialisation. Developing the traditional Marxist accounts of use and exchange-value, Skeggs (2016) explores how the concept of value pervades into the construction of the self and the moral conditions that form around this. As she describes, borrowing from Bourdieu, value manifests through different forms of capital (economic, cultural and social). These forms are then converted into value. This value is structured around the two forms that Marx identifies of use and exchange but as she describes, the self’s use-value is the performance of the forms of capital and the exchange is the realisation of that value as it is put into practice to accrue it for the individual.

As such, Skeggs’ conception adds more to the experience of value, showing us how individuals and communities live with these processes:

Class as a category is brought into effect through struggles for value in fields beyond production, although set by the conditions of production in which we can see how attempts are made to gain, claim and disperse value (2016: 7).

What Skeggs does with the concept of value is useful here. She moves it beyond its economic realm alone and introduces it to explain how individuals interact with these market forces in their everyday experiences. Like the products of capital that concerns the Marxist tradition, Skeggs sees these valuations as instrumental as to how the self is shaped and exchanged through interactions with others. Like a product, the self has a value. Skeggs (2016: 9) maps this pattern historically by demonstrating the manifestation of moral coding throughout time whether these distinctions be:

the improper to the proper; the labourer to the possessive individual; those with interiority and those without, those with sentimental attachments in opposition to those who only see value in exchange; the mass to the singularity.

In all accounts, a distinction is made that there is a correct form of personhood which necessarily implies the alternative, that there are those with incorrect personhood.

What Skeggs is primarily concerned with is how those who are unable to accrue value to perform this personhood correctly, live. Throughout her research, Skeggs focuses on the performance of value particularly in working class women and how these groups attach alternative values to their sense of self to defend against devaluation. In response to their exclusion from the traditional forms of capital that accrue the self's value, working class people will reject or renegotiate. Importantly then what Skeggs' work tells us, and what she advocates for, is to step away from the traditions of how we define value as it reinforces the existence of a value-less group. Instead, we must redefine our parameters of 'proper personhood' to include the forms of capital that the working class create and therefore, value.

In this respect, I agree with Skeggs and therefore maintain the use of the term 'value' when describing working class cultural practices. More so, for this thesis, it is appropriate to separate value from its economic domains as it does not reflect the experiences, or the accounts of the workers

presented here. Instead, it is much more useful to think of value as existing as a discourse as well as cultural capital and a set of market relations that can be accrued. This is something Skeggs (2016) herself advocates for as moving away from the traditional modes of defining value can open us up to understanding the less dominant forms. Within this research, value and particularly devaluation is described as a force acting upon the workers and their community. This emerges most prominently when considering the role of the community itself which for the workers, acted as a protective shield to the mass influx of changes that were spurred by deindustrialisation. However, as the parameters of the community were shifted, devaluation was able to seep in. Value therefore appears as a discourse as well as a structured set of capitals to be accrued and exchanged. Overall then, *value* is the capital forms that are acquired and legitimised, *discourses of value* are the accumulations of these capital forms that are legitimised within the cultural community.

Thinking of value as a discourse allows us to understand the complexity of how value is experienced. It is something that can be shifted and altered by massive structural changes like industry loss. Conceptualising it as solely accrued by market conditions does not entirely reflect the processes present in the occupational cultures explored here as it does not account for how value can so easily be lost and altered if it has already been gained. More so, thinking of it as a discourse explains how working-class people can construct their own conditions where they assign themselves value. Therefore, we must understand value as one part of the wider structures of power that are in flux and therefore, as a discourse. Like the Foucauldian definition of discourse, here value is understood as multiple languages that are reflective of power structures. Nevertheless, my usage of discourse is more in line with how Laura Jane Smith (2006) understands heritage as a discourse. As she describes, there is an 'official' discourse of heritage which often contends with the 'unofficial' forms generated and shared by local communities. As she suggests, multiple discourses exist in tandem. Heritages manifest in the craft communities past and present which forms a framework of value that is a

discourse existing alongside the middle-class forms that Skeggs notes. Therefore, there exists a dominant discourse that defines the parameters of the 'correct' person as Skeggs has previously described, however, workplaces such as the ones explored in this research are able to form their own value through accessing forms of capital that are available to them and legitimate to them. They therefore form a competing discourse when they define their own parameters of value. Again, locking the discussion into a reflection of market conditions alone where value is accrued and exchanged would limit us here as it suggests that the value assigned by the workplace community is a rejection of the norms of how value occurs. Instead, it appears more of a subversion or renegotiation. This however does not necessarily occur in response to the traditional models of capital but instead, occurs based upon the requirements of their community. They therefore do not act in protest to or *because* of devaluation but define their own parameters of value *despite* discourses of devaluation acting upon them. For the respondents in this research, they do not see themselves as acting in response to devaluation or wider power structures, but they are creating another space where value is defined and redefined, just as legitimate and just as valid in their discourse of what is valuable.

But how are these discourses experienced by individuals? Discourses of devaluation become embedded within the individual shaping their experiences. They become embodied sums of experience where moral judgements become affective judgements. Ignatow (2009) refers to this as 'embodied habitus' whereby morality becomes rooted in bodily dispositions. Individuals do not just experience devaluation therefore, they internalise it and practice it through affective responses. When working class people are devalued or delegitimised, they experience shame or resentment which:

...are not just forms of 'affect' but are evaluative judgements of how people are being treated as regards to what they value, that is things they consider to affect their well-being. They are forms of emotional reason (Sayer, 2005: 48).

Affective and embodied responses to devaluation are social responses embedded in the individual. This is where the structural lessons of the class community internalise within the individual, as emotional reactions are responses specific to the communal codes and boundaries that the individual adheres to (Ignatow, 2009). As such, the class community that the individual is a part of will determine if devaluation produces feelings of resentment or shame. For many, boundaries will be redrawn as cultural markers to circumvent the emotional experience of moral judgements. Part of being working class is using the experiences of structural inequality to practice 'moral boundary drawing' to create cultural frameworks in which they can find value (Sayer, 2005). This can come in the form of rejecting middle-class notions of what is valued as in the case of Skeggs' (1997) working class mothers who deemed the middle-class to be 'buying' their children, or creating a work based communal identity that reinforces its own legitimacy.

This 'moral boundary drawing' means that systems of cultural value will be created which allow members to avoid shame (Sayer, 2005). Renegotiating these boundaries creates new cultural spaces in which working class people can find value. To understand this, writers have focused on the geographical organisation of class identities as they manifest themselves in physical spaces (Linkon and Russo, 2005; Kefalas, 2003; McKenzie, 2015; Hanley, 2007). Kefalas (2003) in *Working class Heroes* examines the interrelation between class and space whereby physical space reproduces cultural spaces. In Chicago, Kefalas (2003) identified a racial disparity that was used to signify black working-class people as 'beneath' their white counterparts and intersected these experiences with a class analysis. In this instance, the white upper working class and lower middle-class used the physical terrain of neighbourhoods to mark a cultural space that was exclusionary to other races. The houses and gardens of the white middle-class and upper working class were reflective of the cultural traits they deemed valuable. Importantly, these were values that were accessible to them such as honesty and hard work. Rejecting normative middle-class discourses that were unachievable to them, the

white working class and lower middle-class redrew the moral boundaries to allow themselves to claim a sense of value. They maintained a clean aesthetic of their houses and gardens to reflect these cultural signifiers of discipline. Conversely, they viewed the lower white working class and black working class as lacking in these traits reflected in their inner-city neighbourhoods. Their physical space was a marker for their morality and as the inner-city area was not as well kept, the residents were depicted as failures and lacking in the valued cultural traits. The assumption being that one is not disciplined if their home is not maintained (Kefalas, 2003).

Furthermore, the morality latent within the experience of being working class is discussed by Lamont (2000) who, like Kefalas, examines the role of moral codes of conduct within working class communities. Lamont (2000) spoke to lorry drivers, plumbers, painters to name just a few, to examine the ways in which communal lines are drawn. She found that as the working class are placed at the bottom of the economic and social stratification systems, they are forced to create new techniques in which they can find success. Once again, the working class were developing a moral economy that allowed them to prevail and distinguish themselves as 'better' over their middle-class counterparts. Lamont (2000) found traits of being hard working and responsible to be two key signifiers to attain the status of being a 'good person'. As individuals could achieve these goals despite economic deprivation, it ensured that they had a moral schema in which to attain success. Therefore, work and work-based identities is a core area around which moral valuations are formed and lived for working class communities.

These moral boundaries too manifest physically in the workplace. Hodson (2001) in *Dignity at Work* examines spaces from factories to hospitals to understand the renegotiation of cultural spaces through revaluing boundaries. He found this to be a necessary practice in labour forms that can create disillusion whereby dominant discourses of value exclude the workers. In response, workers create a

workplace culture of resistance where dignity or value can be attained (Hodson, 2001). Both in work and at home, cultural spaces are created that manifest a physical marker to moral boundaries that the excluded use to find solidarity. The physical and cultural spaces in both accounts therefore were laced with moral judgements which could include and exclude others. Consequently, multiple discourses of value emerge. Each providing legitimacy to the identities of members. Class therefore is the performance of an inherited cultural identity; it is the accumulation of these moral boundaries and discourses of value that when occurring in consensus, form a community.

Understanding the sense of pride and value that was once available to industrial communities' forms one of the central themes of the thesis; the 'craft-skill identity'. Accessed through socialisation with the other workers, the craft-skill identity is the accumulation of knowledges developed over generations that allowed the workers to find value in their identities. In many ways, the cultural norms valued are highly loaded with classed and gendered nuances; the forms of capital that are now largely counter-productive to finding paid employment (Nayak, 2006). However, when the Yard was operational, these cultural forms were legitimate and reproduced through pre-socialisation and the apprenticeship programmes. As Dockyard schools often preferred a 'certain type of boy' (Penn, 1986), those who were already demonstrating aspects of the craft-skill identity were employed, meaning these circuits of value could be repeated.

These communities of 'craft-skill' are intrinsic to industrial work cultures and particularly to the Dockyard which stressed the importance of technical skill and a more social form of skill throughout the apprenticeship programme. By becoming engrained into the character of craft-skill, both practical knowledges are refined, and the individual embodies the social or personal character of the community. This process occurs through accessing the 'community of memory' or 'mnemonic community' as Mistzal (2003) terms it. Through learning both formal and informal elements of the

workplace culture, the individual is engrained into an intergenerational dialogue by inheriting past knowledges, refining them into their current context with the expectation of passing them onto future generations of workers. This process was particularly apparent in the Dockyard apprenticeship schemes which relied on interactions between experienced workers and apprenticeship workers to transmit work knowledges. Through these dialogues, the craft-skill identity is formed and reproduced, maintaining itself as the dominant and legitimate culture in the workplace.

Finding forms of value through communities of craft-skill is easier when the frameworks reproduce intergenerationally. When the craft identity thrived, apprentices could access the same cultural norms as their Skippers meaning they could find pride in their craft. When they learned a new practical or social skill, they were able to share in the pride of the earlier workers as what they were doing was legitimate within that sphere. Through this process, a conversation occurred that tied together the past and the present, allowing for cultural norms to be shared across generations establishing the frameworks that allowed cultural and social norms to be legitimised and thus valued whether it be formally or informally. Through this, cultural values were transmitted via the community of skill. Nevertheless, when the frameworks of the community of skill are removed, intergenerational communities lose their potential to allow for value to be found. Thus, they can only flourish when the frameworks are enacted within the realms of the community of skill as this identity provides value.

Deindustrialisation and half-life

When the Yard shut in 1984, the opportunities to find pride in their craft were lessened. Chatham Dockyard's closure was initially announced in 1981 by the then Defence Secretary John Nott. The doors would not close for another three years, but the Yard would slowly be dismantled throughout this period. At the time, around 7,000 workers were employed at the site making the

immediate job losses immense for the area. The surrounding industries that had relied on the Dockyard for both trade and the output of skilled workers produced by the Yard's training, suffered with many being forced to close. For the apprentices, they had to finish their time and find other employment or could relocate their training to other Dockyards. A similar offer was made to all established workers. They could uproot their family and move across the country or face breaking their contracts and lose their pensions. George Ackers (2014) in his study of Chatham Dockyard found that the men he interviewed were able to relocate to London or make the journey to undertake administrative roles. However, this was only the reality for those in management positions. The craft workers were less able to give up the lives they had formed for their families over generations due to a lack of economic, social and cultural resources as well as a disdain at the idea of giving up on craft work. Many chose to quit their role before the new placements were offered and those who stayed faced economic isolation and some had to take low skilled jobs to feed their families. For those who moved, a cultural dislocation occurred as they were forced to leave behind where for most, they had spent their whole lives. With the drain of skilled workers many industries closed over the subsequent decades as other industries could not afford to train apprentices to the same standard. Eventually, apprenticeship placements dwindled and the reputation surrounding the skills of Medway became resigned to a past era. The overall image of Chatham too began to deteriorate as unemployment grew and locals could no longer rely on their naval connotations or skilled work to find a sense of pride.

Across many other parts of the United Kingdom and the United States since the 1970s, industrial loss has hit working class communities hard. As industries closed, apprenticeships became defunded and therefore dramatically reduced in number (Ryan and Unwin, 2001). Consequently, the cultural and social effects outlived the economic. The closure of the industry, therefore, is only the first step in deindustrialisation which has a continued legacy felt today, meaning as Cowie and Heathcott (2003) suggest, a more historical approach to understanding industry loss is necessary.

When deindustrialisation first took hold, many studies aimed to understand the economic consequences of the decline of industry. Bluestone and Harrison (1982) for example, offered a largely economic account to depict deindustrialisation which focused upon the disinvestment in industry that led to multiple losses across the United States showing that mass closure was a long time coming. More recently, a shift has occurred with many concentrating more upon the social and cultural effects for communities and individuals. Attention has been paid to the 'rust belt' of America although the parallels with the United Kingdom are undeniable; industrial loss is experienced through a plethora of complex forms (Russo and Linkon, 2003; 2005). Shifting away from the financial losses, K'Meyer and Hart (2009) spoke to the former workers of Harvester and Johnson Controls plant in Louisville, Kentucky to document their experiences of work and how they felt after losing it. Many in their accounts attempted to negotiate multiple narratives of why the plant was closed to attempt to reclaim some stability in their own life histories. This lack of fixity is something present in accounts of deindustrialisation. Workers often expected to spend their whole work life in one place and to have the same for their children and grandchildren. Instead, the skills they spent a lifetime accruing were suddenly made redundant.

Sennett (1998) in *The Corrosion of Character* explores this shift through a father and son Enrico and Rico. Enrico began his work life when industrial labour was more widely attainable and thus developed an expectation of job security that was reflected in his dispositions as he valued loyalty and consistency. For Enrico, despite not engaging in industrial labour directly, having the ability to habitualise these dispositions were paramount to achieving meaning and dignity at work as they were largely more valued in dominant cultural narratives and seen as reflective of what it was to be a 'good worker'. For Enrico's son, Rico conversely, this notion of stability was less attainable as he faced the more 'liminal' labour market of deindustrialisation and thus had to necessarily invert the expectations and dispositions of his father's occupational culture to gain value and success. Instead of being able

to achieve value through loyalty and stability, Rico had to habituate the opposite; traits of competition and disloyalty. With Rico struggling to attain a sense of dignity at work, his labour lacked in meaning leaving him in a precarious state whereby he felt achieving value in the labour market would be antithetical to the dispositions taught by Enrico. Through accounts such as Sennett's (1998) that focus more upon the lived experience of industry loss, the cultural change of deindustrialisation is demonstrated, and we learn more about the subsequent friction of what it is to be a 'valued worker' *now* compared to *then*. Devaluation of industrial identities therefore is inherently linked to deindustrialisation.

The impact of the industrial past on the workers of the present is well articulated by employing the 'half-life' coined by Sherry Linkon (2018). Initially used as a literary concept but given further articulation here as a communal experience, the half-life helps us to understand the continued effects of industry loss. As Linkon (2018: 5/6) describes:

In physics, half-life refers to the time it takes for a substance to lose half of its activity, and it has been used most often to talk about the decay of radioactive materials. The half-life measures the slow decline of toxicity, highlighting its persistence as well as its dangers. These implications apply usefully to deindustrialization, which is both toxic and still active in the lives of many working-class Americans. Like radioactivity, deindustrialisation may be losing influence over time, but it has not yet dissipated, and its continuing effects are problematic.

When applied to our understandings of how communities at work form and reproduce in deindustrialising communities, the half-life takes on a new form. It is not only a means to understand change and the continued existence of industry, but it is the performance of memories. When acted upon the community, the individual body is imprinted with the character of the half-life. Individuals perform their inherited classed and gendered identities but also internalise the precarity that the half-life creates. They therefore become the character of half-life, at once existing in the industrial

past and half-life present. Likened by Linkon (2018) to 'radiation', the half-life is the effects of the 'injuries' caused by deindustrialisation passed onto the children and grandchildren of workers. This will emerge in the thesis through the 'half-life community'. These are the current workers who experience deindustrialisation through communal memories i.e. the inheritance and performance of a classed and masculine definition of skill alongside the liminal landscape of the present. By understanding their communal identity as the half-life character, we can see how they negotiate the framework of the past, selecting what is useful and renegotiating the terrain of what is valuable. Utilising the language of the atomic bomb is useful too as it enables us to see the 'craft-skill community' acting as a fallout shelter to protect the workers who experienced deindustrialisation first hand and bridge the gap between industrial and deindustrial. It helps articulate how their communal identities were affected and how they have traversed these changes. In sum, the half-life is a concept that explains mass change and allows for the nuances of experiences to be discussed. It rejects the demarcation of the industrial past and deindustrial present and highlights the slippages between these two periods. The half-life therefore is central to understanding the communities of workers as it articulates how the current workers negotiate their inherited identities with their present experiences.

Community and Memory

Memory is key to this and more so, is a powerful tool through which identities are formed as Linde (2008: 222) reminds us:

Any analysis of identity is also an examination of memory. Identity, whether individual or collective, is identity through time. An identity of this moment, not related to the past and not remembered in the future, hardly counts as identity at all. Memory is thus central to the concept of identity.

To understand how the craft-skill and half-life identities are formed, we must examine the ways in which memories are lived and shared. The craft-skill and half-life identity take form as both individual and collective identities. For much of the 20th century, the study of collective memory was dominated by a Halbwachian distinction between individual and communal forms of memory. However, recent studies have treated each as part of a similar process; as inescapably tied.

The two forms meet at a crossroads in Sherry Linkon and John Russo's (2002) *Steeltown USA* where they think of 'communal identity'. This 'communal identity' is one shaped by the individual and the collective based upon struggle and conflict over representations. One of the primary questions they aim to deal with as they marry together stories of deindustrialisation with what we can know about the nature of memory is; who owns the communal identity? Through their account, Linkon and Russo (2002) demonstrate different forms of memory at work and how competing memories shape the landscape of a deindustrialising community. Therefore, they highlight the role of communal memory through heritage displays and public rhetoric which is often contradictory to more individualised forms of memory that take place through the people. In *Steeltown*, the former workers struggle to negotiate their individual memories with the communal which results in a competing narrative about the history of the town's industry. Mis-remembering therefore is shown to be harmful as it adds to the devaluation of communities that already struggle with the economic, cultural and social losses of industry. As such, they outline the importance of communities' rememberings to shape their future, demonstrating the central role memory plays in deindustrialised communities. In their case, by focusing on the contested nature of memories and representations, it is useful to consider the individual and the collective memory as two distinct phenomena as it shows how one is often given precedence over the other which acts to subjugate working class histories.

Linkon and Russo (2002) therefore show 'communal remembering' to be based in story-telling and the sharing of histories to develop a future for the community. In this sense, it is both individual and collective at once, but members are unable to draw a strength from this because of the contested visions of this future that pits the former workers against the collective narrative. As such, the workers are unable to develop a strengthened communal identity as their histories are subject to distortion. In some instances, then, such as in *Steeltown*, to think of the individual and collective memory as two different and competing forces demonstrates the nature of memory and its important role within communities' and individuals' senses of self. This however does not always appear as the case as to disaggregate communal and individual rememberings does not allow the scope for us to consider the communities that still exist within deindustrialised areas such as the craft-skill and half-life communities. Hence, as individuals like Stuart Pollitt remember, they remember with the width and breadth of their craft community in mind. He remembers those who worked alongside him, those who struggle to attain the identity today and those passers-by who have no knowledge of it. Seeing the two processes of remembering as separate yet related does not appear to be applicable here then. Instead, they seem as one of the same.

As such, it is useful to adopt the language of Linkon and Russo (2002) and how they understand 'communal remembering' as central to a community's identity through storytelling and future oriented thinking and apply it to the craft-skill community. Communal remembering in this thesis, takes groundwork in Linkon and Russo's (2002) account of conflict over representation and reconstructing a communities' identity as they suggest, but demonstrates how through remembering an existing identity is maintained and developed in Chatham. Intergenerational discourses of value as used in this thesis, builds upon 'communal remembering' as it is understood as the process of remembering both individually and collectively at once. The individual remembers, but as they remember they add to and shape the dynamic nature of the collective memory. Like a rhizomic

structure, individuals create an offshoot that adds to the communal memory as such they shape it, reinforce it and alter it. Remembering then is not just an individual/ collective/ communal practice but it is all at once.

By adding to Linkon and Russo's conceptualisation of the communal memory, we can see how useful it can be alongside Anderson's (1983) 'Imagined communities' and Mistzal's (2003) 'Mnemonic communities'. Anderson (1983), in the simplest form, examines national identities and narrates the idea of an imagined community as a constructed nationalistic identity. In this way, individuals share in the same memories of a nation's history and invest in the collective community of that national identity. Mistzal (2003) suggests something similar, that communities are based upon memory and share a collective identity based upon that memory. However, what Mistzal (2003) does not show us is the lived experiences of both the individual and the community within this process. This is where adding in Linkon and Russo's conceptualisation of communal remembering works well. Anderson (1983) and Mistzal (2003) allow us to see individuals as a part of the collective memory and that memories shape contemporary identities. However, what Linkon and Russo (2002) show, is that these identities are transformative and dynamic as they are subject to both distortion but also latent within this is the potential for negotiation. Dominant within these accounts however is a focus on either the localised community, the individual or wider popular memories, not on the lived experiences of smaller cultural communities.

However, understanding intergenerational discourses of value as a form of memory can add to this as it is both individual and communal, local and more generalisable. More so, it operates like an underground memory movement, keeping alive the histories and cultural resources that can be challenged in deindustrialising communities as we have seen in *Steeltown* (2002). Intergenerational discourses are a form of remembering as they take on the 'communicative remembering' that

Halbwachs ([1941], 1992) and Assman and Czaplicka (1995) highlight as the everyday remembering's that are temporally limited between the two discussants and 'cultural remembering', which is a much wider remembering that is not temporally locked because it becomes enshrined in texts, pictures etc. Instead of communal remembering being an either/ or scenario as Assman and Czaplicka (1995) suggest, intergenerational discourses of value are like a *communicative cultural remembering* as they do both suggesting that storytelling and artefacts share similar precedence in how communities form a sense of identity.

Despite intergenerational discourses of value having both communicative and cultural potential, to disaggregate the two does not reflect the experiences of the craft-skill or half-life community as both forms are a part of the same process. For those with the craft-skill identity, they resist the notion that their memories are temporally locked as Halbwachs ([1941], 1992) suggests, as intergenerational dialogues are essential to the survival of the community and its history. In this case, 'cultural remembering' is inherent to the process of craft work as it relies on the objectified nature of identity and memory through the making of things which will be seen in more detail throughout the thesis. Similarly, the 'communicative' is central as it is the medium through which apprenticeships are undertaken and taught. Both are important therefore and both are reliant on memories of value as the communicative is enshrined in the product of labour or 'cultural memories' which act as an instruction manual to future craft workers. Intergenerational discourses of value therefore are acts of remembering through storytelling and making artefacts. Through this remembering, value is passed on as it shares the respectable history of the craft-skill identity and restores the discourses of value. Understanding individual and collective memories in tandem is important to understanding working class culture as to avoid devaluing discourses, memories of value are the shields of resistance. Class and memory rely on each other in this case and need to be understood as individual and collective to

fully narrate the role of remembering in the craft-skill community and to make visible memory as a tool of working-class pride.

Generations and Oral History

Sharing these memories across cultural cohorts is central to creating and recreating discourses of value. Importantly, we must explore how this process occurs. Therefore, generations have a dualistic use as both a theoretical and methodological tool. Methodologically, by splitting the sample into two generational groupings the research has the scope to reflect on both the rememberings and imaginings of each. It enables a cross comparison to take place giving the research an approach to forming the story of Medway that occupies four periods of time; the rememberings and future imaginings from the Dockyard workers and the constructed imaginings of the past and current experiences of the apprentices today. As such, work cultures are remembered and imagined by both generations enabling a cross over that demonstrates both actual experience and representational understandings formed through stories and imaginings. Theoretically, the concept of generations gives us more insight into the usefulness of the craft-skill identity, half-life identity and intergenerational discourses of value as concepts in themselves.

Mannheim ([1952], 1997) and Edmunds and Turner (2002) understand a generation to be a social location rather than an age group, therefore, as a group that share in experiences that are demarked by an event. A generation then is:

A cohort of persons passing through time that come to share a common habitus, hexis and culture, a function of which is to provide them with a collective memory that serves to integrate the cohort over a finite period of time (Eyerman and Turner 1998, p. 93).

For them, a generation is a group that share in collective memories and share a similar culture. The two groups sampled in this thesis then pose some tensions for how we can understand generations as one were those who underwent their craft apprenticeships when industry was thriving and the other when industry collapsed. Therefore, they all have experience of industrial closure and loss, some first-hand and some through others. Nevertheless, all could be described as the generation of deindustrialisation. Despite this, some were able to undergo their apprenticeships before this process, meaning that deindustrialisation and its subsequent cultural destructions were only occurrences later in their work lives. For the other group, their entire work lives have been marked by this loss, producing different experiences of the same event. Mannheim ([1952], 1997) calls this difference, 'generational units'. These are subgroups within a cohort that experience the same event in different ways. For this thesis then, it much more useful to think of the two groups sampled as the Dockyard-based 'craft-skill identity' and the more contemporary 'half-life identity' as they share in the cultural experience of deindustrialisation. More so, they transmit their similar cultural values across generations meaning that they share a craft-based culture. However, they have different experiences of their socialisation and becoming into their craft-based identity.

Generations therefore appear as a cultural marker but even this delineation of groups is problematic to assume. As the 'half-life community' share their identities, their perceptions of their own craft will have effect on the 'craft-skill community'. For example, if the 'half-life community' believe craft work to be illegitimate, this will affect the memory of the 'craft-skill' and therefore will alter the way the latter think of their own trade. To assume a generational unit is a static identity then appears fraught as it is subject to change. Instead, we must distinguish between a 'generational identity' and a 'generational status'. A 'generational status' builds upon Mannheim's ([1952], 1997) 'generational units' and therefore is a rather static grouping of those demarked by an event but with differing experiences. These units find meaning and identification in the past, when the event occurred and only after the event, when we can look back and see their position within that context. This

grouping is one imposed to enable a sample to be abstracted. Despite working against my wishes to not impose on the construction of the communities, it is a necessary requirement to understand change. As such, the 'generational status' is tentatively applied to enable us to differentiate between those who completed their apprenticeship before deindustrialisation with those who undertook theirs after.

In comparison, a 'generational identity' stems from the interviewees themselves and is born from their experience of change. It is therefore more transient and future oriented as it is always changing and will continue to change even after the 'craft-skill identity' is gone through memories and representations. Therefore, the generational identity is seen to not be an imposed framework but is the lens through which they differentiate themselves. Hence, it is dependent on members to shape it and to reinforce it. Although I maintain the grouping of the 'craft-skill identity' and 'half-life identity' as two generational statuses and generational identities, I do so tentatively as these are constructed by both the interviewees and me. It is important to note that the status and the identity are different and need to be understood as separate yet relational identifications. Conclusively then, the status is a methodological framework necessary for study whereas the identity is the lived experience of the craft culture. By enforcing this distinction, it is possible to see the differentiation between generations as a marked framework imposed upon a group and how generations are lived and experienced. As such, the *status* is a guide and the *identity* is their narrated experiences.

Like generations, I understand oral history as much as a conceptual and theoretical tool as a practical one. Insofar that, as Portelli (1991) states, the act of oral history rejects the movement of time as it allows for the narratives to be cemented therefore available to future generations which becomes a means to share discourses of value. By rejecting this movement, the narratives of the former Dockyard workers are shown to have present context, again reifying the notion that their

cultural values exist in 'half-life' (Linkon, 2018) and not in a temporally locked 'past'. Oral histories then occupy a curious site as they are both fixed and dynamic at once. The interview itself is a fixed occurrence but storytelling by nature is dynamic. Through the research, the workers have allowed their narratives to be locked into a recording but with the intent for them to be fluid as they want them to be passed on, adding to the history and potential future of the craft-skill community. In this sense, oral history is the process of reifying the craft identity. Like the objectified product of craft, oral history provides a stasis for the identity to be documented and thus shared. As such, fixity is necessary for fluidity as it provides a tangible form for future and current workers to engage with and develop the community from.

As I have already discussed, intergenerational discourses of value are an accumulation of both the individual and the collective remembering simultaneously. Through oral history, the individual remembers through their storytelling, but this takes collective form as they pass their memories on. Through their narratives, they share their cultural values and therefore are engaging in an act of creating and adapting the collective memory or the mnemonic community (Mistzal, 2003). Furthermore, they remember through the stories of others. As they share the memories of their former colleagues and their narratives, they intertwine their own life history with that of the collective. They remember not only their own work lives but those of others, creating a wider narrative of the craft community. As such, the point of the view of the story is not fixed (Schrager, 1983). When the narrator speaks through the stories of others, this tells us about the nature of the relationship with the other person as it demonstrates how close they are and who they feel they can represent (Schrager, 1983). When the individual speaks of the collective then, it tells us about the community that has formed through their experiences and that oral history by nature is a collective act. Therefore, as the individual remembers through oral history, they remember both individually and collectively.

This collectively extends too to my role within the rendering of these memories. As Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2006), remind us, oral history is an intimate relationship between narrator and interviewer making the process entirely collaborative. As such, it is important to reflect on my role as it has shaped the narrative and stories told. Christina Walley (2013), a working-class woman from a deindustrialising community in *Exit Zero* shares an intimate account of her family's experiences of industry closure. In her account, Walley (2013) describes her father's job loss and the effects on the community. She then discusses her movement from her deindustrialised home-town, via an elite school, to university where she discovers a class divide between herself, her family and her student peers. Like Walley, I am from the community I have researched, making the process of collecting histories even more of a personal and collaborative venture. My own working-class background has meant that I am able to understand the languages and references used throughout the stories allowing me to be a voice from within. More so, I have grown up experiencing the deindustrialising processes that have had economic, cultural and social influence on my family and peers. My story is as much entwined in with my participants' which reminds us:

Our individual stories are always communal ones...telling stories means not only looking inward but also turning the self-outward and tracing the links and relationships that shape and define not only who we are as individuals but also the broader social worlds of which we are a part (Walley, 2013: 5).

As such, by taking the approach of a 'voice within' we can learn more about working class communities. Lisa McKenzie's (2015) *Getting By* further demonstrates the merits of this. Again, McKenzie (2015) is a working-class woman who through an ethnographic account of the community she lives in demonstrates how her area is culturally, socially, economically, politically and geographically devalued. By reflexively recounting our role as working class researchers within our own work we can see ourselves as a part of the process of sharing value. We act as a vessel for storytelling which makes oral histories a welcome and enjoyable process for participants. More so,

our working-class identities coupled with our academic voices give us the opportunity to narrate the histories of communities and offer a voice to them. Oral history therefore is always collaborative but even more so when the researcher is a part of the community they study. Once again then oral history highlights the collective/ individual nature of memory which in this case appears as the dialogue between participant and researcher.

Importantly too, oral histories give us the opportunity to capture the living memories of the 'last generation'. As stated, the Dockyard workers share in the craft-skill generational identity meaning when they are gone, their generational identity becomes more fixed as industrial craft workers. Without their physical presence, their identity loses part of its fluidity as it can only develop through the rememberings and recountings of the half-life community. Importantly for the Dockyard workers, sharing in an intergenerational discourse of value as an oral process has a time limit, one they are starkly aware of. Through the oral histories they can create a time capsule of their memories which can be shared to future generations. Without oral history, once they are gone, access to these memories would only be possible through the stories of others. The craft-skill and half-life community are aware of a break in their cohorts as industrial apprenticeship numbers have dwindled since the 1980s (McDowell, 2003). A gap has emerged between the two cohorts, creating two communities. Therefore, it is important that they share value to ensure that the gap is reduced, and their social and cultural values can still be passed along in similar ways to how the craft-skill community have done before. This is made possible through oral history which prevents the memories of the craft-skill community getting lost.

The Research

Through exploring Medway as an area of industrial loss focusing on the subsequent changes in working class value that is experienced within its communities, we can learn more about the cultural consequences of deindustrialisation. In 1999 Lunn and Day advocated for this approach particularly when discussing Dockyards as they saw the move away from a focus on the ships onto the workers to be a necessary task. Rather than seeing the workers as passive victims of declining work, I utilise the concepts of the craft-skill identity, half-life identity and working-class value to demonstrate practices of negotiation that show the people of Medway to be active in pursuits of legitimacy. In agreement with literatures that depict precarity to be the mark of de-industrial capitalism (Beck, 2000; Bauman, 1998; Standing, 2011; Sennett, 1998), a more liminal version of skill is shown to be the newest form of craft. This, however, does not allow for the creation and stabilisation of frameworks of value in the same way as the craft-skill identity. Consequently, work is still a social structure that forms identities and communities. Unlike Sennett (1998) who demonstrates through Rico and Enrico that work cultures are entirely individualistic, work communities are still able to develop but take a more fractured form. Therefore, work and value are found to be still central to working class life, disempowering the notion that employment is no longer fundamental to how we construct our identities (Rifkin, 1995).

Nevertheless, except for Dudley (1994), understanding the effects of deindustrialisation on working class value has been a largely neglected avenue within both fields of literature. More so, attempting to understand these phenomena through the sphere of apprenticeships has not yet been approached. But, through apprenticeships we can see how pride at work was attained by those who had little other opportunity for value. Michael Ward's (2015) *From Labouring to Learning* tells us more about the cultural practices of apprentices and their inherited traditional industrial values but missing from this account is the voice of the workers before them and an examination of what happened

between these two cohorts. By focusing on the social and cultural implications of deindustrialisation and the impact it had on apprenticeships, we can identify a living sphere of industry and are able to narrate the changing experiences of them. Building on Linkon's (2018) half-life, this approach encompasses the existing effects of industry loss with the lived experience. In this way, we can see how the half-life is lived and how individuals and communities negotiate this terrain. Hence, how social and cultural practices occur in the half-life. Therefore, Medway's story offers a unique perspective by portraying a historical account of deindustrialisation as well as examining the implications for both the workers and the community today. Working class pride is central to how industrial work was experienced so it is central for us to now understand what has happened to it without that work.

Once again, by narrating working class value historically, this research differs from other accounts of the devaluation of working-class cultures and identities. By using the works of Skeggs (1997; 2011) as a starting point, the research follows her tradition by depicting how working-class identities are delegitimised and subject to devaluation processes. However, I take her concept forward by offering a more historical analysis of how the value was attained in the first place. By taking this historical trajectory, we can understand the form working class pride once took, the processes that led to its dismantling alongside the experience of this today. To be able to recover working class pride, we need to do more than identify the existence of its loss; we must attempt to identify how it can be re-established. By doing so we can give back to the communities that allow us to research them and can move forward in pro-actively gathering stories of what has happened to the working class.

Furthermore, the concepts that are introduced in this work, offer a refreshed understanding of the structural implications of changing economies on lived experiences. More so, they articulate the nuances of how value was formed in industrial work, how it was reproduced and shared and what has become of it now. Through these terms, the loss of work and its social and cultural implications

can be understood as crossing boundaries of the communal/individual and the past/ present/ future as all exist at once. Therefore, I argue that it is wrong to try and understand the craft-skill identity, half-life identity or discourses of value as temporally or spatially separated as they are processes and experiences that occupy multiple sites and spaces. When they are lived, shared or reproduced, the past/ present/ future and the individual/ communal all exist within that moment as they are intertwined. Consequently, the craft-skill identity and half-life identity as frameworks can tell us about more than skilled work, they enable us to know more about working class pride past, present and in the future. As workers find value in their identity, they are becoming and belonging at once as they share in the pride of their ancestors and future generations. The concepts introduced in this thesis can offer this interlinking perspective on communities of deindustrialisation as we cannot and should not understand industrial closure as a linear passage; it is a phenomenon tied up in the workers' histories and futures because when they narrate their losses, they do so with the width and breadth of working-class experiences in mind. Hence, through engaging with the concepts this research offers, we can identify how time, space and place are affected by deindustrialisation but rather than demonstrating these to be abstract concepts, we can see how they are experienced and lived by former and current workers.

Although Medway is a relatively small part of the United Kingdom, it is a unique place to study. The South East in general is lesser known for its industrial history but Medway was once an industrial hub home to Dockyards, transport manufacturing and oil refineries to name just a few. More so, Medway often now is only spoken of regarding its connotations with 'Chav', making it an interesting site to explore the effects of deindustrialisation on working class value. Medway acts as a microcosm for the wider processes of change that have taken place. By focusing upon this area, we can see these wider structural shifts 'close up' and can understand the everyday experiences of these changes, telling us more about the cultural and social effects of mass economic upheaval. Through the stories of flags, bicycles and old machinery workshops, I explore working class experiences and how their

safeguards against narratives of delegitimization have been corroded. For those in Medway who had, and were expected to, spend their work lives hanging from ships' sails, the winds of change have certainly battered them hard.

Chapter Two: Before Number 8

To understand how these concepts intercept and how they manifest as the craft-skill identity, this chapter examines how these communal identities formed before the workplace. Focusing in more detail on the cultural experiences of class and community that I have introduced, chapter two shows how individuals develop a craft identity through these. Beginning with the earliest stages of the craft identity and the pre-socialisation into Dockyard life, this chapter will explore how identities are formed by examining 'skill' as a performance of class and masculinity in the workplace. This notion of skill is used to create a moral boundary, forming a community amongst those willing to reproduce it that allows for a sense of value to be shared.

Firstly, through a discussion of the school life and pre-socialisation of the Dockyard workers, I show how education allowed the soon-to-be apprentices to form an early classed identity. This created an anticipatory working-class self that manifested through cultural iconographies in the school yard that formed a moral boundary of class which allowed them to avoid wider societal devaluation. As such, before they entered the apprenticeship, they were becoming part of a working-class community. Similarly, I will show how masculinity appears as a social identity that moves from becoming into being in the workplace. Further, how the apprenticeship programme was the structure to develop this 'male' identity, as the workers discuss the transitional nature of the technical education which moved them into manhood. Class and masculinity flux through stages of becoming and being in an apprenticeship and it is through these processes of forming the communal self that discourses of value are created and recreated.

These boundaries are enforced through the apprenticeship both discursively through 'banter' and in a physical way through initiation rituals. Here, the apprentice hands over their body to the

community to perform their learned male identity legitimately. This culminates in the title of 'skilled worker' – a specific classed and gendered framework. Through the making of tools and the subsequent performance of their working class, masculine skill, the apprentice creates an intergenerational bond with the community. This is the final stage of the social education of an apprenticeship as they move into the being of class and gender through acquisition of the title of skill. They perform all they have learnt and reproduce the legitimacy of these lessons and the values of the community. Overall these discussions will show how the craft-skill community emerged and how value was formed and reproduced through occupational communities.

School Life

Dockyard culture, like the sounds, spilled out beyond the gates as the occupational culture was reproduced through physical, social and moral boundaries, making the culture of the towns a mirror for the culture of the Yard. As Chatham Dockyard was once a site of skill and pride for the workers, it directly reflected the value of Medway as its reputation was of a Naval town adding to the war efforts. Particularly these moral economies of pride were reinforced at Dockyards because of their proximity to national service efforts (Knight, 1999). For the people of Medway, solace against discourses of working-class degradation could be found in that their community worked for the national interest. This meant that for the young working class of Medway, the draw to Dockyard work was strong as they knew it to be a place where they could go and share in the pride of former workers that they had witnessed. More so, as the Yard was so deeply entrenched within Medway's culture anyway, a form of pre-socialisation was occurring, allowing them to feel part of Yard culture before they had begun working there.

Both Penn (1986) and Strangleman (2005) outline the important role these forms of socialisation took in industrial work cultures. For Penn (1986), apprenticeships were central to working

class communities and therefore familial connections would often drive young people into the training scheme. Because of this, fathers would introduce their sons into the normative ideals of work life in preparation for their expected careers. Similarly, Strangleman (2005) discusses how memories of industrial cultures are shared throughout families and communities, binding members into the cultural standards of work before they begin. As such, the workplace was reproduced physically through the surrounding towns and socially through the members of the community. One did not need to be a Dockyard worker therefore, to share in its culture and reputation.

The reputation of being highly skilled was a title often afforded to Dockyards. Managing to avoid the standardization of production that had affected many other engineering industries, ship work maintained the high level of craft skill that allowed the workers to develop their trade to highly specialised levels (Brown et al, 1972). This level of skill and the good reputation that accompanied it came from the apprenticeship programme which Chatham was particularly renowned for. Dockyard apprenticeships in Chatham began in 1860 but initially were very unpopular and the quality of the educational training was not to a very good standard (Casey, 1999). By 1914 the discipline at the schools had become stricter, often taking on standards from the Royal Navy which prompted both an academic and moral education. This meant a focus on a social apprenticeship as much as a technical one which for many was seen to be the secret to Chatham's success at ship turnarounds and surpassing targets. It was at this same time in the early 1900s that the educational programme was standardized across all British Dockyard schools and an entrance examination was introduced which meant that only those with an aptitude for engineering were able to enter the Yard (Casey, 1999). Pre-socialisation then became useful as it provided young working-class men with an understanding of Dockyard culture and engineering. This was important for the young men when trying to negotiate the difficult terrain of secondary school.

The education system in Chatham was, when the participants were beginning school in the 1940s, and still is, streamed into secondary modern schools and grammar schools. For Paul Reynolds, a former electrical engineer apprentice who began in 1972, the grammar school was for those young boys who wanted to go onto university, it was not the place for the working class as highlighted by his teachers shock at a grammar school boy wanting to become a craftsman as he described:

Paul Reynolds: When I went to the grammar school I said I wanted to make a side board to go with my dining room chairs and table, the chap there nearly fell off his perch, it was a bit of a no, no subject in the grammar school, you know, it was languages and the arts and that sort of thing.

The education system was reinforcing a classed identity early in the young men's lives and shaping a correlation between working class and craft work. Paul Reynolds, despite failing his 11+ examination and initially attending a secondary modern school, was offered the opportunity to switch to a grammar school because of his aptitude for mathematics. As Paul described, the expectation was for him to utilise his skills to go onto university. However, Paul had spent his childhood in his father's workshop assisting him with his RAF duties on the ham radios (used for official communications). This early experience meant that Paul developed an interest in engineering and the military, often helping his father build and repair the radios as he described; "electrical engineering, it's what I'd been brought up with". For Paul therefore, working with his hands and being a part of the Navy through his labour was more interesting and he was keen to utilise his mathematical skills alongside his interest in craft and become an electrical engineer. For Paul, he experienced two competing forces throughout his youth, the grammar school that encouraged the normative ideology of a university career and his early engineering socialisation with his father. In the end, his familial connection to craft was strongest and he went to take the Dockyard entrance exam against the wishes of his teachers. The pre-socialisation into craft work therefore had a much stronger effect on Paul which is disseminated by familial connections before the young person begins at work.

This experience is exemplified in Selina Todd's (2014) historical account of working-class culture. Since the inception of grammar schools, despite the potential for equal opportunity, the system remained a largely classed one. Historically, young working-class people lacked access to the basic resources that would allow them to compete with their middle-class counterparts (Todd, 2014). Culturally too, the young people would face resistance to attend a grammar school within their own family as parents, particularly fathers, would be concerned about their children becoming socially isolated from the rest of the family, their peers and the wider community (Todd, 2014). Instead, the preference would be for the young men to learn a trade which would offer them stability and a 'job for life' (Todd, 2014; Vickerstaff, 2007). For those working-class children who did attend a grammar school, extracurricular activities and resources would often be too expensive for the families, creating the assumption that they were not as dedicated to their learning (Todd, 2014). Throughout their young lives, the working class are already subjected to the struggles of class inequality. In the education system, they faced early confrontation with the discourses of valuation that deem them to be 'lacking' (Lawler, 2005; Reay, 2017). Consequently, they are considered unsuitable for grammar school education even if they manage to attend. These 'symbolic injuries' become engrained into their sense of self early on (Sennett and Cobb, 1972). Paul's experience of school life is the manifestation of these 'symbolic injuries' as he is dissuaded from pursuing the kind of craft education that he enjoys. It is treated as 'improper' work and therefore, devalued.

For the young working-class boys like Paul, their fathers, rather than necessarily encouraging their children to avoid a grammar education due to a lack of ambition, instead instilled a sense of resistance by rejecting the system that deems them to be valueless and rather, pursue a secondary education with the intention of becoming a skilled craftsman. From early on in their lives, all twenty-three former workers in Chatham outlined the role their fathers played in encouraging them to reject

the normative educational discourses that could offer them little success and instead re-evaluate the educational sphere to find a route that would give them legitimacy. The Dockyard men explicitly recalled the expectation laid down by their older male relatives aimed at directing their careers towards engineering and away from the school yard as exemplified by David Wray, a former Yard service maintenance worker who began in 1965 and Mark Foster, a machinist apprentice beginning in 1979:

David Wray: It was a family sort of tradition that you went in the Dockyard.

Mark Foster: Someone in everyone's family worked there.

Both men articulate the normative route for young men when they left school and were contemplating their career paths. As David suggests through his description of it as a tradition, it was an expectation and one that was not easily deviated from. Even when circumstances would lead the young men towards a different path, their fathers would guide them back to what was expected from them as we can see in the school career of Paul Reynolds.

Adrian Turner, a former coppersmith who entered the Dockyard in 1989, further exemplified the discourses of value that existed in Medway with some forms of learning given legitimacy over others:

Adrian Turner: That was a bit... little bit out of the ordinary for you know, secondary school... especially secondary school kids to go to university.

As Adrian describes, there was an expected route for young people dependent on the school that they attended. For those like him who attended a secondary school rather than grammar, the options to pursue traditional education were limited. So, for working class boys like Adrian Turner and Paul Reynolds, the Dockyard offered the opportunity for a highly respected four-year education in an industry that interested them with the likely potential for good, stable paid work at the end of it.

Common amongst literatures on working class young people in education are the accounts of schools' systemic failures (Reay, 2017), or young people themselves renegotiating the space (Willis, 1977; Ward, 2015). Diane Reay (2017) in *Miseducation* explores this idea further by engaging with young people at school who are disproportionately more likely to be unsuccessful in traditional education such as working class and black and ethnic minority students. Here, Reay (2017) gives voice to the students who are facing discouragement and systematic examinations which often leaves them at the bottom of league tables, adding to their own sense of failure. At traditional schools, young people from working class families are held back by the system that does not allow them to achieve through performance of their own inherited classed and gendered identities.

Paul Willis (1977) offers one of the seminal depictions of the experience of young working-class boys at school that can help us to understand the cultural effects of an education system designed to benefit only some pupils. Through his work, we can see how young men were more likely to fail in traditional educational settings in comparison to their middle-class counterparts because of the normative expectation for them to move onto industrial work. As such, they adopted ideals of heightened masculinity, cultural codes they felt would be more beneficial for their future job prospects that were largely counter to the expectations of behaviour from their teachers. Michael Ward (2015) revisits this in *From Labouring to Learning* where he examines the loss of industry on these practices of anti-education masculinity. In both accounts, the young men were inheriting an industrial heritage that affected how they engaged with their schooling. From a young age, the working-class had to compete with opposing discourses of value. One that values practical talent versus the official discourse that prefers mental accretion.

For the Dockyard workers, this duality manifested in their bodily disposition of craft. Peter Sargison, a former shipwright apprentice who began in 1953, attributed his aptitude for engineering

to his childhood of playing with Meccano. This metal construction game, coupled with his father's long career in engineering, enabled him, as he described, to develop the ability to work well with his hands. Meccano is a toy that encouraged him to develop a satisfaction from physical work and the tangible result of it. Like the processes of revaluation, Peter was learning to reject normative educational discourses that would prioritise the intangible in favour of finding pleasure from the palpable. This was reinforced by most other participants who described 'working with hands' as the only way to find satisfaction in labour. They varied in accounts of their socialisation into it but like Peter, all identified there being a 'natural' aptitude for this type of learning and labouring which rather than being intrinsic to them, can be traced back to teachings from older male relatives. This was exemplified by Adrian Turner, a Coppersmith apprentice from 1980 and Stuart Pollitt:

Adrian Turner: My older brother, erm... he... he was already in the Yard, he did a technician's apprenticeship [...] erm... so basically, I was a bit involved in it, erm... knew about the culture and stuff... I was never an academic, erm... I was better with these [holds up hands].

Stuart Pollitt: I was receptive and responsive to erm... to that kind of training... hands on training rather than reading from a book.

The Dockyard workers therefore were being trained for engineering from childhood which could give them a sphere to find value and success.

Learnt through pre-socialisation and reinforced at school, the young men were being shaped into a classed identity by positioning them as opposed to their middle-class peers. This was an intrinsic aspect of what lead young men into the Dockyard apprenticeship scheme as Chris Willing, a former boilermaker who began in 1972 remembered:

Chris Willing: I joined the Dockyard from a secondary modern school at which I was in the C Stream and the school was not interested in pushing anyone below the B stream into doing

any O levels or any other sort of qualifications, in fact the careers office had the opinion that you could only be fit for general labouring or shop work.

As Chris describes, from an early age the young people were streamed into their future careers. This enabled them to develop a strong classed identity in preparation for their work lives. Being working class is far more complex than the labour you engage in then, it is a cultural and social identity deeply rooted in the development of the self and reinforced by institutions. E.P. Thompson (1982 [1968]) in *The Making of The English Working class*, focused upon the lived experience of class by narrating people's experiences, showing the impact these have on their outlook on the world. As such, class identities manifest from the beliefs people adhere to which in turn, alters how they engage with their surroundings. Class in this sense is reciprocal, shaped by experiences which define their sense of self, enforcing and reinforcing a class position and identity. For Chris Willing, the way in which his school classified his aptitude directly impacted both his future work life and the social identity that he adhered to. Class therefore is a reciprocal social positioning, as structural inequalities like the boundaries enforced in Chris' school, shape the individual which in response, will determine how they navigate their social and cultural environments. Those who share in the same experiences will adopt a similar perspective, creating a collective identity. Class communities therefore are:

the way[s] these experiences are handled in cultural terms; embodied in traditions, value systems, ideas and institutional forms (Thompson, 1982[1968]: 9).

Class as Thompson (1982[1968]) sees it, is the accumulation of structural inequalities that harbour and embed within the individual creating a culture in response that is shaped by the landscape of discrimination.

In addition, Pahl (1984) in *Divisions of Labour* draws a similar conclusion as he sees class as a reaction to material conditions. Pahl (1984) looks at different forms of labour, seeing class as inherited

practices that are born from structural conditions. Like Thompson (1982[1968]), Pahl (1984) sees class cultures as identities in response. Pahl's (1984) work however is focused around how class identities manifest into divisions of labour both in and outside of the home. What both authors tell us here is that class identities form from material relations that shape a collective solidarity as a coping mechanism. Becoming into a classed identity requires these shared experiences of unequal access. These can take form in multiple arenas and specifically for the young men here, were concentrated in their school life. In this way, class identities are understood as multi-faceted cultures shaped by differing experiences. Class identity therefore is not just a static identification of structural positioning but is laced with multiple experiences of becoming into an identity shaped by environments. An individual can develop layers of a class identity based upon the contexts that shape them, performed specifically for that setting. Once again class is experienced as a discourse, hierarchical but layered with multiple discourses shaped by circumstances. Therefore, the classed identity formed through the Dockyard apprenticeship would be a specific one to that landscape.

These classed identities were shared through familial connections at Chatham as David Wray, a Yard service maintenance engineer who began his time in 1965 describes:

David Wray: Well it was basically known as the family Dockyard because you followed in the Yard, if your father worked in there, or a brother or uncle, aunt, you basically went in there, you know, cause it was the only biggest employment in the Medway towns at the time ... the main erm, employer was Chatham Dockyard and erm, like I said my father worked in here, my late father in law erm, my brothers worked in here various jobs, my uncle so basically it was a family sort of tradition that you went in the Dockyard.

As David implies, legacies of a specific craft culture were being shared and reproduced across one generation to another. This has historically been a core characteristic of Dockyard work (Hill, 1976). Hill (1976), in his account of privately-owned Dockyards from the turn of the century, outlines the

importance of social connections to Dockyard work as fathers would encourage their sons to join the labour force to “transmit traditional skills and pride in craftsmanship from generation to generation” (Hill, 1976: 28/29). This resulted in a workforce that prioritised social connections at work to ensure the job standards were reproduced. Because of the highly specialised nature of this work, it was rarely recognised outside of the industry (Hill, 1976). This buttressed the kinships at work as it was largely only amongst the occupational community that their skills were admired. Dockyard work is therefore social work. Hence, passing on these social connections and cultures were particularly important as Hill (1976: 175) describes:

the presence of older relatives in the industry should facilitate the transmission of occupational culture via anticipatory socialization.

The social transmission of this culture therefore was essential to maintain a sphere in which their skill could find value.

More so, this historical memory of labour that Hill (1976) describes, is the accumulation of all past knowledges of the labour which manifests within the individuals to form the craft- skill identity; the social character of craft work. By passing this on to the newer workers, the valued identity is shared. Ensuring this culture is transmitted early on is essential for Dockyard work, as pre-socialisation enables the spheres of value to be reinforced. Creating and reproducing these communal identities was an organic process handed down throughout family members like David Wray suggested. As they saw their older male relatives enter this workplace and the communal identity that went along with it, the young men recognise the legitimacy of this labour and identity before they began at the Yard. Thus, from an early age the young men were being socialised into the circuits of valuation, devaluation and revaluation. They were already being taught what will enable them pride and what will delegitimise their identities and cultural traits. Subsequently they were being trained to pursue avenues in which they can find value by rejecting normative discourses and reconstructing their own.

It is here that they are becoming into the classed identity. They have experienced the devaluation of the normative educational discourses and have been taught by their fathers to reevaluate this sphere and seek legitimacy elsewhere. Their fathers are teaching them how to become working class.

Through relations with existing workers, the craft community was developing the expectation of giving something to the young men but first, needed them to meet the requirements to enter into a social contract of a reciprocal relationship. Therefore, the community was reproducing itself and using the father to do so. This was enforced through familial connections in Chatham:

Richard Boorman: Because many thousands of families over the years became totally committed to generation after generation being employed mainly in the Dockyard, this aspect alone has dictated that the sheer culture of local people has been required to change.

As Richard tells us, the communal identity of Chatham has been shaped by the Dockyard. Craft identities leak outside of the walls of the industry and shape the identities of the workers and those around them. Ian Roberts (1993: 7) in *Craft, Class and Control* offers an account that parallels this as he uses the Dockyard in Sheppey as a microcosm for understanding wider structures. As he describes:

The specific quality of the local culture can be seen to influence the nature of the social relations of production within the workplace, as well as vice versa.

What Roberts (1993) shows is how practices of the Shipyard were reproduced outside into the local community which demonstrates that the experience of labour is a slippery one that does not hold within the workplace walls. In his account, he maps the transitions that have occurred through Yard work in terms of materials used, managerial structures and employment relations. Roberts (1993) uses this as a metaphoric site to examine wider changes in capitalist structures which highlights the complex webbing of industrial labour and its association with wider experiences. Importantly too, he demonstrates the need to understand micro experiences in relationship to the macro landscapes in

which they operate. In this instance, Roberts (1993) demonstrates the leakage of industrial work which gives us more insight into how craft work shapes the lives of the workers beyond their labour identities.

In Chatham, Philip MacDougall (2012) remembers attending annual Navy Days hosted by the Dockyard as a young boy. There were various attractions throughout the Yard but most prominently, ships and submarines were available for attendees to board. Thousands of people would flock to the Yard for the attraction creating what MacDougall (2012) remembers as 'gridlock' on the surrounding roads. Of course, only certain areas of the Yard were made available to the public due to the military privacy. Nevertheless, these events and even the secrecy shrouding aspects of the place, would give young people, friends and families insight into the work and the Naval connotations of a career in the Yard. Dave Venus, a former engine fitter who began in 1957, remembered the effect that the Navy days had on his aspirations and imaginings of his future as a young boy:

Dave Venus: [I] used to go to Navy days, used to enjoy that... and obviously... always had visions and pictures of me, being in the navy uniform with the ship coming in and... my wife standing on the quay and waving [laughs].

Attendance at these events were an important event on the local calendar. For the young men like Dave in particular, these would be the first glimpses of Dockyard life inside the walls. Focused mostly on the military successes, the events would reinforce the notion that Dockyard work is proud work that serves to protect the nation. Offering the same promises of heroism that come with joining the military, the Navy days allowed the men and women of Chatham to feel that their community were heroes too.

Through these glimpses, the discourses of value that maintain craft work as legitimate work within the Dockyard will seep out to potential future workers, instilling the parameters of legitimacy onto them. These discourses are necessary for the young working-class boys in response to the devaluation faced at school and to the local community of Chatham. Turning to Sennett's (1998) account of the lives of Rico and Enrico can allow us to see how workplace identities shape moral identities. As Enrico was able to develop a workplace identity when industry was thriving, his sense of a 'good' character was determined by the conditions of labour. Similarly, for Rico, his identity was shaped by his work although this left him in a state of turmoil about what that 'good character' should be. Importantly through, what this account shows us is that working-class people derive their sense of self from their labour which affects their identities outside of the workplace as Sennett (1998: 71) suggests "people see their work as a reflection of their own identities." In this case, we can see how Enrico was once able to shield from working class degradation through valuing traits available to him which was buttressed by his rewards of a linear life narrative.

What Sennett describes then is a morality latent within relationships to work identities. This is a central aspect more widely to the experience of being working class where inherited knowledges, like those Enrico tried to pass onto Rico, are put into practice to circumvent narratives of devaluation. Likewise, Saatcioglu and Ozanne (2013: 692) in their study of trailer park communities, attempt to understand how these moral parameters are experienced every day. As they found:

Morally oriented worldviews are enacted through consumption practices and social evaluations within everyday communities.

Value is something felt and understood by working class people and enacted and negotiated through material conditions. Morality and value in this case are the 'symbolic injuries' whereby circuits of value decipher what is respectable and good and what is not (Sennett and Cobb, 1972). This is similar to the conclusions drawn by Skeggs (1997) that circuits of valuation are exclusionary spheres which shift to

continuously devalue the working class. Therefore, identities are a cultural expression of material conditions which shape the experience of being working class. However, in response, the craft community share in their own discourses of what is valuable. In Chatham, these manifested through performances of their inherited class identity which when fully performed in this sphere, gave them value. Through pre-socialisation the young men were being engrained into these discourses and learning their parameters. Nevertheless, this was not a one-way process, the young men were keen to socialise themselves into Dockyard culture too.

In Chatham's local schools, cultural icons and the attachments to symbols of craft work reproduced these discourses. Cultural icons are loaded with judgements about morality, creating boundaries of value. Laurence Goater, a former electrical engineer apprentice at Chatham Dockyard beginning in 1980, gives insight into how through these icons, young people could gain legitimacy in their identities and engage in practices of revaluation. At Laurence's secondary school in Medway in the late 1970s, the workwear of Chatham Dockyard workers was a fashion statement. As Laurence describes:

Laurence Goater: If you knew someone in the Dockyard, you used to be able to get a Donkey jacket and you used to get what they called... a big thing at the time at school was called Steeles.

Throughout local secondary schools this Dockyard workwear was coveted. Luckily for Laurence, his uncle worked at the Yard which meant he could prove his association to the Dockyard and earn value amongst his school peers. In Medway, it became an essential part of life for the young people to have a relative who worked at the Dockyard to be able to engage in these processes of revaluation. As such, they were able to reject the normative ideology of education that often deems working class boys as failures (Willis, 1977; Ward, 2015; Reay, 2017), and find a sphere in which they can gain legitimacy. As these circuits of value necessarily require exclusion (Skeggs, 1997), a new discourse was formed based

upon Dockyard culture which excluded those who could not acquire these status symbols. This history of fetishizing working-class culture was a common practice throughout the 1960s whereby TV shows and literature depicted working class people as authentic (Todd, 2014). As in the case of the jacket, this iconography was detached from the material conditions of work. The young men were eager to adopt the culture of the Dockyard with little further knowledge of what the labour would entail. The reality of the jacket and the Steeles serving a practical role in the labour was removed, instead they represented an identity that was accessible and legitimate within that sphere.

Turning to the work of Caplow (1964: 101), the importance of iconography becomes clearer as he describes:

Belief in the skilled nature of its work is ...used in such a way ...to win acceptance of its claims to have an exclusive sphere of competence... Such a belief forms an essential element of what has been called the 'sacred' realm of occupation: that collection of myths, values and norms which constitutes the distinct culture of the trade or profession, and which both binds the members to the occupation and controls their activity.

The jacket adopts the role of the 'totem' that Caplow (1964: 101) describes and represents a discourse in which the young people could form value. By engaging with this iconography before they joined the Dockyard, the young people reinforce the "exclusive sphere of competence" (Caplow, 1964:101), as they buttress the legitimacy of the culture of industrial work and allow the identity to be shared to them. By coveting and wearing the jacket, they wear an identity, like an intergenerational cloak of pride, they access the legitimacy shared by current and former workers; they want to engage in this iconography because they recognise the value it holds. This is because associations are tied to material objects (Miller, 2008).

As Miller (2008) 'thinks through things' in London living rooms, he outlines that through the objects people hold important, social relationships are displayed. Objects are associations in this sense as they demonstrate a connection to a person, a group or a memory. Like Assman and Czaplicka's (1995) 'cultural memories', objects retain memories of individuals and communities. In this case, the jacket and the Steeles hold the memories of pride as they are imbued with histories of discourses of value which they legitimise by desiring it. Therefore, through these cultural items the young people are sharing and reproducing a discourse of value. By adopting and displaying this valued iconography, the cultural identity is disseminated throughout the surrounding community and offers an avenue for those who usually lack access to legitimacy, an identity that can give them pride. The attachment given to the jacket and Steeles is a symbolic attachment to the community of skill found in the Dockyard. The community becomes reified within this iconography, a common practice in craft work for Crawford (2009: 15) who as a mechanic and academic, articulates this process:

Shared memories attach to the material souvenirs of our lives, and producing them is a kind of communion, with others and with the future.

Although here Crawford (2009) is referring to the making of things through craft, we can apply the same idea to the making of a community through cultural symbols. As the young people in Laurence's school create this community of Dockyard jackets and Steeles, they create an imagined association between themselves and the workers. The jacket becomes a vessel of that valued identity which can be shared, bridging value to other working-class boys which reinforces solidarity within these communities based upon the identity of the local industry.

This fixation with Dockyard culture is part of a wider project to subvert working class shame (Sayer, 2005). As Sayer (2005) describes it, people care about how others view them and often consider themselves in terms of their position to others, whether they are viewed as respectable or not. These judgements intertwine with the moral judgements of class and become affective locations

within a social grouping. This 'moral boundary drawing' means that individuals will create schemas in which their social identities are legitimate (Sayer, 2005: 952). In Laurence's account of the cultural iconography of the Dockyard and its uniform, he engages with these affective terms that denote some as lacking. The other school children who do not have Dockyard connections to gain the uniform in this instance are the ones who lack. This distinction is important to re-appropriate some value for the working-class children who 'lack' traditional and legitimate educational capital. Instead therefore, they popularise the iconography of a system in which they can find value; Dockyard culture. In this way, they engage in a process of 're-valuation'. The young people such as Laurence act as Bourdieu (1984) describes, by refusing what they are refused. They therefore create a framework or discourse, in which they find value early on through the Dockyard. They begin the process of becoming into the craft-skill identity by accepting its frameworks and therefore, pre-socialise themselves into the community as they respect it and admire it whilst still at school. They therefore are giving consent to adopt the cultural values of craft work and begin to invest in the community identity pre-emptively, creating the conditions for the existing workers to see their adherence to the craft work order and accept them into the fold where they can achieve value.

Class identities are not static then but are a state of being that is shaped by experiences which vary dependent upon race, gender and other structural interventions. Each identity will differ slightly as they renegotiate boundaries to suit their environment. Each classed group will recreate these moral boundaries to form cultural spaces in which they can find value and legitimacy in their identities. They are becoming class when they face the structural inequalities and are being their class identity when they revalue and renegotiate. Through preliminary socialisation they are accruing the collective experiences of delegitimation and discrimination which allows them to find solidarity within a communal identity. These processes as we have seen are not static as experiences fluctuate in between states of becoming and being; it is an identity in constant negotiation. Class is not a stagnant

response to material conditions therefore but is an active identity that is reinforced by members. Reevaluation is an affective response to the experience of what it is to be working class. It is an identity that is shared, rooted in the community and embodied in the individual. This framework was a classed and gendered sphere in which they were legitimised, allowing them to internalise and perform the identity. Masculinity, therefore, like class, is embedded with states of becoming and being.

Becoming Male

Masculinity is the most explicit form that the craft identity took as explained by Stuart Pollitt and Simon Sandys, a shipwright apprentice who began in 1979:

Stuart Pollitt: To, to lead you from being a lad if you like, working with Skippers, into becoming a young man, erm, paid as an adult and working on your own.

Simon Sandys: There was more future in going, in getting an apprenticeship, going to the Dockyard, you know, there was a future in it, you know, I was eventually gonna become a skilled man.

As Stuart suggests, the role of the Skipper was to lead the boy into the process of becoming a man. Simon shows us that this was the expectation of the young people too. Both Skipper and apprentice knew the journey into masculinity that the craft learning would encompass. This, as Simon recalls, is a process of futurity. The development of masculinity was synonymous with investment in the future craft self; to be successful and have longevity at work, they had to undergo this transformation. Young men like Stuart and Simon were transitioning into a more developed state of manhood, achieved through a craft education. This is because masculinity is a social identity; one that is learnt through association and then embodied and performed which serves to reproduce it. Masculine identities form discursively, shaped by the communities that individuals are engaged with which manifest within the body. Not necessarily just a reflection of physicality, masculinity also becomes a moral form of affect

which creates boundaries of exclusion. As Simon suggests, this transition into manhood is inextricably linked to skill. Like class, masculinity as a social identity is a fragile one that requires enforcement and reproduction. It is a practice of revaluation undertaken by working class men to propagate their classed identity who unlike their middle-class counterparts, lack in institutional power so must find control elsewhere (Kimmel, 1996). Like a moral boundary, masculinity is a framework to find value that was gifted to the men like Simon and Stuart as it created a cultural community in which they could achieve legitimacy and it is in this way that they are being a masculine identity.

Becoming into a masculine identity is a response to structural conditions that seek to devalue them which for working class men, is synonymous with the workplace (Hodson, 2001). As Segal (1997: 297) outlines, work “is one of the main anchorages of male identity” as:

Men’s engagement in paid work, in ‘skilled’ work, is central to the construction of masculinity, or, as the contrasts in men’s working lives would suggest, of masculinities.

Segal’s (1997) plurality of masculinity implies that like class, there are multiple identities as they are shaped by experiences. As such, the identity forged in Chatham is specific to the experiences of Chatham’s workforce. This does not mean however that similar patterns do not emerge. Overwhelmingly in accounts of men at work, the discursive practice of masculine identities is synonymous with the “incubation, reinforcement and reproduction of macho values and attitudes” (McIvor, 2013: 77), which include:

signs and signifiers like in-jokes, coarse, often sexist language; the ‘piss take’ of one another, having a laugh, homophobic banter/ jokes and the exclusion of the feminine (Ward, 2015: 29).

This too was an important aspect to the Dockyard male as Tony Gutteridge, an electrical engineer from 1960 describes:

Tony Gutteridge: When you went in you were 17, 18 and you were jack the lad then you know.

Tony outlines the journey into masculinity and how they would take the 'jack the lad' attitude that they had developed as Chris Willing further demonstrates:

Chris Willing: The Skippers I think had a genuine desire to look after their charges and mostly gave very good advice, but you needed to be aware of the odd wind up, if you spotted the first one you were in.

This legitimised mischief was likely because they would have gone through the similar process themselves and therefore developed the attitude of messing around that became intrinsic to their craft identity and reproduced and legitimised as they recreated it with the young apprentices. Crawford (2009) in *Shop Class as Soul Craft* introduces the integral role masculine discourse takes in becoming a masculine identity. In his autobiographical account of entering the motorbike repair industry, he articulates the requirement for correct cultural languages and codes to be used for his mentor to instruct him. These discourses were macho in character, requiring Crawford (2009) to engage in sexual banter and the feminisation of others for the other workers to accept him into their community. Masculinity in this sense was a requirement to access the workplace which is reproduced and reinforced as Crawford (2009) engages.

Through Crawford's (2009) account, he explicitly identifies these masculine discourses to be a central component to the work community and implicitly reinforces this through his accounts of his work life. Whilst describing the process of 'kick starting' a motorbike and the formal and informal procedure he was taught to achieve this, Crawford (2009) demonstrates the importance of maintaining a strong masculine identity throughout by checking no 'rivals' or 'attractive women' were able to see the failed attempts. Through these discussions, Crawford (2009) displays how ingrained these masculine values are into both his construction of the 'self' and in his work practices. Part of Crawford's (2009) learned occupational disposition was a heightened masculinity as the process of 'kick starting' a motorbike is habitually linked to 'performing' his masculinity through displays of

physicality, territoriality against other men and the sexualisation of women. Crawford (2009) was able to find meaning through masculinity, allowing him to share in a valued cultural identity within the discourse created in that occupational culture.

Like the discursive banter required to join the communities at work, embodying masculinity is an act of becoming male. Theil (2007; 2012) found manual labour sites to be reciprocally manifesting and reinforcing masculine classed ideals through his ethnographies of building sites. Here, the males were bound up in notions of physicality both embodied and discursive in practice which derived from the physicality necessary for their work roles. In this sense, because the builders relied upon physical strength to complete their tasks at work and to exhibit their competence, the demonstration of bodily masculinity was both a practical and social necessity. This became intrinsic to their identity and central to their construction of the self which resulted in physicality and therefore violence, becoming a dominant measure to achieve an ends (Theil, 2012). This embodiment of masculinity and physicality is conducive of how manual work 'mortifies the body' (Dudley, 1994), as it shapes the bodily self to suit both the social character of the labour and the physical requirements of the job. Kideckel (2008) too found the bodily impact of craft to be problematic for post-socialist Romanians who attempted to find work in the new economy but whose bodies had been transformed by industrial labour. As such, the body was hard to re-train once it had learnt a specific way to perform skill and labour. In this way, Theil's builders' dispositions, like those in Kideckel and Dudley's research, is shaped by the skill required for their role as labourer. More so, Theil's builders can share access to the community of masculine values by enacting a bodily version of craft-skill. As such, by both producing products of skill (which we will later come to see is also a gendered act), and performing their shared disposition of masculinity correctly, they are engaging in a communal identity both discursively through sexual banter and physically through violence (Theil, 2012). As they embody and practice the shared

community of labour and of their class culture, they can attain dignity at work as they achieve autonomy practically and socially.

Like in other workplaces, the body was an essential part of craft work in Chatham. The Dockyard worker was anticipated to use their physicality in their role, as in a sense, their body was to be given over to their craft through the physicality required to demonstrate their skills to achieve the highest standard. But also, their bodies were up for grabs in terms of the pranks pulled. These pranks would range from equipment being tampered with to apprentices being dangled from machinery. This giving over the self was an integral part of the apprenticeship and was an important social lesson to learn reinforced by the graduation process that all apprentices would face on their last day. Described by Bob Dennis, a former boilermaker apprentice who began in 1961, the last day of apprenticeship would be an important day for the final initiation from a boy into a man:

Bob Dennis: Then you always had your ceremony when you got, when you come out your apprenticeship and you can't escape that, even the fully qualified men join in then, they all hide on your last... like if this was today, your last apprenticeship day, they would, when you clock out they get ya... strip ya... and then you're in what they call, it's like a ... what can I say... it's a paste with gritty bits, so it gets all the muck out your hands and that but they used to have a big drum of it, you know, and you had to go head first in that ... and you knew it, I mean, everybody hid different places cause they were hoping, I mean, I'll be honest, I knew where I was going ... in the loo and lock the door and I thought well I'll sit in there half hour and that'll be it, they'll be gone and I can walk out... see if you got out the boiler shop without 'em getting ya then you passed, that was, they wouldn't touch you again ... but you couldn't... they had every exit covered and silly old me thought oh I'd got it, I come out all cocky 'oh nobody about' and I got more or less ready, I had me card ready for donging down and they jumped on me ... so I didn't get away with it ... but... part of being an apprentice.

Unfortunately for Bob, the ritual concluded with his clothes being taken and having to negotiate getting home whilst attempting to preserve his modesty. For Bob, the biggest disappointment lied with his inability to avoid the ritual which would have allowed him to escape the humiliation that would carry through for the next few years of his work life. These kinds of initiations were paramount to the craft-skill community as the apprentice was removed of all clothing that signified them as in training and humiliated in a very physical way, a measure to demonstrate their ability to have the physicality required to become a man. By undergoing the ritual, the apprentice could prove their masculinity as their bodies were resilient enough to remain unharmed. Too it symbolised their willingness to allow their bodies to become a part of the community as the prank was enacted in the public sphere of the Yard. These kinds of pranks were common throughout the apprenticeship and marked both the beginning and the end of the process of becoming into the craft-skill identity. Like a religious conversion, the apprentice's self is moved from a physical unmarked state into an almost transcendent embodiment of the craft-skill identity and community. They are no longer just an individual body but are a part of the collective body. Remembering through the self is an important aspect of the 'mnemonic community' discussed earlier, as it gives a physicality to the collective memory (Mistral, 2003).

This is a central aspect to communal remembering as Mistral (2003) describes in her account of 'mnemonic communities' whereby communities of memory are reliant on individuals to give embodiment and physicality to that history. Through this, the individual becomes engrained into the collective and can share value from the traditions they are now a part of. Through the embodiment of the craft-skill identity, the individual is enacting the collective through the individual. Like the workers in Theil's (2012) account, the craft-skill community is performed through the work that moves them into a physical embodiment of the labour. This allows for the craft-skill identity to be bridged through the individual as they become the performance of that identity that can be copied and reproduced

through others. This process of becoming and being was all a part of the training; the training of how to become a skilled man. The sharing of the normative standards of masculinity therefore were as essential to the Dockyard training as the basic hand skills.

Latent within this process is the symbolic representation of the young man being handed from one father figure to another, the Dockyard itself. As such, it would take over the socialisation role and become the masculine figure to the young man, taking him from a boy into a man. The Chatham Dockyard workers described this process implicitly through reoccurring narratives that placed the Skippers or more widely the Dockyard as an institution, into the paternal role of the workplace culture. Exemplified by Chris Willing once again, who described the apprenticeship programme at the Dockyard as:

Chris Willing: Lead[ing] you from becoming a lad if you like, working with Skippers, into becoming a man.

This entrance into the social nature of labour is believed to be an intrinsic part of Dockyard work. Alice Mah (2014: 9) in her account of Port culture found these Dock communities to be essentially male in character, “each Dock labour force has become highly insular, with strong intergenerational traditions of sons following fathers onto the Docks.” The passing on of the labour and the labour identity is an essential part of Dockyard work that reinforces the tight knit communities. The solidarity that is created from this sharing of culture forms a distinct way of life and a pride in what can come from this form of labour (Mah, 2014). As such, the cultures of work are reproduced and are valued as they allow for lifestyles to form and become essential to the character of the work itself. Distinctly then this is a masculine discourse that is handed down from member to member as the Yard takes over the paternal role, the young men are socialised into the dominant hegemonic ideal of Dockyard masculinity. Because new members are engrained into this ideology, they share in the belief of its legitimacy, allowing it to reproduce.

Once the workers have internalised the discursive and embodied character of masculinity, they perform it and are being masculine when they use their identity as a moral boundary. Reproducing and reinforcing their masculinity by distancing themselves from femininity was an essential means for the masculine culture to survive within working class communities (Walkerdine, 2010). Walkerdine (2010) examines this retrospectively to industry but we can see these practices were alive within industrial workplaces. Collinson (1988) in his ethnography of a lorry parts factory identified the feminisation of management to be an important practice in the moral distinction of masculinity which enabled the discursive and embodied to be practiced. In this sense they feminised management for not engaging in the informal rhetoric of masculinity and less directly, mark them as lacking in masculinity for not engaging in physical labour (Collinson, 1988). Collinson's (1988) focus is on the role of humour at work which was utilised as a tool of resistance. Similarly, banter has been associated as an affective tool to subvert boredom and authority in industrial labour (Roy, 1959; Coser, 1959; Wilson, 1979; Linstead, 1985). Humour therefore is an affective response to structural conditions like the 'shame' of class stigmatization that Sayer (2005) discusses.

Like class then, masculinity is practiced through affective responses. It is an identity with boundaries which include some and exclude others. The inclusion of those who participate within its practice allows for camaraderie and solidarity to form. Through the enforcement of these boundaries, the individual is being masculine as they are performing the discursive and embodied elements inherited through the becoming. Like class, masculinity is a language, a performance and an identity that creates solidarity and value. It is an identity that changes through periods of becoming and being which creates a community where a certain form of masculinity can be enacted and legitimised. Both masculinity and class are boundaries of legitimacy which manifest within the individual and reify in craft work through attachment to the notion of skill and skilled labour. In workplaces like Chatham Dockyard, the parameters of what is valuable classed and masculine identities manifested in the title

of skill. To be skilled was to reproduce the discourses of value and perform the craft-skill identity legitimately.

Crafting a Skilled Identity

Both class and masculinity intersect within the notion of skill. It is here that both forms take shape as the being of the skilled identity which allowed the workers to find value. They were given the title of 'skilled' enabling them to perform and legitimise their classed and gendered identities. But this skill too fluxes through states of becoming and being. The being of the classed identity and of the masculine identity are the state of becoming for the skilled identity. This is because it requires adoption of both forms for skill to manifest and move to the state of being. As such, the practice of moral boundary drawing of both class and masculinity create cultural spaces where skill can exist as they are the component parts of the valued skilled identity. Therefore, becoming skilled is being working class and masculine. As such, the title of skilled is not a value free judgement but is a moral imperative to find value in work. It is an identity that draws boundaries including some and excluding others. Largely in the literature on the relationship between gender and skill, the exclusionary nature of the identity is highlighted in the prevalence to think of skill as a title inaccessible to women as Maynard (1989: 159) articulates that masculinity is "bound up in the labour process, the notion of skill and the experience of work." Commonly too in sites of industrial labour, female participation in tasks deemed to be skilled was limited (Gaskell, 1983).

Skill then is not merely a physical manifestation of talent but takes form as a social construct that has both inclusionary and exclusionary potential which in this case imposes itself as an "ideological category" that is assigned "by virtue of the sex and power of the workers who perform it" (Philips and Taylor, 1980: 79). Like class and masculinity that make up its form, skill is not a static identity but is a construct to draw boundaries. Dudley (1994) in *End of the Line*, examines the role skill

played in industrial identities. As she found, skill was a context specific cultural identity which developed through generations of workers. In Dudley's (1994) descriptions, the workers had built up across generations a repertoire of informal and formal knowledges of how to complete the job to both a high standard and at a faster pace. By accumulating these knowledges through the medium of other workers, the individual is investing in a shared community of both the past, present and future, as workers acquire shared knowledges, implement them and adapt them to be passed along to future generations. The process of being skilled and identifying as such was in active renegotiation in the workplace dependent upon those who shared in the communal identity of what it was to be skilled. Skill, like its component parts, is reliant upon its environment as it is shaped by the needs of the workers and the workplace.

This skilled identity took physical form through the making of objects. Through craft, skill was performed and shared in the apprenticeship:

Paul Vandapeer: The apprenticeship programme meant that the Dockyard always had its own... erm, source of good quality er, very capable people with, with excellent skills I mean the level of training that people received er, was very, very good although... you don't have cause to do it... I could still file a piece of metal straight all these years later because it's a little bit like riding a bicycle... once you've been properly trained... you don't forget erm, erm, it was training of that level that, that... so people would, would have skills that they would keep for... for their life erm, so you had a workforce to draw from of, er, highly skilled people [...] it was a very high quality workforce [...] there were lots of... very, very skilled people.

As Paul, a technician apprentice from 1970 suggests, being able to craft properly was the way to attain the status of skilled. Once these techniques were mastered, skill would become a lifelong title. As such, it is the most recognisable form of a shared and valued identity that is reproduced through apprenticeship training. This however is a definition shaped by the community and whilst sharing in

basic principles, is formed by what the community deem legitimate. Through making therefore, moral boundaries are enforced and reproduced as each new cohort shares in its legitimacy. Much like the cultural iconography of the jacket and boots, tools in craft work serve as memory transmitters that can allow for value to be reproduced. They too hold within them the potential for social relationships to form which create a community that relies on the memory of pride. More so, they act as vessels to reproduce this value and the legitimacy of the community.

On their first day in the workshops the Dockyard apprentices were handed a chisel, file and a lump of metal which they had to file down into various tools. They were given specific measurements to meet but with no equipment to measure with. If they were not close enough to the given measurements, they had to begin again. This was an essential part of the education process as shipbuilding required a high standard of craft:

Even though a great deal of equipment is supplied by outside sub-contractors, the building of a ship depends essentially on the manipulation of tools and materials by men who have acquired craft skills over a period of years (Brown and Brannen, 1970: 197).

Learning these practices was a part of the initiation into the communal identity as they needed to replicate the standard of those who came before them. Nevertheless, this kind of training for many was seen to be brutal and instilled a very strict discipline within them. Despite most boys despising their time with the file and chisel, it meant they developed a keen eye for precision that would serve them well throughout their careers. Alex Routen, a boilermaker apprentice who began in 1958, described the monotony of this time but the strict disposition it taught him when it came to his craft:

Alex Routen: So... what he'd do, he'd scribe a line across there... a nice straight line, from here to the lowest point... and the first tools they gave us was a hammer and chisel... two pound hammer and a cold chisel ... and you'd have to chip that metal down... until you got it down

to that line, more or less on that line, chip, chip, chip, chip erm... until that was flat and square, so it had to be square across the thickness and it had to be level across that way ... with a hammer and chisel, well I mean god, you just stood there all day hammer and chisel... the scars are faded now but you can imagine when you missed that chisel... you had scars all up your hands, gradually built up calluses on this hand with the hammer ... but, what was good about it was, it taught you to do as you were told even though it was a job you didn't wanna do... that, that discipline, that's where the discipline started with that.

Through making, the body was transformed into a resilient one that could handle the brutal effects of craft work. Scars developed across the hands that wore like badges of honour, tying together the generations that had passed through the same system. Throughout this training the physical and social self was shaped into one capable of making and with the discipline to craft to an exceptionally high standard. However, this also formed a social response which further reinforced an intergenerational camaraderie. As Alex describes the hours and upon hours of 'chip, chip, chip', he reflects on how these conditions harboured a disruptive reaction amongst apprentices:

Alex Routen: I mean you imagine standing chip, chip, chip all day long on that bit of metal, it got boring there, you're gonna get up to mischief aren't you.

This was reinforced by many Dockyard workers who recounted their time in the workshop and particularly Alan West, a former electrical engineer who began in 1964, who, like McIvor (2013) and Ward (2015) earlier described, identified a discursive camaraderie of banter forming:

Alan West: It was quite character building because there was a lot of mickey taking going on and if you could cope it would strengthen your personality [laughs].

Through this labour a culture begins to form of camaraderie between apprentices who bond through their boredom and toil. This was an essential part of the socialisation of apprentices as it served a dual purpose. It taught the sense of discipline that as Sennett (2008) notes, has always been an

intrinsic part of what it is to be a skilled craftsman. More so, it developed a social character that is essential to be an apprentice. More than an accumulation of social characteristics that foster the masculine character of industrial work that has been described, Alex Routen's time 'chipping' is another essential part of becoming into the craft-skill identity. The tools that he is using represent this process of becoming into the community and the identity. This is because the toil is shared with those apprentices who are with him there and then, but it also bonds together all the apprentices who had previously undergone this process and will do in the future. An intergenerational bonding is formed by tools. This kind of association with tools and the making of the same metal product associates the apprentices in a wider community of skill, discipline and mischief. As each generation becomes temporary custodians of this boredom, they are sharing the same experiences of past apprentices and therefore going through the same initiation process, ensuring the identity and culture that emerges in their early stages of their work, is like the ones that have existed for generations before. The 'chipping' in this case becomes the "sacred" act of initiation that Caplow (1964: 101) outlines as it is through this activity that "myths, values and norms" are shared and instilled. A consistent response is expected that allows the young people to share experiences with the other Dockyard workers from the first day of their apprenticeship which binds them into the "self-justificatory ideology" (1964:101) of the craft-skill community.

The relationship with the tools of craft is also a moral association. Like the classed distinctions outlined earlier on through Skeggs (1997) and Sayer (2005), the process of making the tools creates a moral distinction of what is 'good work' and a 'good attitude' to work. Those who can embody these traits and exhibit them through their work practices are respected which reinforces and legitimises the framework of what the craft-skill identity should be. When the apprentice is learning how to create and use the tools, they are engaging in a moral education as well as a technical one as Fine (2003: 76) notes:

Socialisation into an occupation does not consist only of acquiring techniques for performing certain tasks; socialization also involves taking over specific standards, beliefs and moral concerns.

Firstly, this moral concern comes from imbuing the objects with value as they are determined to be to a good standard. They are therefore transformed to become embodiments of the 'good worker' and become an objective version of the self which can be shared across generations. This imbuing of value and the objectification of the craft self is identified by Sennett (2008) as a quality of craft work that has always existed from artisanal making to industrial labour. Through this creative process there forms a "moral significance of material culture" (Crawford, 2009: 59). This connection between morality and the products of craft is not often expressed. Crawford (2009) however, as a craft worker himself, can extrapolate this connection in greater detail as it was a motivator for his own movement out of academia and into the motorbike repair industry. For Crawford (2009) materiality is inherently moral in craft because the act of making requires value judgements about what is essential and 'good' work. More so, he outlines the requirement to hold a certain disposition to be able to make these value judgements that are both intellectual and moral in character.

For the Dockyard workers alike, the making of tools was inherently a social and moral process. Recurrently, the workers described the making to be essential as it instilled a sense of discipline typified here by Dave Venus, a former engine fitter apprentice beginning in 1957, who expresses:

Dave Venus: The discipline that went with it... and it was a hell of a discipline.

Of course, standards were imposed of how to build products. But, thinking back to the role of discipline in Kefalas (2003) work of cultural spaces of neighbourhoods, we can see how it is much more social in character. The role of discipline acts as a moral boundary marker to decipher the character as good. It is an attainable cultural trait for the working class which can give them an accessible form

of value. When the former apprentices describe the making of tools as instilling discipline then, they are talking about inheriting these moral boundaries of what is good. Once again, they are learning to become working class through revaluation. Furthermore, Stuart Pollitt describes the moral connotations attached with disciplined labour. As he describes:

Stuart Pollitt: The more discipline you had, the better things you produced, the better you worked and the prouder you were with yourself.

In this case, he articulates the morality bound up with discipline. It is a cultural trait that is rewarded within that cultural sphere which gives the individual a sense of value. Too, it takes a tangible form, it is something that can be seen and measured which corresponds directly with the form of education they were socialised into which was earlier discussed. They prefer the palpable and through the making of tools, they can express their skill and attain value at work.

More so, as the Dockyard workers described, they are engaging in a moral assertion of making with hands as a valuable masculine trait. As Theil (2007;2012) showed us through the builders, physicality in labour is an essential part of finding dignity which is bound up in notions of masculinity. Like in Peter Sargison's earlier recounting of Meccano, the making of tools reifies working with hands to be an essential and valuable character to the labour. Stuart Pollitt too continued to describe the masculinity intrinsic to this as "[he] was blessed with discipline from [his] father." Once again, discipline was a social character taught to him in which he could find value. It was passed on through his father as a masculine trait which can achieve legitimacy within the sphere of craft work. To make and to express discipline were essential to the job role which was recognised by Stuart's father and shared to him to allow him to gain value. Therefore, physicality and the expression of the physical male body is necessary to the role. Through the teaching of making tools and the imparting of discipline, they are learning to be skilled through reinforcing the becoming into a classed and masculine culture.

The product of skill can appear as the vessel of the craft worker and the skilled identity as it allows the reification of the craftsman's values that may not diminish at the same rate as the individual (Crawford, 2009). Rather than thinking of material objects in the Marxist tradition of products of alienation, the tangible aspects of craft instead gives insight into the social nature of the work. Material goods show kinship as social connections become invested within the product which are conducive of their relationships with others (Miller, 2008). Craft work enables the attainment of value more so than non-manual roles because of this reification as the skilled identity is given tangible form showing alignment to the craft-skill identity. As the worker makes products, they are showing the accumulation of all current and past knowledges, leaving a cemented form for these to be passed on. Craft work is inherently social and intergenerational which allows occupational communities to develop and flourish. The product and material component of skill can bind the generations of workers together in a form that celebrates the individual's attachment to this important component of what it is to be skilled; access to these shared networks. Through these processes of tangibility and social networking, the craft-skill identity is shared, and the cultural norms valued as they were operationalised through the work process and legitimised by the dominant discourse of value shared by the occupational community.

Through the process of making in the apprenticeship, the young worker shares in the moral act of craft and gains an awareness of the intergenerational nature of tools. They learn what makes a product 'good' and the social and technical skill that is required to develop these knowledges. By being forced to develop a moral connection with the metal as they were given no measuring equipment, the apprentice must create an association between themselves and the product. This teaches them that craft work has a moral character and there are discourses of valuation that determine what makes a good craft product and a good craft worker. Craft work is moral work in this instance which aligns with their earlier experiences of moral distinctions at school. Once again, morality is central to the working-

class experience. More so, this morality is shared as the tools of labour becomes vessels of the craft-skill identity. Thus, this moral character is latent within the products and the process of making them which creates an intergenerational association with former and future apprentices as all share in the toil of 'chip, chip, chipping'. Their craft character is shaped by the lumps of metal which in themselves are imbued with the history of the craft-skill community.

Skill manifests within the individual which when performed, allows a certain solidarity to ensue. As Crawford (2009) entered his workplace, masculinity was a central component to learning the labour. However, it was only through this being of the masculine identity that he was able to too be considered skilled, allowing him to embody skill in a way that gave him access to the community of other workers. By engaging with these other workers, he was able to learn the informal techniques to complete certain jobs from them. Through these individuals, Crawford (2009) developed 'an eye' and 'an ear' for the problems with the bikes; being able to diagnose an issue through sight, sound and smell. Only through demonstrating his masculinity, was he able to embody skill once again reinforcing their interconnected nature. To access the title of skilled, Crawford (2009) had to demonstrate his alignment to the current social order of masculinity. The workplace develops a specific definition of this skill which reinforces its ideological dominance.

Skill therefore is not a simple reflection on the level of ability but is a social identity imbued with moral judgements of what it is to be working class and masculine. It is a boundary judgement that reifies within the community and the individual. Being working class gives the individual the experience of devaluation but also equips them with the tools to seek value through their own means. This expresses itself within industrial workplaces as a certain form of masculinity that gives them access to a discourse in which they can find value or as Caplow (1964:101) frames it, a "sphere of

competence". Here, they can find value through skill by performing their classed and gendered identities and being rewarded with the title of skilled craftsman.

Concluding discussions

The central focus of this chapter has been to show how the craft skill identity is formed by the earliest experiences of class and masculinity. In doing so, I have shown that an apprenticeship is a social education as well a technical one. It is an education that loads class and gender into the concept of a 'skilled' person. Throughout their learning, the young people go through states of becoming and being. This however is not a static or linear process but one that fluctuates between the two forms based upon memory – how successful the apprentice is able to draw upon these memories and how they can perform them. Therefore, an apprenticeship is just as much memory work as it is craft work. Throughout the apprenticeship, cultural memories are used to share the history of the community to the apprentice. This happens discursively throughout pre-socialisation that engrains them into expected norms of masculinity and class. More so, it happens through bodily and tangible cultural forms like the Donkey jacket, tools and the physical self. It is through these cultural memories that discourses of value are formed and reproduced. Here I have shown value to be likened to the tradition of Skeggs (1997) as a set of cultural codes that accrue value when they are legitimised within the sphere of the community of workers. In this case, specific class and masculine identities are assigned value. The community reproduce and legitimise this value by encouraging it.

Importantly, this raises more questions as to how these inherited identities of class, masculinity and skill are reproduced and performed in the workplace. More so, how these enabled discourses of value to form, giving legitimacy to the workers. As such, the following chapter will unpack how skill manifested at work and why industrial craft work created the conditions for this. Therefore, to further elucidate why Stuart Pollitt places such a high value on those that worked with him in the

machine shop, the next chapter will explore more of the language he uses to describe his memories. Particularly articulating what he describes to be 'thriving'. Through this discussion, we shall see how the lessons learnt in the apprenticeship were reinforced whilst at work and how the individual was able to perform a communal identity with the full autonomy that comes with the title of being a 'skilled craftsman'.

Chapter Three: A Thriving Machine Shop

As chapter two has described how the craft skill identity was formed by inheriting, reproducing and valuing specific classed and gendered ideals through pre-socialisation, chapter three can now explore their manifestation in the workplace. Specifically, how and why discourses of value were performed and shared through craft work. For this chapter, I examine why the workers enjoyed their jobs and what they got from them, what they liked about their work and what we can learn from that. This, I argue, is the skilled nature of the work which will be the focus for my discussion here.

This chapter is split into four sections which explore how skill is related to enjoyment. Firstly, what the workers in Chatham understood skill to be in practice; languages. More so, I show how the workers defined themselves and each other as skilled. I will also outline how problematic the definition of skill can be and the various measures and means that the workers used to attempt to create a skilled identity specific to their trade. Through these, I show that skill is contextual and is formed of different languages. Each occupational community would have had their own conversation about skill which was formed by the languages of their trades and culture. As such, in this section I will show how we can approach an understanding of skill that is nuanced enough to encompass different trades.

Once I have established how they were defining skill, I will introduce the idea of the skilled body. Here I show how workers embodied these discourses of skill and performed them. This demonstrates how the individual engaged with these on a much more grounded level. To demystify any abstract notion of skill and language, I show how skill was experienced and practiced by the workers to foreground that we can understand skill as a context-specific conversation. I then move the discussion in a similar vein through the material manifestation of skill in objects and explain why

craft work created the conditions for this. I allow the workers to introduce different products that they made at the Yard and demonstrate how they imprinted their individual and collective skilled identities onto these. Objects are not just reflective of social relationships, but they are social processes in themselves. Thus, I consider the affective nature of the community and how it enabled members to find value and legitimacy in their communal identities. More so, I show that the community acted as a protective wall to members which shielded them. Taken together, chapters two and three follow workers from young boys who were subject to devaluation in school to skilled workers who had found a community that valued them, but also protected them.

The Language of Skill

Although this may seem unusual considering overall, we are trying to understand why the men in Chatham liked their work, I would like to begin the discussions by introducing Gary Brooker, the one participant who did not enjoy his time at the Dockyard. Gary is a former engine fitter who joined the Yard in 1954 and described it as “awful” and “horrible”. Gary was the only Dockyard worker I spoke to who had negative feelings towards his time in Chatham and voluntarily left soon after his apprenticeship finished. Despite this, his account demonstrates how skill was defined by the cultural community in Chatham and particularly, how this was experienced by an ‘outsider’ like Gary. Throughout our conversation Gary was mostly drawing upon unhappy memories of his time in the Yard, describing the place as “grey”, “dark” and “dirty”. When trying to articulate further to me what it was about his time that he disliked, he recounted an afternoon soon after his apprenticeship had ended when he was sent to work in the boiler room. Whilst here, Gary was struck once again by how dirty the upright copper boilers were. This appeared to be the final straw for him and he acted:

Gary Brooker: I replaced all the pipes and I looked at it and I thought cor, so I got some Brasso and I shined all the pipes up. All nice copper.

The reaction to Gary's cleaning took him by surprise:

Gary Brooker: This officer came in, 'What have you done that for?' I said, 'it looks better'. 'I don't like that,' he said. 'Well it looks better.' 'No, no, I'm not having that. Make it dirty again.' It looked lovely! I like shiny copper pipes, I do. But you couldn't buck the system.

Here Gary is describing a different attitude towards work. His clearly did not fit in with "the system" which resulted in him not enjoying his work and the environment. If we compare this to other Dockyard workers, we can see that there is something more to the pipes than a dispute about dirt. Mark Foster, a machinist apprentice who began in 1979 described the officers and other workers as "a lovely bunch of people". Similarly, Adrian Turner, a former coppersmith apprentice also of the same year, described Chatham as "the best job in the towns". Lastly, Mark Colyer, a former tug worker who began shortly before closure in 1981, fondly remembered the Dockyard as "the best job I ever had". Clearly, from this brief snapshot of some of the other workers, we can see that there must have been something about Gary that caused his time to differ so vastly from the others interviewed.

This is because, despite Gary being formally trained as an apprentice and therefore having the technical skill, he lacked in the social character and knowledges of what the skilled community was. He repeatedly opposed the officers and other workers because he was not recognised as sharing in the craft-skill identity. For Gary, a clean pipe was representative of a good job but for the others, meant something entirely different. In this instance the copper pipes and boiler operate like a cultural language; one that Gary is not able to understand. For him, to demonstrate his skill is to replace and clean the pipes restoring them to a like-new condition. For the officer he encountered, skill clearly meant something different, it manifests itself within the dirt which is a sign of hard work. The pipes and the boiler bore the marks of labour, and that was a symbol Gary could not read. What Gary lacked then was access to the social and cultural knowledges that allowed the community members to hold the same values and share the same attitude and perspective on their work.

This tells us a lot about what skill means. It is not just a reflection of physical talent but is a social location rooted in social relationships. Here, we see skill operating on two levels, it is something that has a social and cultural origin as much as a practical one but too, it relies on interaction with others to exist. Within literatures, skill is largely considered as a social construct designed to be exclusionary. Either this is through enforcing a constructed masculine identity that excludes the 'feminised' management (Maynard, 1989), defines skill (Heron, 1991), specifically excludes women (Cockburn, 1983), or to unionise against workplace institutions (Thornley, 1996). As we have seen in the discussions in chapter two, skill too is often thought of as a gendered construct designed to undermine the labour of women (Gaskell, 1983; Philips and Taylor, 1980: 79; Cockburn, 1985). Even when broadly applied to both men and women, skill is considered in explicitly exclusionary terms, used to deny others access to legitimate work. Dudley (1994) in her account of factory closings uses skill in a more nuanced way as she considers the different meanings it can have in different contexts. Here she reflects on skill both inside and outside of industrial settings and shows how skill can be devalued when removed from the structures that utilise it. What Dudley (1994) suggests seems to be the closest account to understand what is happening here as she reflects on the contextual nature of skill. However, in the case of Gary we can see these contexts differ within the same workplace. This is because skill is dependent upon relationships. What is evident from Gary's remembering is that within the conversation between himself and the officer, the definition of skill was being challenged. As Noon and Blyton (1997: 78) suggest, "skill is a definitional minefield" and certainly, that is what Gary experienced. But if there are multiple definitions of skill that rely on the context, how can we understand what skill is?

Within the interaction between Gary and the officer, the terms of what it is to be skilled were being negotiated and asserted. Therefore, skill is a conversation made up of different languages. So, it is possible for there to be multiple versions of skill within different contexts, as the languages of

each context will differ. In Gary's account, he demonstrates that he was unable to understand the subtext of dirt which principally is a language of working-class skill. Class and skill in this case are bound up within each other, something that will become clearer throughout these discussions. We have however seen this begin to emerge as these classed and skilled concepts are the kinds of social identities that the young men were becoming into throughout their pre-socialisation. Gary however did not have the same experiences and therefore, could not speak the same languages as the other Dockyard workers. Gary, unlike the other workers interviewed, was not from a working-class family. Many others spoken to remember their fathers returning home from industrial work being saturated with filth. From a young age, they associated the end of a long day of work with dirt.

Alex Routen, a boilermaker apprentice in 1958 had the opposite experience to Gary. In our discussion he recounted early on his memories of his father returning home from work and his mother washing "filthy overalls." Later on in our conversation Alex was telling me about a former colleague of his, Jack White, who he had great respect for. When describing what it was about Jack that he respected so much, he reflected on the role dirt played in his and Jack's work when they were sent offsite to refurbish a boiler:

Alex Routen: Poor old Jack, he got a brand new coat on, he got new shoes, he got nice trousers on, nice shirt and all that sort of stuff, nicely presented he was but he got a load of old clothes that he'd taken with him to put on for when he was gonna do this work and we travelled up on the train and he looked ever so smart Jack ... unusually... so erm, I said 'well, we'll go down the ladder Jack and I'll show you what's gotta be done' we're going down the ladder and it's about that deep with water so we go down the ladder so I stepped aside and trod on a girder over here and a girder there, Jack comes down, down the ladder in his posh clothes splash, splash, splash in his nice new shoes and he was that deep in water [...] and he gets out his chipping hammer and he says 'oh let's have a look' chip, chip, chip 'oh yeah', he said, 'that's

coming off quite good' and he starts the job! In all his nice clothes! I think he also got new spectacles [...] well I left him to it, when I came back lunchtime you wouldn't, he didn't change his clothes ... he was covered in rust, his glasses had dropped down in the water and he hadn't changed his shoes, his shoes were like soggy cardboard now and he'd trodden on his glasses, so he'd got one lens which had all starred [...] When we went home that night he looked like a tramp... he's sat on there, tryna read the paper with one, one lens all starred and he's sitting on the train like this reading the paper [laughs] covered in rust and paint.

Clearly this extreme example was comical to Alex who thought Jack silly for ruining his nice clothes. However, this is what Alex described as being a central reason for his respect for Jack; he did not find dirt repulsive, he embraced it as a part of the labour. In this case dirt is the marker of hard work and Jack and Alex shared in the same language of what that means. Alex therefore remembered Jack as "a character" and "extremely skilled" because they both had access to the same knowledges of what that skill meant.

Existing accounts of the role of dirt in workplaces frame it as an obstacle to be overcome to achieve dignity. This is seen through both Rafkin (1998) and Goerdeler et al (2015) who examine house cleaners and nurses and the tools they use to create boundaries of acceptable and unacceptable dirt. More so, dirt has been described as a mechanism to find solidarity as individuals share in their disgust (Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999). Nevertheless, in industrial work, dirt, rather than being a boundary to be worked around to negotiate dignity, it is to be embraced as a marker of valuable work. Theil (2007) identified a similar relationship in communities of builders whereby dirt had a moral connotation as it symbolised skilled work. To be covered in dirt in the setting of work was deemed 'good' as it demonstrated a skilled workman undertaking his job in the correct way. Dirt therefore was a token of hard work. It is a cultural knowledge which in this case is negotiated to determine who has access to the communities' language. For Gary, whose father did not work in industrial labour and therefore lacked in this pre-socialisation, this association was never made. He consequently did not have access

to the same language to understand what dirt meant. Therefore, the conflict with the officer in the boiler room was so confusing for Gary, he was not being defiant, he simply did not have access to the same language of what it is to be skilled in that context. Rather than skill being an imposed category designed to create exclusion, it emerges here as an indirect consequence. No one explicitly rejects Gary, instead, he is simply unable to access the same languages to fully gain the title of being skilled. Skill therefore is exclusionary in these terms, but not in the explicit way often considered in the literatures.

Because skill is a conversation that lies beyond the practical talent alone, the workers at Chatham were able to access this title without the formal training of an apprenticeship. It therefore can also be inclusionary. Rather than being used to undermine other forms of labour, in this context skill enabled those who were unable to do formal training a means to find legitimacy in their work identities. Once again, this is because they shared in the language of skill. As we saw in the discussions in chapter two, the skilled identity was largely made up of discourses of class and masculinity. By demonstrating their understanding and ability to 'speak' these languages, the untrained workers could access the conversation of skill and find value. Four of the workers spoken to had not undergone formal apprenticeships but were considered skilled within the workplace. Similarly, all other nineteen former apprentices described working alongside formally unskilled workers and considered them to be just as skilled or even more so than others with formal training. As Brian Peters, a former shipfitter apprentice who began in 1962 described:

Brian Peters: When you worked afloat you had a mate who was... a semi-skilled guy, they knew it all as well... there would be times you'd be working with him [...] he knew as much as Lou (Brian's Skipper) did... probably more 'cause he'd been there longer.

As Brian describes, the formal training alone did not correlate with how good you were at your job; longevity is something that he describes as important. But more so, Brian suggests that they could

learn the practical side formally whilst on the job as well as the social knowledges. Therefore, the skilled conversation was not exclusionary to them despite their lack of formal training.

David Wray worked as a Yard service maintenance worker in 1965 after starting as a Yard boy. Unlike others, David was not given the opportunity to do a formal apprenticeship but:

David Wray: When I was 18 ... I worked as a Yard fitters' mate, working alongside the skilled base [...] I learnt a lot of skills [...] and I enjoyed it, I really enjoyed the time I was in the Yard.

Despite not being formally trained, David liked his work, unlike Gary. So, what is the difference? As we have already seen in chapter two's discussions, literatures on skilled labour outline the level of autonomy skill provides which makes work much more enjoyable (Lamont, 2000; Marshall, 1992 [1950]; Hodson, 2001; Theil, 2007). So why was David able to enjoy it and how was he able to find autonomy?

Once again, this leads us to consider the social nature of skill that often takes precedence over practical talent. As David spoke more about his time, he reflected on his relationships with the other workers and how much fun he had with them. This is something that was revisited by all other workers except Gary, that they were able to find fun in their work. These kinds of fun were heavily masculine in character as they largely took the form of 'banter' which as we saw in chapter two through Alex Routen, was derived from the shared experiences of the boredom of 'chipping' in the workshops. So, fun was an intrinsic part of the workplace in Chatham. This fun however formed a part of the skilled language as it was a way to traverse formal distinctions of skill and find community through social interaction. Laurence Goater was an electrical engineer and was one of the younger Dockyard workers spoken to who began his time in 1980, although his time served was short, he too distinctly remembered the banter in the Yard that overcame formal boundaries:

Laurence Goater: If you left your locker open, doesn't matter who you were, if you were a manager or what, if you left your locker open, they would take all their wet tea bags and try and lob it in your locker.

Alex Routen too remembered Tom, a labourer he had worked with who would join in with their fun because:

Alex Routen: It didn't matter whether he was the boss or whatever, they all got together, that's the sort of camaraderie you had.

This kind of banter is prevalent across many industrial workplaces. Banter in many respects is often considered to be subversive, reinforcing a specific kind of masculinity to establish dominance over workplace norms through joking (Bradney, 1957) or play (Nusbaum, 1978). This is a form of 'expressive' work which Fine (2003) describes as a tool to renegotiate workplaces. Collinson and Hearn (1996) describe banter in a similar way as a subcultural practice that produces and reproduces a specific kind of working-class masculinity that feminises others and creates exclusion. Banter is particularly masculine in these workplaces because it is the accumulation of the languages which are hyper-macho in character such as "practical jokes, coarse language and the 'piss tak[ing]'" (Ward, 2015: 115). Once again, we can see this as evidence as to why Gary Brooker did not enjoy his time in the Yard, as he remembers his first day after his apprenticeship joining the main workforce:

Gary Brooker: The men were nasty and ignorant, they were all smoking away and the swearing...I'd never used to swear!

In this example, swearing serves a similar role to banter, it is an expression of the form of masculinity that is hegemonic in that workplace. Gary was not used to this and therefore found himself on the outside of the skilled community.

The exclusion that Gary obviously felt and is reinforced in the accounts of Collinson and Hearn (1996) amongst others, is clearly part of what is happening here; banter and swearing are being used to reproduce the language of a classed masculinity. But rather than being as clear cut as a tool to subvert dominant work values and be explicitly exclusionary to the 'feminine', they are also being used as levellers. As Laurence and Alex show, the hierarchy was irrelevant as they all engaged in the same banter. This is because all of them had to do the same basic workshop training, even if they were going to become senior staff. This enabled for the same languages of masculine banter and likely swearing, to emerge. They all saw the value in these practices as tools to overcome the boredom of 'chipping' in the workshop and other monotonous tasks in the Yard and therefore was not discouraged. Of course, this is unusual and in most work places described elsewhere, the managers may not have engaged in the labour in the same way. But the hierarchy did not create animosity in the Dockyard because banter was used to ensure a level playing field was maintained. Since banter and subsequently swearing, was given this central role, it offered a means for the formally unskilled to access the social conversation of skill and become identified as a member of the craft-skill community. Mark Colyer, another Dockyard worker who was not formally trained recounted the role banter played in the community in Chatham further:

Mark Colyer: There was banter but there was no backstabbing erm... everyone respected everyone and... it was a fantastic job.

Here, Mark is describing the character of their banter, it was not vicious in any way, but was a playful part of the work that he aligns with respect. It therefore was a vital part of the language of the skilled community which when demonstrated, allowed skill to be recognised. In this sense banter serves as what Eyerman (2011) describes as a 'master frame'. These are narratives that are transmitted through cultural languages which serve to create group membership. Like the classed language of dirt, banter is being used as a masculine language that reaffirms the skilled communities' values. As such, banter

is as a practiced masculine discourse which creates solidarity with those who engage with it (Ward, 2015).

Overall then, skill served multiple roles within the community in the Dockyard. It was a social language that was transmitted in the workplace that went beyond the formal teaching of practical knowledges. Skill took form as a social language bound up in notions of class and masculinity. To access the title of skilled you needed to demonstrate your understanding of these languages. Gary Brooker here, despite the unfortunate situations he often found himself in, shows us what happens when a new worker did not speak the same language as the community. Skill, therefore, rather than being a fixed ideal of the standard of work, emerges as a social identity and a conversation, one that requires the ability to speak certain languages as the workforce you enter. Skill is contextual, reliant on those you try to establish the conversation with to speak the same language. Rather than being explicitly exclusionary, it is a consequence of the community that formed. The workers here were not seeking to exclude anyone as seen through the involvement of management that counters traditional accounts of workplace hierarchical relationships. Instead, skill is seen to be a conversation that anyone can join if they speak the same language.

Bodily Craft

These conversations of skill were not just abstract notions but were embodied. Skill is reified within the body allowing them to perform and demonstrate their skilled identity and status. Industrial work and particularly craft work, is extremely physical. Despite the potential for this to be difficult, all the workers described this to be the aspect of craft that they enjoyed the most. Mark Foster was a machinist apprentice who began in 1979. Throughout our conversation Mark described his job as not particularly physically demanding but incredibly tactile. When I asked him to reflect on what it was

about this kind of labour that he found the most rewarding, he described a job that he had taken after his time in Chatham that mostly involved overseeing computers and programming:

Mark Foster: I programmed and run CNC machinery erm, ... [sighs] but they're so boring ... they're so boring, you're not using the skills that I was given hence why I now work for a company that make chandeliers and so... we've got a belt driven lathe... it's all old school, it's back to old school... its great cause you're making things with your hands.

Emma: Is that what you prefer then?

Mark Foster: Yeah... that's what it's about yeah... creating stuff.

At this point in our conversation Mark's frustrations were palpable. He had left the Dockyard due to the upcoming closure and was left struggling to find a job that he enjoyed as much as the Yard. He remembered the feelings of anxiety and boredom that came with CNC (Computer Numerical Control) work which he later told me he was "stuck" in for "ten years". During this time Mark's skills had become outdated which meant he had to go to night-school to retrain for the job he is in now. In Mark's story, we learn a lot about what skilled work should be and importantly, what it should not be. Although here we will not reflect on the changing nature of work which of course is central to his narrative as this will be saved for later discussions, we can still draw from this what he considers to be central to skilled work. Notably, he remarks on the role of his body within his labour and the consequences of the absence of the tactile. For Mark, the "old school" belt lathe represents a form of work that was once valuable to him, one that requires him to "create stuff". More so, he describes working with hands to be the central component to skilled work which when removed, becomes monotonous labour.

Part of the pleasure of skill is the ability to create. In the literature on the skilled body, we can see three associations emerging; the body as the maker, the body as the performer and as an active

memory. The maker and the performer share a commonality in that they describe the embodiment of craft teachings. The body therefore is the vessel of the memory of the community which brings us to the third understanding; the body as an active memory. These three however are not mutually exclusive practices as often, they will overlap. Firstly, the body acts as the means of which to create and therefore is 'the maker'. This is the principle way that the relationship between self and craft is understood. In these discussions, the skilled body is depicted as the tools by which the craftsman engages with their labour and refines the self to create better products (Theil, 2007; 2012). The body becomes tied to labour through habitual performances of craft (Dudley, 1994), developing a sensory knowledge of products i.e. how they should smell and look (McCarl, 1974), or developing a moral concern for the product that likens a good worker to a good product (Fine, 2003). Sennett (2008) in *The Craftsman* describes the experience of craft as a bodily negotiation of skill. In this way, skill is about adjusting the body using reflexive knowledges to create the product. The body therefore is not in a static routine when creating. The worker needs to feel attuned to their body to be able to reflexively negotiate the conditions of the labour and create the product, as Littler (1985: 42) describes:

Innovation always has to flow over a barrier of mental and social rigidity. Once learnt, routines limit one's perception of the possible.

The body therefore must be as malleable as the materials used for making; it must adjust to be skilled. Centrally the body becomes a commodity itself in this respect as it is a resource of craft. This is what Theil (2007) describes on the building site as the workers' 'bodily labour exchange'. The builders use their physicality as their tools for the trade which helps them to secure employment. Similarly, for Mark, despite not needing such strength, he had to alter his relationship to his body and think of it as a commodity that needed re-training. Mark therefore had to amend his physical state of skill to be able to find employment which would allow him to work with his hands again. To be skilled then the

body must be open for interpretation and change. It must reflect the nature of the work and move with the labour.

Secondly, the body acts out skill and therefore takes on the role of 'the performer'. It embodies cultural codes of the community and becomes the vessel by which the communal values are given life and movement. This becomes reinforced within the community, the boundaries of which are in constant negotiation. Here a specific form of industrial masculinity is performed as:

Industrial employment also accrued its own type of 'bodily capital', forged through notions of the patriarchal 'breadwinner', physical 'hardness' and a strict sexual division of labour that split the public 'masculine' world of work from the private domestic realm of women's unpaid labour (Nayak, 2006: 814).

Both in and outside of the workplace this ideal is reinforced. It further manifests itself and finds validation in the labour as physical masculinity is rewarded through gaining employment (Theil, 2007).

Thirdly, the body acts through the performance of a certain industrial masculinity which can be inherited and renegotiated (Nayak, 2006). In this case, the body is an 'active memory'. The revision of a bodily masculinity emerges as Connell (1995) describes, as a 'body-reflexive' practice whereby memories of masculinity become habitual and renegotiated. The same process is also identified by Connerton (1991) as 'bodily social memory'; memories embedded within the performance of the self. Just like in the scenario described by Bob Dennis at the end of the apprenticeship in chapter two, the body is moved from an individual to a communal state during the socialisation stages of craft training. More so, the masculinity and craft teachings of the community appear within the individual and shapes how they engage with their labour at work. The body therefore is the accumulation of the social, cultural and material memories of the community. In Mark's account of his struggles to find

meaningful employment, he reflects on the same practices that occurred within the workshop as we saw through the making of tools in chapter two. The men are creating an object that exemplifies the communal memory which allows for a tangible form of their identity which can be reproduced, recognised and shared.

Nevertheless, what is missing from these dominant accounts is the way in which the body negotiates the boundaries of what skill is. When performing the communal, masculine and craft identities, the workers' bodies engage with the conversations of what it is to be skilled. They internalise the specific languages of skill as seen in the previous discussions, they then perform that language. They do so firstly by using their body as a tool to communicate what skill means to the group. Secondly, the body reproduces the boundaries of that notion of skill by inflicting 'banter' on each other through pranks. In both cases, they are performing the language of skill. John Nash, a joiner from the Dockyard in 1954 can serve as our guide to understanding this first aspect of performative skill. John presented himself as an extremely skilled and proud man during our conversation. He thoroughly enjoyed his time in Chatham and had vast amounts of training that he took through to his final work years as a building site foreman. John spent a lot of time while we talked flashing back from the Yard to the building site which suggested to me his understanding that the workplaces had more in common than one might imagine. John also felt it important to distinguish between himself and the university educated engineers on sites who he felt lacked the same ability as him. This was because, they lacked in the bodily disposition of skill that he had learnt at the Dockyard. Instead, John reflected on the natural resources that having a skilled body was able to afford him:

John Nash: There's no good taking a spirit level like you do on a building site, you know, you've got to have an eye and you've got to have an eye that... that's level, yeah cause the boats leaning that way, and that's level, you know and you gotta know that's level.

As John describes, the conditions of a boat that sits atop water makes the use of some tools particularly difficult. Instead, an “eye” for these things needs to be learnt. Crawford (2009) recounts the same relationship with the body in craft whereby in his own labour, he needed to develop ‘an eye’ and ‘an ear’ for the work. By using the body as a tool, John and Crawford (2009) suggest a natural element to their skill. It is something that they possess and is necessary to possess. As such, they naturalise the definition of skill. They internalise and negotiate the languages of skill which has been agreed upon by the community and then the individual naturalises it through the relationship between craft and the body. Skill is depicted as something that they inherently possess and therefore, is legitimate. For John, this was a tool that was developed throughout his apprenticeship. The body is being acted upon in craft socialisation, it is being moulded to suit the definition of the skilled identity which reproduces itself as the workers do their jobs. When John is on the building site, he is making his skilled eye the legitimate one and therefore, reproducing and reasserting the boundaries of what skill is to him. He therefore transmits the legitimacy of the community beyond the workplace and cements his own value as a naturally skilled workman.

More so, within the Dockyard the body was used to negotiate the language of skill using pranks. Pranks are often described as tools to level hierarchies (Collinson, 1988), a means to create comradeship (Smith, 2012), avoid boredom (Collinson and Hearn, 1996; Hodson, 2001) and assert masculinity (Collinson, 1988; Collinson and Hearn, 1996; Fine, 2003). This in many ways acts as a similar practice to what we saw earlier through the discussion of banter and the rituals of masculinity in chapter two. But what is also happening here is that the body is used a means to assert the hegemonic ideal of skill which as we saw, is a language of masculinity. Alex Routen, the boilermaker who shared the account of his friend Jack with us earlier on, also had fond memories of pranks in the boiler shop:

Alex Routen: Yeah, I mean it weren't dangerous, they weren't dangerous pranks but there's a lot of pranks went on ... a lot of fun like that [...] a bloke would be working in the boiler, working away in the boiler and they'd close the doors and do the bolts up and he's stuck inside the boiler, no one could hear him, see him or anything else [laughs] all those sort of tricks and it, it must have been the same with every trade, every trade had their little jokes and what have you.

Two things stand out from Alex's memory here. Firstly, he clarifies that the pranks were light-hearted and with no malicious intention. Secondly, that all trades had these kinds of relationships and practices. Both tell us more about the bodily expression of skill. Like Mark Colyer's account of banter where he states that there was "no backstabbing", Alex is highlighting that these practices were intended to be friendly. They therefore form a part of the fun that we have seen was central to the discourses of masculinity in craft work. Through pranking, the workers reinforced the role of male languages at work and inflict them upon the body. The body therefore becomes a part of the conversation of skill as it is used to create membership with the community. These practices were used to assert the dominant form of masculinity as Laurence Goater, the electrical engineer we met earlier described when discussing pranks, "you knew you were the boy, you was the lad". Pranks therefore were about imprinting masculinity on the body through demonstrating your tolerance to the activity. If you could laugh it off, you demonstrated your masculinity and were deemed a man. Simon Sandys, a former shipwright in 1979 similarly equated pranking with masculinity as he discussed the consequences of not sharing in the joke of a prank; "I think the skilled men would probably say wus". Likewise, Chris Willing, another boilermaker from 1972 described that:

Chris Willing: The Skippers I think had a genuine desire to look after their charges and mostly gave very good advice, but you needed to be aware of the odd wind up, if you spotted the first one you were in.

As Simon and Chris highlight, the skilled men were those who defined the appropriate reaction to pranks because they were the ones with the authority on what counted as skill. They were negotiating the boundaries of what it was to be skilled and part of that was demonstrating your ability to take a joke. To be masculine therefore and speak the same language of what defined skill, you had to allow your body to be pranked.

Further, Alex denotes these pranks to be common throughout all trades. Once again, he is suggesting to us that pranks act in the same way as languages and therefore are specific to the context of the community. All trades would have engaged in the same conversation to negotiate the boundaries of skill, but each would use different languages to form that definition. In the case of the boilermakers that Alex show us, the language was to literally connect the workers' body to the boiler by locking them in it. Through this act the worker demonstrates tolerance to uncomfortable conditions and their endurance of being in the boiler and therefore, are demonstrating a specific bodily masculinity of stamina. As Alex suggests these would differ per trade, but in all accounts, what it is to be skilled is being defined through the body. Like language then, the body acts as a conversation to negotiate the definition of skill within the craft community. Therefore, when thinking through the role of the body in craft work, we need to consider it in much more fluid terms. The body is neither fixed as a singular entity nor is it in a stasis when in practice. The body fluxes through states of being an individual body and the culmination of the communal body. More so, it is ever changing to the needs of the labour. The skilled body therefore is not a fixed concept but instead, needs to be understood in context. Each account of bodily labour is a snapshot of a certain body in time which must be understood within the wider context of the community it is a part of and the labour it engages with.

Material Value: Cake, 'Rabbits' and Tugs

So far, we have seen that a large part of the culture in Chatham Dockyard was about defining and redefining skill which created legitimacy for the workers' identities. However, what we need to try to unpack now is why craft work was central to this. Primarily, what is it about craft work that creates these conditions? To do this, I want to show the kinds of social practices that the Dockyard workers told me they engaged with. Importantly, the social practices of making and maintaining objects of craft. Through these, we can see how value was shared at work and why craft enabled these discourses of value to be created and recreated.

Objects hold within them the stories about the relationships of the makers and the owners. Literatures that directly address the relationships between objects, their owners and their makers are scarce. Mostly, accounts will allude to them as part of a wider analysis of the role of personal collections of items (Miller, 2008), or to demonstrate the character of the maker (Crawford, 2009; Sennett, 2008). Consequently, to understand the role of material objects in sharing value, we need to piece together these accounts to interrogate what is already known. Miller (2008) in *'Thinking through things'* visited living rooms of various London residents to discover how they presented their ornaments and objects to detail the relationships of the owners. Here, he discusses how the objects we display in our homes are an expression of how we display ourselves and the relations we accrue throughout our lives. Of particular interest, he discusses one participant who proudly displayed the Christmas decorations that he had hand crafted over the years. Here he was using the skills that he had developed through his labour of working on cars and transferred them to personal artefacts. The Christmas decorations therefore became a personal expression of his skill which he could share with his family. They acted as vessels of skill that were 'readable' to those family members who were outside of the industry. In this case, the objects had value as they were used to communicate a central aspect of the makers identity, his skill.

Objects therefore are vessels for the makers identity to be performed which enables them to create and reinforce social relationships. Alex Routen, the boilermaker we met previously, used his skill to imbue memory, community and pride into a gift for his Skipper's retirement:

Alex Routen: They'd a bought George a watch and I made this... it's a... it looks like a cake don't it... it's made of metal so... at night time rather than coming home I would stay behind and cut this lump of metal out and welded it up and er, drilled holes in it and we stuck the candles in it and the boys, Carlo and Tommy they, they painted it all up [...] and I, I braised it on around the edges just to decorate it er... it gives you an idea of the camaraderie you know... that's the sort of thing they would do for you when you retired.

Like the Christmas decoration maker in Miller's (2008) book, Alex was using his skill to create a tangible form of his skilled identity. He used the metal cake in the same way as the decorations, as a tool to communicate. Rather than communicating his skill to an uninformed audience however, Alex was using it to demonstrate camaraderie. Both the decorations and the cake therefore were made and shared to express affection; the decorations to show affection to his family and the cake to show affection to his Skipper. Objects therefore are a language in themselves, a language of skill, affection and community. Alex used his skill and dedication as a measure for his respect for George; the more skill he demonstrated, the more it displayed his strength of relationship to him. Craft objects therefore are languages of skill that reproduce community and demonstrate social relationships.

As we have seen, these languages of skill are synonymous with autonomy. In Chatham, the workers enjoyed a lot of autonomy over their workday, often being able to plan how it would be structured. In many cases, this meant that when they had completed their assigned work for the day, they would have some free time. John Nash, the worker we met earlier who had worked both in the Yard and on a building site, described to me what would happen when someone was being particularly productive and had finished all their Dockyard work earlier than planned:

John Nash: [They would] have half hour working on their own little private job, and somebody else used to see 'em you'd say 'rabbits'! because 'rabbits' was a Navy expression for... doing your own work, not the government work, you know. So, it was 'rabbits' all the time, you know.

A 'rabbit' was a collective term used for doing work that was not commissioned by the government. This ranged from making something from scratch or doing general repairs on an item. It could also mean making or repairing something for someone else as part of a bartering system. Mark Colyer, the tug worker described earlier, remembers a time when he needed repairs done on his motorbike;

Mark Colyer: If you did need a hand, you needed something, like a little bit of welding done on your motorbike erm, people used to put you forward 'oh go down and see John down at the welding department' and it, it was all nicely done.

Mark knew that this would mean he owed John a favour that would need to be repaid as he was engaged in a social contract that could be called upon any day. In this case, the welding was a gift to Mark as he was never forced to repay his debts. As such, 'rabbits' did not operate as part of a strictly enforced code but were a part of the camaraderie of the workplace. Mark was not required to repay John which suggests that John was able to find resolution elsewhere. 'Rabbits' were not undertaken to expect something in return then, they were completed both for the enjoyment of craft work and to add to the community through gift giving. Giving to the community and its members was not expected to offer a return of equal parts but was reciprocated through membership, camaraderie and mutual respect. Importantly then, 'rabbits' were used to reify their skilled identity and to create social bonds through favours and through sharing in a common practice and language. In this sense, 'rabbits' were a cultural icon imbued with conversations surrounding the nature of skill and community.

More so, through 'rabbits' the boundaries of the moral community were negotiated and enforced. The rules of 'rabbits' are negotiated between the workers as both need to agree on the value of the object. This extended out to the managers who had to identify value in this informal working to allow it to happen. Managers benefitted from the same system and would often take advantage of the skills available to them. They therefore legitimise this informal economy and reproduce it creating what Ian Roberts (1993) identifies to be 'strategies' that management employed in Shipyards to find commonality and mutual respect with workers. These were especially central to this kind of work where replacement of highly skilled men was not always straightforward. Therefore, they allowed the 'rabbit' system to continue because it is useful to give workers some freedom to maintain harmony. In one of the most well-known accounts of workplace culture, Donald Roy's (1959) *Banana Time* describes similar practices of finding 'joy' at work, as he noticed, 'banana time' was one of the many informal breaks that workers would share in, these would not necessary increase productivity throughout the day, but were essential for workers to negotiate their workday in such a way that monotonous labour was made bearable.

Similarly, Ray Pahl (1984) found similar informal practices occurring at Sheppey and Chatham Dockyard. Here, workers would take off cuts of wood called 'chips' with which, like the 'rabbits', there were reciprocally understood standards for this practice as only pieces under a certain size could be taken. This was sanctioned as legitimate by the Admiralty and therefore allowed to occur. However, in 1753, management attempted to circumvent this practice which led to a riot in Chatham (Pahl, 1984). Therefore, these kinds of practices were essential to maintain order and form part of the informal economies that existed in workplaces. As the comparison with Roy and Pahl demonstrates, these are common across industrial workplaces where value is found through renegotiation of formal structures. 'Rabbits', therefore, were an expression of the moral economy at work that demarked

what was legitimate and necessary for the community to flourish and relationships between hierarchies to maintain stability.

'Rabbits' were also used to express their level of skill as they imprinted their skilled identity into these objects. Therefore, when a craft worker makes a product they are "manifesting oneself concretely in the world through manual competence" (Crawford, 2009: 15). The worker is creating a physical vessel that demonstrates their ability. Once again, this is a social relationship as the value is assigned through the bartering system as "the effects of manual work and competency are tangible, and this holds a form of 'social currency'" (2009: 14). The object becomes elevated when it is recognised by others. Sharing the product of skill in this way is another form of the skilled conversation as it relies on others to agree on the definition of what is a skilled product for the transaction to occur. Both parties need to agree on the product holding a certain value which both need to be able to replicate. For the bartering system to work, in the case of Mark Colyer who needed help with his bike, both Mark and John needed to agree that the work Mark would do in return was of the same standard as John's for the trade to be fair. Both men needed to recognise each other as skilled. This becomes particularly important when we remember that Mark was not an apprentice and therefore, did not have the same formal training as many other workers at the Yard. But, by being able to engage in the social contract of bartering, we can see that his skill was recognised and valued just as much as the others'. Once again, like in the languages of banter and pranks, we can see how these material objects were levellers. They enabled Mark a means to demonstrate his competency and access the skilled conversation. 'Rabbits' then were the physical manifestation of the conversation and negotiation of the skilled identity. 'Rabbits' were a central aspect of the informal culture in Chatham as John continued:

John Nash: So, if you ever met anybody from the Dockyard and said to em 'rabbits', cor it's a brown one over there... no, it aint really... it's just what it is, and it's er... well it's a code word like er... in every trade you get code words don't ya?

Like banter, John identifies 'rabbits' to be a code word that is local to the Dockyard but shares similarities with other trades. Therefore, he recognises that they form the Dockyard language of skill which is a part of a wider conversation around what skill is that occurs in all craft industries. Overall then it appears at first glance that objects in craft are manifestations of social relationships and skilled conversations. In chapter two we looked at the ways in which the memories and social histories of the community manifested in objects through the apprenticeship tools. The same processes are clearly occurring in 'rabbits' on a one to one scale. But rather than re-treading old ground here, we can see how objects that required collective efforts to build and maintain, strengthened these conversations of skill and manifestations of sociality.

Further into our conversation, Mark Colyer began to talk in more detail about the tugs that he worked on. Unlike the other workers, most of his work day was spent near the ships, boats and tugs as most others would build in the workshop and fit the machinery onboard. Because Mark was not an apprentice, his work consisted of maintaining and sailing the tug boats which were used for transport to the ships. This meant that Mark developed a very strong attachment to the tug Collie, the one he was assigned to. Mark described to me that he and his colleagues would begin and end every workday by meticulously cleaning Collie. When I asked him if that was their assigned work, he said it was not, they chose to do it because:

Mark Colyer: I think a lot of people in Chatham in the olden days come up with really, really poor families and they didn't really have a lot so of course when you get something which is nice you [would] really appreciate and look after it and really nurture it and think oh... and everyone's got sort of... pride.

As Mark describes, the people of Chatham who worked in the Dockyard had little opportunity to own something “nice”. He links their working-class identity directly to their appreciation for the objects of craft. The workers were able to find pride and value through their engagement with the material aspect of work. The physical representation of their ability and skill that the tug gave, meant they could find “pride”, an affective response to valuation which is antithetical to the ‘shame’ that Sayer (2005) describes as central to working class devaluation. The tug, like the ‘rabbits’, allowed them to access the conversation of skill as it showed their talent and their inclusion within the community. The tug was a language that gave them entry into the framework of legitimacy. They could find pride in their labour and legitimacy in their identities despite not being formally trained. The object gave them opportunity to demonstrate their alignment to the conversation of skill which conversely to the experience of Gary Brooker who attempted to clean the dirt off the copper pipes, manifested as clean work here. This once again highlights the complexity of defining skill that Noon and Blyton (1997) suggested. Here, it takes multiple forms within the same community. Despite the pipes requiring their dirt to show the hard work taken to maintain them, the tug was treated differently. As Mark describes, the tug took a different role to the boilers and was something to be looked after. It was something “nice” given to the workers that needed to be treated differently because the tug was the manifestation of the skilled community which therefore, needed to be maintained and ‘nurtured’.

Mark tells us this aspect of the tugs through the language he uses which show us how it was thought of within that community of workers. Firstly, he describes their relationship to the tug as ‘nurturing’. This implies that it has a lifeforce that needs to be maintained. Like a child, it is something that they invested in and looked after to enable it to grow. Seemingly, he is assigning a life to the tug which in many respects we can see as the community in itself. The tug, unlike the tools and the ‘rabbits’, were collective efforts and therefore are the accumulation of the community’s skill. Multiple workers will have imprinted their skilled identity onto it, making it more than the manifestation of one

person but of the collective. Sennett (2008) describes this similar phenomenon when outlining the central characteristics of a craft worker. For him, when the craftsman makes a product, they transform it to become an embodiment of their own values. The object therefore becomes an objective version of the worker (Sennett, 2008). This is what we can identify as happening on the collective scale as the workers impart themselves onto the tug with every repair, they create a vessel of the communities' self. Mark also discusses how it was something "given" to them which implies a feeling of ownership. The relationship with the tug shares the same moral imperative as the community, it must be reproduced/ nurtured as the expectation is for the new generation of workers to take it over. This moral component is also central to craft work for Crawford (2009). Crawford (2009) outlines that the craft worker must be able to think beyond themselves and care about the object being made. Even if the product does not belong to the worker, they still must dedicate themselves and put their fullest efforts into its making. Mark here acts in these terms, although they do not outright own the tug, they act as though they do and take on the responsibility as if they were owners. Mark and his crew can exemplify the craft worker in these terms as they are members of the craft-skill community.

More so, when Mark discussed visiting Collie after the Dockyard at Chatham had closed and it had been moved to Roseythe, he recalled another strong emotional reaction:

Mark Colyer: Roseythe had no respect for that tug and it was really... cold as ice I felt, my heart was just really cold, and I looked at all the blight work and... it was rust coming through on the tug [...] I left there and I thought... I never wanna meet the tug again erm... it was just upsetting, you go home with sort of cold heart thinking ah [...] it was a shame at Roseythe... it's... one of the things I wish I never went to see now.

Once again Mark's language highlights that for him, the community was within that Tug. His concern with the aesthetic of Collie reflects his membership within that community as a proper craftsman is one who concerns himself with the form as well as the function of craft (Fine, 2003). The deterioration

of Collie reflects the deterioration of the community. As the sign of good craft for Mark is to keep the tug clean and looked after as it is the imprint of the community, when rust sets in, it highlights to him what has happened to his community after closure. Without the Dockyard and the labour frameworks which legitimised them, the workers' discourses of value have increased potential to lose legitimacy. This is what really upsets Mark as he watches the vessel of the community that he laboured over literally corroding. He describes the sight as making his heart "ice cold" because he loved Collie. As he describes, he had a deep emotional attachment to the tug and the community that it represents to him. But Mark only worked there for two years. This fact is something I have chosen to hold back until now because it was firstly important to set up how much the Dockyard meant to him. Of course, this raises the question of how he could become so attached to Collie after such a short period of time.

This is because once again, it is not just a tug. He loved Collie because it was the manifestation of the community that gave him value. Mark had left school with no qualifications which for him, meant he resigned himself to a life of low paid labour. More so, when Mark left Chatham, he had a difficult time finding his feet again. He was homeless for just over a year while he tried to find work. Whilst he was homeless, Mark used the flag of the tug Collie as his blanket stating that it reminded him of better times. Fortunately, Mark was able to get a job as a gardener and has now re-started his career. He also has a home, a tug that he has converted into a living space with the Collie flag draped over the steering wheel. In a similar way to the 'rabbits', the flag is imbued with the communal identity and therefore still serves to represent the value that membership gave him. The restoration of an old tug into a home for Mark demonstrates more about his feelings towards the community. Tugs are evidently equated with home for him which is of course, the place where family lives. Once again, these strong emotional bonds appear with the tug acting as the vessel to contain and reproduce them. He still lives on a tug that represented the valued community with the object representative of skill proudly displayed. Clearly, the Collie is still significant for Mark. All of this however cannot be an

attachment to a tug alone. But the labour he engaged with whilst on that tug was a time where he felt valuable and he actively attempts to maintain this sphere.

Objects of craft therefore are not just reflections of social relationships as wider literatures suggest (Miller, 2008; Crawford, 2009; Sennett, 2008). They are a part of social relationships as they help to form the community and act as a tactile embodiment of the collective which the members can attach meaning and emotion to. The community itself is too transient and too spread out for the workers to attach to so instead, they hold the feelings for the communally built objects like Collie. These objects, whether they be cakes, 'rabbits' or tugs are expressions of the value the community gave. They allowed the workers a physical manifestation of skill which they could share. Because they were material objects, they were easy ways to engage in the conversation of skill as other workers could recognise their talent. The objects in craft were central to how value was shared and how skill was defined. Therefore, craft work creates discourses of value. This is because it has a tangibility that allows workers to demonstrate their talents and find value within the community and even outside it as we saw through Miller's (2008) decoration crafter. Objects act as another element of the skilled language, they however manifest them into concrete form which means value can be shared and displayed.

Community Walls

So, what does all this culminate to? The community used the negotiations and materialisations of skill to form a language of legitimacy. This translated into a wider community identity that provided protection from discourses of devaluation. This is how they found value through skill. The workers articulated these sentiments through repeated suggestions of affectionate relationships forming between them. Mark Foster, Mark Colyer, Adrian Turner and Richard Boorman all described the

workers as a “family”. Richard maintained strong attachment to the Yard and its former workers as he volunteered there as a tour guide after its conversion into a heritage site post-closure. From this we can see Richard’s bond to his former team was one beyond colleagues. Mark Colyer further described the workplace as “one happy family” with his Skipper acting as “a father figure”. Too, Mark Foster remembered Skippers as:

Mark Foster: Like your dad really, some of ‘em... it was like a big family really, I would say it was a big family, everyone knew everyone and yeah it was great.

Evoking the language of a family shows the level of bond the workers felt, it was one based on admiration and affection. Describing the Skippers like a father too expresses their feelings of respect for those higher up. More so, how they felt a masculine based kinship, one that allowed them to develop their language of skill in an affectionate relationship. Through this affection, deep bonds were formed that meant a community of emotion was created. A family in this sense, creates a framework that implies loyalty and affection to each other and to work. This is not unusual for workplaces that required cohesion between workers as Vecsey (1974: 124) found through an ethnography of mining communities:

Over the years, the men build up friendships with each other that are not equalled in many marriages or families.

Craft work creates these conditions because it requires them to work together closely and rely upon each other to finish the job safely and well. The community replicates itself through creating conditions where the members find emotional bonds. It makes them want to be members. This membership acts like a social wall, creating boundaries of skill which protect workers from delegitimization.

In their accounts, the workers describe the physical wall that marked the spatial location of the Yard. The worker who most explicitly referred to the Yard and its wall was Paul Vandapeer, who was a technician apprentice beginning in 1970. Nevertheless, others reflected on the social character of the space in ways that also implied physical and social segregation. These were Simon Sandys, who was the shipwright we met earlier. Tony Oakes, who was a store supplies worker who began in 1977 and Adrian Turner, a coppersmith apprentice that we have also met before:

Paul Vandapeer: It was just like a... like a microcosm society, all in one place because it was surrounded by a, a wall.

Simon Sandys: Everybody had their own, little area that they'd made theirs so, you know, it was like empire building [...] so it was, it was a town of itself, of its own.

Tony Oakes: To be honest it was like a little er, like a little community within a community.

Adrian Turner: It was very much... a village, you know.

These descriptions of the Dockyard as a “society”, “town”, “community” and “village”, suggest the Dockyard was an insular collection of infrastructures and social relationships. Here the Dockyard workers give life to the Yard, much like Mark Colyer did with the tugs, by describing it as a place associated with activity. In this way they equate the site as being a somewhat closed network of associations. Like the physical wall that surrounded the Dockyard, the community surrounded them like a cultural and social wall that kept these networks inside. By keeping the languages of skill behind the wall, they allowed the legitimacy to be maintained as they could hold their authority over the skilled conversation. As the workers describe, the Dockyard was alive with these conversations and social bonds which protected them from devaluation.

For the workers, the community manifested as social networks that were spatially tied and imagined through the physical character of the workplace. This is a commonplace practice of claiming

physical and cultural places that Frank McKenna (1976: 66) calls 'defendable space'. These are spaces carved out by 'tribes' – collections of workers who differentiate themselves by:

Work patterns, by acute grade consciousness, by uniforms, by the tools they used, by the use of local or regional colloquialisms, and by their fierce identification with the territory they inhabited.

The reclamation of physical and social place in the workplace forms part of how communal identities are performed in labour spaces. Nevertheless, sociological depictions of communities often locate them within social networks formed of associations rather than being spatially locked (Savage, 2008; Pahl, 2005). A community therefore is based upon relationships which Pahl (2005) describes as 'personal communities'. As such, they are social networks which form a solidarity between members. More so, Anderson (1983) believes all communities to be 'imagined' and therefore are based upon more abstract notions of belonging and association. The Dockyard community acted in similar terms by forming their communal identity through conversations, languages and social networks. They however gave them a much more physical location, rooting their relationships in objects of craft and space. Looking at their community as formed by relationships alone therefore does not do enough to articulate how they experienced their membership.

Similarly, for Walkerdine (2010) thinking of communities as formed by networks does not tell us about the affective experiences of community or the 'beingness' as she frames it. Walkerdine (2010) adopts a psychosocial approach to this, arguing that communities create a sense of 'being' through creating solidarity, which can act as a protective shield to the community. Walkerdine (2010) makes this more explicit as she discusses the closure of the Steelworks in 'Steeltown' whereby the communal body acts as a protective 'membrane' that rigidly contains the values of the townspeople. Like the physical wall, the family relationships that the Dockyard workers describe are creating a social wall or a 'membrane' as protection. These walls however were both fixed and fluid. They would move

to allow new members and to amend their definition of skill. However, they also gave it fixity in tangible form. Rather than communities being networks or spatial locations therefore, they can appear as both.

Walkerdine (2015) predominantly sees the membrane as masculine as members of the community attach to the trope of an industrial masculinity which gives them iconography to draw pride from. This acts similarly to the way the workers engage with their products of craft as they imbue their value onto them and the community finds solidarity from them. As we have seen too, masculinity served as a language of skill. To add on to what Walkerdine (2010; 2015) describes then, we can see that occupational communities drew protection from more than masculine identities. These were part of a wider accumulation of what it was to be skilled workers. The membrane is the craft-skill community which gave them protection. Similarly, she sees the community as being a much more affective experience. This is something we see emerging through the Dockyard workers' accounts of family and kinship which tells us that the members of the community want to be members as they form these strong social bonds. Revisiting Mark Colyer's description of the workers is useful here as he described the "pride" that was found by looking after the objects of craft. As he stated, it was the structural conditions of growing up in a poor family that harboured this attachment to products that he described as "nice". His description shows that the Dockyard was a space where working class people could find pride. The community therefore was an affective experience.

As Walkerdine (2010; 2015) depicts, this forms a sense of beingness within the community as the members embody the values of the collective and as Mark has done here, have a physical or embodied response to that membership. Because of this affective response, it also made them want to reproduce the community. As such, the walls of the community were not static as they were based upon social networks which moved. The workers would want new members to expand their 'family'

and therefore, the walls were in motion to allow new workers to join. The affective relationships they experienced were flexible and created a feeling of responsibility; they wanted to recreate it because they felt a loyalty to it. Being a member of the craft-skill community therefore gave the workers value, but it also made them happy.

Concluding discussions

What can we take away from all this? My aim here was to demonstrate why the workers liked their jobs. Importantly we saw that this was because craft work and its communities formed conversations and networks which gave legitimacy to languages of class and masculinity. These were languages that as we saw in chapter two, were not legitimised in all aspects of society. But within the walls of that community, they could find like-minded people who respected them.

The definition of skill offered by the workers depicted it as negotiated, rather than a rigid definition, consisting of different languages that vary between trades but overall, all aim to create a discourse of skill and belonging. By understanding skill in this way, we can see how it can be so varied in use and application, yet still share the same underlying conceptions. In Chatham these languages were largely that of class and masculinity which took form through banter and through competing understandings of cultural symbols and objects. We saw through Gary Brooker that when a worker did not speak the same language as the others, they were unable to find worth in their craft. Although unfortunate for Gary, this told us that there were certain situations where the skilled conversation directly plays out. Within these kinds of scenarios, a negotiation occurs whereby the worker can either agree or face isolation from the community. Although on first appearance this may seem to suggest skill is exclusionary, it can in fact be the opposite. The Dockyard workers offered a perspective that differs to common accounts of skill and focused more upon the inclusionary potential. Traditionally,

skill is thought of as a power struggle over its construction (Gaskell, 1983: 24). Of course, as we saw through Gary Brooker and the copper pipes, the workers who were a part of the community had a privileged position to understand the boundaries of skill. However, there is no doubt that the flexibility of the skilled conversation allowed for those without formal training to join. Skill is contextual and fluid rather than purely hierarchical. In many aspects that the workers describe, the lack of economic capital gave them the best access to be part of the conversation. Skill is also a classed concept then but one that can allow the working class to negotiate their own definition to find value.

This conversation of skill took form through the body. Pranks were the physical representation of banter and served in a similar way to a discourse, as a language to be spoken and understood. The body therefore is another way in which the boundaries of skill are negotiated. More so, skill manifests as a social relationship through products of craft. The metal cake, rabbits and tugs demonstrated that when making a product, a conversation around skill was occurring which formed an affective relationship to the community of skill. Objects are not just reflections of social relationships but are relational. They formed a part of how the workers communicated with each other and therefore were part of a language in themselves. The men in Chatham here offered us a unique perspective on the bodily and material aspects of skill. We saw them sharing in the same flexibility in meaning and presentation as the skilled conversation. Both act to negotiate and assert the dominant languages of skill and therefore act as vessels of communication. Therefore, they are not passive replicas but are active in the process of defining and redefining skill. Importantly too, they are receptacles of affection. Therefore, the community was an affective one which gave pride and happiness to its members making them want to reproduce it. The workers described the Yard as an active network and this was how we can understand an occupational community; as an active network which manifests in cultural walls that are moulded and moved to expand the 'family'. Industrial work therefore was not just a brutish masculine practice but was embedded with strong emotional bonds.

The workers were active in reproducing their community and this came from their genuine affective attachments to each other. Occupational cultures were emotional cultures and gave feelings of pride and happiness which equated to value and legitimacy in their identities. Similarly, to chapter two, I have shown value to appear once again as cultural codes that are assigned value when reproduced by the community. The craft skill identity accrues value and the community reinforce the discourse of value.

To end this chapter, I want to bring back the voice of Stuart Pollitt who has been acting as our guide through the history of Chatham Dockyard. As he remembered his first day returning to the Dockyard he began to question aloud:

Stuart Pollitt: I remember... suddenly getting this feeling of belonging to somewhere I just worked... I only worked there didn't I?

Within the walls of the Yard workers found a strong kinship which gave them opportunities they might not have had elsewhere. So, what we have seen is that skill was a fluid conversation that manifested in the individuals' body and their product. They developed attachments to the objects which were imbued with the collective identity allowing social bonds to form. The community created the conditions for its own survival as it enabled workers to invest in it. But what happens when workers may want to reproduce it, but simply are unable to? In the next chapter, we need to unpack this by understanding what happened when the Yard closed and how young people now can find attachment to their labour without the same structures in place.

Chapter Four: Dismantling the Frame

In the previous chapter, I showed how the workers formed a discourse of value that gave legitimacy to their definition of skill. When the Yard closed in 1984, many other industries closed or downsized too. With craft work less common, and fewer opportunities to reproduce the craft-skill community, it is essential to understand how the young people entering industrial workplaces today experience the legacies and memories of these discourses of value. Consequently, this chapter focuses on the idea of dismantling to document the changes deindustrialisation kickstarted to the industrial apprenticeship programmes in Medway.

Once again, using the account Stuart Pollitt provided of the skeleton machine shop as a metaphor for change, I show how the structures of the craft-skill culture have been dismantled like the Number 8 machine shop by external neoliberal agencies, and the result this has on the apprenticeship cultures now. To understand the significance of this not only to the current apprentices but the former workers too, revisiting Stuart's account with a fresh perspective is useful here:

All these people around me now [...] they're not stopping to think of what was going on in there, in the days when it was thriving and had all these machinery sounds and the smells... all of the people who are milling about outside of the skeleton building as I'm standing there imagining what it was like and I'm thinking to myself, none of these people know... what I experienced or they're not... seeing what I saw.

Here he is specifically reflecting on this privileged viewpoint to see both the past and the present. Most importantly, he notes the invisibility of that past to the 'passers-by'. This is where this chapter will draw parallels by narrating how that invisibility manifests in apprenticeships and the effect this has on those currently training. I explore the dismantling of the communal walls and like Stuart, try to understand what can be learnt from standing within their ruins and assessing the aftermath. To begin

to make sense of how the cultural and social walls of the craft community have shifted and the impact of this, we must firstly look to examine the parameters in which this culture must now operate. The education system since the day of the Dockyard workers and the closure of 1984, has changed. Medway is no longer famous for its apprenticeship programmes and the buildings in which craft workers learn no longer dominate the landscape of the towns. Instead, they are pushed to industrial estates that lie on the periphery of shopping and residential districts. So physically, culturally and socially the industrial apprentice has been moved since deindustrialisation began. This chapter will be split into four themes, all of which depict the role of external agencies on current industrial apprenticeships and how the workers experience this.

The first part of this chapter's discussion shows how the training system has increasingly been outsourced to other education industries and how this location fracture is mirrored in the community of craft training. The second section of the chapter engages with, what I have termed, the 'learning of liminality', to borrow the language of scholars such as Sennett (1998) and Standing (2011), who offer longstanding accounts of fractured work identities. Through this term, I demonstrate how external agencies have impacted upon the young apprentices, preventing them from finding commonality in their experiences. This is given further elucidation through focus on the community itself and what these changes have done to it through the concepts of memoryscapes (Samuel, 2012) and social hauntings (Gordon, 2008; Edensor, 2005a; 2005b). Through these, I depict a contestation between past and present that manifests in the apprentices' relationships with each other. This dialogue between temporal sites, reopens the discussion of the 'half-life' seen in chapter one (Linkon, 2018). Specifically, I use it to show the transformation of their inherited communal identities. I argue that their community is a half-life version of the original as it is deformed, and consequently, the routes to value that were well trodden by their cultural ancestors, are no longer clearly marked. As such I show

the cultural significance of deindustrialisation on their craft identity and how understanding industry loss as a continuous, corrosive process has impacted upon it.

Developing this idea of the half-life identity, Cara, the only female participant interviewed, introduces how masculinity has changed in the new craft landscape. Her experiences and relationships to her male colleagues tells us a lot about the friction of traditional masculinity against the half-life forms. Following on from this, I show how these shifting cultural languages manifest in the bodily experience of work which has also changed dramatically since 1984. Therefore, the reserved relationship between the body and labour that the young people exhibit will be discussed; that they are not performing their skill in the same way as industrial apprentices once would. These young people are less willing to endanger themselves and give over their body for their labour. Much like the metaphorical form the body took in chapter three, we see that the restrictions placed upon the self carries over to their relationship with the community which makes them less willing to give up a part of their individuality for a similar craft community that we have already seen.

Overall, this chapter shows that deindustrialisation moved the communal walls of the craft-skill community. As such, forms of classed and gendered devaluation were able to seep in which as I will argue, took the form of external agencies and their regulations. This has altered the skilled conversation of craft which results in the young people feeling disconnected from their trade identities and each other. Without this connection, they are unable to form discourses of value in the same way apprentices once could and consequently, they internalise narratives of devaluation. As such, the most common sentiment that all the young people expressed but was most clearly articulated by George Taylor, 18, a multi-skilled apprentice at IPS was, "I was too stupid to go to uni". The devaluation has set in and industrial apprenticeships are no longer giving working class men and women an easily accessible tool to find community and pride.

The Closure

Alex Routen: We knew there was gonna' be an announcement that one Dockyard was gonna' close, we didn't know which, and erm, I think it was about 2 o'clock in the afternoon ... I had a radio in that office so obviously we were tuned in to get the news... and all my team, all my lads, cause I had about 30 blokes working for me, they were all hanging around about the office, we opened the window so they could all hear the radio and erm, and it was announced like that and he said and er, 'and Chatham Dockyard is to close in 1984'... well it went quiet, and then all the black humour started, er so we knew we were all gonna' be out of work er, 'I'll see you in the dole queue', 'yeah, but you'll be three places behind me cause I, you're always late', and all this sort of black humour was going on er, 'I'm gonna' get a job up Tesco's pushing the trolleys' or you know all this black humour was happening, erm... that was that afternoon and it carried on most of the afternoon, people taking the mickey and, you know, saying what they were gonna do... the next day... it started to sink in and it got a bit quieter and ... it got a bit quieter.

The announcement of the 1984 closure was not wholly unexpected news to the workers. In many ways, they had embraced the possibility that they could lose their work as rumours of closure had circulated for decades. But this meant that the confirmation was even more harrowing. They also knew the realities they faced as Alex describes; they were aware of their pending unemployment, forced relocation or new work in the retail sector. Their immediate response, to use humour to cope, is indicative of the culture they had developed. It demonstrated a camaraderie in their grief that whilst acknowledges their future of individual pursuits, relies on the community to find ways to overcome the trauma. This is not an atypical response as accounts of industrial closure often document similar practices when announcements are initially made whereby workers will actively reconstruct the narrative of shutting to make sense of the mass change that awaits them (Bamberger and Davidson, 1998). In *Closing*, Bamberger and Davidson (1998) see this manifest through mythologies which vilify

managers offering a coherent narrative for all to remember through. Their joking in Alex's case works in the same way, they imagine their future through humour which gives them a collective attachment to the narrative of closure; if they all do not take it seriously, it must not be that serious. They were using the skilled language of banter that we saw in the previous chapter gives a feeling of collectively, to try and negotiate their imaginings of their futures. This of course wore off quickly as the reality sets in. Nevertheless, it is in that period that overnight, we can see the cracks first emerge in their communal walls. As they realised they were losing their physical and cultural space, they become aware that the walls will shift, and working-class value will become a difficult discourse to maintain outside of them.

Outsourcing the Community

Adams is a strange case to behold when trying to construct a coherent narrative of the changes spurred by deindustrialisation. This is one reason why it is probably better not to try. Instead, we can use them to challenge the perception that deindustrialisation had a linear path and definitive end. Adams has existed in the Medway towns for decades under various names but largely following the same work; engineering design and parts manufacturing. When deindustrialisation swept through the towns and claimed the Dockyard amongst many other industries, Adams was downsized but not closed. They also benefitted from the mass loss of employment locally, being able to employ a swathe of highly trained engineers. But because of this, their apprenticeship programme slowed down over the years as there was not as much need to train newer staff when ready-made skilled workers were awaiting employment. This also meant that the effects of the changes in apprenticeships and industry was slow to effect Adams who up until the early 2000s were able to largely maintain the system of training that they had utilised for generations. It is only recently that they have begun to feel the effects of change and the external influences seeping in. Ben Taylor is a metrology engineer who began

his apprenticeship at Adams in 1999. He therefore trained post-Dockyard and throughout deindustrialisation. However, his apprenticeship in many ways was like that of the Dockyard workers as he was in-house and trained with a group of peers relatively large for the company (although, not on the Dockyard scale). Ben in many ways sees himself as a voyeur between two worlds, seeing the industrial past and deindustrial present; not old enough to be thought of as a 'traditional' pre- 84 worker and not young enough to be a 'modern apprentice' as Adams sees it. But his situation gives him an advantage as he can show us that the clean break between apprenticeships now and then is much fuzzier than perhaps even I have accounted for so far in the discussions. More so, he can use his experience to articulate the changes that have occurred:

Ben Taylor: Our new apprentices get sent to... IPS for two years so... [...] I'd say the quality of them has dropped slightly where we used to, cause when we were taught in house we were taught everything about this place, you know, whereas cause their taught outside, they're taught general sort of machinery, not stuff that relates to the problems we have in here you know so... so I'd prefer, personally I'd have 'em all back in here you know, crack the whip in here as you go out, cause the, the, the instructor there's not employed by Adams you know he's got no sort of... disciplinary action on them you know.

As the eye between both generations, Ben describes a lot that he finds problematic about the way apprenticeships have changed. Principally though, he identifies the root cause to be the outsourcing of the training to other agencies, even if for one year. As someone who has not undergone this form of learning himself despite undertaking his apprenticeship alongside the backdrop of mass economic change, he is able to demonstrate that this has happened not just because of industry closure, although this is the catalyst. But something more has taken place, a cultural shift has altered the way apprenticeships are conceptualised by those who decide their form.

Outsourcing the training is a financially viable option. It reduces the need to hire or train specialist mentors for classroom time, reducing the amount of 'lost work' off the shop floor. This kind of neo-liberal cost cutting began for Adams when apprenticeship funding started to reduce. The involvement of third-party organisations has already been identified as problematic for apprenticeships by Brockmann et al (2010). As they identify, the companies are not getting the best result from the current framework. More so, with this intrusion of private sector educators, the workplace has less responsibility to the worker and ends in apprenticeships being what Fuller and Unwin (2009) describe as conflated with work experience. This complication of training acts only as a mirror to the wider market changes that exist in the "post-Fordist labour market" that has:

not only worked to delay and interrupt traditional youth transitions but it has also worked to complexify them (Chatterton and Hollands, 2003: 81).

Like the fractured transitions that await the young people outside of the apprenticeship, their education is too fragmented both spatially and socially. This complexity that young people now face, particularly the working class, has been well documented from Lyon and Crow's (2012) re-study of Ray Pahl who found imaginings of careers were far more fractured than in the 1970s. Too, the destruction of traditional post-education routes has been examined by many as offering little option for working class people other than unemployment (Bates, 1984), poorly paid government schemes (Nayak, 2006), or redefining their personhood to 'learn to serve' (McDowell, 2003). In 2016, Mazenod identified that in the UK, apprenticeships were still not a mainstream alternative to academic educations in comparison to other parts of Europe. This is despite key policies by the government to encourage widened participation into apprenticeship training (Mazenod, 2016). These measures however cannot undermine the systemic stigmatization of these types of learning which mark them as second-rate options to academic pathways (Hogarth et al, 2012), restrict the educational content of courses (Mazenod, 2016) and force young people to justify their choices (Ryan and Lórin, 2018). These wider social influences have also seeped into the educational system of industrial apprenticeships meaning

that the liminality and discreditation that young people face becomes inescapable even when they have chosen a path to follow. Apprenticeships, like the labour market, has become fractured which as Ben identifies, has impacted the craft community.

Ben's cohort was one of the final few to experience the 'old way' before it became too expensive for the few it was training. Then, there was a group of workers who had already experienced teaching apprentices and therefore, did not need to be trained. Therefore, it was of minimal expense to allow them to teach Ben's cohort. However, this group are largely retiring which has created a skills gap. Now, there are few left with the expertise to train incoming apprentices and the company does not want to invest in this. Instead, they send their apprentices to the local colleges or training centres for a cheaper 'blanket' engineering course. But, as Ben explains, this has consequences for the quality of education that they are getting. As he describes:

Ben Taylor: they're taught general sort of machinery, not stuff that relates to the problems we have in here you know.

Principally, as he suggests, the young people miss out on the trade specific machinery skills and therefore often lack the knowledge of how to use the equipment at Adams. This of course is problematic. But more importantly for these discussions, this detachment from the tools of craft means they lose an important aspect of socialisation that was once essential to industrial apprenticeships. As we saw in chapter two through Alex Routen and the 'chip, chip, chipping' in the workshop, tools at work once were part of a larger moral community. They bound generations of workers together in shared toil and were a cultural language of skill which could be reproduced and shared. These current apprentices are not accessing this same important aspect of the tools of trade. They are not only limited in understanding their practical usages but also lose a central aspect of sharing value. They do not engage in the same processes of becoming into an intergenerational community through mutual experiences. Nor do they have the opportunity to impart their skilled

identity into a tangible form in this way. Without this, they have no vessels to recognise each other's skill and each other's value.

Importantly too as Ben highlights, they lack the trade specific "disciplines". Much like the role of tools, these "disciplines" are a communicative tool to impart the craft identity onto new workers. As they are not trained by Adams workers, there is little opportunity to socialise them into the languages and conversations of that occupational culture. More so, he describes their inability to "crack the whip". There are two aspects to this that Ben alludes to. He first discusses the "disciplines" which as I have just described, are these cultural knowledges and languages of skill. More so, invoking the idea of "cracking the whip" invoking a very physical approach to imparting skills and knowledges. In this sense, he indicates a restricted access to impart the bodily experience of craft. Both aspects will be discussed in further detail as this chapter goes on but what is important to note at this stage, is that someone like Ben who has access to both the past and the present, is identifying the imposition of third-party educators and the subsequent spatial and cultural fracture of the apprenticeship to be the root cause of a social lack. This lack that Ben is talking about is the moral order of the workplace and the once present moral community that shaped the cultural disposition and metaphorical body of the worker. Without the ability to control their education, the older workers like Ben are unable to share these important aspects of craft socialisation. Overall, their craft has been physically and culturally fractured limiting their ability to form and sustain a solid communal identity that can help them find value in an occupational community. This has impacted the way the young people experience their apprenticeships.

Learning Liminality

Robert Fieldwick, 18, is a chromatography apprentice at IPS who, like those at Adams, is detached from his workplace. He began in 2015 so at the time of interview, was in his final year of apprenticeship. He spent two days a week in the classroom and three at work. Like the others, he enjoyed his time on site but found little merit in the education. When I asked him what kind of tools he had learnt to use, he replied with the same critical tone:

Robert Fieldwick: I mean we do like... wiring regulation and stuff and I don't do that sort of stuff [at work] so... it's just a complete waste of time for me but... you sort of just have to do... it's very generic I'd say [...] nothing that I've done here really crosses at all so... it's... yeah... it's completely just... to meet the criteria of an apprenticeship I think is the main reason I'm here... basically.

As Robert identifies, like Ben, the dislocation between work and education is detrimental to his technical and social conceptions of skill. He learns what he thinks of as 'generic skills' which limits his ability to adopt the trade specific cultures and languages of skill that as we saw in the previous chapter, were once integral to the apprenticeship experience. More so, he believes he is just meeting the "criteria of an apprenticeship" which illuminates how devaluation has been able to seep in. As Robert highlights, there is a set way that apprenticeships must be done which he sees as counterproductive to what he needs to learn for his work. This standard is something that was set by outside agencies. During my fieldwork at IPS, the tutors showed me the curriculum set by the National Apprenticeship board that they were expected to follow. This outside imposition is clearly felt by the young people who cite this as their main reason for feeling the dislocation between work and education; an external agency has determined the parameters of their learning. This has limited their ability to engage with the trade specific knowledges that they require to become engrained into the occupational culture. Therefore, these external agencies are having a detrimental effect on the cultural and social aspect of craft learning. As Nayak (2006: 814) highlighted young people today experience "poorly structured

government training schemes” or as Coffield et al (1986:86) describes it, “shit jobs and Govvy schemes”. This wider experience of post-education opportunities has seeped into the apprenticeship scheme. It is therefore no longer the protection from discourses of devaluation that it once was.

Instead, they are learning a much more liminal version of skill which, because of its flexible nature, has shifted the cultural walls that once helped to hold the value in and the devaluation out. ‘Liminal skill’, derivative of a labour marker that favours flexibility, can be defined as the ability to possess skills that can be cross-occupational insofar that they can be utilised in a variety of roles which manifests in the rise of ‘multi-skilled’ apprenticeships. Here, they learn all aspects of trade in a less detailed form which has the intention of allowing them to manoeuvre the unstable job market that awaits as they can turn their hand to any trade. Accounts of the intrusion of flexible capitalism on once stable careers is well documented from ‘flexploitation’ (Gray, 2004), ‘the precariat’ (Standing, 2011) and the ‘corrosion of character’ (Sennett, 1998). Clearly, there is merit in these depictions as younger workers find it increasingly challenging when they face a labour market that is particularly fragile for the working class. In *The Precariat* (2011), the rise of liminality is described to be alienating to the working classes whom are required to traverse multiple and often fractured work identities. Predominantly, the working class are susceptible to disruption in their occupational identities as new liminal workplaces lack in the “fraternity...social memory [and] codes of ethics and norms” (2011: 12) that once marked working class labour. The way Standing (2011: 12) describes current workplaces in the age of the precariat, summarises a lot about the experience of the apprentice today:

When employed, they are in career-less jobs, without traditions of social memory, a feeling they belong to an occupational community steeped in stable practices, codes of ethics and norms of behaviour, reciprocity and fraternity.

These are the forms that one marked industrial apprenticeships that were ingrained with cultural memories, solidarity and intergenerational cultural transmission. Without these frameworks, the

same kind of valued identity is unable to be shared and reproduced. It is in this sense that the more liminal labour market has inverted the rules of value through work; job specificity is less sought after and instead is favoured by 'personality skills' (Sennett, 1998). Problematically however, *The Precariat* (2011) assumes the existence of a stable past that is juxtaposed to the liminal present which is a largely reductive stance that obscures the cross-over of present working-class fragmentation into the identities of past workers. Sennett (1998) offers us more on this as through comparison of the father and son, he shows the two generations to influence each other's work culture and dispositions through forced contrasts. What Standing (2011) does instead is assumes a 'new class' of workers, one who are marked by insecurity that are separated from their cultural ancestors.

Therefore, to assume them to exist as a separate class does not appear to reflect the experiences of the young people in this research and other scholarship. Instead, they are better understood as a community as this reflects the fractured nature of their experiences. Their precarity is not singular to one group and therefore reducible to a new 'class', as Standing (2011) suggests, instead, they share more similarity with what Mistral (2003) terms to be a 'mnemonic community' or community of memory. Their existence and commonality are defined by the memory of stability, or perceived stability. The precariat is only recognised as such through comparison to the memory of what once was and therefore, are based upon memory. The precariat is an 'imagined community' in this way as they are transient; individuals will dip in and out of this precarity throughout their lifetime, there are various levels to how precarious they find themselves and how involved they are in the precarious community. For example, some young people might find themselves in an apprenticeship which is still precarious culturally and socially as well as lacking the definitive end of stable employment, this of course differs to those on zero-hour contracts. All are precarious, but to define them all as a singular class flattens out the complexities of their experiences. Instead, we must

see them as a community because of their shared experiences of liminality, described here as imagined because of their transcendence across borders and groups.

Thinking of the apprentices and their community of skill in this way is much more useful as it allows us to see their existence and characterisation as dependent on those who came before them; the 'stable'. Framing their skilled identities and languages like this removes them from ahistorical obscurity; they are a product of memory. This is one of the central features of working-class communities which manifest through various forms such as recreating collectivity by accessing shared memories (Walkerdine, 2010), telling stories (Strangleman, 2005) and reconstructing their heritage (Linkon and Russo, 2002). Understanding them as this 'mnemonic' community of memory tells us more about the experiences of younger people in deindustrialisation as they share in practices of precarity but differ in their involvements and experiences. The industrial apprenticeship is one facet of this complex grouping who negotiate their existence in the wider community of the precariat but must manage this status within their lived context i.e. they attempt to reconcile wider structures of liminality with their inherited languages of skill. It is therefore important to understand the boundaries of these liminal landscapes to uncover the impact it has on their skilled conversations and subsequently, their ability to find value in shared experiences. For those apprentices today in Medway, they must contend with the changing landscape of little opportunities for industrial employment alongside the communal identity that they inherit. Robert Fieldwick and many of his peers experience this threat of precarity through the detachment of their work from their education. They prioritise their manual work over their education because it bears the marks of liminality; they learn multiple skills in less detail. It therefore is a reminder that they are being trained to be precarious. They are not expected to stay in one career and are being prepped to be multiple tradesman throughout their work-life. Coming face to face with precarity within their apprenticeship does not match their expectation

for their learning as they believed they would learn in the same way as their fathers and grandfathers before them. Instead, they are learning liminality.

Haunting Communities

Like physical spaces of lost work, the cultural space has been altered by neo-liberal capitalism. It is in this way that we can see the industrial apprenticeship as a cultural memoryscape. A memoryscape is characterised amongst literatures on space and memory as areas where remembering is strictly controlled such as heritage sites, ruins or towns and cities (Edensor, 2005a; 2005b; Samuel, 2012; Smith, 2006). Therefore, there is a shared notion that memoryscapes are marked by the power struggles that reside within them. Although not singularly are these spaces of work, we can see the manifestation of the power imbalance of different groups explicitly through lost workspaces and its former workers. This is certainly the case in former sites of work whereby official discourses seek to reconstruct collective identities in a way that is often unsympathetic to the former workers and their communities (Linkon and Russo, 2002). In *Steeltown*, Linkon and Russo (2002) despite not explicitly using the term, outline the same power imbalance that occurs in deindustrialised communities. Here, they present how public representatives and official heritage groups attempted to construct the image of the area which contested with the memories of the workers. This is a common experience for spaces where memories are reimagined as official discourses will seek to reshape the history of a community into a coherent story which is often used to attract paying visitors (Mistzal, 2003; Smith, 2006). This is what Smith (2006) calls an 'authorised heritage discourse'; the 'official' memories that are constructed for commercial use. In this process, the complexity of individual and communal memories and experience become flattened into a linear narrative that is easily rendered for audiences to consume.

Silence is an important aspect to the memoryscape. Some histories must be made invisible for the sake of coherence. This also exists outside of the controlled and more directly managed spaces of museums and heritage sites in public spaces that may at first appear more organic in their representation. This is what Raphael Samuel (2012: 39) refers to as the “historicization of the built environment”. Here, spaces and buildings are ‘restored’ to reflect a past that is more tangible and to fit more seamlessly with the current environment. In these instances, the history of the space and the communities that once occupied them become silenced and relegated to a bygone past. This architectural recoding, like the heritage discourse, creates the sense of a linear passage of time which can be cleanly separated into ‘then’ and ‘now’, rejecting anything or anyone who may complicate this. This rejection is what Edensor (2005a) terms ‘exorcising’ whereby complicated histories are removed rendering the past into a simple narrative and more importantly, removing their significance and presence within the present.

Obvious parallels can be drawn here with the industrial apprenticeship as complicated histories become flattened and the past is broken from the present by deindustrialisation and the subsequent expectations of a modern education. The new conversation of skill that is engineered by the new apprenticeship system acts in a similar way to the ‘authorised heritage discourse’ (Smith, 2006), as it renders an ‘official’ version of skill that does not reflect the histories of the workplaces or the craft-skill communities. The experience of the former workers is stripped from the apprenticeship and are marginalised to the ‘old way’ much like we saw in the earlier account of Ben from IPS. This version of skill is relegated to the past and seen to lack present value. However, as we have seen, this means that there are integral parts of the apprenticeship scheme that get missed out on. The experience and skill that was accrued over generations becomes flattened into worksheets and curriculums that are easier to develop and numerically grade. The apprenticeship is held to the same standard as other post-16 educational types and therefore is expected to give the same kinds of

generalizable results, grades and assessments. As Robert Fieldwick earlier identified, there is a “criteria” to the apprenticeship that must be achieved but which is met with disdain by the apprentices because of its ill-fit with the kind of work they do. Like the physical sites of memory described in Samuel’s (2012) work, the history of the craft community is squeezed into the current environment and expected to fit. As a cultural memoryscape, the industrial apprenticeship is fraught with contestations over the past and the present. Therefore, it is stripped of its complexity by removing the memories of the communities that gave life and, in this case, value to those spaces of work.

Most of the young people spoken to across both IPS and Adams, shared in the same experience of dislocation between work and education. They also struggled to develop strong relationships with their peers. On my second day of fieldwork at IPS however, I noticed one group who appeared to have formed a collective, sitting together and being much more vocal with each other in comparison to the rest of their cohort. They also were the most at ease with me, were more open to be critical of the apprenticeship in a public space and were confident in their imaginings of their future work life. These young men were training to work at the same industry; Southeastern Railway. The existence of this group had already been pointed out to me by other apprentices who in many ways, treated them with disdain. This, coupled with their presence in the apprenticeship centre, showed me that there was something about them that contested with the training system and the other apprentices.

Described by their peers as a “clique”, I spoke with four young men who despite being at different stages of their training, appeared to hold a tight bond that starkly contrasted with the other apprentices. Jack Aspland, a 16-year-old fault finding apprentice for Southeastern, describes his work culture in a way that parallels the accounts of the Dockyard workers from previous chapters:

Jack Aspland: Yeah, yeah at South Eastern we're all quite close... really good friends so... sometimes we have like erm, every pay day at Southeastern is our review day for NVQ so, all of the apprentices come to the Ramsgate depot cause there's three like London, Gillingham and here and Ramsgate even... so they all come down to Ramsgate and usually after that we'll go out for food, go out for drinks and stuff like that... yeah it's, it's quite nice, it's like, it is like being a part of a family.

As we saw in Chapter three, the idea of being “part of a family” is particularly significant for how the craft-skill community was experienced. But rather than repeating this discussion, we can also see Jack's account as symbolic of their status within the apprenticeship system as the Southeastern “clique” act as an intrusive presence on the cultural memoryscape. The group brings disruption as they represent an ideal of what craft communities should be that has been resigned to the past. More so, this group were the most critical of the apprenticeship programme. Jack Aspland was keen to get his training over and done with and the three other Southeastern boys shared similar accounts. When I asked two of them what they're favourite part of the apprenticeship was, Cameron Jamieson, 16, and Simon Cranfield, 19, both train engineer apprentice replied; “Er, the finish [laughs] will be, will be” and “The end [laughs].” Similarly, Liam Sampson, 17, a multi-skilled apprentice for Southeastern elaborated:

Liam Sampson: I think that they, they make you try too hard at it like they, they make you focus too much on the qualifications rather than actually knowing what you gotta do when you finish, cause when I finish I'm not gonna be doing BTEC work, I'm gonna have to fix those trains and... and they're always wanting me to do my BTEC stuff when I wanna really be learning how to fix trains so.

Like the other apprentices, but emphasised most resolutely, the Southeastern boys repeated their desire to finish their apprenticeship quickly and struggled to find merit in their experiences of the training centre. Most likely this is because of the community of railway workers that they are engaging

with when on the job. Strangleman (2004; 2005) has written on the experience of railway workers that shares comparison with other 'traditional' industries like Dockyard work, whereby generations would pass through the industry, creating an intergenerational community. Railways would form these strong communities that bound them together through collective socialisation. The nature of the labour created insular communities reinforcing a strong attachment both to the work and to each other (Strangleman, 2004). Unlike other smaller industries in the area, the railways did not face deindustrialisation in the same way. The railways were privatized, and aspects outsourced post- 1963 after the Beechings report which recommended smaller scale closures to increase productivity (Strangleman, 2004). As such, the communities were not necessarily dismantled but would have undertaken their own mechanisms to cope with the change. As Jack highlights, they still feel like a "family" despite the potential for these labour market intrusions to alter their experiences.

In comparison, Cara Bernard, 18, a control and implementation apprentice for the National Grid, feels an imposing presence in her relationship with her training. As he describes:

Cara Bernard: I know the large companies really like to invest as much as they can to get as much out of them [apprentices].

When asked what she plans to do after her apprenticeship, she responded:

Cara Bernard: I don't want to stay in one place forever, but I'd like to stay there just, just to get my experience up.

In opposition to Jack who describes his apprenticeship as fostering a sense of community in his workplace, Cara defines her apprenticeship and relationship with her employer in terms of a transaction. She describes herself to be commodity- like insofar that she is something to be invested in to receive an output. More so, she imagines her future with them to be in a similar way, to take what she is able and to then move on. Her description implies a sense that her training and skill

development is much more about productivity than about socialisation or sharing in a communal identity. This attitude recalls what Dudley (1994) describes as 'meritocratic individualism', an attitude that she identified as present within deindustrialising communities. This ideology is the key feature of areas of lost industry whereby individuals are treated as failed actors for not being able to adapt to the new economy. This rise of individualism dissipates communities in favour of market relations. This is the kind of external narrative that appears to have seeped into Cara's relationship with her learning and one that she has internalised. In this regard, she is responsible for her own success in her education and treats the apprenticeship as an economic transaction rather than as an important cultural socialisation. The Southeastern boys in comparison all intend to stay on the railways for the duration of their work life. Not only because they already feel a sense of community flourishing between each other and with their colleagues at work, but because they feel a sense of obligation to their labour, as Simon joked; "you start on the railway you don't leave". Although spoken in jest, he highlights that a railway career is much more than a personal endeavour but is a lifelong commitment. Clearly this contrasts with Cara who sees her future and present in much more liminal terms. With this approach, her individualism is likely to restrict the ability for a collective community to form in which value can be shared. This stands in direct contrast to the young men at Southeastern whom already share a collective identity.

It is in this way that Jack, Cameron, Simon and Liam (the Southeastern boys), occupy a strange position in the apprenticeship as they challenge the 'exorcism' of the education that stripped away these traditional experiences of training. They act in similar ways to the presences that Edensor (2005a; 2005b) refers to as 'ghosts'. Throughout his works on industrial ruins, Edensor (2005a; 2005b) describes former sites of work as 'haunted' spaces. Those with direct memory or experiences of these places challenge the whitewashing of the history. The spectres disrupt the fixity of the capitalist narrative that economic and therefore geographical, social and cultural change is inevitable and

natural. The existence of the ghosts brings the reality of the past into the present and therefore challenge the discourses of a linear break between past and present. Gordon (2008) describes a similar process of 'social haunting' whereby memories of the past appear in the present, sometimes devoid of context but like the ghosts, offer a challenging representation of change. The boys of Southeastern are acting in this way, as ghosts of the craft-skill community. They appear as memories of the past that emerge within the memoryscape of industrial apprenticeships and challenge the notion that educational techniques should change. They represent the 'old' way and therefore contest the individualistic approach encouraged by assessments and gradings which is internalised by Cara. This is why they are resented by the other apprentices, because they offer a friction to the remodelled training. They are representing the discourse of value akin to the craft-skill community form. For the others, like Cara, who are unable to follow the same route to legitimacy, they are finding their conversation of skill to be much more fractured and liminal. The Southeastern boys however are sharing in a similar language and conversation of skill to the Dockyard workers.

The 'Half-Life' Community

For those who are still within the sphere of the 'traditional' craft-skill community, they experience a newer form of the older conversation of skill. The current apprenticeship teachers try to impart the same skills onto the young people but because of the restrictions placed upon them, do not achieve the same result. Jack Goudie, 18, a metrology apprentice at Adams and Jack Aspland, a fault-finding apprentice at IPS demonstrate this:

Jack Goudie: The whole year was at college where we were on a machining course, that might seem slightly odd because I'm an electrical apprentice and I was being taught machining but erm... I was being taught erm... how to use the different tools and machines.

Jack Aspland: I think at points the teaching could be a lot better, we could learn more but... at the end of the day I come here, I do my work, I get my work in and as soon as that's done, I'm not here for the rest of my life so... get it out of the way [laughs]... that's all it is.

What Jack Goudie in the first instance is demonstrating is that he is learning tools and machinery, in the same way that the Dockyard workers would have done. However, he lacks in the understanding of the significance of this training. Jack Aspland also feels no attachment to his education, plans on leaving and consequently, forgetting a lot of what he has been taught. Rather than seeing it as an opportunity and a process of socialisation, he experiences his learning as a chore that lacks significance to his work. This tells us that aspects of his training are like those we saw in the previous chapter, but it is not delivered or received in the same manner. Ward (2015) in his update study of Willis' work, experienced a similar practice of the young men separating 'thought work' from 'body work' in their apprenticeship and giving more weight to the latter. However, in these cases, the young people of Adams and IPS did not make such a clear separation and found even the practical aspects of their learning to lack. Seemingly, there must be more going on here than just the rejection of 'mental work' that often dominates accounts of working class learning as we have seen through Willis' (1977) *Learning to Labour*, the reimagining of this study offered by Ward (2015) and Reay's (2017) *Miseducation*. Instead, young people here reject the whole process of craft learning which is directly oppositional to the experience of industrial workers that we saw in chapter two whereby the young men would reject traditional education for industrial education. This is because despite them engaging in the same kinds of learning of machinery, tools etc, it is not the same cultural education. It is something less valuable; a deformed version of the original. Deindustrialisation therefore began a change and one that is still carrying impact.

To understand and articulate this, it is useful to employ the literary term 'half-life' coined by Sherry Linkon (2018) who utilises the analogy of an atomic bomb to explain the process of deindustrialisation. Here, she discusses how industry closures were the epi-centre of this explosion

which rippled through the local communities. In its wake has been left the radiation, the continued effects of loss that corrode those who still exist within the blast's radius. The remaining discussions will highlight how we can use this to understand what has happened to the skilled identity and conversations of skill that the apprentices learn today. They are learning a version that has been deformed by the atomic fallout of their communities' explosion. Deindustrialisation therefore still impacts them as they traverse the mutated version of an industrial apprenticeship. They are attempting to join a community which as the metaphor suggests, has been blown apart and therefore does not offer the same stability to find value. The sharing of value was a natural transition, but as Linkon's (2018) half-life shows us, this has been poisoned by the fallout of deindustrialisation. More so, the passing on of the craft community itself was an organic part of the industrial apprenticeship and its culture both within Dockyards (Waters, 1999; Casey, 1999) and more broadly through pre-socialisation and work training (Strangleman, 2005; Dudley, 1994). This resulted in the manifestation of the skilled identity, framed as the 'conversation of skill' in chapter two, being passed on from generation to generation relatively seamlessly as we have seen throughout the previous chapters' discussions. However, the influence of external educational agencies who have attempted to create a newer form of the apprenticeship by spending less money but with the expectation of producing the same type of skilled worker, has muddied this organic process of reproducing similar identities. Instead, they have tried to 'engineer' a new conversation, creating a mutated form of the original. As Jack Goudie shows, they lack an emotional attachment to their education and therefore miss out on the important aspects of the craft socialisation. This means the kinds of bonds and community is unable to form so readily. Without this, the communal walls remain sparse and they are unable to find value in their craft identity by following the paths already laid out for them.

As Linkon (2018) suggests, in the half-life, the physical spaces of former labour deteriorate, marking the landscape as a reflection of loss and deindustrialisation. We have seen this in the

memoryscale. However, Linkon also alludes to the relationship between the material and the social in the half-life, a suggestion that we can build upon here, as she states that in deindustrialised communities:

People live every day with the tangible evidence of the past, in buildings where people once worked and in empty lots where neighbours' homes once stood. Memory remains in social relations as well. Although social networks fray when some people leave the area, those who remain often feel more deeply tied to each other, in part because they draw on shared memory to remind themselves of why they stayed. They tell each other stories about the way things used to be and how they changed. These stories create and maintain social relationships, but they also function as cultural interpretations that explain and evaluate what happened and the way things are in the present (2018:4).

She continues:

The past and the present are thus interconnected, even, we might say, mutually dependent. The past, in the form of stories but also social and physical structures, remains significant because of its social function – as part of identity formation, social connections, and material experience – in the present (2018:4).

What Linkon suggests here is that within the half-life, the physical and the social are relational. Both are vessels of memory that shape how the working class living in the half-life, form their identities and relationships. To separate the material and the social therefore does not fully encompass the experience of half-life as she suggests. Similarly, we have seen this correlation emerge in the previous chapters' discussion, when we looked at how the physical walls of the Dockyard were reminiscent of the social and cultural walls of the community. The changes in the landscape therefore reflect the changes in relationships. As the physical spaces of labour became more liminal through downsizing, closures and many more forms of restructuring and destruction, the cultural and social relationships were also affected. For those trying to reconcile this half-life with their inherited memories of industry,

as Linkon (2018) shows, they rely on stories to reinforce the community. However, as we have seen with the young men and women of IPS and Adams, the sharing of these memories and stories have also been disrupted.

Particularly for those at IPS, this disruption between the material and the social was reflected in the workers' struggle to form a stable communal identity which left them without cultural boundaries that could act as a protective shell (Walkerdine, 2010). As we saw in chapter three through the work of Walkerdine (2010), the shared experience of a community can be used to provide a barrier for working class communities from devaluation, keeping their valuable cultural ideals in and anything contradictory out. When the Yard closed, this communal wall was shattered or in Linkon's (2018) terms, exploded. With these walls in tatters, the established networks that created and recreated discourses of value were forced to move and subsequently, the discourses diluted. The cultural space of the half-life community does not allow for the same discourses of value to form. This is because the languages of skill that the apprentices inherit complicate the reproduction of stable relationships and therefore stable communal walls. Now they are sparse and so are the relationships, as many of them alluded to. Particularly, this fracture was felt by IPS apprentices and most explicitly identified by George Taylor, 18, a multi-skilled apprentice, Luc Debont, 18, a mechanical technician and Simon Morris, 16, an electrical instrumentation apprentice:

George Taylor: The people I work with don't really live round here and we're like quite far apart, so we can't guarantee to see each other like on the weekends.

Luc Debont: I don't personally see any of them outside of here but... we all live so far away, like I live in Gravesend and some people I get on with live in Sheppey or Ashford so, it's, it's quite hard to do because of that... some live even further.

Simon Morris: Depending on where you live, depends on... how close you are and that and a friendship you got with 'em cause if you live er, if you live the other side of England then... there's not gonna' be a lot going on.

As the three of them explain, living far apart from those you train with is not conducive of strong social bonds. However, because of the lack of industrial apprenticeships across the country, they have little choice but to travel for their education. Once again, the effects of deindustrialisation act like radiation, poisoning their relationships by weakening the geographical and social bonds of the craft community. They cannot develop the same camaraderie to carry over into their work lives. As such, the dissolution of their relationships affects their ability to find strength in their communal identity and they lack a protective shell in which they can reproduce their valuable cultural norms. As highlighted by Linkon (2018: 4) earlier on, social networks in places of former work are maintained through memory. However, this is not translating to those who are attempting to attach themselves to these networks. They instead face the liminality that she describes as the character of half-life. Their networks have stretched to such a point that they struggle to find commonality in their experiences and therefore develop the same kind of craft identities that were dominant in the past.

De-industrial Masculinity

Returning to Ben at IPS who was introduced at the beginning of the chapter is useful here. He articulated the two aspects of industrial training that were lacking, the "discipline" and inability to "crack the whip". As I argued then, this "discipline" is bound up in the languages of skill which have changed. The older workers are not able to pass on their languages as the explosion of deindustrialisation fractured the organic pathways. Instead then, the new radiated languages of skill emerge which clearly Ben feels are lacking. Cara Bernard, as the only female apprentice spoken to, offers a unique perspective on the skilled languages that form the newer, half-life version of the skilled

conversation. Once again, like with the Dockyard workers, masculinity emerged still as a central experience to their learning. However, rather than the presence of an industrial masculinity being the marker of a communal identity, it is rather the loosening of it that characterises the group:

Emma: Would you have done an apprenticeship 30 years ago?

Cara Bernard: I probably wouldn't have, I probably wouldn't have been... as easily accepted into it, it was very... male, male dominated, much more than it is now cause I think the mindset was a lot different erm... whereas now it's acceptable... to go into it, maybe not er... as... what's the words I'm looking for... erm... accessible, I mean not many, many girls want to go into it because they still feel it's very male dominated and very male saturated er... back then it was, it was even worse it was kind of no opening I can see erm... and I feel I would've been like, if I had done that 30, 40 years ago I might've been pushed out of it erm... because that's just kind of the mindset that was then, erm, a lot has changed, still got a long way to go but a lot has changed erm... and you can see it in some of the tutors their... their kind of mindset from when they did their apprenticeship it was kind of different, different to now... so no I probably wouldn't have done that thirty forty years ago.

Cara identifies that masculinity was once the central feature of industrial learning and that this has loosened. Here, she is using the tutors as the measure of a generational culture shift as for her, they clearly represent the 'old' way of craft. From Cara's account we can see that masculinity is less exclusive within the sphere of craft. This clearly has benefit because it allows her to engage with industrial work. However, as we saw through chapter three, masculinity does not necessarily mean a gendered and physical state as Segal (1997: 123) articulates:

Masculinity is not some kind of single essence, innate or acquired. As it is represented in our culture, 'masculinity' is a quality of being which is always incomplete... it exists in the various forms of power men ideally possess, the power to assert control over men, over their own bodies, over machines and technology.

Masculinity therefore is not a given state of being, it is a process of negotiation based upon relationships with others, the self and material objects. As I have previously argued, it bears more resemblance to a conversation than a gendered state. In these terms, it is made visible that masculinity is flexible and therefore subject to change and particularly:

Processes of gender cannot be set apart from economic restructuring, but instead are embedded within the restructuring process itself (Nayak, 2006: 817).

The radiation that has restructured the educational programme and the experiences of labour will necessarily have impinged upon the forms of the skilled languages and namely, industrial masculinity.

In accounts of the effects of deindustrialisation, a central theme that emerges is that of the effects on young men who attempt to negotiate a traditional form of masculinity against the new labour market that prefers as Hochschild (1983) terms 'emotional labour'. In deindustrial capitalism, what has been described as 'body work' (Wolkowitz, 2006) and 'interactive work' (Leidner, 1991) further reflects what McDowell (2002; 2003) identifies as the preference for more 'feminine' attributes in the workplace. These are contradictory to the kinds of performative labour roles that young men in deindustrialising communities have been socialised into which restricts their participation and success within the labour market (Nayak, 2006; Walkerdine and Jimenez, 2012). As such, the young men are forced to renegotiate their masculinity if they want to get a job. This is what we can characterise as a 'deindustrial' or 'half-life' form of masculinity. Through Nayak's (2006) exploration of the deindustrial 'Geordie' city we can see the disruptive potential of deindustrialisation to the cultural codes of young working-class men trying to negotiate their familial and geographically inherited manual labour dispositions that have little transferable value to the service economy. The young men in Nayak's (2006) account exemplify the masculine character of industrial cultures as they reflect the physical embodiments of the masculine discourses that they learnt from their surrounding communities. They acquired the preferred dispositions found in industrial labour. These practices of

masculinity and of what it is to be skilled in a craft work setting were derivative of the industrial labour values learned by the young men from the community of manual workers that they had grown up in. Similarly, Walkerdine and Jimenez (2012) found how these contestations between past and present manifest a feeling of 'shame' for the men who are unable to find work that they deem appropriate to the masculinity that they inherit from their previously industrial communities. Increasingly, young men are finding that these cultural codes that had held value for the generation before them were restricting their access to legitimate employment as they were largely seen as counter-productive to the occupational norms of 'feminised skill' valued by the labour market (Nayak, 2006; McDowell, 2003; Walkerdine and Jimenez, 2012).

Similarly, McDowell (2003) observed the difficulties faced by young working-class men who had inherited an industrial specific masculinity that was conflictual to the kinds of cultural traits they were required to exhibit in a deindustrialising economy. In the aftermath of deindustrialisation that ruptured the value of these classed and gendered cultural norms, these young men are left with this 'cultural fallout'; scattered remnants of an industrial hegemonic masculinity that litters their identities as memories of their inherited pasts which only serves to cloud their legitimate employment opportunities and pursuits of value. These young men thereby faced a contention that would not have been as common place for those whom imparted the norms onto them. The community of craft-skill had taught them to value physicality, pub culture and heightened heterosexual masculine practices that were once an essential form of social currency, were juxtaposed to the more 'feminised' values required by service work (Nayak, 2006; McDowell, 2003). By embodying these traits without the framework to create value, the men were facing a crisis of craft skill as they had no schema in which to attain value and meaning.

De-industrial masculinity therefore is characterised by conflict and loss. As Cara identifies, it is something different to what it once was. As she sees it, it was much more exclusionary. This suggests it was much more coherent in its form as it was able to hold a communal identity together. The more liminal version that appears now, is more inclusive to her showing it is now more fractured in its form. Her relationship with her tutors makes this difference visible as they clearly hold onto the form that once enabled them to attain value. Like the networks of sociality, this liminal state is unable to reproduce the same discourses of value and therefore does not offer the same kind of communal value that it once could. Particularly, Cara was the most critical of the Southeastern boys, finding them to be:

Cara Bernard: Very laddish, very kind of...erm... boisterous and brash so at times it can get quite irritating erm... just with, you know, the stuff that comes out of people's mouths you, you wouldn't imagine.

This is because they still hold the kind of masculinity that was once central to the experience of industrial socialisation. Cara has however made a moral distinction that this kind of masculinity is bad. As we have seen through Kefalas (2003), Hodson (2001) and Lamont (2000), these kinds of moral economies are prevalent in workplaces and working-class cultures. They are used to distinguish who performs an acceptable form of working-class identity and who does not. Cara uses masculinity in these terms and rejects those who exhibit the traditional form. In this way, she once again demonstrates her relationship with her work identity as much more individualised and neo-liberal as she internalises the rejection of the traditional forms of skilled conversations. Her place as the only female in her cohort gives her this viewpoint of being 'new' to the industrial world and therefore allows her to inhabit the position of the radiated, half-life skilled individual. She has less of the inherited cultural fallout of masculinity to negotiate and therefore, is able to enter the world of the apprenticeship with a clean slate and embody the half-life of skill entirely. As she can show us then, the half-life of masculinity is a liminal form that cannot provide the same kind of collective identity.

The De-industrial Body

The “discipline[s]” that Ben described as the problematic aspects of liminal learning are exemplified through Cara’s response to industrial masculinity. However, Ben also identified cracking “the whip” as a lost but important practice. Like I briefly argued earlier on, this encompasses the bodily aspect of craft which like masculinity, is ever present but deformed. Like the Dockyard workers, dirt and its bodily connotations re-emerged as a central theme for the apprentices. Unlike the Dockyard workers however, the young people were rejecting dirt, viewing it as unnecessary now. George Taylor, a multi-skilled apprentice, Simon Morris, an electrical instrumentation apprentice and Robert Fieldwick, a chromatography apprentice, all at IPS, reflected on what apprenticeships once were in similar terms:

George Taylor: Grotty.

Simon Morris: Greasy... I can deal with the manual labour but the greasiness eurgh... you gotta draw a line sometimes.

Robert Fieldwick: Dirty... I like to keep clean.

Similar sentiments were present in all apprentice’s imaginings of what industrial work once was. Dirt was once an important classed and gendered aspect of industrial labour as we saw through Alex Routen and his friend Jack in the previous discussions. However, the young people now are rejecting these cultural languages. They are renegotiating the inherited cultural languages from the community. In the same way as the half-life, the basic principles remain insofar that they still acknowledge the importance that dirt once had, however it now has a different meaning. In a similar manner, the apprentices described the danger that was once integral to industrial work:

George Taylor: It weren't the best place to work, like a ship would come in and you'd have to throw your tools on the ship and jump in whilst it's not even stopping, like... some of the conditions were probably pretty bad there but... I dunno... it's a lot different to what it is now.

Simon Morris: I would've thought a lot of it was more just getting in there, getting stuck in and ... working.

George Taylor again and Simon Morris, 16, an electrical instrumentation apprentice at IPS are reflecting on similar practices as the role of dirt. In both accounts, there is an unwillingness to hand over their bodies to their trade in the way they thought was once necessarily. Through both dirt and danger, they demonstrate that their bodies have a much more passive relationship with their labour. Bodies were once central to the experience of industrial labour as the cultural languages of masculinity were embodied and physicality was a requirement for this expression (Theil, 2007). In this case, the body was an active participant in the workplace and was both imprinted upon by the work (both culturally and in many cases physically through injury). Interestingly, Daniel describes this kind of active relationship as "working". This suggests a reflexivity to his account that he recognises the limitations that this passivity can ensue when trying to complete certain tasks at work. Nevertheless, this does not stop him and the others from rejecting the bodily experience of craft. Like the 'protest masculinity' Connell (1995) identifies, the young people here can be said to be engaging in a 'protest skill'. In Connell's (1995) work, he sees young men as trying to reclaim a sense of traditional masculinity in the juxtaposed service economy. They therefore exhibit 'hangover' traits or half-life attributes and try to assert some legitimacy in their displays of traditional masculinity. Quite the opposite is happening in the apprenticeship here. Instead they are rejecting the traditional systems that once allowed for value to be retained and instead favour the individualised half-life skill. Their 'protest skill' therefore is more conflictual than nostalgic.

Symbolically they are doing much more than just refusing to get themselves dirty or not engage in dangerous work. They are refusing to give over their individual bodies to the communal. This act of danger, dirt and the full performative and embodied aspect of craft was once central to show the individual was willing to become a part of the communal. These kinds of practices were learnt during the apprenticeship whereby rites of passage were used by enacting upon the body to demonstrate that they needed to transcend beyond their status as individual and become a part of the collective. We saw this explicitly in chapter two through Bob Dennis who was stripped and rolled in a barrel at the end of his apprenticeship. However, these kinds of acts are missing from the apprenticeship today which limits their ability to identify the significance that their bodies hold. They are not just being passive in their bodily experience of craft, they are withholding themselves from the cultural community both physically and symbolically. Robert Wimbeugh, 18, a pharmaceutical apprentice expresses this sentiment as he describes the role banter plays:

Robert Wimbeugh: It's all quite... clean banter if that makes sense.

Here he evokes the same language and moral demarcation between clean and dirty. He sees this kind of "clean" banter as preferable because it does not require handing over the individual body to the community. But, by avoiding these practices they do not get to engage in the important process that is enacting upon the body. The body therefore is a moral playground; a space where important acts of socialisation and demarcations of what skill is, are negotiated. This process is central within working class communities:

For working class men, masculinity and masculine advantage in the labour market are based on bodily norms of strength and virility, on the ability to endure hard labour, even an insensitive toughness that permits hard bodily labour to be undertaken day after day. These attributes often lead to the development of a masculine camaraderie in the workplace that protects men at work and that strengthens male bonds (McDowell, 2009: 132).

Giving over the body therefore is central to developing a collective identity. This shift in the way the body is seen in labour is once again down to external agencies and their influence.

Largely, health and safety regulations were discussed by all as an important reason as to why certain changes were made in the workplace. They describe 'health and safety' as an external entity that acts upon them, it is also the first thing that all apprentices are introduced to on their first day at both work and in education. In comparison to the Dockyard workers who described their first days as learning the workshops and the tools, the apprentices now firstly learn to manage their bodies. This appears to make this an important and central component to their craft identity. They also see these regulations as an ever-present force that they carry through from their training to their workplace. Like an all-seeing eye, it restricts their movements at work and dictates what they believe they can do. This does not mean that they are critical of it though as they see the introduction of these regulations as beneficial and protective. Once again, they internalise and accept these external sources into their craft community.

Because they have accepted these regulations as central to their craft, the way they think of activities that encroach upon their bodies has changed. 'Pranks' were once a central aspect of the moral economy of craft socialisation as it reinforced the boundaries of who was skilled and therefore valued. Like the role of dirt, they now view acts upon the body as negative. Liam Sampson, 17, a multi skilled apprentice and David Hicks, 22, an industrial refrigeration apprentice, both at IPS, described these kinds of acts in similar terms:

Liam Sampson: Some a bit... naughty I guess, some a bit... [laughs] some things that are probably a bit... yeah... they got stories about all the pranks that used to happen cause back then it was... you had, you had to take a joke sort of thing now it is a lot more... cautious of

how you treat people which is a good thing in some ways cause ... a lot of people have a lot of things that you don't know what's going on with them and, but then it was sort of... it doesn't matter who you are, you're an apprentice and you're gonna get bullied like... you were gonna, you were gonna get chucked in the boot of a car and stuff like that, it was just... that's probably what I, that's what I heard really just the things they used to get up to, throwing spanners at people and all that, cable tying your tools to the roof... I think that happened here actually... I think we cable tied someone's trainer to the roof in there somewhere ... something like that happened... that's probably as bad as it ever gets.

David Hicks: 'Cause the ones I speak to at work like the engineers they say, well it's a lot, obviously a lot less er... health and safety was literally... non-existent...er... yeah they just... like... get beaten up and stuff like at work [laughs] yeah like proper... bullied and stuff, er, obviously don't get away with that now.

Both describe these practices as 'bullying' which indicates that there has been a moral shift around these acts as well as a cultural one. Deindustrialisation therefore changed what is considered valuable. Even within the craft community itself, the value of certain practices has shifted. They are still willing to engage in 'pranks' as James describes, but they are far less physical and do not require the individual body to forfeit its protected status for the sake of camaraderie. As a cultural language and practice, pranks too have deformed in the half-life as they still act to create a sense of community, but are not reproducing the same kind of collectively as we have seen. Therefore, these kinds of pranks are not allowing the same kind of value to reproduce because they do not require the same level of sacrifice. For the community to be maintained, there needs to be a certain level of expense for the members as they must allow themselves to be a part of the community. If they do not, then they will not form the same level of camaraderie and therefore value.

What we can see here then is the emergence of a 'half-life' body. As Linkon (2018: 59) describes:

Economic restructuring and neoliberal ideology further complicate working class identities, however, by bringing in a second point of contestation: between individualism and belonging.

This contestation is the character of the half-life, deindustrial body as it is restricted, protected and ultimately individualised by health and safety regulations. More so, this ethos is adopted by the apprentices who guard their individual bodies from the community practices that could cause it to lose its protected status. In the half-life, the communal body no longer holds prevalence. It has too been blown apart by the atomic bomb of closures and separated into individualised bodies. Ones that are held to be of greater importance for the half-life apprentice. Without the communal body, the individual lacks the ability to attach themselves to a wider narrative of skill. They struggle to see themselves as part of a community which can offer them protection from discourses of devaluation. Instead, the half-life body, like the half-life conversation of skill and the half-life worker, is individualistic and deformed by neoliberalism which limits the ability for the working class to form and reform discourses of value in the same way they once could.

Concluding Discussions

Overall, I have shown that it is the masculine aspect of skill and craft that have been challenged. This has shifted the communal identity away from one that is closely reminiscent to the language of skill that the Dockyard workers performed. As such, the focus of this chapter has been the idea of cultural dismantling. Once again, we saw this to manifest through Stuart Pollitt, our appointed guide through the multifaceted terrain of industrial, cultural and communal change. By joining him in his remembered present inside the skeleton frame, as he watched the passers-by, we saw his awareness of a dislocation between past and present. What we saw early on then was that

deindustrialisation is a temporally layered experience that was felt across the generations. This chapter explored the effects of change on the experiences of those undertaking apprenticeships today to depict how their craft identity is formed without the same structures as the Dockyard workers.

Primarily, I argued that the young people must contend with external influences that impact how successful they can be at reproducing the kind of occupational community that the Dockyard workers had. Consequently, they lack the ability to find the same kind of commonality in their experiences because the communal walls were fractured during deindustrialisation. This allowed for the discourses of value to leak out and devaluation to seep in. The current apprentices have a more individualised perception of their craft identity that mirrors the expectations of the liminal marketplace that they have grown up in. They must detach themselves from the communal body, refusing to allow themselves to move from a state of an individual self into a communal one. Without this shift, the apprenticeship scheme lacks the same social and cultural significance to how they develop their craft identities. To further illuminate this, I presented the Southeastern boys who challenged the 'half-life' identity that many of the younger workers exhibit. Instead, this group appear as echoes of the past cultural community which causes friction with their peers who cannot form value in the same way. As such, I have shown the experiences of the current apprentices to be multi-layered and more complex than the Dockyard workers training and development of the self.

Therefore, the discussions here have shown that the development, redevelopment and acquisition of value is made more precarious in deindustrialising communities. In the past, workers would reproduce the discourses that were handed down intergenerationally to maintain the 'walls' of value that allowed them legitimacy in their identities. However, the young people now identify a sense of lack to be present in their training. This lack is clearly displayed through their relationships to each other, their tutors, their education in general and to the languages of skill. They feel dislocated from

the past forms that once allowed value to be obtained. As such, they are unable to find value in the same way from the dominant forms of masculinity and the performance of craft through the body that were once the most successful ways to maintain the community in industrial work cultures. Instead they must reject that which is not useful to them. This culminates in a sense that they are adding to the dissolution of the craft-skill community by refusing to reproduce any cultural forms that would allow past, present and future workers a schema in which they can find pride. The discourse of value is a fragile one. As the community are unable to reproduce their discourse, the cultural codes are not assigned value. They therefore are exposed to discourses of devaluation as the community cannot reproduce, legitimise and therefore protect the craft-skill cultural codes. As the community loses its power, it loses its value.

Nevertheless, to assume that the young people have totally given up on trying to reclaim spaces of value is too simplistic. They know they cannot find value through reproducing the past so instead, they must work harder to find their own ways to source legitimacy. They must carve alternative pathways to value. Continuing with the theme of the 'half-life' and how we can use this to understand cultural legacies of industry loss, chapter five, 'trying to rebuild' will show how the young people navigate this more liminal terrain. Maintaining an awareness of their liminal circumstance that we have seen in this chapter is essential as it will show the difficult task to rebuild frameworks of value that the young people face. But ultimately, how the desire to find legitimacy within working class communities is stronger than the influence of neo-liberalism that seeks to devalue them.

Chapter Five: Trying to Rebuild

In chapter four I showed the changes that formed the half-life identity that were spurred by deindustrialisation. The half-life community are deformed and the discourses of value, corroded by the seepage of external organisations into their work identities. Primarily this occurred through rejecting the explicitly discursive and bodily aspects of masculine skill. In this chapter, I examine these processes further by outlining how the apprentices are constructing alternative discourses of value by re-establishing their own craft community. Here, we will see that the current apprentices do share similarity with the experiences of the Dockyard workers, despite the precarious context of their cultural development. Although the community is different, it appears as more of a renegotiation of the original form rather than a complete rejection. Therefore, although the communal walls have shifted, devaluation has seeped in and the young people are struggling to find value in apprenticeships, they have not given up and are still fighting to negotiate their cultural spaces to find legitimacy.

This chapter therefore is about renegotiation and defiance. However, not a defiance against the former community, but one aimed at finding value in a deindustrialising culture and economy that as I argued in the previous chapter, aims to devalue working class cultural spheres. This defiance is a shared reaction to change across both generations of working-class workers. Stuart in the skeleton frame does the same. His 'unofficial' remembering defies the forced invisibility of the collective history of the craft community. As I will demonstrate, the apprentices attempt to form an 'unofficial' community that negotiates their inherited cultural and social values within the context of the half-life. As such, apprenticeships are a working-class battleground for value as they continue to find ways to source value from collective membership despite the encroachment of the external influences

outlined in chapter four. Apprentices are active in this reclamation despite attempts to limit their value.

The first part of this chapter outlines the changing attitudes towards the title of apprentice and how the younger workers are restricted from that. Emerging as a custody battle over the moral parameters of skill, a chasm exists between the two generations that inhibits older workers from recognising the skilled identity of their descendants. Building on to this, I outline how the young people respond to this contention around their title through a preliminary discussion of their attempts to recharacterize their craft identities. As such, how important the status of apprentice is to the craft identity of the workers. In the third part, I continue to problematise how different their communal identities are by presenting the early socialisation of the younger apprentices that is distinctly reminiscent of the experiences of the Dockyard workers outlined in chapter two. They therefore experience similar phases of pre-socialisation as the older apprentices but rely heavily on these cultural learnings to negotiate the pressures of the deindustrialised ideologies that encompass them. They must work harder to resist these normative narratives of what their work identities should be and therefore in many ways, are forced to defend their classed identity more vigorously than previous generations.

The fourth part of this chapter goes into greater detail of what this community now looks like. Following on from the discussions in the previous chapter, I outline what still exists as inherited traditions in their craft culture as opposed to what has been lost. Firstly, the existence and display of a moral character is still required to enter the craft community at work. The young people are still able to display this because of the pre-socialisation that they experienced so they are still able to find value through collective membership. However, once they are within the community, they must begin to renegotiate it. This is most evident through a discussion of how they perform their half-life masculinity

at work manifesting through banter. This banter allows for an intergenerational connection to form as it is a language of skill that both older and younger workers recognise. Of course, a cleaner version of this banter is preferable for the young people which highlights their renegotiation of existing forms within present context. Finally, this section of the chapter will explore the ways in which the craft community is still passed on and the importance of this handing over of custody that has always been an essential practice of craft. The young people recognise that the community must adapt if it is to continue which unfortunately puts them at odds with their predecessors. This however is a part of the moral conditions of being a craft community member, value must be reproduced for future generations, whatever the cost.

The 'Modern' Apprentice

Initially when I began to think about the narratives of the current apprentices and what the older apprentices thought of them, I, like the Dockyard workers, believed that the notion of a craft community was absent from the current apprenticeship narratives. I first realised that something was wrong with this assumption when I noticed the similarities with the memories of the former workers and the fact that the young people were finding value. I struggled to understand how the young people were doing similar practices and finding fulfilment and legitimacy, if they were totally rejecting their inherited traditions of class and masculinity. This is when I realised that their sense of a community was not gone but hidden, both from me and from the former workers. This is because we had both held a rigid definition of the community based upon the experiences of the Dockyard's craft-skill generation. For the Dockyard workers, there are two reasons that they identified for this invisibility of the current apprenticeship culture; the structure and the apprentices themselves. Firstly, the changes to apprentices that have remodelled them into the 'modern apprenticeship' is blamed for redefining the parameters of traditional apprenticeship learning. This is exemplified by Alan West, an electrical engineer beginning in 1964 and Chris Willing, a boilermaker from 1972:

Alan West: Generally, apprenticeships, if they're not engineering based with a structured apprenticeship, I wouldn't really call them apprenticeships.

Chris Willing: The term 'modern apprenticeship' has, I believe, cheapened the status of the traditional 'master and apprentice' type schemes.

What both Alan and Chris highlight, is that the introduction of new forms of apprenticeship have corroded the legitimacy of the form of learning that they engaged with. Since before the Dockyard closed in the 1970s and 1980s, but likely with little effect to Yard, apprenticeships had been restructured under the same neo-liberal policies that sparked its closure. These policies replaced traditional apprenticeships with youth training schemes (Ward, 2015). Consequently, the definition of apprenticeship shifted, causing the disconnection in recognition from Alan and Chris. More so as Vickerstaff (2007: 343) agrees:

Apprenticeship has slipped from its status as part of the intergenerational family heritage, wider collective memory and a respected and trusted route in the labour market and adulthood.

By refiguring the structure of the traditional passing down of skills, the communal wall of the community was fractured causing a disassociation between all the former styles of social, cultural and practical learning in favour of a more rigid training scheme. These changes continued with the introduction of the 'modern apprenticeship' in 1994 which attempted to disseminate the title of apprentice to various industries outside of industrial craftwork (Ward, 2015; Reay et al, 2005; Unwin and Wellington, 2006; Young, 2003; Deissinger, 2004). This caused the complexity of what constitutes an apprenticeship that Alan and Chris refer to.

The development of what has become known as 'the modern apprenticeship' has been a process spanning decades that has attempted to redefine the type of learning that workers like the

Dockyard men would have experienced. Deissinger (2004) identifies this need to understand apprenticeships alongside the economic and political landscape in which they operate. Since the 1970s and 1980s when deindustrialisation began, apprenticeships have undergone multiple restructures, initially replaced with youth training schemes (Ward, 2015). These were seen to be more economically efficient and competitive to reflect the neoliberal marketplace through a focus on generalisable skills that could be transferred to multiple industries and workplaces (Ward, 2015). The primary aim of this initial schemes was to move away from the traditional structure of an apprenticeship as a 'provider culture' which shared knowledges and training between colleges, workplaces and unions to a 'learning culture' that prioritised individual achievements and abilities (Young, 2003). In 1994, the 'modern apprenticeship' began which still largely appealed to working class boys but suffered from the lack of specificity to trade or skill-set (Reay et al, 2005). The 'modern apprenticeship' expanded the training outside of craft industry and used the route of learning to work in new workplaces such as office-based industries (Unwin and Wellington, 2006). Fuller (1996) describes this shift as part of wider post-fordist labour trend that treats workers as a commodity that accrue capital. As such, using the apprenticeship training scheme across multiple industries allows workers to generate profit both for the company and add to their own skill set whilst they learn (Fuller, 1996). Intrinsic to this development is the intrusion of neoliberal policy into learning that moves apprentices away from communal learning to profit-driven, individualised learning. For the workers like those of the Dockyard who bear witness to this change, they imagine the corrosion of community and the memory of craft-skill that was embedded in apprenticeship learning for centuries. The complexity of what an apprenticeship has become has created its invisibility to them. For the young people too, it becomes difficult to reconcile what they understand an apprenticeship to have once been with the system they face today (Ward, 2015).

Unwin and Wellington (2006) have previously examined how young people related to their titles in their learning spaces to ascertain if the term 'apprentice' held any social currency to them or if it was treated as 'old fashioned'. They found that in some of the more traditional industries such as steel, the term 'modern apprentice' was rejected in favour of 'management trainee' (Unwin and Wellington, 2006). Interestingly here, the young people were distancing themselves both from the new definition of apprentice and the more historical notion, instead preferring a title that alludes to non- manual work. This is likely due to a need for redefining themselves as Fuller and Unwin (2003: 43) describe:

The traditional image of the apprentice as a young school leaver being patiently trained by an expert craftsman (sic) in the rules and practices of a craft or trade unchanged over many years does not sit easily with the image of the flexible, fast- moving and fragile contemporary workplace.

The shifting and redefining of the title of apprentice, like many other aspects described in chapter four, was instigated by external, neo-liberal ideologies. Young people today have a much more liminal landscape to traverse when trying to decide their path post compulsory education. This new landscape has been described by Katherine Newman (1993) as 'meritocratic individualism', a system whereby individual worth is equated with economic success. Instead of being rewarded for hard-work, as would have been the case for the Dockyard's craft-skill generation, the ability to overcome market conditions is the marker of success (Newman, 1993). As such, there is increased pressure on the young working-class people of today to navigate an economic and political system that has removed the traditional outlets for their inherited cultural and social skillsets. The ability to 'graft' as a social currency has lessened in its value, instead they must achieve financially to succeed. This framework leads them to place a higher worth on a university education over a technical one as it is the normative route to achieve status in contemporary marketplaces. More so, a working-class person achieving a degree despite the adversity of their social standing is seen as more in-line with the ideal of overcoming the

market conditions that they face rather than following the familial path carved out for them of manual work.

Similarly, Kathryn Dudley (1994) uses the phrases 'culture of the mind' and 'social darwinism' to add to this. In this way, she describes the concept of the free market to be a cultural one as well as economic. The ability to attain educational capital is given precedent over the physical. Those who work in traditional heavy manufacturing are seen as failures and are blamed for not getting an education like the middle-class. In this 'culture of the mind', the individual is held accountable for their own success as the ability to be adaptive is paramount. However, as seen in chapter four, these external narratives have leaked into the apprenticeship culture, shifting the parameters of how value can be defined. This is expressed by Nathan Tillett, the eldest of the half-life (or post-Dockyard), generation at 41. Nathan began his mechanical engineering apprenticeship at Adams in 1990 and therefore experienced the closing of the Dockyard during his childhood. He now works with the younger cohort and like Ben Taylor, the metrology apprentice also from Adams whom I discussed in chapter four, has experienced the more traditional training and the newer form. As Nathan describes:

Nathan Tillett: I say now academically they have to be, their looking now for... not all of them but Top end sort of B's A's and B's GCSE's and more whereas when I started... I, I, I passed the entrance exam and that was good enough sort of thing so... which was good [laughs] I think, I think I passed by the lowest ever amount ever so [laughs].

Over the period in which Nathan undertook his apprenticeship, across the UK the number of young people pursuing this training route fell dramatically, from 389,000 in 1964 to 87,000 in 1990 (Sanderson, 2007: 284). He therefore is a part of the 'skills gap' that many of the Dockers are concerned about. As he identifies, the parameters for entry have changed and are more focused upon educational attainment than in the past. No longer can they wholly reject traditional education and expect to use a technical education as an alternate pathway. Instead, they must display their ability

to succeed academically and technically. The young people therefore occupy a position caught between the past and the present as they attempt to find the value of the past within a changing landscape that shifts the parameters of discourses of value.

For the former workers who did not face the same encroachment on their inherited communal identities, this is harder to understand. Therefore, they place the blame on the apprentices who they perceive to be the driving force of change as Mark Colyer, a former Dockyard tug worker describes:

Mark Colyer: Well I've noticed nowadays erm, the working attitude's changed, er... everyone now is always on their phones, hiding up, texting, Facebooking, Whatsapping or whatever so you're not actually doing any production erm... and that's the younger generation, I've employed younger generations, people doing tree work erm, and I'm... over double their age and they can't keep up with me because that's how it's going, they're in their early twenties and I'm saying to 'em look you gotta learn to work longer, harder, faster... 'oh but I'm tired' I say 'yeah but I'm doing all the hard work, you're just doing the clearing like tree work' 'oh yeah but I'm not used to this' erm... course the next day you go to pick 'em up and they're not there 'oh my back aches I can't come in' and that's the way things are going, er, the younger generation don't understand, you know, work, you gotta work sort of thing.

Here Mark describes what he believes to be a shift in the attitudes of young people which causes them to lack to the same moral principles that his generation enjoyed. Instead he believes the priorities have shifted away from valuing hard work and the intrinsic satisfaction that comes from the bodily experience of craft to consumer goods and social media networks. Here he highlights an important shift. As he perceives it, the collective force of the craft community found in labour has been replaced by the neo-liberal networks of the online world. This, for him, is a rejection of the community. Likewise, he describes the unwillingness of the younger generation to perform the bodily experience

of craft. This is reminiscent of the discussion about the embodied craft identity seen in chapter four, so it does not need to be repeated. However, it is another aspect that shows he lays the blame at the feet of the apprentices who he sees as having rejected the community values.

The reproduction of the craft community is therefore no longer a smooth process but instead, is fraught with conflicts over ownership and moral distinctions of the right way to proceed. All recognise that the craft-skill community is not what it used to be. The external conditions make it harder for the original form of the craft-skill community to reproduce and this causes a cultural chasm to appear between the generations making the newer form unrecognisable to the older workers. This sentiment was reinforced in multiple iterations by the Dockyard workers who rejected the modern apprentices and explicitly so by Alex Routen, a boilermaker, Simon Sandys, a shipwright and Tony Gutteridge, an electrical engineer:

Alex Routen: I think it's bad that we don't train young people more and I'm not, not having a knock at you but I think Blair, I blame Tony Blair because all he wanted was everybody to go to university ... somebody's got to do the sweeping up, somebody's got to make the metal brackets to hold up what somebody else has designed, you still need people at the bottom and those people need training for whatever they're gonna do and I think there was way, way too much emphasis on going to university.

Simon Sandys: It's not an apprenticeship as I understand an apprenticeship, so I don't think... the crafts is what apprenticeships used to be about, about skills and using your hands and I don't think since the... probably since the 80s they really have run them the same... and I think because of that now we are ... embarrassingly short of skilled men, you know, my age group 54, once we retire... I don't know where the skills are gonna come from you know.

Tony Gutteridge: I don't think they are apprenticeships anymore, I think they're training schemes to me an apprenticeship is where you commit yourself for five years to working with someone erm... learning on the job as it were, and I don't think things are like that anymore, I think the apprenticeships that er, apprenticeships nowadays people seem to see this apprenticeship thing on the television and... that's not an apprenticeship... apprenticeships were hands on things with the tradesman not people working with some millionaire somewhere doing that sort of thing I mean... that's not an apprenticeship ... to me an apprenticeship was where you worked with someone hands on doing craft type things.

Alex, Simon and Tony's responses are typical of those expressed across all the Dockyard's craft-skill generation; that apprenticeships as they knew them, are gone. Alex's distinction that the emphasis has shifted on a university education is notable as it mirrors the concerns that some of the young people expressed; that they were failures for not pursuing a university education. Alex here recognises these pressures that face the young people today. However, he is not able to identify the existence of those who are pushing away from this path and are still pursuing a technical education. Of course, there is also a classed aspect to this. Alex's concerns that young people are pursuing university is a fear that something is being taken away from working class communities as if all young people pursue this middle-class ideology, there is no one left to undertake the manual, craft jobs that he describes. Therefore, there will not only be an unemployment deficit but a cultural one as fewer people will engage in the working-class community that he recognises. Similarly, both Simon Sandys and Tony Oakes, a former Dockyard store supplies worker who now works for Adams describe a 'proper' apprenticeship in similar terms, as one that is 'hands-on'. Like Alex, they fear a decline in this bodily labour and the community that aligns with this as Tony articulates:

Tony Oakes: I don't think your erm... your allowed to have that community spirit the way we used to have it here and that was the... the whole site, in general, yeah definitely, yeah, the... the Dockyard was a community.

Their concern lies not just in a skills shortage but a cultural shortage. As Tony expressed, the movement away from the traditional notion of apprenticeship further dislocates a sense of community for the younger workers. Therefore, the status of apprentice holds significant moral currency for former workers.

Reclaiming the Title

This however is not reflected in the experiences of the younger apprentices; instead of thinking of rejection as I have already said, the apprentices are renegotiating. Further into Unwin and Wellington's (2006) discussion with engineering apprentices, they found that some of those who engage in the traditional industries instead prefer the term apprentice over 'management trainee' because they still relate it to the long-standing traditions of craft learning and therefore, share in the legitimacy and value of the title. Of course, the steel industries who prefer the title of 'management trainee' fit into this category, so why the difference in response? This contrary account highlights the ability of the apprentice to renegotiate the context of their present. Of course, it would be impossible to speak to the experiences of the apprentices of Unwin and Wellington's (2006) research but for the apprentices of Adams and IPS, the same practices occur. It seems safe to assume then that this renegotiation is the mark of the deindustrial apprentice who has a complex terrain to traverse between past and present. Similarly, Fuller and Unwin (1998) reached a similar conclusion when outlining the parallels between the traditional apprenticeship and the modern form:

We would argue that if a reconceptualised apprenticeship is to represent a genuine advance on the traditional model, it needs to reconcile the previously polarised positions of learner-centred and transmission approaches to pedagogy in order to advance a conception which meets contemporary learning requirements.

Apprentices therefore need to be adaptive in response. It is not possible to implement the same inherited practices in the modern context. For the apprentices, this tension leaks into their relationships with their instructors who embody the traditional system that they find themselves struggling to reconcile with. Robert Fieldwick, an 18 years old chromatography apprentice at IPS elucidates this in our discussion:

Robert Fieldwick: [Talking about staff] I dunno... er... some are... better than others I'd say but er... can be quite arrogant at times I'd say.

Emma: Why arrogant?

Robert Fieldwick: I dunno just... there's a very... what they think's right culture.

This 'arrogance' that Robert describes suggests a sense of ownership over the ability to determine what is the moral parameters of the skilled community or the 'right culture' as he terms it. Robert obviously feels a sense of resentment about this. This reflects the wider dynamics of the group who are trying to reconcile intergenerational differences and assumptions of how the community should be formed and what it should look like. This description of arrogance demonstrates that Robert feels that the older generation are aware of their custody over the moral parameters of the craft community. Equally, the younger group expressed here by Robert, can identify that they are excluded from any authority. Clearly this resentment comes from a sense by the younger workers that change is necessary. The young people are not happy to simply reproduce the existing model because they are aware that it is no longer a successful system for them. Instead they recognise that the community, like their own craft identities must be reflexive and adaptive to the present context.

For the apprentices then, they exist in a hostile terrain where their legitimacy and identification as an apprentice is always up for contestation. For those who work alongside them though, they can see up close the work that the young people do to try and rectify their more

individualised, liminal identities alongside their inherited community pasts. Paul Reynolds, a former Dockyard apprentice beginning in 1972, who also teaches at IPS, had a different perspective to the other Dockyard workers:

Paul Reynolds: I think here [IPS]... it's very traditional er, for this... this environment for this first year, that is... I see so many similarities and Keith [*Another teacher at IPS*] that's been here... er... he started at the Aylesford paper mill school so when they amalgamated it was Sheerness steels' Bluetown training centre and er, Aylesford paper mill school so these benches er... this layout came from them so actually what Keith has developed as all the courses and things, it's not... they don't need updating because the basics are what we're teaching erm... so this one if fault finding [the course he teaches] so the electronics it doesn't matter to a certain extent what the electronics are it's the process that you go through and the recording of the information and getting those processes working so the fault's that I've put on the equipment at the moment, I put on with my experience and some of them I think oh they won't find this but I've been caught out.

Paul and Keith, who have direct contact with the current apprenticeship cohort can recognise similarities in their experiences. They have reproduced the physical environment that they experienced and demonstrate that young people still have good technical knowledge and are able to identify faults that he does not think they could. By recreating the layout and the physical space of their apprenticeships, Keith and Paul are attempting to replicate the cultural space alike. By mirroring the past, they hope to reclaim the pride that this form of learning allowed them. Like the title of apprentice, these cultural symbols are important for the repairing of the communal walls as they help to restore the cultural spaces where pride can be made and remade. Nevertheless, as we have seen, reproduction of the past is no longer helpful for the apprentices and likely adds to their frustrations with their learning conditions. Nevertheless, despite the wider concerns of the Dockyard workers then, it seems that the apprentices are still engaging in similar physical training in the hopes of

restoring the cultural learning too. Therefore, instead of the cultural community being removed, it has changed. The young people have had to renegotiate the practices and identities that they inherited within the context of the external pressures, such as the push to go to university, that they face. They are hidden to the former workers because they cannot reproduce a recognisable version of the community. It is only those like Paul and Keith, who witness this renegotiation, that can still see the embers of the original form.

The apprentices themselves too are active in trying to reclaim the title of apprentice and the cultural identity that surrounds it. Denying the younger workers access to the title of apprentice is problematic and exacerbates the generational rupture that prohibits value from being shared and the communal walls repaired. The status of apprentice is an important aspect of the moral community at work as it is a significant stage of entry into the community. By denying the younger workers this title, they deny them entry into the craft community and therefore any attempts to gain legitimacy from that. Traditional studies of apprenticeships define the integral relationship between 'novice' and 'master' as a linear pathway into the workplace (Lave and Wenger, 1991). This however has been largely problematised as the contemporary liminal marketplace and the access young people have to skills through pre-socialisation makes this transitional phase less simplistic (Fuller and Unwin, 2003). Despite how problematic it may be to define the parameters of the learning, the attachment to the status of apprentice still holds precedence within these communities as they mark the entry point into the community. Henry Metcalfe, 18, an electrical engineer at IPS described his apprenticeship in positive terms:

Henry Metcalfe: Over the two odd years I've been doing it it's really changed me, and it's really sort of... I dunno, pushed me in different ways and made me develop skills that I didn't have... at all and erm, it's, it's really strange, I don't know how to describe it, but it does change you.

By describing his time as a transformative experience, Henry outlines that his inclusion into the craft community has enabled him to shift into a more developed person. Of course, there are gender specific ideals here too of the worker going from a boy to a man and performing an idealised masculine self which I have already looked at in previous chapters' discussion. However, what is significant to note is that the young people still identify a sense of learning from an older worker and achieve pride from that relationship. More so, this relationship has the same social effects of engraining the individual identity of the worker some kind of communal identity. The concerns that the Dockyard workers display therefore of the younger workers not reproducing a communal identity or the same kind of cultural space that they once enjoyed appear unfounded. The younger workers still find value through experiencing the same transition that comes with a social education. Therefore, they do want to share in the same title of apprentice and all were happy to use this term to describe themselves. However, unlike those before them, they must work harder to achieve this status both literally as they have a less linear pathway out of traditional education. But also, they have a more difficult cultural pathway as some members of the community resist their entry into the craft community by refusing to acknowledge the legitimacy of their learning.

Similar Beginnings?

Despite the differences in which the apprentices must learn and create their sense of self, their early experiences of craft share similarity with the Dockyard workers accounts. For many, they described their desire to follow craft work to be because of their dads outlined here by four IPS apprentices and Ben Taylor from Adams:

Jack Aspland: Er... well my, my dad works in the same area as me, the same depot, not for the same company, so it's quite convenient for me.

Luc Debont: My dad works for the same company but he's an electrician... and... I just always like saw what he was doing and got into engineering like I always wanted to help him out like when I was really little so... I just kind of got lead towards engineering.

Matthew Daly: Erm, my dad was er, he started off around my age and he went to an apprenticeship and he's been kind of sort of pretty successful in his life, so I sort of figured, I've always been into engineering as well so... I guessed it'd be the best route to get into.

Liam Sampson: When I was younger, I used to fix cars with my dad, so I quite like the mechanical side and also, I've, I've always been quite interested in electronics.

Ben Taylor: Well my old man was a refrigeration engineer and he'd been through an apprenticeship as well so... and I've always said to myself if I was half as successful as what he is then I'd be happy you know.

Or similarly, because of involvement with other male relatives or mentors seen through two more IPS apprentices, Joe Foley, 21, and George Whiskin-Emberley, 22 both IPS electrical engineer apprentices:

Joe Foley: My first job when I was 15... I used to go to work with my mate's dad who was a stonemason, so I used to do labouring with him during the summer when I was off school and that and then erm, yeah, I kept working with him during the summer's and the weekends every now and again and after that.

George Whiskin-Emberley: I worked at weekends with my cousin in a garage, so I was familiar with Adams and what they make at other sites and things.

For most of the young people, they had either a relative in engineering or had some prior experience to the work. Because of this, they were socialised into the craft community before undertaking their apprenticeships. As we have already seen, through pre-socialisation, cultural norms are shared which shapes the individual into the normative standard early on. These practices of anticipatory teaching are still prevalent for many young people. In Fuller and Unwin's (2002; 2003) research, they identified

these same influences of pre-socialisation to be guiding young apprentices today. Like the young people here, their apprentices had already begun to develop a set of skills that would help them in their learning as they describe:

When they enter the workplace, therefore, many young people have already developed a set of skills, knowledge and attitudes which render the term 'novice' almost meaningless. They will be 'novices' in the sense of having to learn practices and procedures, as well as skills and knowledge, which they will not have encountered before, but they will also have expertise to share (2003: 46).

Like apprentices before them, the young people have already developed an awareness of the craft-skill community. This is most apparent in their shared sense of being a 'natural born craftsman'. Reminiscent of the Dockyard workers, the young people repeatedly described the notion that they were predisposed for craft work. This was most prominently expressed at IPS:

Simon Cranfield: I enjoy working with my hands and things like that, enjoy getting stuck in and... I'm not very good at... all the education part and er, I wouldn't survive in a classroom all week [laughs].

Joe Foley: I've always wanted to do... er... manual work, you know, I've been working practically since I was 16, I worked with my hands-on sites but erm, yeah, I didn't really want an office job, I wanted, I always wanted to do something with my hands.

Rupert Wimbeugh: I've always been more... practically based than academic based, prefer to do things hands on rather than... rather than writing and things like.

Cameron Jamieson: I'm more of a sort of hands on person erm, I'm quite good at thinking about stuff I mean when I was a kid, I did a lot of bikes and cars and stuff like that with my brother so that lead me to, to engineering.

IPS appeared to be the central place for this discussion because of its more direct relationship with traditional education. As I described in chapter four, the young people saw similarities between IPS and school which was a source of tension. This however also caused them to be reflexive about their learning style and identify themselves to be natural craftsman. In this way they still demonstrate a bodily relationship to their craft as they narrate their physical selves to be just as predisposed for industrial work as their cultural identities. They also reject traditional education both through their own experiences and through frequent comparisons with university graduates who as Cara Barnard described, “don’t know what they’re doing”. As such they are still practicing their classed identities and internalising the lessons acquired through pre-socialisation. These still take a natural form for them as they do not identify themselves as having been taught these knowledges but instead, see them as an intrinsic part of the self. The young people, as they chose to enter the apprenticeship and the cultural community that goes along with it, still feel a moral imperative to perform their identity within the communal space. However, they cannot simply mirror the past that they have inherited, they must be more active in response. Instead, they must practice and defend their classed and gendered identities very early on (much earlier than the Dockyard’s, craft-skill generation), and actively decide to what extent they want it to inform their identities.

This negotiation was present for the young people at IPS and Adams. Matthew Daly, 18, and Harry Garner, 16, multi-skilled apprentices at IPS most explicitly experienced this contestation:

Matthew Daly: [My dad] started in college and he was kind of like a really failed student and then he got into an apprenticeship and then he ended up getting an award for the er, best apprenticeship in England.

Harry Garner: I didn’t like school whatsoever like I went to Borden grammar and they just pushed like going uni, pushed going uni and I just like didn’t really wanna go uni and then erm,

this come up as an offer so... I like working and earning money so, that's why I've really done it.

Further on into our discussion Harry continued:

Harry Garner: My step-dad like really wanted me to get erm, an apprenticeship cause he thinks like, he thinks apprenticeships are dying out and he wants more like apprenticeships and er, my mum wanted me to go to uni just because she went uni and like... my sister went uni and done all that so, it was kind of mixed so... it was kind of hard to choose.

Through both of their accounts we can identify the ongoing struggle between the past and the present that they experience through their educational careers. In Michael Ward's (2015) *From Labouring to Learning*, he found that working class boys were still being led towards manual subjects in school because of their experience of masculine and classed cultural values. Too, this was previously expressed by Mac an Ghall (1996: 42) who identified vocational subjects to still share in a culture that:

continues to reflect the masculine world of manual labour [emphasising] chauvinism, toughness and machismo.

For the boys in Ward's (2015) study, like those found in this research, many had a long history of engineering and manual trade within their families. As such, their educational routes were driven by inherited standards of masculinity to work with their hands or go to university to meet girls (Ward, 2015). Nevertheless, they did not replicate these inherited experiences in such straightforward terms, instead, they held influence as the young people opted to pursue A-Levels or BTECHs in sixth form, rather than undertaking an onsite craft apprenticeship. They therefore were negotiating two sides of their upbringing, the inherited ideals of gendered and classed identities alongside the normative expectations of educational, individualised success.

For Matthew and Harry, these divisive lines emerged through their school and family lives. Matthew had seen his fathers' rejection of traditional education and how he was able to share in value from that. For Matthew, this gave him the confidence to reject the normative ideology of moral worth coming from university. However, the presence of an internal conflict for him is illuminating as it highlights the different worlds that he must occupy. Similarly, for Harry, he found there to be a struggle between the expectations of his grammar school and his desire to work. Through this we see his classed identity being put to the test. In a sense, he has found achievement in the 'culture of the mind' that Dudley (1994) terms by attending a grammar school. However, the inherited working-class ideals of working with your hands and earning a wage early on acted as a pull away from university and towards a craft education. At the same, Harry was contending with a gendered manifestation of his choice through his mum and step-dad. For Harry, his mum and sister represented the newer 'feminized' economy that McDowell (2003) has discussed as they set the precedent in his home that the women gave preference to university education and the 'culture of the mind'. In comparison, his step-dad, a former apprentice himself, represented the traditional masculine figure of craft. Again, Harry was influenced by his inherited masculine identity and chose the arena in which he could perform this and pursue value, as such, rejecting the 'meritocratic individualism' present in the new economy (Newman, 1993). Although in chapter two we saw this with Paul Reynolds, his account of grammar school versus craft was an exception. For the apprentices today, each must face this contestation and the wider educational discourses that mark their craft choice as the wrong choice.

The battles faced by Harry and Matthew would not have been so commonplace for the Dockyard's craft-skill generation who experienced a relatively straightforward and expected route into industrial education. For the young people of deindustrialisation, they:

Increasingly perceive themselves as living in a society characterised by risk and insecurity which they expect to have to negotiate on an individual level (Furlong and Cartmel, 1997: 10).

Therefore, they must be more active in response to their cultural inheritance. This, as we saw in chapter four, appears as a rejection of some of the central aspects of the craft community, but, this does not tell us the whole story. As much as they may resist some aspects that they do not see to be useful, they must still perform some of the basic principles of the craft identity.

From as early as when the young people begin their apprenticeships, their cultural knowledges of their inherited pasts are put to the test. Therefore, there is still a strict moral demarcation enforced in the workplace established by longstanding traditions passed down through generations of workers that they must negotiate. These are still enforced by those like Nathan Tillet and Ben Taylor, the former apprentices and current workers at Adams as well as and Paul Reynolds, the former Dockyard apprentice who teachers at IPS. It is workers like these who assist in the interviewing of apprentices. Nathan reflected on his most recent round of interviewees and what criteria they were expected to meet:

Nathan Tillet: Erm... well not ever having had any training apart from life training [...] you're looking for a little bit of a spark about someone that erm... a bit of personality, it's a gruelling four years, you can earn more money... probably labouring somewhere er... you have to do a lot of homework, a lot of studies... and erm... er... it's, it's not easy erm... and I... I think you gotta look for someone that... is prepared to endure that and willing... to do that.

What Nathan alludes to is a sense of endurance, something that Mark Colyer earlier on believed to be missing from younger workers. He also states that they look for someone based upon their 'life training', this of course could easily be seen as pre-socialised cultural knowledges. So what Nathan expects when he hires new apprentices is that they have learned the cultural knowledge of dedication and persistence. Like the cultural languages described in chapter three, a moral parameter is enforced of the character of the worker. This can be discovered quite early on for Nathan in the interview process by paying attention to how they respond to technical tasks. Simon Cranfield, a 22-year-old

Southeastern apprentice at IPS remembered his time in the interview and what his interviewers were looking for:

Simon Cranfield: Hands on skills I think we had to do, erm, they broke something apart and then you had to put it back together again erm, er, they done basic maths and literacy erm, but I think mainly looking for someone whose hands on.

Reminiscent to the position of the young people and how they viewed themselves as 'natural born craftsmen', the potential apprentices in the interviews are asked to display an innate knowledge of craft. As we have seen, these knowledges are developed through early socialisation either through family members or in jobs undertaken from a young age. Through the re-building of these tools, the interviewers seek to identify those who display and perform these specialised cultural knowledges of the craft-skill identity and community.

Like the Dockyard's craft-skill generation before them, the young apprentices are required to display social knowledges through the making of objects. By doing so they can gain access to a craft community as they exhibit their potential to perform and therefore reproduce a craft identity in the appropriate way. Once at work, they must continue to perform these moral and social character traits. For the young people, this was expressed through their requirement to be dedicated as Rupert Wimbeugh, 16, an IPS pharmaceutical apprentice and George Whiskin-Emberley, 22, an Adams electrical engineer apprentice explain:

Rupert Wimbeugh: Unlike the last college I went to where people weren't, they weren't in industry, so they weren't sort of... I wouldn't say dedicated, no I would say dedicated whereas here I don't think, I don't think there are any students here who aren't doing an apprenticeship so everyone's quite motivated to get on with it.

George Whiskin-Emberley: All the mentors I've had I've got on well with, I think it's an attitude thing really, if you're like willing to learn and... show an interest, people... get on well with you, I know some other apprentices have had trouble where, cause they... was a little more... not interested and the got in trouble but it's... all down to attitude in my opinion.

Both Rupert and George identify the need for discipline or a certain 'attitude' as George terms it. Within both descriptions, the desire to learn and take interest in the community are paramount. This requirement for dedication for Rupert, can only be inherited and displayed by those who are familiar with industry. Therefore, he equates it to be a working-class trait. Similarly, to the moral demarcations found in Kefalas' (2003) study of Chicago neighbourhoods and Lamont's (2000) communities, traits such as hard-work and dedication are used to create a moral parameter that both excludes the other but reinforces commonality. Through these traits and the young people's ability to adhere to them, they begin to rebuild the communal walls as they reproduce the culture through acceptance of its legitimacy. For the young people, dedication is still an essential tool to demonstrate their inherited class identity and one that can be performed legitimately in the 'culture of the mind' as it suggests a willingness to overcome imposing conditions which as Newman (1993) and Dudley (1994) suggest, is the preferred attitude to survive in the contemporary marketplace. Therefore, the young people cannot simply reproduce the past but instead must create a mediated form that considers the moral parameters of their collective pasts and liminal present if they are to create and recreate, discourses of value.

The 'Half-Life' Skilled Identity

In terms of access to these cultural knowledges about the craft-skill community, the young people share a similar experience to that of the Dockyard's craft-skill generation. But as I have already said, they have a much more liminal and difficult terrain to traverse. They must therefore renegotiate the craft-skill identity that they inherit for them to be able to find value in their present environment.

They must form a half-life version. Following on from the discussion introduced earlier on, the 'half-life' coined by Linkon (2018) once again is a useful concept to employ to understand the effects of change on these young apprentices' experiences. As we saw in chapter four, the young people of Southeastern had developed a community that mirrors the half-life experience. They exist as a reminder of the traditional way of the community that juxtaposes to the more liminal identities of the other young apprentices. The Southeastern boys appeared as the 'haunting' entities that highlight the radiation that has corroded the languages of skill which differed to their peers. However, all these groups must engage in some kind of negotiation as they are all products of the deindustrialising contemporary marketplace and its cultural narratives of 'meritocracy' and 'cultures of the mind' (Newman, 1993; Dudley, 1994). Both the other current apprentices and the Southeastern boys are all a part of the half-life community. Because of this, we can see that there are actually different stages to the half-life. It is not a homogenous experience as certain groups will experience differing levels of radiation. The Southeastern boys are less impacted by the cultural and social corrosive effects of deindustrialisation and can perform, understand and speak a version of skill that is closely reminiscent to the Dockyard workers' version. More so, Ben Taylor and Nathan Tillet, who both began their apprentices less than 10 years after closure are even less radiated as they directly remember the craft community at work and were taught by those displaced workers. However, they are all still effected in some aspect as they lived through the closure and the subsequent cultural ruptures.

What this tells us is that the community and the proximity to it, will have effect on how the half-life is experienced. When the atom bomb of deindustrialisation exploded, and industry closures swept through places like Medway, a cultural change ensued as I have explored. For those like Ben and Nathan, they experienced less cultural effects of radiation, despite being closer to the blast site because they were already into their journey into the craft-skill community because of the pre-socialisation experienced throughout school and familial connections as Nathan explains:

Nathan Tillet: My dad was in engineering erm... and it's... I wasn't... academically I wasn't... great at school erm, so I thought, maybe I'll work, work with my hands a bit more [...] when I started the apprenticeship I done more learning and more education for the next four years than I ever did when I was at school so... it sort of... but erm, I think... family was in engineering and... it was... a path that I went down, I had an interest.

Like the Dockyard workers, Nathan's father played a key role in encouraging him into craft work. His existing connection to this form of labour and the community that comes along with it, enabled him to already identify that he had an 'interest' in this type of work and therefore, would find value and enjoyment through it. More so, he had already begun performing his classed and gendered identity, inherited from his fathers' cultural community, to reject traditional educational forms. He found preference in the apprenticeship scheme despite it requiring him to learn more than he did at school. Like the others, he was not rejecting the act of learning but the cultural conditions of traditional education that did not legitimise his inherited identity. Nathan and Ben both were already performing aspects of the craft community when deindustrialisation began in Medway and the largest craft employers began to close or minimise.

The craft community therefore acted as a fallout shelter to them, protecting them from the harmful radiation of the cultural erasure of craft communities. Members like Ben and Nathan who were in the early stages of socialisation alongside those who were already engrained, were sheltered from the initial corrosion of the communal identity and therefore, were able to maintain the original form of the craft-skill identity. However, over time, the shelter/ community could not sustain its protective fallout shell and was corroded by radiation as the effects of deindustrialisation spread and took hold. As the shelter was dismantled, there was no means for newer cohorts of apprentices to seek protection from deindustrialisation and therefore, were exposed to the effects of deindustrialisation and formed the half-life communal identity. More so, as those like Ben, Nathan

and the others lost their protective fallout shelter, they too became exposed which effected their ability to attain legitimacy in their craft identities. Therefore, the cultural radiation of deindustrialisation affected all of them but in various levels depending on their ability to seek shelter in the protective walls of the community. Importantly, the half-life is not a homogenous experience but varies in different levels.

Considering these multi-faceted experiences, the half-life identity that the young people display is different but not wholly removed from the original form of craft-skill. Nevertheless, due to the various levels of radiation spread to them from deindustrialisation, it is far enough removed that it is hard for those who have a static conception of what the craft-skill identity is, like the Dockyard workers, to identify. Ben Taylor displays his half-life position when working with young people at Adams which highlights his desire to mediate between past and present through engagement with the young people on work experience. Here, he offers an account that shows how temporally layered and heterogenous the community is now:

Ben Taylor: Because I come from the apprenticeship I'm, I'm there to help anyone you know, all the younger kids, I mean, my sister works at the Hundred of Hoo school and all the naughty kids, well some of the naughty kids she'll be like 'can I send them down to you for like a week?' You know, 'give 'em a bit of work experience, see if that'll get 'em interested again', you know, so I've had a lot of work experience kids with me, you know, and always, always give my best to help them out you know, cause a lot of 'em, they come from shit backgrounds and stuff don't they and you just... you just wanna help people you know it's in our nature innit to help people, be nice... so... I had erm, we had a little girl from... Rainham girls come up the other year, she come up with work experience from school, 15... so we, two weeks she was with us so... that taught her a lot and then she went away and then she... in her sixth form, in her free periods on a Wednesday afternoon she used to come to work for a whole year, for nothing.

Yeah... but then when she applied for an apprenticeship... she got one, you know. There was no way they was gonna turn her down after she'd done that for a year you know. And, and like, I mean after sort of five six months she was with us, she said to me she said you made it sound really interesting when I first come here but now I'm here I don't think it's really for me and she ended up leaving, I think about a year ago now and she moved to Jersey and wanted to be a hairdresser or something but... you know, I always try my best with the kids.

Here, Ben describes the changing responses to both class and gender in the workplace that overlaps the expectations of the communities' past with the current cultural climate. Firstly, he describes those who his sister thinks need help as "naughty" and from "shit backgrounds". There still exists the idea that apprenticeships can be a second chance to find value amongst those who reject, or are rejected by, traditional educational routes. He also equates his desire to help those because of his apprenticeship which has instilled the moral imperative within him to reproduce the communal identity within those who fit the criteria i.e. those who are working class. For the girl that Ben describes, she was still able to find a sense of value through engagement with hands-on work. She returned to Adams, without any financial compensation because it gave her a more intrinsic sense of satisfaction. More so, Ben and his sister could both anticipate this as they still view apprenticeships and industrial work as this valuable space for working class young people.

In this way, the craft identities of the young people when they begin in the workplace are similar to those of the past. However, the young woman ended up leaving Adams in favour of hairdressing. So, she used the influence of her time in Adams to find value through vocational training but opted to pursue a more traditionally 'female' employment route. This could of course suggest that there is still a masculine centric culture which is something already explored in the previous chapter. For the young woman, this mirrors the gendered negotiation that young men must battle through to perform their gender identity in the appropriate way and within the appropriate setting (Nayak, 2006;

McDowell, 2003; Walkerdine and Jimenez, 2012). However, what emerges through Ben's memory of the young woman is that there is a constant negotiation between inherited pasts and liminal presents for both the young people and those trying to engrain them into the community. This is discussed by Walkerdine (2009: 71) who describes this interplay as:

Sets of hybrid practices through which members of the community work out ways that things can change in order to preserve most of what existed before. Of course, this applies to older workers. For the young people, the dynamics are more complex as they play out anxieties about loss from the previous generation.

As we have seen before, this should not be surprising as communities are subject to change (Pahl, 2005; Savage, 2008). Nevertheless, what Walkerdine and Ben highlight is that these changes affect the dynamics across generations. Ben's disappointment with the young woman's decision was palpable and Walkerdine outlines the affective responses to communal shifts. Both therefore highlight how we can see these changes in the community as deeply rooted within the ways of being as Walkerdine would describe it, or simply, how members of the community view each other. This change has sparked a chasm that causes the older workers to reject the younger from the same definition of skill as them. These language dynamics are important as we have seen as without access to the title of skill and the conversation that surrounds it, value within the community becomes harder to obtain. This is why the young people still hold on to aspects of their inherited identities as they need to renegotiate the valuable communal identity. With the presence of the half-life identity, the younger people must occupy both the moral parameters of contemporary marketplaces alongside the moral community of their workplaces. Therefore, they cannot wholly reject the imposition of neoliberal narratives, but neither can they reject the cultures of labour that they enter.

In the half-life, young people must make decisions about their sense of self that may not be welcome to their cultural ancestors but will necessarily shape the dynamics of the community that

they all belong to. Nevertheless, what the young people really look for is to be accepted by their community, this manifested in their repeated assertions that they look forward to being treated like adults as Liam Sampson, a multi-skilled IPS apprentice and Luc Debont, a mechanical technician also of IPS show:

Liam Sampson: I quite enjoy the.... being treated as, as an adult ... that's, I think that's, cause I quite enjoy working, I didn't, I didn't like school, it wasn't for me really, erm, and to be treated like an adult is probably the best thing about it is that... your trusted to get on with what you have to do so, yeah that's probably the best bit.

Luc Debont: I'm looking forward to just kind of.... This is gonna sound weird but being respected at work like... like as a tradesman, someone who actually knows what they're doing.

With this, they want the community to respect them and to allow them to renegotiate its boundaries to find value. Without a sense of ownership of the communal walls, the young people are unable to draw any legitimacy. Like with the Dockyard workers, the young people found a sense of attachment to the community and therefore a form of autonomy to influence that community through banter and through the making of things. As we saw in chapter four, that attachment is more complicated than a reproduction of the original form but again, is a 'cleaner' version of banter. This is similar to what Nayak (2006: 815) terms the "body-reflexive practice" whereby "the industrial past and the post-industrial future is materially and symbolically negotiated." Here he describes how the remnants of the inherited culture need to be managed as the young men now harbour an 'excess' to requirement of masculinity. They therefore must render some aspects unusable or restructure them to find a way to make them more useful as in the case of banter which has been removed off its excessively masculine connotations of 'piss taking' and sexism that Ward (2015) describes and made applicable to the apprentices' present.

Nevertheless, through engaging with these important cultural forms the young people can gain access to the title of skill and therefore, find autonomy through 'adulthood' as Jack Aspland explains:

Jack Aspland: I wouldn't take it seriously, but I think as soon as they saw that yeah, I can have a laugh and a joke, but I do wanna do my job properly, then they all, they all treat me like an adult.

This is further evidenced by Harry Garner, one of the multi-skilled IPS apprentices from earlier on, who recognises that banter is necessary to be able to access the community:

Harry Garner: Because I like used to work down the yard, like with my family, I kind of like know like there's gonna be banter and all that and like... what it's gonna be like, like some people who I work with as well as apprentices have come straight from school and like didn't have any work experience so like, not scary but kind of nervous for him cause like, I sort of knew what I was walking into like er... I was ready for it if you know what I mean, like I knew it was for me.

Harry was able to know that banter would be an important aspect of the communal identity because of his pre-socialisation. By engaging with the cultural language of banter, no matter the form it takes, the young people are still able to obtain a sense of autonomy at work. This suggests that the community exists outside of the control of the workers themselves. Something already alluded to in discussions. The older workers, as we saw in the previous chapter, would not recognise the cultural forms that these younger workers are performing. More so, the younger workers are not reproducing the same cultural forms because it does not provide them with the same opportunities to create and recreate, discourses of value. Despite this, they are still able to gain autonomy and legitimacy from the cultural community. Therefore, it appears that the community exists outside of the influence of the workers as it can shift and change beyond control; as Anzieu (1989: 214) suggests, groups "suffer from not having a body and consequently imagine one." Within this, is the suggestion that the

community exists outside of a rigid or static form such as a body. As such, the craft community imagines itself in stasis through its definition of skill. It is this rigidity that enforces the dislocation between past and present workers as the imagined body restricts their conception of the craft community being able to adapt into the half-life form. Despite the current workers having a more individualised perception of their craft self therefore, we can see how they still are able to form a community. Their communal culture is a disembodied one, providing a collective experience but dislocated from a physical form or location. Cultural languages like banter therefore still provide bonding across the generations, enforcing this disembodied communal identity.

Through the making of things, this disembodied nature of the community is given further illumination. Through crafting objects, an intergenerational bond is formed that firstly, gives the younger workers a sense of autonomy as they perform their skilled identity. More so, it is a fixed form of their communal identity that does not deteriorate and therefore, can maintain itself beyond the enforced bodies of the craft-skill community and half-life community. It will exist beyond these demarcations, displaying the skilled status of the younger workers regardless of whether they use and perform the older definition of skill and cultural languages or the half-life forms. Because of this, it allows the younger workers to achieve legitimacy in their half-life skilled identities. Jack Goudie, a metrology apprentice at Adams further highlights this:

Jack Goudie: I like having the responsibility to, to be able to go out and do a job by myself which you can only do from learning here and... at work, that's, that's quite good and er, like the sense of reward you get from fixing something that's urgent... knowing you've done a good job sort of thing.

Through making, they manifest their half-life identity into an unchangeable form. This allows them to feel a sense of ownership of their cultural space. Through making, they can assert their own, redefined form of a communal body into existence and therefore, can use this autonomy and legitimacy to alter

the definition of skill. As such, they gain authority to define the parameters of their discourses of value. Putting forward their half-life version into the cultural space and taking over the mantle of what is legitimate. In this way, they negotiate their inherited cultural forms alongside the half-life landscape, forging their own spaces to define value in their identities.

Gaining Custody of the Community

The passing on of a sense of community to the younger generation has always been an innate aspect of apprenticeship teaching. We have seen this manifest already through the narratives of the Dockyard workers when they discussed the organic nature of the passing on of the craft-skill identity. This was also expressed by the younger workers who imagined themselves passing on their skills to others at work as was done to them. Through these acts, the community is reproduced and shared. Like with the half-life community, this will likely adapt and take a new form that may be difficult to recognise for the half-life workers in the future. Nevertheless, through this passing on the mantle of the community is moved along. Simon Morris, an electrical instrumentation apprentice at IPS, was aware of this responsibility as early on as his interview:

Simon Morris: I think they was mainly looking for confidence er, eager, eager to learn... someone whose... ready to fill the next position of er, the engineering skill.

As Simon suggests, the community looks to reproduce itself and through the workers, finds the next generation to be able to pass that along to. As the half-life workers have adapted the community, they have taken control over its parameters. The younger workers were most keen to start at work as this was where they had full autonomy to shape the community and perform their half-life skilled identities. When asked what about their future apprenticeships they were most looking forward to, they all responded with similar answers exemplified here by Cameron Jamieson, 18, a train engineer at IPS and Steven Adams, 16, an industrial refrigeration engineer also at IPS:

Cameron Jamieson: The end [laughs] no the er, the fact of finishing it, getting a qualification and being able to understand the job a bit more and then going away and doing things yourself.

Steven Adams: Being at work more cause, whereas, some people are here for six blocks but where I've been to work for two straight blocks, I know work like now, I prefer it cause it's just more, there's more like freedom and you do learn a lot more hands on than you do here but you learn the basics here to be safe when you're out there so, it is, it's more looking forward to... going out and just doing your actual job that your gonna do when you're older.

Their eagerness to join the workforce culminates in their desire to be able to do the job themselves as at work they can perform their half-life identities fully and take full custody over the community. The young apprentices do not change the community in a malicious attempt to exclude the former workers despite the assertion made by others that definitions of skill are outlined to exclude some at the expense of others (Gaskell, 1983; Philips and Taylor, 1980). Instead, they have reshaped the boundaries of the community out of necessity. This has recently been reinforced by Ryan and Lórinč (2018: 13) who identified that despite the difficulties that apprentices face, they reclaim their legitimacy by focusing on their technical training and narrating it as a sensible option. As they highlight:

The participants in our study were aware of these issues and the negative image of apprenticeships. They had encountered discouraging reactions from schools, colleges, parents and friends, as well as some work colleagues. Nonetheless, they persisted in their assertion that apprenticeships were a practical 'good way to go', in contrast to the more expensive and risky pathway of university.

In this sense the young people utilise their growing autonomy to redefine their own value discourses. The young people in this respect are forward thinking, they alter them into the half-life community so there is future prospect for value. From early on then, the young people are aware of their need to find value and sustain it as Jack, a 19-year-old apprentice can already identify:

Emma: Do you think apprenticeships are a big thing in Medway?

Jack Goudie: Oh, I think they're the future really.

What the young people are doing by renegotiating the communal boundaries is using their class identities to attempt to repair the fractures caused by deindustrialisation. As E.P. Thompson (1982[1968]) identified, class identities are formed by historical responses. Renegotiation based upon social context therefore is the marker of how class identities are made and remade. As such, the young people are using their classed identities to repair the community so working-class value can be shared. Coppersmith and Dockyard's craft-skill generation worker Adrian Turner, who now teaches younger apprentices at Adams, also outlines their concern with preserving the past community as much as possible:

Adrian Turner: They've been, a few of 'em have been actually taking old test machines out of, from different areas and updating them putting in you know new motors in and putting new, new software in them and stuff, so they can, you know, be used again.

Repairing the old machinery has been an important task for the young people that Adrian works with. Seemingly, this is because they identify it to have present value, much like the former workers. They want to help to repair the old way of performing the craft identity where possible and restore value for both former, present and future workers. This is reminiscent of how Skeggs and Loveday (2012) describe the 'social subject' – as one who uses their access to cultural norms to perform their worth in public arenas. On this, Skeggs (2004) had previously explained that working class people are often seen to be those who do not accrue value and therefore are blocking those who are future-oriented and seek to develop the value-subject. In this sense, working class people are deemed to lack a sense of futurity as they make no attempts to collect cultural value for themselves. Throughout Skeggs' (1997; 2001; 2011) accounts of working-class cultures and identities, this has been seen to not be the case as working-class people revalue dominant narratives to achieve their own sense of legitimacy. Similarly, here, the younger working class are finding ways to collect value for their future community.

Like the Dockyard workers before them, they use this sense of futurity and concern for value accumulation to stretch what Walkerdine (2010) terms to be the 'membrane' of the community. They therefore once again go beyond the embodied state of a communal identity and want to create a community that reaches into the future and offers value for potential workers. They use their class identities not only to try and accrue value for themselves but also for former and future workers.

Therefore, apprenticeships are still battlegrounds for value. However, for the younger, half-life workers, this battle is evermore present in their early career choices. They still use this form of training to create an identity and community in which they can define, make and remake value, but now must work harder and engage with their classed and gendered identities much earlier. They, nevertheless, still can form their own discourses of value through renegotiating the community that they inherit. Nathan Tillet, a former Adams apprentice who began his time post-Dockyard, was able to use his perspective of training throughout mass industrial closure alongside his time with current apprentices. Despite the cultural rupture that has shaped his work identity, he was able to, like the others, renegotiate his inherited culture to find value:

Nathan Tillet: My dad was in engineering erm... and it's... I wasn't... academically I wasn't... great at school erm, so I thought, maybe I'll work, work with my hands a bit more erm... in truth... I was... I had dyslexia and probably so much, wasn't so good academically but was, I didn't learn how to... learn, if you know what I mean with, with my... it's not that big a deal but er... slight dyslexia erm... as it turns out, when, when I started the apprenticeship I done more learning and more education for the next four years than I ever did when I was at school so... it sort of... but erm, I think... family was in engineering and... it was... a path that I went down, I had an interest, but I think when your 14, 15 you don't really know what you want to do but... as it turned out when I started it.. I enjoyed it and carried on and that sort of... I'm very proud of the fact that I done an apprenticeship erm... and quite frankly, quite proud that

I've managed to keep a job for as long as I have done... some people don't always see it like that, but I do, it's.... I think it's a good thing.

Using what he inherited from his dad but negotiating it within the landscape of half-life, allowed Nathan to construct an identity that shared in value. Although he was able to seek protection initially from the cultural fallout shelter of the community, the effects of radiation impacted upon his work life, identity and career expectations. Nathan is aware of how difficult it is to maintain this job and therefore this pride in the liminal job market that he worked through. He, therefore, although less radiated by the half-life than the younger apprentices, was able to negotiate the past and present to share in value that he now helps to pass along to current apprentices.

Concluding Discussions

Overall, this chapter has shown that despite the young people needing to reject the static definition of skill that the Dockyard workers perform, they still gain value through utilising their inherited classed and gendered cultural norms. Instead of reproducing the community culture as those have done before them, they must mediate this alongside the half-life landscape of liminality that corrodes the legitimacy of that which they inherit. This becomes ever more difficult for the younger, half-life apprentices who also face conflict with their cultural ancestors who overwhelmingly are unable to recognise their craft identity as the same as their own. Instead of the community being a static embodiment that the Dockyard's craft-skill generation experienced, it is a dislocated accumulation of cultural identities that must shift if members are to accrue any value.

The community therefore is not gone but has been transformed. We have seen this emerge through the relationship to the title of apprenticeship which arose as a tool for the battle surrounding value. The concerns of the older Dockyard workers about the loss of the traditional form of

apprenticeship, culminates in the younger workers having limited access to the title of apprentice. This holds cultural significance as it inhibits young people from being welcomed into and engraining themselves into the community in the first instance if they are not seen to move through the same social stages from learner to tradesman. Titles, therefore, like the language of skill, are cultural symbols used to reproduce and repair communal walls to allow value to some and subsequently, problematise the acquisition of value for others. The significance of these cultural languages is still taught to the young people through pre-socialisation. As such, the training of apprentices shares stark similarities to the experiences of the older workers which highlighted that the differences within the generations stems from the deindustrialising economies that they must now negotiate. Therefore, the community appears to be less rigid than previously thought. Instead, it is a disembodied state that allows movement and the flexibility needed to pass successfully along generations.

The craft community therefore needs to be handed over and is outside of the control of the workers themselves. It exists almost as a third party to the craft community, a disembodied collection of stories, cultural practices and norms that moves through the generations. Existing in different states depending upon the needs of the workers, it allows them to find commonality in experiences, so they can have legitimacy in their identities. Nevertheless, because of its necessary flexibility, it is invisible in its newer form to most of the older workers. This however does not mean that it does not hold significance for them, they were the previous custodians who attained their value, but this cannot last. Instead, it is passed onto the younger workers who now have the autonomy to shape its parameters. The former workers can still draw pride from its memory but for the younger workers who lack access to these cultural spaces, they need this custody much more and therefore should be encouraged to negotiate it to find themselves the same value that the Dockyard's craft-skill generation once enjoyed. This emerges most explicitly through the rejection of masculine performances of skill (seen in chapter four). Nevertheless, the classed aspect of craft remains and, in some ways, are performed more

overtly as a counter to deindustrial discourses of devaluation. Masculinity no longer can accrue value in the same way that a working-class identity can.

Once again, the distinction between *value* and *discourses of value* have been made clearer. As the apprentices are unable to reproduce the discourse once legitimate to the craft-skill community, they must form their own. As discourses of devaluation (manifested as the third-party agencies) have removed the value and legitimacy from the cultural codes of masculinity, the discourse of value cannot be easily reproduced. Instead, it must be reformed. Value therefore is accrued but fluxes in form as it is subject to structural processes. More so, multiple discourses of value exist which compete for legitimacy. Without a stable community to maintain it, the half-skill apprentices must redevelop their own discourse.

Memory is a central aspect to how craft identities are made and remade. Not just a memory of a forgotten past but an active attempt to draw the past into the present and future through engaging with rememberings. Recurrently, we have seen this emerge throughout the thesis. In the final chapter, I will focus onto the role of memory in this research and its place in the sharing of the community to the half-life skilled workers. More so, how both generations imagine and remember each other's work identities to examine how these cultures are reproduced and the importance of this process to the reclamation of value.

Chapter Six: Remembering Number 8

Taking over custody of the craft community requires access to memories of what the craft community once was, as well as an imagination of what the community will need for future survival. In doing so, the younger cohort draw the past experiences of their cultural ancestors into the present and future, creating a temporal bridge across the generations. The histories of the community members who came before them are kept alive through their renegotiations of the past. Despite actively changing the usage of these inheritances, they continue to sustain them by engaging with their memories. Inherent to the community therefore is the notion of legacy – passing it on and framing their own for the future. Once again, the disembodied nature of the community becomes apparent as it moves through the generations, shifting its form but maintaining its core objective – to survive. Through memory this is made possible as it is a central project for the workers to pass on their cultural legacies:

Richard Boorman: With the location of the Dockyard being so close to the university complex which is now a much valued part of the Medway towns, the Dockyard could be a focal point for the support of those being trained in engineering.

Richard's assessment that the Dockyard and its former workers are an essential tool for current engineering apprentices highlights his desire to engage with the future of the craft community. Remembering the past and imagining the needs of the current and future cohort, is an integral part of how the craft community is renegotiated through the generations. Richard Boorman was a former apprentice at Chatham Dockyard and a volunteer at the heritage centre. I was introduced to him through the Chatham Dockyard historical society at the very start of my research. Richard came to be a remarkable mentor and friend throughout my PhD journey, and often I would refer to him as my third supervisor. He gave advice, guidance and helped to clarify some of the more technical aspects of Dockyard life through his personal experience and extensive research. Sadly, in December 2017, in

the final stage of the research process, Richard passed away. This was a terrible loss that forced me to reflect both on our relationship and the importance of my project. I had captured his oral history, a vocal record of his life story, both via dictaphone and through our hours of conversation. Upon hearing the news of his passing, I began to think about the heavy sense of duty that this loss left upon me, I held his story in my hands and I wanted to do it justice. This led me to think about the apprentices now, and the heavy burden that is passed to them and the important task we share to continue the stories, traditions and legacies of former workers. Importantly too, how timely this project is and the importance of retelling histories within these communities to help restore their discourses of value. Richard's death was a terrible moment in this research but from this loss, we can see what role memory plays in deindustrialised relationships. More so, how we can understand the association between memory and work in rebuilding and sharing a craft identity and community.

Memory was a central theme of this research from the beginning, but the loss of Richard re-focused my thinking about how important these practices of remembering are in working class communities. More so, it gave me a small-scale insight into the loss of history that workers like Stuart Pollitt had been trying to press upon me through their accounts. Throughout this thesis, we have used Stuart and his recollection of the Number 8 skeleton machine shop as our guide through what the work was and what he saw in the present. Importantly now, I want to think more laterally about the nature of his remembering by considering the wider picture of what he was able to do with his memory and imagination within that space of work. Therefore, this chapter will consider the roles played by memory and the imagination within this research and the craft community more generally, whilst challenging assumptions about the loss of the community and instead, highlighting how active they are through their remembering.

Stuart's 'Temporal Mourning'

As I have previously highlighted, Stuart's account of returning to the machine shop illuminates many important aspects of what it is to remember. However, it was only after the loss of Richard and the subsequent empathy for his family's grief, that when I re-read the quote from Stuart that has been the driving force of this thesis, I noticed that in many ways, he too was grieving. Perhaps not an immediate raw grief, but a more considered and reflexive type of grief. As he remembers:

Stuart Pollitt: I was never more so grateful for my apprenticeship and the guidance I had [...] Now... when the Dockyard closed in 1984, although I never went back to it... and... knew it was there in the background, I never wanted to go back, erm... when it closed in 84 I was extremely sad... now I've spoke to you haven't I about people I've met and I've said to them, I'll take you down the Dockyard [...] and they still won't go, even if I offer to take them because they're still so upset after 30, 40 years or whatever it is, erm... with regard, how the Dockyard closed and how they lost their... livelihoods and they're erm, their sense of community and all sorts of things that it was.[...] But I do remember feeling more sorry, and I remember talking to people about this... erm, my sadness was for those poor people I've spoken about who couldn't turn left or right when he was sweeping that floor or the blind person who... felt part of a society, in a community where he was able to produce something and feel... erm... er... and feel like he had some worth you know. [...] so... when did I first go back to the Dockyard after that? It was erm, if we, if we er, remember when they started to convert the... er... boiler shop which is now the outlet centre and they'd taken all the outer casing off number 8 machine shop, I went down there before they laid the gravel floor, as a, as a, as a, erm, which still exists now, erm... and I went in there and I could actually walk as if I was going to clock in through the big doors but the doors aren't there now cause it's just a skeleton structure but I was able to walk down the gang way that that chap I told you about swept in my imagination and I could see the bolts where the machines were bolted to the concrete floor and I could

pretty well count and know it was either this set of bolts or that set of bolts when I left there, the machine I was working on was, was sitting there and that's where I stood when I was 16, learning how to work on a turret lathe if you like [...] so that was quite nice to er, stand there as a mature adult if you like, and basically... mentally back track to erm, to how brilliant it was when I was a lad really, you know, erm... no, and even see where the engravers sat and stuff like this and also strangely enough think to myself, and I think this is old boy syndrome isn't it, standing there thinking all these things and then you think about it afterwards that when I was standing there, imagining what it was like and that I was gifted to have been part of it... that all these people around me know, like the likes of yourself or people in the... boiler shop who are going in there shopping, they're not stopping to think of what was going on in there, in the days when it was thriving and had all these machinery sounds and the smells and[...] all of the people who are milling about outside of the skeleton building as I'm standing there imagining what it was like and I'm thinking to myself, none of these people know... what I experienced or they're not... seeing what I saw and I'd love there to be a way one day where I can impart that somehow and I suppose this is, this is the way but [...] time is accelerating and I'm not getting done... this kind of conversation on paper for... for... people in the future or to listen to or whatever and, maybe what your doing is... helps that endeavour in a way.

In this part of our discussion, I had prompted Stuart to tell me about his first time revisiting the Dockyard after its closure. This led him to think about friends that he had previously invited to join him at the site but who had refused as they felt it would be too painful. He then began to recount his reasons for wanting to revisit his former workplace. Stuart begins this part of his narrative by thinking about his appreciation for the Yard and the strong emotional connection he felt with those who taught him. This, he swiftly connects with the themes of loss. Whether that be his own feelings of loss through the sadness he felt at closure, the loss of community that his friends felt, or the loss of access to discourses of value that those who "swept the floor" must have experienced. Importantly too, this leads him to contemplate the invisibility of these memories to the passers-by who unaware of the

history of the machine shop. This invisibility is what Trouillot (1995) describes as 'moments of silence.' Referring to museums but equally useful to consider here, Trouillot identifies the impact of erasing histories in creating a dislocation in the construction of a community's narrative. This 'silence' is deafening to those like Stuart who feel isolated from their past, present and future when their stories are silenced.

Nevertheless, Stuart is more hopeful and considers the future impact of these memories for the continuation of the community and his desire to pass them on. Here, Stuart is going through his own personal stages of temporal grief as he considers the fond memories of the past, the loss that is invisible in the present and how he can reconstruct these histories to those in the future. Through his grieving, he connects these locations. This 'temporal mourning' allows Stuart to hold these multiple time tenses in a stasis. Meaning, he freezes the passing of time by remembering the past, seeing the present and imagining the future all at once. Friedman (2014: 295) identifies this kind of equilibrium of temporality to be present in oral histories which he describes as transformative as:

We are able to generate narratives using all three-time tenses in order to tell a story and thereby transform the objective world into a subjective life- world.

This kind of process however is not the sole domain of the academic methodologies as everyday rememberings, like Stuart's, share the same principles. He stands in the skeleton frame and gives subjectivity to the objective frame. He imbues it with value, meaning and history by reflecting on the past, present and future in tandem. Rather than thinking of mourning as a reflection of something lost in the past therefore, it is more future orientated than that as it requires a reflection both on what is present (or not) as well as what will be. Through remembering his work, he imagines its loss and therefore, mourns. It is in this way that we can elucidate the relationship between memory and imagination; they are co-existing entities. As he remembers, he simultaneously imagines through the

stories of others; he remembers the discourses of value whilst simultaneously imagining their invisibility.

The connection between memory and imagination has been given minor attention in this way. Haukanes and Trnka (2013: 8) discuss how remembering a nation's past requires imagination of its present and future. Therefore, the interplay of memory and imagination emerges as they try to understand how nation states and its members construct a national identity. As they see it:

Our imaginations are also always permeated by shared values and cultural scripts, some replicating hegemonic forms and others more idiosyncratic in nature. Acts of imagination, in particular of our collective or social imaginations, are crucial to the constitution of a range of collective forms, including the nation state.

They therefore place imagination as central to identity construction as we remember collective pasts that influence our present and imaginations of the future. Like memory, imagination is contextual. For former workers who remember their communities' pasts and imagine their futures, they do so through the lens of the present. They therefore will be shaped by their present experience of their community appearing as 'lost' or 'dead'. As they imagine the future, they do so with a sense of melancholy as they are imagining a future that does not include their once valued cultural norms. This assumption of death was common amongst former Dockyard workers. Alan West, a former electrical engineer, Brian Peters, a ship fitter and Mark Foster, a machinist apprentice, all invoke the analogies of death when they imagine the future of engineering in Medway:

Alan West: Nowadays anyone with any kind of craft skills... there aren't any, well there are but they're dying off, apprenticeships probably stopped 20/ 30 years ago, proper apprenticeships.

Brian Peters: There's no skills... to bring industry back... no skills.

Mark Foster: The industry's gone I think really [...], all the, engineering's crucified I think erm [...] it's missing it's... industrial history really, it's history of engineering I think... cause it's died, engineering's died.

Like Stuart, the three are in mourning for something they perceive to be dead. By remembering what once was, in the context of the present, they imagine a future full of loss. Treating imagination with the same gravitas as memory seems central to understanding how individuals make sense of change. Lyon and Crow (2012) uses imagination as a methodological tool to map the cultural shifts across generations in the Isle of Sheppey. By asking young people to imagine their future through essays, they document changing attitudes to work lives. Giving imagination this central attention is illuminating as it allows Lyon and Crow (2012) to document the kinds of social changes that are central to many accounts of shifting attitudes to work but with a more future oriented approach. Sennett (1998) for example through his account of the father and son Enrico and Rico in *The Corrosion of Character* suggests the importance of mapping changing cultural attitudes but does not consider employing imagination as a central mechanism to understand this. Nevertheless, imagination is central to how people like Rico and Enrico make sense of their own and each other's work lives. Barbara Mistzal (2003: 119) in *Theories of Social Remembering* also briefly acknowledges this:

Memory and imagination are interconnected through their respective roles in assigning and reading meanings, as memory is crucial to our ability to sustain a continuity of experience, and this sense of continuity is essential for understanding the world, while our imaginative thinking is based on our ability to make the world intelligible and meaningful.

Here she explains that memory provides continuity. In Enrico and Rico's case, we can see how their differences in work life become illuminated through the memory of Enrico's work primarily. However, it is through their imagination of each's labour, that they can articulate these experiences and ascribe meaning to their work identities. Therefore, to understand not only how people identify change but how they understand it, memory and imagination need to be understood in tandem. By utilising Lyon

and Crow's (2012) approach and expanding on Mistzal's (2003) commentary then, we can see how the past, present and future are central aspects of how individuals and communities make sense of economic and cultural changes and how they reconcile these in their life histories and expectations.

Stuart's 'Spatial Mourning'

What Stuart does is just that. He uses his memory and imagination to try to make sense of the massive economic upheavals that he has witnessed. Importantly, this is prompted by his relationship to his space of work. In *Theatres of Memory* Raphael Samuel (2012) considers the connection between memory, imagination and place when he unpacks the role of imagining spaces. Here, he refers to museums, places and groups who often struggle to recreate an accurate depiction of the past and therefore will imagine one. This is a useful way for us to consider the type of imagining that Stuart is doing. He remembers the past, perhaps with at least a touch of romanticism, and recreates the history by piecing together his imaginings of other workers and of what has future and present value. Spatial remembering in this way requires an acknowledgement of imagination as it is inherent to its recreation, narration and the experiences of its visitors. As Stuart 'mourns' in the skeleton frame, he creates a narrative of the past, present and future. With engagement of what is thought to be dead, Stuart attempts to resurrect the community. Through his mourning, their communal identity becomes more present as Boym (2001: 54/55) suggests, "collective frameworks of memory are rediscovered in mourning" which reinforces a community's sense of solidarity. Space therefore is an important medium through which to understand the interplay of imagination, memory and community. Importantly because spaces of work require access to memories and imaginings of communities both in its creation and usage.

Maddrell and Sidaway (2010: XV) in their edited collection '*Deathscapes*' introduce this idea of the connection between place and rememberings of death:

Death and dying draw attention to the meanings that we invest in space and place, in as much as spaces and places offer a lens through which to understand death and dying.

They locate space as a manifestation of relationships. Therefore, by understanding how spaces of death are used, we understand the experience of loss. Furthermore, they continue their account in a way akin to the message that Stuart was trying to get across:

The ability of spaces and places associated with death and dying to evoke the deepest memories and to stir an intensity of emotions is evidence of the power of place and is a reminder that the very nature of our meaningful experiences with place is fundamentally anchored in emotions, not functions (2010: XV).

Through their collection, they reinforce this necessity to understand experiences of loss as geographical. Like Friedman (2014) previously noted about oral histories, this is not an objective relationship but one that embeds subjective experience within the material world. Seemingly, we can see a correlation emerge here between oral histories and spatial mourning; both give subjectivity and render emotion into remembering. We can see this manifest through Stuart's account. When he went back to the Yard, he stood in the frame and it caused him to go through a form of grief, so his memories of loss manifested within that space. In his narrative, this account connected to the nature of oral history as he reflected on why he was telling me this, because he wanted to impart these histories. Therefore, he saw the act of oral history as imparting subjective value, much like he did in the frame. Seemingly then there is a similarity between remembering in workspaces and the telling of their oral histories. But, does that mean that oral histories and former sites of work are remembrances of the dead?

Locating spaces of work as sites of death, loss and mourning is an emergent theme in literature on deindustrialising spaces. However, analogies of past spirits have been a longstanding feature of

how spaces with histories are understood in cultural studies; as De Certeau (1984: 108) claims, places are “haunted by many different spirits, spirits one can ‘invoke’ or not.” Avery Gordon (2008) describes work spaces, but primarily former coal collieries, as ‘haunted’ by those whose personal experiences challenge attempts to redefine history. Likewise, Tim Edensor (2005a; 2005b) referred to former spaces of work more widely as ‘haunted’ with memories of ‘spirits’ who complicate a clean breakage between past and present. In his work, Edensor (2005a; 2005b) examines industrial ruins, spaces that are either forgotten or demolished to make way for regeneration. Within this process, agents of restoration attempt to strip spaces of memory, washing over ‘haunted’ spaces. These practices attempt to produce a single narrative of history which removes the possibility for contestation. For Edensor (2005a), those with direct links to these sites of memory act as ghosts, fluid entities who disrupt the fixed narrative of modern capitalism that attempts to create a clean break between past and present. Raphael Samuels (2012: 221) in *Theatres of Memory* describes this to be a common practice in heritage sites that try to control the memory of a place; “the past is seen not as a prelude to the present but as an alternative to it, ‘another country’”. These ghosts, outlined by Edensor (2005a) however, haunt all these spaces of memory as they embody the contestation of power, acting as a transgressive form of remembering. Ghosts occupy the grey space between past and present as they draw in competing discourses of memory to these sites. They encourage active remembering by the passers-by or casual visitor by complicating the narrative that change is natural as they layer in their complex and diverse experiences to these discourses.

Of course, this is similar in practice to what Stuart is doing as his memories and experience disrupt the present. As the shoppers mill about and ignore the skeleton frame they engage in what Steven High (2013) describes as ‘ruin porn’, the tourist interest in sites of ‘decay’ who lack understanding of what happened in the place or simply chose to ignore the past. Stuart however complicates this as he stands as a figure of the past who represents the history of the building. His

'temporal mourning' therefore acts in a similar way to the ghosts and hauntings of Edensor (2005a; 2005b) and Gordon (2008) as he complicates a clean temporal break between past and present.

Like with Stuart, the symbolism of death remerged in the accounts of former workers who had gone back to the site. Mark Colyer described his first time back at the Yard:

Mark Colyer: Even then when you're walking round you can hear ghost voices from the olden days and... when it used to have a laugh and a joke with the other... crew members it's... ah blimey.

He too describes his former workmates as ghosts. Things that were once present but are now dead and gone but linger through memories. Nevertheless, Peter Sargison, a former shipwright apprentice who is writing a book about his life at Chatham, imagines the Dockyard by evoking the same ideas of life and death but with a less terminal description. In the chapter on his time with the heritage organisation, he identified:

Peter Sargison: The Dockyard trust and the Dockyard society. Two groups of people, both concerned with sustaining life within the four walls of the Yard.

Unlike Mark, Peter has been involved in the regeneration and therefore is more likely to see life as being "sustained" within the Yard. He accredits both the trust and the society (of former workers and interested members), as being the life-support that holds the memories of the workers alive within that space. Peter's heritage work, for him, seems to be about instilling life rather than remembering it. However, literatures on heritage often do not often share the same opinion. Heritage sites have been criticised for their lack of representation of those that they claim to represent. Summerby-Murray (2007: 52) for example explains that:

Heritage landscapes are seen as increasingly anonymous sites of commodification, consumption, and spectacle that debase specific place identity.

As such, heritage narratives remove a community from their spatial location, much like the consequences of the sustained invisibility of the frame that concerns Stuart. This is particularly problematic for craft communities as capitalist interests become the dominant drive for reshaping a spaces' identity to normalise mass economic and cultural changes like deindustrialisation (Dicks, 2000; Savage, 2003; Smith et al, 2011).

Bella Dicks (2000) in *Heritage, Place and Community* describes this process. Local councils since the 1980s, at the height of deindustrialisation, were encouraged to redevelop their 'cultural assets' into tourist attractions (Dicks, 2000). Forced to compete for funding and tourists, the councils increasingly treated former sites of industry as marketable spaces, stripping the histories to make a commodifiable experience for those with little to no knowledge of the history of the place. Even when the spaces are retained, heritage prioritises the:

physical fabric and technology over the social relations of production, labour processes and class conflict (Smith et al, 2011: 2).

This is what Savage (2003) identifies as part of a wider glorification of complicated histories. Comparing former industry to war memorials, he highlights how the realities are removed to create a narrative of a coherent past that is clean, simple and marketable (Savage, 2003). Nevertheless, when those like Peter Sargison who are a part of the history that the site tries to represent are involved in its production, the potential for heritage to have positive effect for the community is greater. As Wedgwood (2011) describes, it can help restore self-esteem in communities that have been isolated particularly by a widespread loss of employment. More so, as Courtney (2011: 71) suggests:

Heritage represents competing claims to institutionalise memory between specific social and cultural groups. As such, heritage provides legitimacy to reproduce social memory for future generations. The ultimate difference in the function of memory and heritage is that memory

is about an historical consciousness of social groups and events, and heritage is about the right to take the meaning of those memories into future civic space; thus, heritage is important for social and political change.

Heritage sites therefore offer an important avenue for the reproduction of a communal identity for future generations. When the community are involved, it can allow for them to depict their cultural history in a way that helps to bridge with current and future generations. This is how Petes (2003) understands heritage spaces to be a centralised location for communities of memory as they can become a site of significance, rooting those with similar histories to a singular and identifiable spot. In this way, heritage spaces can be a useful tool for working class communities particularly when they have been temporally, culturally and spatially dislocated.

However, when heritage sites are less future oriented, it can further the notion that it represents a community that are 'lost', or in some way, dead. High and Lewis (2007) in *Corporate Wasteland* describe 'dark tourism' which are heritage sites that focus on loss, suffering and death which they liken to the revisiting of industrial ruins and former workplaces. Savage (2003) likewise made the comparison described earlier between war memorials and museums of steel workers whereby the glory is remembered at the expense of the real sufferings. However, once again we see the correlation of death emerge when considering what happens when people remember at sites of work. Like them, Mark Colyer sees the Yard as a space mostly of the past but complicated with memories in the present. However, what Stuart and Peter can see is a more future oriented approach to the analogy of life and death. They describe their mourning and sustainment with a sense of futurity as both seek to preserve the past, use what is valuable in the present for the benefit of the future. This is where I believe the analogies of death common to accounts of deindustrial spaces and heritage sites show their limitations.

Immediately from this we can see it may be problematic to use the term 'mourning' in this case, as it implies death or inactivity which clearly is not what is happening here as workers give life to the history of the workplace as they remember and imagine. Stuart is not necessarily therefore mourning something that is dead or completely lost, more so, something hidden to workers and to others outside of the craft community. Particularly we have already seen how they might believe this as they struggle to identify their own culture within the half-life version that current apprentices construct. Mourning therefore is more about perception here. Is he mourning something he believes to be already dead or something soon to be dead? The latter seems most likely particularly for Stuart and Peter who both demonstrate optimism in their accounts for the community's existence in the future. Instead of mourning the presently dead, they mourn the invisibility in the present but also the potential for death in the future. Therefore, by relying on these analogies of death in how we describe these workers and their communities, we are a part of the process of resigning these workers to the past which limits their potential to pursue present or future value discourses. If they remain hidden, starved of oxygen, they may well die. Nevertheless, they are much more active in their rememberings when they revisit their spaces of work because they become aware of the dangers of invisibility as Tony Gutteridge, a former electrical engineer recounts when he asks his daughters about his former workplace:

Tony Gutteridge: It closed over 30 years ago, people now don't even remember it, 30 year olds now erm, it never existed really to them, I mean I ask my daughters about things and they haven't really got a clue and my daughter lives on the Dockyard in St. Mary's island and she can't appreciate what it was like I mean the Historic Dockyard hasn't changed at all apart from the new houses on there but I think that was a mistake... I think it has recovered... I don't think people even really think of the Dockyard anymore... certainly not people aged under 40.

This sentiment was reinforced amongst the current apprentices. Jack Aspland, a fault-finding engineering apprentice was confused when I asked him about his experiences of the former Dockyard

although of course his age will factor into this, he is taught by Dockyard workers and is unable to recognise the history of industry that is present at the site through buildings like the skeleton frame. He therefore has little awareness of his local industrial heritage and instead only sees the contemporary manifestation of labour:

Jack Aspland: I don't know, I've never pictured it as an engineering environment... it's just a shopping centre to me [laughs].

Just because Tony's daughters and Jack do not see it as a Dockyard, does that mean it is a 'deathscape'? I don't believe so. When thinking of workers as something lost, 'haunting' a 'spirit' or any other analogy for dead, we strip them of their presence in the future. More useful than 'dead' then, we can think of them as 'half-alive' to revisit the metaphor of Sherry Linkon (2018).

Thinking of them as 'half-alive' allows us to appreciate that they are not gone but retain an awareness of their precarious presence. Bearing parallels to how 'half-life' has been used so far to describe the community of current apprentices, 'half-alive' can be used to understand the existence of something *past* in the *present*. Unlike 'half-life', thinking of former workers as 'half-alive' in these spaces does not define their community but instead, offers an analogy of how we can conceptualise their temporal presence as not in fact fully former. Their existence as a cohesive community was put under threat by deindustrialisation that attempted to split them apart. Rather than destroying the community though, they have simply become less visible. They therefore have been transformed by industrial closures, but it has not destroyed them. They however do have the potential for this to happen if their invisibility continues as they will not be able to pass on their histories, find value and keep their community alive. In this sense, they are 'half-alive'; something not dead but quite close to being so. Utilising this term in the place of 'spirits' allows them to retain their much-needed presence but also recognises the dramatic transformation that they have been subject to and just how perilous this is for them. More so, as I have shown throughout the previous chapter, their communal identity

and cultural values retain life through the current and future workers. Therefore, seeing workers like Stuart and Peter as 'half-alive' but who seek to reclaim part of that lifeforce through their spatial remembering, we can see that their memories are much more forward thinking than simply yearning for what is gone. Instead, they appear to be struggling to find something that in its present form, is hidden to them. Rather than thinking of them as ghosts of industrial ruins therefore, they act more like explorers of those ruins, trying to collect the histories of their workmates and collate them to preserve and share them.

Critical Nostalgia

When former workers remember, they are not just inhabiting the past. Often, when thinking through memory of former workspaces, workers and their narrators are accused of being nostalgic. Bonnett (2010) in *Left in the Past. Radicalism and the politics of Nostalgia* unpacks the criticisms often aimed at nostalgia and concludes that it is most often treated as regressive and therefore, something often avoided or shame-inducing, particularly in scholarly writing. As Bonnett (2010) agrees, this is a reductive view of nostalgia as it is in fact, as much future-oriented as it is backward looking. Peter Sargison reflects on this in his forthcoming autobiography:

Peter Sargison: I am not suggesting we should live in the past, but simple bring the best of the past into the present and take it forward into the future. With respect we must be concerned with the industrial heritage that should be handed down to future generations from such world-renowned names as the Royal Dockyard at Chatham and Short Brothers of Rochester. The Dockyard could be the very place to site a "living" museum to celebrate the best of Medway's industrial past. By design it could become a living part of the University Technical College's DNA and bring together for the benefit of the modern apprentice a hands-on approach to engineering brilliance as it was practices in the Dockyard.

When Peter reflects on what the Dockyard and other places of engineering offered, he does not do so in a simplistic manner. Firstly, he recognises the necessity to move beyond the past but remain connected to it. Therefore, he is not just expressing a desire to “live in the past” but recognises the limitations of looking backwards. More so, he expresses the need to only draw out the “best”. In doing so, Peter acknowledges that not all aspects of his past employment are desirable. He is not uncritical in his remembering but is able to use his perspective to consider what is the most useful and applicable aspects of his training and work life to the current context. Being nostalgic therefore has its benefits as it enables the rememberer to reflect on the past through the lens of the present, meaning they have an awareness of what is necessary to remember and perhaps bring into the present. It is therefore a critical form of remembering (Strangleman, 1999; Bonnett, 2010; Loveday, 2014), despite its connotations with obscuring reality or mis-representing the past. Importantly, we must move beyond this tradition of conceptualising nostalgia as regressive (Bonnett, 2010). Strangleman’s work shows the complexity of nostalgia as it is employed by workplaces to rebrand or commemorate traditions (1999), as a way for former workers and commentators alike to critically reflect on the past (2013) and to understand workplaces in the present through workplaces of the past (2012).

Davis (1979: 9) in *Yearning for Yesterday* offers one of the earliest sociological accounts that takes nostalgia seriously as a social experience. Primarily, he sees nostalgia as a very different form of remembering and one that cannot be separated from its present context:

Since our awareness of the past, our summoning of it, our very knowledge that it is past, can be nothing other than present experience, what occasions us to feel nostalgia, must also reside in the present regardless of how much the ensuing nostalgic experience may draw its sustenance from our memory of the past.

Davis (1979) therefore sees the present as the lens through which nostalgia occurs. This is useful to allow us to see the potential that nostalgia has to be a type of remembering that occupies multiple

time tenses. However, Davis (1979) thinks the application of the term 'nostalgia' must be done reservedly as it only refers to the lived experiences but more so, that it preferences pleasant memories at the expense of bad ones. It is on both points that I disagree.

The benefit of hindsight that nostalgia allows, gives people like Peter and Stuart the opportunity to cherry pick from the past, selecting only the better parts to take forward. This however does not mean an ignorance to the bad parts, quite the opposite. It requires an acknowledgement of the bad to be able to avoid it. Nostalgia is not a 'rose-tinted' reflection on the past then, it is much more reflexive than that. Peter acknowledges that only the "best parts" of the past are necessary, implying his awareness of the bad. I believe Svetlana Boym's (2001) does a better job here than Davis (1979) of acknowledging this critical reflection that is inherent to nostalgia. As she sees it, nostalgia takes two forms, 'restorative' and 'reflective'. Restorative nostalgia refers to the restoration of the past whereas reflective is more focused on individual and cultural memories and their longing for the past. Inherent to Boym's (2001) account is dislocation and the attempts to overcome mass upheaval through nostalgic reflections. What Boym (2001) can show us though in comparison to Davis (1979), is the intersection between the collective and the individual in reconstructing the past. Although still, Boym (2001) does not unpack this distinction enough. Instead, we can use her 'restorative' and 'reflective' to understand the nostalgia that Stuart and Peter are doing. What both want to do is restore the best aspects of the past to be used in the present and the future. This however requires the reflexivity of individual memory to consider what has been lost and what is best lost. Nevertheless, as we have seen it is already problematic to frame these things as lost as that is not how they have appeared in this instance.

This does not mean that they are not being nostalgic though. As I have previously argued, what may appear as lost may well be hidden. So, for them, loss is not necessarily a reality but a

perception which does not detract from the nostalgia they experience. Nevertheless, it does mean we need to rethink what nostalgia appears as. This is where the problem with Davis (1979) definition of nostalgia becomes problematic for us. As he sees it, nostalgia takes three forms, 'simple, reflective and interpretative'. Simple nostalgia is the uncritical memory of the past as a better place. Reflective does more than this, it considers the reality of this past. Finally, interpretive, a critical reflection on the nostalgia itself. Although acknowledging the critical potential, these three stages centralise the individual and their first-hand experiences as the only form of nostalgic remembering. This is not helpful when considering the collective community of memory that Stuart and Peter both reflect on. The memory of the community that Peter is referring to, also requires an acknowledgment of the future community. To make this informed decision of what are the better parts of the past and which we should desire, he must consider the future and what would be most necessary.

To be nostalgic therefore requires imagination of the future and the involvement of 'others'. More so, when Stuart remembers in the frame, he remembers the loss of his workmates. Both Stuart and Peter also reflect on the community now and what they might be missing. Thinking of nostalgia as an entirely individual experience based solely on personal experience does not seem to do justice to what Stuart and Peter are doing then. Framing their nostalgia as a longing for what is lost based upon their own individual memories locks it into a one-way path to the past. Instead, we must think more laterally. Nostalgia allows them to create a bridge between past, present and future whereby they can critically reflect on the memories that are most useful for present and future context. This requires an acknowledgement of others both in the past and in the future. As I have previously argued, they remember through the stories of others and their histories are intertwined with the communities and therefore, their nostalgia is a communal one. Boym's (2001) reflexive nostalgia appears most useful here of all the existing scholarship as her account takes into consideration the cultural memories that inform nostalgia. In this sense, Stuart and Peter use their reflexive nostalgia for

restorative means. They want to recreate the community and use their critical eye to remember the value of that community to attempt to share it in the past, present and future.

Working class Storytelling

This sharing occurs through storytelling within the community. This research and the oral histories collected here are a part of this process of reconstructing and making available, the histories of the community. Importantly what is identifiable from this method of approaching the research, was firstly, the importance that oral history has to working class communities in reclaiming access to discourses of value. Rather than oral history being the domain of the academic, it is a tool used through working class storytelling to create a bridge between generations as Strangleman (2011: 147) suggests:

It is important to see autobiography produced by working class people, often in the context of work and the workplace, as a vital part of cultural heritage, one that is often undervalued, ignored or in some cases vilified.

Importantly then, storytelling is an essential tool in working class communities to reclaim access to the discourses of value. For the younger workers particularly, storytelling was the medium through which they learned about the craft community. This is what Zerubavel (2011) terms 'sociobiographical memory' which occurs when individual memories blend with the memories of the community. Particularly for George Wiskin-Emberely, an electrical engineer apprentice at Adams, Rupert Wimbeugh, a pharmaceutical apprentice and Jack Aspland, a fault-finding engineer apprentice at IPS, their work identities are experienced in comparison to the memories of others:

George Wiskin-Emberely: It was funny, some of the stories he used to come out with, he, he was a clever guy, but I mean... he used to tell us about how they used to carry round sheets

of asbestos cause he was a welder down there and they'd be... lugging 'em around 5 days a week, like... sounds mad.

Rupert Wimbeugh: Just how much he enjoyed it and how much it was a good time in his life and sort of the average stories of just workplace banter really.

Jack Aspland: No I... it's just... in general, like I don't know specifically about Chatham, but I know that the boys who did their apprenticeships in like the 80s, 70s... that it, it's not like it is now, we have it very easy now compared to how they had it like a lot, the workload is minimum compared to what they had, I know that.

Their experiences primarily derived from the stories that they were told. In this sense, they are engaging in the same kind of remembering as Stuart and Peter as they remember something that is thought to be lost. But rather, as we can see through these young men, they are hidden to the former workers as they are kept alive in the memories and practices of the current cohort. They use these stories as a comparison to their own experiences, to mediate their work identities as either harder or easier than before. Their work identities are temporally loaded in this way as they rely on the past to make sense of their present which can only be achieved through storytelling. They use these stories to negotiate a sense of value. To locate what was better or worse and compare themselves, using this as a mechanism to achieve solidarity and legitimacy. More so, Rupert recounts the stories his father shared with him of "workplace banter" which as we have seen, make up a large aspect of the social parts of skill. This is the kinds of pre-socialisation that were also essential to the industrial apprentices as we saw in chapter two. These enable the apprentice to become accustomed to the social aspects of skill early on. By sharing these stories, Rupert's dad is allowing his son to share in the solidarity of his own work community which Rupert can then reproduce or redefine in his workplace.

These practices of sharing stories are central to working class communities which rely on stories, myths and folklores which are passed down and amongst each-other, binding generations of workers together in a shared cultural heritage (Strangleman, 2005). Like folklore, stories create a common memory and form a cultural heritage (Harding, 1999). Storytelling therefore is intergenerational as it connects workers of the past with workers of the present and future. The content of the narrative therefore is less important than the collective meanings attached to them (Loveday, 2014). Through telling stories, workers can stop themselves and their histories from being resigned to the past as Portelli (1991: 59) suggests:

To tell a story is to take arms against the threat of time, to resist time, or to harness time. The telling of a story preserved the teller from oblivion; the story builds the identity of the teller and the legacy which she or he leaves for the future.

This becomes even more apparent when we consider the time limit that some of the workers find themselves on. Through storytelling, they allow their culture to reproduce and therefore can be active in their temporal negotiations. They refuse to allow their histories to be 'lost' in the past or stuck in the present as they pass away. Instead, they keep their culture and value alive through future workers. This is central for working class communities to reclaim their access to discourses of value. Portelli (1991: 160) continues to suggest this is the role of folklore, although we can easily see the same apply to any kind of working-class story:

Folklore no longer appears as the residue of an archaic past, but rather as the contemporary, constantly renewed product of the permanent disruption of the culture of working people in the encounter with the cultural messages of the elite – and of its remaking in cultural resistance.

Like folklore, working class stories act as a 'culture from below' which allows the reclamation of value discourses. It opposes the official memories of their work or the popular distinctions of working-class people as lacking in value and instead allows for them to find and share legitimacy. Stuart Pollitt

exemplifies this sharing of value discourses when he reflects on the importance of passing on work identities and practices:

Stuart Pollitt: But it's lovely to have... to have that and to... realise its value, to yourself as a person erm, because it is your history and not only is it your history, it's the history, its other people's history isn't it.

As he suggests, the sharing of histories is both a collective act and one that allows for value to be recognised. Stuart here is explicitly telling us that through the sharing of the community identity, it enables the workers to see the legitimacy in their identities. More so, Mark Colyer described why storytelling is useful in a work setting to share access to value discourses:

Mark Colyer: You got someone whose got the knowledge, just pass it on instantly, with my gardening knowledge, if I teach people gardening, I don't mind sharing all my knowledge erm... cause people say oh yeah but they might then get better than you and you know like put you out of a job sort of thing, I said 'not really' I said, 'if they're better than me, then I can think I taught them, I gave them the secrets of the trade and bits and pieces' and of course then I go away feeling really proud cause someone's listened to me.

In his case, the sharing of value emerges as reciprocal. Mark has given the apprentice the tools to do their job well which will allow them satisfaction and value at work. However, it also gives satisfaction to him as having another worker be willing to listen to him allows him a sense of legitimacy. The passing on of access to discourses of value is not a one-way process as with storytelling; the latter requires a teller and a listener. Value appears in a very similar way, by sharing access to value discourses, the worker's discourse also attains some value. Thus, storytelling is essential for working class communities. Lisa McKenzie (2015: 6) explains this with her benefit of perspective as she can see this role of narrative both in her own experiences and in her research:

Narratives, and storytelling, are important in working class lives. It is how we explain ourselves, and how we understand the world around us, and how we situate ourselves in a wider context. We learn to make sense of what sometimes seems senseless through narratives. Anyone who has done qualitative research will know it is very difficult to get a succinct answer from a working-class respondent. It is much easier and more interesting to listen to 'their story' from the very beginning, and to see where it goes.

Particularly as she describes, storytelling is an essential aspect to how we can research working class communities and better understand them. Therefore, oral history is both an essential academic tool but also one that can help the working class in their pursuits of value.

Like remembering through space, storytelling derives its ability to reclaim access to discourses of value through its temporal negotiations. At the end of Stuart's discussion of the skeleton frame he highlights this:

Stuart Pollitt: Time is... accelerating and I'm not getting done... this kind of conversation on paper for... for... people in the future or to listen to or whatever and, maybe what your doing is... helps that endeavour in a way.

As he identifies, there is an importance to telling his story. As he remembers the past, he does so with the consideration of its present timeliness and opportunities for future value. Like in the frame, he occupies multiple time tenses when he is sharing his story. This process is identified by Friedman (2014: 295) who details that "oral history is a particular activity that sets aside the typical storytelling experience and is focused instead on explicitly using 'bracketed time'", therefore, "one accesses temporality by narrating one's life experiences." Oral history and the act of storytelling inherent to it are active in condensing time into a singular moment. From this, value can be shared as it collapses the temporal divide between generations, making the transference of access to discourses of value an

easier process. Through memory, the worker revisits the past with the intention of collecting the valuable cultural norms which can be passed on to the future and the present. When the past, present and future are brought into singularity like this, the ability to attain access to this value is immediately brought into the present as the valuable cultural identity becomes visible. Therefore, rather than being something 'dead', as I have previously argued, it is brought into existence by the telling of the story as the teller and the listener give it validation in the present. Through telling stories and oral history, the once-thought dead community are evoked which gives them visibility and therefore access to value. More so, the sharing of the story is future oriented as it passes it on either to "future generations" as Stuart imagines or, for someone to remember in the future. It also requires the teller to consider what would be interesting or important to tell which is also an anticipatory act as it requires imagining what will be useful for the listener to hear. All of this occurs in the moment of the telling which is where the three-time tenses collapse. Storytelling and oral history therefore require an acknowledgment of the future and the present as much as the past.

The Craft Community

So, what does all this mean for the craft-skill community? Overwhelmingly as we have seen, we can conclude from the discussions that thinking of the craft-skill community as dead, is not useful here. Instead, we have had to reconsider the way we can think of memory and rather, highlight the more active aspects of remembering that engage with the present and the future. Nevertheless, as we have seen, the former workers too imagine the death of their community and can struggle to see its half-alive status as the context of the present, in which they and their histories are invisible, clouds their imagination and memory. As such, imagination is fraught with the same inconsistencies that have long been documented in memory studies. More so, despite thinking of their community largely in these terms, they still engage in sharing access to value which they identify as having the ability to revive their culture. Mark Foster emphasised how important it is to share his skills:

Mark Foster: Oh yeah big time yeah, otherwise there's no future for engineering, if you've got no one to, if I can't pass my skills on to someone then... it's a bit wasted really, you need to, you have to pass on your skills like someone showed me.

Mark highlights an awareness that the newer cohorts having access to the skills of the past is the essential means for the survival of the community. Despite resistance over them taking over the custody of the community, the older workers are aware that the newer cohorts need to access the memory of the past. But, for this survival to happen, they need to imagine what they will need and adapt the community to their requirements. The contention between the needs of the community in its disembodied form and the static form it takes within the individuals is apparent. Despite the members wanting to maintain their versions of the community, they cannot do so because the community will move on without them. This however does not mean that members are selfish in their desire to maintain ownership but rather, acknowledge that their craft-skill form allowed them to share in a discourse that was valued. Something that they want to maintain for themselves but too, wish to pass on. This is most apparent when thinking of Paul Reynolds, the former Dockyard worker who decided to undertake teaching apprentices at IPS. Paul is aware that the community needs to move on and wants to see the young people succeed. Despite his attempts to recreate his form of the community through the layout of the classrooms as we saw in chapter five, he does not do so for self-indulgent reasons:

Paul Reynolds: So, it's always been there sort of thing, it's just taking the decision to give something back now and that was it, sort of... took a drop in pay of something like 20 grand.

The pay drop that Paul is referring to is regarding his decision to leave his job as a craft worker and become an apprentice tutor. This decision obviously was not of financial benefit which suggests there is something more to be gained from this transition into teaching. In both Paul's and Mark's accounts they allude to there being an intrinsic satisfaction to passing on the histories of skill that they inherited. More so, they identify there to be an imagined community to pass their skills onto. This existence of

a community based upon imagination was first examined in detail by Benedict Anderson (1983). His concept of an 'imagined community' was one largely based upon national citizenship identifying that individuals can envision themselves as part of a wider collective. Since then, many more scholars have sought to make sense of this ability to individuals to imagine themselves as a part of a community that extends beyond first hand interaction. Goankar (2002), for example, terms 'social imaginary' to be the feelings of belongings to wider social groups. The craft-skill community operates in these similar terms, as a group based upon the imagination of its members. The former workers lack first-hand experience of current apprentices in many cases and therefore, imagine their existence and their work lives. Similarly, current workers piece together their imaginings of former workers through stories and assumptions. Both however imagine themselves to be a part of this collective community, despite their assumed differences. They therefore can keep the community alive through these imaginings. Whether they believe each other to be doing similar work or not becomes less important in this respect as the fact that they still identify themselves as having a relationship highlights that they think of themselves as a cross-temporal collective.

The craft community appears as a community of memory and imagination as they can cross the temporal boundaries of a material, place-based community and instead, can imagine each other at a distance. This community enables the workers to draw a sense of belonging to something that goes beyond the individual as Stuart reflects;

Stuart Pollitt: I just had this... feeling of er, still belonging to it, and erm... in... which I think, er, a lot of... people that worked in the Dockyard, certainly for... most of their lives or all of their lives, had that kind of feeling and I'd only been in there... for what... 6 to 7 years at the most from 15 to 21 years old and yet... erm, 20 30 years later I'm going down in the Dockyard for the first time and... and suddenly getting this feeling of belonging to somewhere I just worked... I only worked there didn't I? You know, what is, what is this particular kind of affection by someone?

Stuart asks an important question here. One that forces us to consider the emotional aspect of this craft community. As has already been present throughout the discussions in this research but may be worth explicitly stating here, this was more than just a job to them. They gave over themselves both physically, socially, culturally and emotionally to the craft community and therefore have heavy investments in seeing it continue. Wedgwood (2009: 283) sees this as a material connection whereby working-class communities in particular hold strong “emotional ties with their landscape and architecture.” This however extends beyond the material aspect of their culture and leaks deeply into the social aspects too. Hochschild (1983) in *The Managed Heart* explores this connection between emotion and labour detailing her belief that emotions have become commodified and used by employers in the deindustrial economy. Nevertheless, as Stuart shows, emotion was always a strong aspect of industrial employment. It may not be directly managed by employers as much as Hochschild (1983) believes it is now, but it certainly was important for them to feel attached to the community and therefore want to be successful in their labour. It was a tool used at work to attain solidarity which made them good at their jobs. This emotion is clearly present in the community which fuels their desire to pass on their skills. They do not just want to pass on their skilled identity for their own intrinsic satisfaction, they want to pass it on because they care. In this sense, they keep the craft culture alive by sharing their stories, memories and imaginings and in doing so, allow each other to draw some value from its existence.

Richard in particular was a keen advocate for this. He dedicated the latter part of his life to try and make connections with local schools and colleges to be able to pass on his knowledges. This was not for his own ego, exactly the opposite, he wanted to give the working class of Medway a means to access, create and recreate discourses of value in the same way he was able to. Like Paul, he was concerned with the needs of the future cohort and shared in the desire to recreate discourses of value. Richard thought it was of great importance for the local young people to be able to have the

opportunity to find a career that would give them skills and a community in which they could thrive as he wrote to me:

Richard Boorman: It is because in my heart I believe that I owe a lot to Chatham Dockyard in all respects that I am now a volunteer visit maker for the historical trust and a member of the Chatham Dockyard historical society. Both of these roles afford to me the opportunity of putting something back to Chatham Dockyard and long may that continue while we still have some former apprentices who can share their experiences which albeit in a totally changed environment could inspire others to make worthwhile careers for themselves.

As Richard described, he felt indebted to the Dockyard. This sense of owing drove him to try to find ways to give back to the community through passing along the pride and value it afforded him. This is how the community works, by gifting something to the workers with the expectation that they will pay this forward to future cohorts and in the process, reproduce the commonality of experiences. By sharing the accounts of Richard, Stuart and the others, this research can become another extension of their cultural sharing and storytelling and show the real value of Medway and its engineering workforce in the past, present and future.

Concluding Discussions

What I have done in this chapter is discuss the roles of memory and imagination in this research both as a methodological tool through oral histories and as a conceptual means to understand more about the working class and the craft-skill community. Death has also been a looming concept over most of these discussions; how we can understand its place in deindustrialising communities and how useful it can be to help us narrate these mass changes. I argued that concepts and analogies of loss, death and mourning have haunted these workers and their communities which does not accurately reflect how they remember. Instead, they are active in their memories and

imaginations which helps to restore the visibility of their community, challenging any notion that they are in fact dead or gone. Despite this, the chapter was brought about by the loss of a friend who had become an important part of this research, Richard Boorman. Although this was the catalyst for thinking about the role of death and loss in many of the Dockyard workers accounts, it also highlighted how active Richard was in his pursuits to reclaim access to discourses of value. Demarking him as something that was already gone did not do justice to the good work he was doing for his community and for present and future workers. Instead, I wanted to challenge these assumptions of death that permeate accounts of former workers to show that people like Richard and Stuart are not gone and can remain members of the community through collective rememberings.

I used this chapter primarily to unpack three aspects of this remembering; temporal, spatial and narrative. Overall, showing that memory and imagination are essential parts to the craft community. This is something I have alluded to throughout the discussions but wanted to end with a more comprehensive discussion of its place. Overall, I demonstrated that although the community have challenges to overcome to maintain themselves and their discourses of value, they have tools to do so and are working towards that goal. It therefore can end on a glimpse of optimism that working-class discourses of value can be retained and recreated within these communities through those like Richard and Stuart and many others who work hard to ensure its continuation. But also, through the dads, grandfathers, teachers and workmates who share their stories and knowledges every day to the younger workers. In this way, they are demonstrating that engineering apprenticeships are alive and there are groups of people who intend on seeing them thrive as much as they once did.

Conclusion

Overall, this research has examined the effects of deindustrialisation on how working-class people form and reproduce discourses of value. Specifically, how these processes manifest in apprenticeships and the workplace. Chatham, the home of a Royal Dockyard for over 400 years was ideal for these aims as the culture of the workplace was so deeply entrenched in the local culture and identity, that the effects of disruption were similarly paramount to its present character. Therefore, one of the central aims of this thesis was to show Medway as a microcosm for the broader changes spurred by deindustrialisation. Its shifts in reputation from a community that added to the efforts of the Royal Navy and the excellent standards of its apprentices, to its contested relationship with the derogatory term 'chav', demonstrate the cultural consequences of industrial closure. As such, the thesis highlighted how these fluxes in value are experienced by the workers in the past and present. More so, how they manifest within the cultural of the workers formed through industrial training. This approach demonstrated how deindustrialisation can be understood through communities, identities and memories.

Importantly, I posed three research questions that focused upon this friction between industrial past and deindustrial present. They were;

1. How do we understand the role of occupational communities throughout processes of deindustrialisation?
2. How is knowledge of the industrial past remembered and transmitted within these processes?
3. How do individuals experience these processes?

Designed to narrate changing experiences, the questions were not specific to an industry or generation. Instead, allowing a cultural community that spans time and place to describe their

workplace culture, identities, communities and discourses of value together. Thus, forming a picture of a cultural place located against the backdrop of mass structural changes. As such, each question can be met with an answer that situates lived experience in its economic, social and cultural context;

How do we understand the role of occupational communities throughout processes of deindustrialisation?

Occupational cultures are formed by classed and gendered cultural norms which when performed together in a workplace setting, take the form of skill. An identity formed by languages, agreed through a mutually understood conversation, forms a community. Each place will have its own language of skill based upon the culture of the community that they come from. In Medway, this manifested in specific linguistic and bodily experiences of masculinity found through banter and danger. In the workplace, this common conversation is performed which allows them to reinforce boundaries of what is valuable. Those who can demonstrate adherence are accepted and too can share in its virtues. This is then reproduced across new members who need to display primary understandings of these languages to gain entry to the community and the discourses of value it offers. For the current workers, the community still exists but in a half-life form. It is a radiated version of the original that maintains aspects of their inherited craft community but in an altered state to allow value discourses to be recreated and created in the current circumstances. Despite how they might manifest, both versions form a discourse of value by defining the parameters of what identities are legitimate. These are then performed and given further validation by the community in the workplace. Therefore, despite their appearance, the role of both forms of occupational community are to provide levels of protection from discourses of devaluation and give value to working class, craft skill.

How is knowledge of the industrial past remembered and transmitted within these processes?

Memory is central to how these discourses of skill and value are created and reproduced in workplaces and working-class communities. Manifesting through language, symbols, objects and the body, the inheritance and reproduction of a class based, craft skill is the way memory operates within these communities. Apprenticeships are key to this as they are the gateway to access these memories. Acting as a cultural pull to the young people, apprenticeships are the beacon of the community that calls them to craft work through pre-socialisation. When at work, they are taught the shared discourses of skill and value which are accessed through remembering the skill and value that came before them. Each new cohort act as vessels of that communal memory, ensuring its survival. Industry closure and downsizing was of course disruptive to this process as with the outsourcing of the apprenticeship training, the pathways to access these memories were distorted. They therefore were able to access some aspects of the manifestations of skill, but the discourses of value were made more complex. The young people today still go through processes of pre-socialisation and therefore still share in the memory of craft but interact with a more difficult terrain to perform these memories. Deindustrialisation therefore complicated the role of memory in craft communities, making the embodiment of them problematic for those who seek to create and recreate discourses of value. Nevertheless, the renegotiation of these memories is still central for how the workers past and present find value.

How do individuals experience these processes?

These processes of memory, value and skill manifest in the cultural break caused by industry closures. For the workers, deindustrialisation is the marker of change. Despite the cultural disruption caused by deindustrialisation, it is possible for these communities to still provide a discourse for value to be reclaimed. In the past, their autonomy to create their own communal moral boundaries allowed them to create a protective shield from devaluation. These walls were shifted when mass industry

closure took hold. Because of this, the moral boundaries were dissolved as members of the community were dislocated and the prevalence of these forms of labour that could create these communities were reduced. Alongside this, the post-industrial economy shifted away from craft work and towards what McDowell (2003) calls 'feminized work' i.e. the rise of the leisure and retail economy. With this being the dominant marketplace, the arenas for performing these working class, largely masculine identities were scaled down and these cultural norms were increasingly subject to discourses of devaluation as they conflicted with the preferable disposition of a deindustrial worker. For the industries that did survive, their legitimacy was evermore corroded as the narratives of devaluation seeped in.

The legitimacy of an apprenticeship as an option post-secondary school was complicated by the introduction of new types of learning and a widening of the definition of an 'apprenticeship'. More so, the ability to follow fathers into industry was restricted. Rather than working with your hands, it is increasingly better to succeed in the 'culture of the mind' (Newman, 1993). Despite all of this, the apprentices maintain confidence in their craft because of the ability they share to pass along aspects of their community and the discourses of value that come with this. They are still able to attain a notion of skill that gives them the confidence and autonomy to redefine the community. Working class people are active in response to structural conditions in this way as they can renegotiate their inherited communal values alongside the changed marketplace conditions to create a space where they can access value. Therefore, it is the community and the confidence that comes from association with this communal body that allows value to be reproduced despite any wider structural changes that may dislocate these opportunities. Primarily therefore, these wider processes are experienced through the cultural effects of deindustrialisation on the discourses of value that they form and the devaluation that they face. It appears as a change to what kinds of work are available and preferable as well as, what identity they can perform to be successful in that workplace.

Research findings

Through oral histories with former and current workers, these research questions were explored across temporal and spatial locations. This was important to develop a picture of a craft community that was dislocated by structural upheaval. Within these discussions, the central findings can be summarised as; how communities of craft form, what they look like, what function they serve and how they were affected by deindustrialisation. Therefore, how processes of industry closure affect how working-class people experience their work identities and communities.

Overall, industrial apprenticeships are a social education where languages of skill are taught. This took form in Chatham as inherited classed and gendered identities that the young people developed through pre-socialisation as an inherited disposition that comes into being when performed in the workplace. These class-based identities were not ahistorical responses, but as E.P. Thompson (1982 [1968]) tells us, were formed in relation to economic and cultural experiences. Therefore, were acts of revaluation against the wider cultural narratives of devaluation that are commonplace (Skeggs, 1997; 2003; Lawler, 2005; Sayer, 2005). When the workers were pre-apprenticeship, they were in a constant state of becoming into a cultural identity that fights against this devaluation. Within the framework of the craft-skill community they could perform their inherited traits which moved them into the stage of being their working class and gendered identities as they could fully enact them. This took fruition in the workplace as a skilled identity. Formed of the inherited practices of class and gender, skill is a social language and identity that was used to revalue the cultural codes of the workplace enabling the workers to be their male, working class selves in a sphere that legitimised it.

Skill, therefore, for the workers of Chatham, was the intersection of class and gender in labour. It was a moral framework of value used to demark which discourses of skill were valuable and which were not. This is a common practice amongst working class communities that must form these parameters to create a culture in which they can achieve value (Hodson, 2001; 1997; Lamont, 2000; Kefalas, 2003). By adhering to the moral boundaries, the members of the community found solidarity and could access the discourses of value. Skill therefore was a moral judgement informed by class and gender inherited through pre-socialisation and enforced throughout the apprenticeship.

The craft-skill community was made up of the moral parameters enforced throughout the apprenticeship that demarked what constituted the title of skill within that specific workplace. The workers were introduced to it in the apprenticeship and expected to reproduce it at work. As such, skill is made up of languages that are dependent on the culture of the workplace. Therefore, it was formed by trade specific languages. For workers to access value, they needed to be able to speak this language of class and masculinity which here took the forms of banter and through competing understandings of cultural symbols and objects. Being able to speak this language, enabled them to perform the skilled identity. In Chatham, this skilled conversation was enacted through the body which was an important aspect to the craft community. The workers were expected to fully perform their craft identity through making objects but significantly, through handing over their individual body for the sake of the communal. This manifested through pranks and dangerous work, something the men were happy to put their physical selves on the line for. This was because through these acts they showed their willingness and ability to enact their skilled identity. As such, their individuality was less important than the reproduction and reinforcement of the community.

Likewise, the making of things enabled them to display their technical skill in a recognisable form. However, this also required access to social knowledges as an entire moral community existed

around making as it was used to enforce social relationships seen in Alex Routen's metal cake that was given as a retirement present. More so, 'rabbits' also manifested an informal practice of making that required adherence to a social economy of barter to maintain itself. Once again, the performance of technical skill required a social knowledge to operate effectively. When the workers spoke and performed the skilled identity, it allowed for a commonality to be formed. This created a moral wall around the community that kept value in and devaluation out.

Deindustrialisation however, moved these walls and allowed narratives of devaluation to seep in. As a part of the wider period of deindustrialisation, the Medway towns, like many others, experienced an economic, social and cultural rupture in this period. Over thirty years on, the apprentices are feeling the effects. This accumulates in the imposition of external influences over their education. Because of this, the young people are unable to reproduce a linear communal identity like the Dockyard workers once could. Instead, their craft identities mirror the liminal marketplace that they are a part of. Rather than embracing the communal experience of craft, they have a more individualised perception of their work identities. They therefore struggle to find the same cultural significance in their learning. For the half-life apprentices, this defining of the parameters of value is much more challenging as they struggle between two worlds of the past and present, neither of which they feel entirely attached to.

Despite the frictions present, the young people actively try to renegotiate their inherited classed and gendered identities alongside the liminal landscape of the present. For the former workers, this appears as a rejection of the community but rather, it is a necessary renegotiation. The half-life skilled identity is an unrecognisable language and performance of skill which further fractures the generations. Nevertheless, like the Dockyard workers before them, the young apprentices are forming a classed identity in response to structural conditions – the liminal, neo-liberal deindustrial

marketplace. Therefore, they must necessarily reject some aspects of the craft community to carve out a cultural space where they can access value discourses. This manifested in the conflict over the title of apprentice, something that the former workers were hesitant to apply to current apprentices. This reflected their concerns that the community was being wholly rejected in the modern form. The current apprentices however were attempting to reclaim the social and cultural status of this title by taking custody over the parameters of the skilled community. By becoming the owners of the communal boundaries, they could successfully negotiate the past and the present to form a half-life community that allowed them legitimacy. Therefore, the deindustrial apprentice has a much more complex path into being the skilled identity as they have a temporally layered experience that is made up of stark cultural and economic differences. In this case, masculinity was rejected but a class identity buttressed. Reproduction of the past therefore is not possible, instead they had to be much more active in their approach to becoming and being a skilled worker.

Memory is central to the experience of craft and value. However, memory cannot be fully understood without considering the role of the imagination in constructing a community across time. Importantly we must problematise the notion that death and loss are the marker of remembering work communities. This is a common assumption underlying accounts of deindustrialised communities, that the workers are in some way 'dead' and therefore, gone (Gordon, 2008; Edensor, 2005a). However, through memories their communal identities are kept alive. Spatially, this occurs through workers like Stuart who can draw the past, present and future in a tandem when they remember in former spaces of work. By doing so, they bring past discourses of value into the present, giving former workers current significance and removing their status as something 'lost'. This reconstruction of discourses of value too occurs through storytelling which once again, keep the memory of the community alive. Oral history is central to this process. We must acknowledge the collaborative nature of collecting working class histories as it reinforces the legitimacy of their

community. Through sharing their stories, we engrain ourselves into the community and become an essential aspect of its reproduction. We, therefore, as researchers, can help in keeping the community active in the present. In this sense, memory and imagination must be taken more literally than a conceptual lens to view deindustrialising communities. Instead, they are tools for working class people to overcome the cultural rupture of deindustrialisation, used to seek out and recreate frameworks in which they can form value from their skilled identities.

Contributions

By focusing upon these aspects of researching a deindustrialising community, the thesis has made important contributions to existing fields of knowledge. Firstly, using Skeggs' (1997; 2003) conception of value as a starting point, I have developed it to show it to be a cultural experience embedded within a community identity. Therefore, as a means for a collective to form and share its membership. I show 'value' to be a tool by working class communities to form a sense of self both individually and collectively; it is an identity maker as well as marker. More so, it appears as a discourse as well as an accrument of capital forms and therefore, I understand processes of valuation and devaluation in more fluid terms than Skeggs (1997;2003) allowed for. It is necessarily linked to power relations as she details, but it manifests in multiple forms as it changes and relocates. Therefore, it is more slippery in how it is acquired and reproduced, and, in some ways, it is transient as it is subject to leave and return as workers attain value and lose it dependent upon the structural conditions that they are in. Value therefore is likened to a conversation, one that can be joined, developed, renegotiated and shared to others. It is the manifestation of a collective agreement by the community of what is legitimate and useful. I also understood value as akin to a force acting upon individuals and therefore a discourse that is generated by individuals and communities which impacts them and others. It is a tool used to maintain boundaries of legitimacy as well as an accrument of forms of capital as Skeggs (1997; 2003) outlines. In this research then, value and processes of valuation are

conceptualised as about more than the accrument but rather, how individuals and groups share and access it.

I have also looked at occupational cultures in a similarly refreshed light by framing them as cultural spaces of value. Encompassing too the well-known accounts of how technical and social skills are learnt (Vickerstaff, 2007; Collinson, 1988; Pahl, 1984; Roberts, 1993; Sennett, 2008) and how moral boundaries are reproduced at work (Hodson, 2001; Lamont, 2000; Collinson, 1988; Theil, 2007). These knowledges are bound up in notions of class and masculinity derived from workplace specific definitions of skill. I have framed this as all part of a wider working-class project of legitimacy. Utilising the two concepts introduced early on in the thesis; the craft-skill community and half-life community, I develop an understanding of occupational cultures across time marked by cultural inheritances and loss. The craft-skill community articulates how classed and masculine identities were legitimately formed through apprenticeships and performed in the workplace and broader cultural community. Conversely, the half-life community is formed by loss and the difficult task of traversing this new landscape of loss with the culture inherited across generations. Through these depictions of how occupational cultures are created and experienced, I show how mass structural changes like deindustrialisation is lived by cultural communities formed by work. Overall, demonstrating how work places were and still are, the intersections of where value is defined, sought after and reproduced. It therefore is still an important aspect to working class life that shows how the individual and communal self is formed dependent on structural conditions.

In this way, the research integrates the experiences of working-class value with Linkon's (2018) half-life to highlight the effects of deindustrialisation on communal pride at work. Linkon's concept of the half-life is effective as it uses metaphorical language to describe the continued effects of deindustrialisation. What the half-life demonstrates is that the industry closure is the epi-centre,

but various waves and levels of effect still permeate the communities much like in a nuclear fallout. By harnessing this analogy, I showed how value exists in pulses across the generations, fluxing and shifting dependent on the trade, community and time. This allowed us to account for those like Ben Taylor and Nathan Tillett who learnt through deindustrialisation but clearly felt lesser cultural fallout. Although they were closer to the 'explosion' of closure, it is the radiation that corrodes the communal identity and their proximity allowed them to circumvent this as they had attachment to the dislocated workers and therefore the craft community. In a sense, the community walls acted as a 'cultural fallout shelter', providing some protection to the norms and values of craft-skill. As the walls continued to dislocate and corrode, this protection was unable to reach each subsequent generation.

As such, the research too has built upon existing accounts of communities that identify their need to create an imagined body or membrane (Walkerdine, 2010; Anzieu, 1984). However, I have shown communities also flux between an imagined body and a disembodied state. When this occurs within the community, the flexibility can allow for value to be found but when it is a forced dislocation like in this instance, discourses of value leak out and devaluation in. In this research, the radiation appeared as neo-liberal narratives of education and the influx of external agencies who try to align a craft apprenticeship with the 'traditional' educational routes that have long been rejected by these working-class communities. Going forward, each new cohort into the cultural sphere of craft were inheriting radiated norms that further distanced them from the original form which creates the 'half-life' skilled identity. As such, the parameters of the community are enforced and altered to provide protection or the 'membrane' that Walkerdine (2010) describes. The half-life is not just a useful analogy to understand deindustrialisation, but to understand changes to communal boundaries as it describes the waves of cultural change that must collectively be negotiated. Like Linkon (2018) suggests, the half-life is not a homogenous response but varies upon the cultural distance to the blast

site. However, I have shown how this manifests into work communities who were able to use workplace pride to manage the effects of radiation and recreate their discourses of value.

Methodologically too, I have advocated throughout this research for an approach to oral history that is embracing of the working-class identity of its participants and researcher. Rather than shying away from the idea of there being a romanticised bias to these types of work cultures, I have used my attachment to the community and my own place within it as a working-class woman of the same town, to underpin my approach. Rather than thinking of this as a methodological problem of impartiality, I wanted to highlight my own stake in the field of working-class studies and the sharing of this community's history to demonstrate how oral history is a tool for working class value both for the community I have presented and for working class researchers. Oral history has the real potential for this approach because of its intrinsically collaborative nature that relies on the participant and researcher to subjectively participate in the act of storytelling and reconstructing that story. Therefore, I have encouraged the pursuit of further collaboration in the collection of oral histories by highlighting that the researcher must understand their place within that community when they research it. When oral histories are collected, the researcher becomes a part of that community, if only for a brief time because they are involved in the reproduction of discourses of value. Doing oral history and telling the stories of working-class communities becomes a tool for them to maintain their community for the future and therefore, this must be embraced by the researcher rather than attempting to remain impartial.

It is in this way too that oral historians can give back to the community by allowing themselves to be vessels for storytelling and helping to reproduce the legitimacy of devalued communities by giving them a platform to speak. As a part of the working-class culture myself, I was able to understand the intricacies of how it is lived and articulated by those I interviewed. As such, despite not being a

skilled worker, male or an apprentice, I was still able to access the community through my class attachments, once again reinforcing what was discussed in chapter five, that these cultural communities are held together by their shared class culture. Despite this research not fully reflecting my own community as a working-class woman, our class connection dominated the research experience, creating a story of a local working-class community shared by one of its members.

Overall what the discussions in this research have shown is that deindustrialisation was not destructive to the craft community but corrosive. Inherited classed identities are still being reproduced as they were when industry thrived. However, they must be negotiated alongside the half-life landscape to allow current apprentices to access discourses of value. Working class people therefore are not passive victims of deindustrialisation or any cultural narratives that seek to delegitimise their identities or experiences. They are active in reclaiming spaces where they can perform their individual and communal selves legitimately. They are adaptive and understand the need for their community's survival. As we saw, even as early as 16 years old, they are aware of the necessity to find legitimacy and reproduce it for the future. This survival instinct is taught to them because of the devaluation that they face. This adversity makes them community oriented despite attempts to individualise their experiences. The focus here of apprenticeships is just one of the many battlegrounds over value in working class communities. As outlined in the initial aims of the thesis, an important conclusion that I have made in these discussions is that industrial apprenticeships are places of cultural legitimacy. These are central spaces for working class people and are real experiences, not just abstract concepts. We have seen this through the former workers who continue to find ways to reproduce access to value discourses that they were able to experience. Particularly, Richard Boorman who, right up until his death, was heavily invested in maintaining his craft community as he wrote:

Richard Boorman: While we must take due account of the advances in technology, changes in economic considerations and the fact that every day the world moves forward, we must never lose sight of the fact that our hands are not simply the means of keeping the ends of our arms

tidy. People will always use their hands to deliver skills and to demonstrate their crafts. Not everyone will be content or indeed be needed to earn their living and contributing to their country by sitting at a computer keyboard or something similar. The skills and practice of everything “Engineering” as viewed in the broadest possible terms will never disappear.

For those like Richard Boorman and Stuart Pollitt, the future of engineering in Medway is more than just trying to remember and reproduce a work community or craft work, they share their stories, memories and concerns as part of a wider project in maintaining legitimacy for their past, present and future colleagues. It is through workers like them and their counterparts today that we can see working class people as proud, skilled and active in the reclamation of their cultural spaces and discourses of value.

Bibliography

- Ackers, G.K. (2014) Rethinking deindustrialisation and male- career crisis. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 42[5]: 500-510.
- Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.
- Anzieu, D. (1989) *The Skin Ego*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ashforth, B. E., G. E. Kreiner. (1999) "How can you do it?" Dirty work and the challenge of constructing a positive identity. *Academic Management Review*, 24(3): 413–434.
- Assman, J. and Czaplicka, J. Trans (1995) Collective Memory and Cultural Identity. *New German Critique*, 65: 125-133.
- Bamberger, B. and Davidson, C. (1998) *Closing*. US: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Bates, I. (1984) *Schooling for the Dole? The New Vocationalism*. London: Macmillan.
- Bauman, Z. (1998) *Work, Consumerism and the new poor*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Beck U (2000) *The Brave New World of Work*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bluestone, B. and Harrison, B. (1982) *The Deindustrialisation of America*. New York: Basic Books, Inc Publishers.
- Bonnett, A. (2010) *Left in the past. Radicalism and the politics of Nostalgia*. New York: The continuum international publishing group.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge.
- Boym, S. (2001) *The future of nostalgia*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bradney, P. (1957) The Joking Relationship in Industry. *Human Relations*, 10[2]: 179- 187.

Brockmann, M., Linda, C., and Winch, C. (2010) The Apprenticeship Framework in England: A New Beginning or a Continuing Sham? *Journal of Education and Work*, 23 (2): 111–127.

Brown, R.K. Brannen, P. Cousins, J.M. and Samphier, M.L. (1972) The Contours of solidarity: social stratification and Industrial relations in Shipbuilding. *British Journal of Industrial relations*. 10[1]: 12-41.

Brown, R.K. and Brannen, P. (1970) Social relations and Social perspectives amongst shipbuilding workers – a preliminary statement. *Sociology*, 4: 197.

Caplow, T. (1964) *The Sociology of Work*. New York: University of Minnesota Press.

Casey, N. (1999) Class Rule: The Hegemonic Role of the Royal Dockyard Schools, 1840 – 1914. In: Lunn, K and Day, A. eds. *History of work and labour relations in the Royal Dockyards*. London: Mansell, pp 66-87.

Chatterton, P. and R. Hollands (2003) *Urban Nightscapes: Youth Cultures, Pleasure Spaces and Corporate Power*. London: Routledge.

Cockburn, C. (1983) *Brothers: male dominance and technological change*. London: Pluto.

Cockburn, C. (1985) *Machinery and Dominance: Women, men and technical know-how*. London: Pluto.

Coffield, R., Borrill, C. and Marshall, S. (1986) *Growing Up at the Margins: Young Adults in the North East*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Collinson, D. (1988) 'Engineering Humour': Masculinity, Joking and Conflict in Shop-floor Relations. *Organization Studies*, 9[2]: 181 – 199.

Collinson, D. and Hearn, J. (1996) *Men as managers and managers as men: Critical perspectives on men, masculinity and managements*. London: Sage.

Connell, R. W. (1995) *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity.

- Connerton, P. (1991) *How Societies remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coser, R. (1959) Some social functions of laughter: a study of humour in hospital setting. *Human Relations*, 12: 171- 182.
- Courtney, R. (2011) This is our island. In: Smith, L. Shackel, P and Campbell, G. eds. *Heritage, Labour and the Working Classes*. New York: Routledge, pp 69-83.
- Cowie, J. and Heathcott, J. (2003) *Beyond the Ruins: The Meanings of Deindustrialization*. New York: Ithaca.
- Crawford, M. (2009) *Shop Class as Soul Craft*. US: Penguin Books.
- Davis, F. (1979) *Yearning for yesterday*. New York: The Free Press.
- de Certeau, M. (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Deissinger, T. (2004) Apprenticeship cultures a comparative view. In: Roodhouse, S. and Hemsworth, D. Eds. *Apprenticeship: A Historical Re invention for a Post-Industrial World*. University Vocational Awards Council, Bolton, pp 43-58.
- Dicks, B. (2000) *Heritage, Place and Community*. Wales: University of Wales Press.
- Dorling, D. (2014) Thinking about Class. *Sociology*, 48[3]: 452- 462.
- Dudley, K. (1994) *The End of the Line. Lost Jobs, New Lives in Post-industrial America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Edensor, T. (2005a) The Ghosts of Industrial ruins: ordering space and disordering memory in excessive space. *Environment and planning D Society and Space*, 23: 829-849.
- Edensor, T. (2005b) *Industrial Ruins: Space, Aesthetics and Materiality*. Oxford: Berg.
- Edmunds, J. and Turner, B. (2002) *Generations, Culture and Society*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Eyerman, R. (2011) The Past in the present: Culture and the Transmission of memory. In: Olick, J. Vinitzsky- Seroussi, V and Levy, D. eds. *The Collective Memory Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp 304-307.

Eyerman, R., and Turner, B. (1998) Outline of a Theory of Generations. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 1[1]: 91– 106.

Fine, G. (2003) Occupational Aesthetics: How Trade School Students Learn to Cook. In: Harper, D. and Lawson, H. Eds. *The Cultural Study of Work*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc, pp 75- 95.

Friedman, J. (2014) Oral History, Hermeneutics, and Embodiment. *The Oral History review*, 21[2]: 290-300.

Fuller, A and Unwin, L. (1998) Reconceptualising apprenticeship: exploring the relationship between work and learning, *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 50[2]: 153-173.

Fuller, A. & Unwin, L. (2002) Developing Pedagogies for the Workplace. In: Evans, K. Hodkinson, P. and Unwin, L. Eds. *Working to Learn: transforming workplace learning*. London: Kogan Page, pp 93-109.

Fuller, A. (1996) Modern Apprenticeship, Process and Learning: some emerging issues. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 48[3]: 229-248.

Fuller, A. and Lorna, U. (2003) Fostering Workplace Learning: looking through the lens of apprenticeship. *European Educational Research Journal*, 2[1]: 41- 55.

Fuller, A., and Unwin, L. (2009) Change and Continuity in Apprenticeship: The Resilience of a Model of Learning. *Journal of Education and Work*, 22 (5): 405–416.

Furlong, A. and Cartmel, F. (1997) *Young People and Social Change*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Gaskell, J. (1983) Conceptions of skill and the work of women: some historical and political issues. *Atlantis*, 39[2].

- Goankar, D.P. (2002) Toward new imaginaries: An Introduction. *Public Culture*, 14[1]: 1-19.
- Goerdeler, K.J., Wegge, J., Schrod, N., Bilinska, P., and Rudolf, M. (2015). 'Yuck that's disgusting!' – 'No not to me': antecedents of disgust in geriatric care and its relation to emotional exhaustion and intention to leave. *Motivation and Emotion*, 39, 247–259.
- Gordon, A. (2008) *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gray, A. (2004) *Unsocial Europe: Social Protection or Flexploitation?* London: Pluto Press.
- Guest, G. MacQueen, K. and Namey, E. (2012) *Applied thematic analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Halbwachs, M. ([1941], 1992) *On Collective Memory*. Coser, L. ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hanley, L (2007) *Estates: An intimate history*. London: Granta.
- Harding, S. (1999) Value, obligation and cultural heritage. *Arizona State Law Journal*, 31[2]: 291- 354.
- Haukanes, H. and Trnka, S. (2013) Memory, imagination, and belonging across generations: Perspectives from post socialist Europe and beyond. *Journal of Global History and Anthropology*, 66: 3-13.
- HC Deb (12 March 1976) Vol 907. CC 336- 7W. Available at: <https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/written-answers/1976/mar/12/chatham-Dockyard-apprentices>. [Accessed on 11.06.2019].
- Heron, C. (1991) *Working in Steel: The Early Years in Canada, 1883-1935*. McClland and Stewart, Inc: Canada.
- Hesse- Biber, S and Leavy, P. (2006) *The Practice of Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE Publications.
- High, S and Lewis, D. (2007) *Corporate wasteland. The landscape and memory of Deindustrialisation*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

High, S. (2013) Beyond Aesthetics: Visibility and Invisibility in the Aftermath of Deindustrialisation. *International Labor and Working-class History*, 84: 140-153.

Hill, S. (1976) *The Dockers. Class and Tradition in London*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Hochschild, A. (1983) *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hodson, R. (1997) Group Relations at Work. Solidarity, Conflict, and Relations with Management. *Work and Occupations*, 24[4]: 426- 452.

Hodson, R. (2001) *Dignity at work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hogarth, T., Gambin, L. and Hasluck, C. (2012) Apprenticeships in England: What Next? *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 64 (1): 41–55.

Ignatow, G. (2009) Why the Sociology of morality needs Bourdieu's habitus. *Sociological Inquiry*, 79[1]: 98-114.

Jermier, J. Knights, D. and Nord. W. (1994) *Resistance and Power in Organizations*. London: Routledge.

Jones, B. (2012) *The Working Class in Mid Twentieth- Century England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

K'Meyer, T and Hart, J. (2009) *I saw it coming. Worker narratives of plant closings and job loss*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kefalas, M. (2003) *Working class Heroes: Protecting Home, Community and Nation in a Chicago Neighbourhood*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Kent County Council (2013) 2011 Census: Cultural Diversity in Kent. Business Intelligence Statistical Bulletin. [Online]. Available at: https://www.kent.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/8559/Cultural-diversity-in-Kent.pdf.pdf. [Accessed on 17.07.2019].

Kideckel, D. (2008) *Getting by in Post Socialist Romania. Labor, the body and working-class culture*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Kimmel, M. (1996) *Manhood in America*. New York: Free Press.

Knight, R. (1999) From Impressment to Task Work: Strikes and Disruption in the Royal Dockyards, 1688-1788. In: Lunn, K. and Day, A. eds. *A History of Work and Labour relations in the Royal Dockyards*. London: Mansell Publishing, pp 1 -21.

Lamont, M. (1992) *Money, morals and manners: The culture of the American and French upper middle class*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lamont, M. (2000) *The dignity of working men. Morality and the boundaries of race, class and immigration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated Learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lawler, S. (2005) Disgusted Subjects: The making of middle-class identities. *The Sociological Review*, pp 430 – 446.

Leidner, R. (1991) Serving hamburgers and selling insurance: Gender, work, and identity in interactive service jobs. *Gender and Society*, 5[2]: 154- 177.

Linde, C. (2008) *Working the Past: Narrative and Institutional Memory: Narrative and Institutional Memory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Linkon, S. (2018) *The Half-Life of Deindustrialization. Working class writing about economic restructuring*. USA: University of Michigan Press.

Linkon, S. and Russo, J. (2002) *Steeltown USA: Work and Memory in Youngstown*. Kansas: University Press of Kansas.

- Linkon, S. and Russo, J. eds (2005) Introduction: What's new about new working-class studies? In: Russo, J. and Linkon, S.L. *New Working-Class Studies*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Linstead, S. (1985) Breaking the 'purity rule': Industrial sabotage and the symbolic process. *Personnel Review*, 141[3]: 12-19.
- Littler, C. ed. (1985) *The Experience of work*. Hampshire, England: Gower Publishing Company Ltd.
- Loveday, V. (2014) 'Flat- Capping it': memory, nostalgia and value in retroactive male working-class identification. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 17(6): 721- 735.
- Lunn, K. and Day, A. eds. (1999) Introduction. In: Lunn, K. and Day, A. Eds. *A History of Work and Labour relations in the Royal Dockyards*. London: Mansell Publishing, pp xi-1.
- Lyon, D. and Crow, G. (2012) The challenges and opportunities of re-studying community on Sheppey: young people's imagined futures. *The Sociological Review*, 60: 498- 517.
- Mac an Ghaill, M. ed. (1996) *Understanding Masculinities: Social Relations and Cultural Arenas*. Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Macdougall, P. (1987). *The Chatham Dockyard Story*. Whitstable Litho Ltd: Whitstable, Kent.
- MacDougall, P. (2012) *Chatham Dockyard. The rise and fall of a military industrial complex*. The History Press: Gloucestershire.
- Maddrell, A. and Sidaway, J. (2010) *Deathscapes. Spaces for Death, Dying, Mourning and Remembrance*. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Mah, A. (2014) *Port cities and global legacies. Urban identity, waterfront work and radicalism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mannheim, K. ([1952] 1997) The Problem of Generations. In: *Collected works of Karl Mannheim*, Vol 5. London: Routledge, pp 276- 320.

- Marshall, T.H. (1992 [1950]) *Citizenship and Social Class*. London: Pluto.
- Maynard, S. (1989) Rough work and rugged men: The social construction of masculinity in working class history. *Labour/ Le Travail*, 23: 159-169.
- Mazenod, A (2016) Education or Training? A Comparative Perspective on Apprenticeships in England. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 68 (1): 102–117.
- McCarl, R. (1974) The production welder: Product, process, and the industrial craftsman. *New York Folklore Quarterly*, 30: 243- 253.
- McDowell, L. (2002) Masculine discourse and dissonance: Strutting ‘lads’, protest masculinity and domestic respectability. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 20: 97-119.
- McDowell, L. (2003) *Redundant Masculinities? Employment change and the white working class youth*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- McDowell, L. (2009) *Working Bodies. Interactive service employment and workplace identities*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- McIvor, A. (2013) *Working Lives. Work in Britain since 1945*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McKenna, F. (1976) Victorian Railway Workers. *History Workshop Journal*, 1[1]: 26- 73.
- McKenzie, L. (2015) *Getting By. Estates, Class and Culture in Austerity Britain*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Medway Council (2019) How we’re doing with apprenticeships [Online]. Available at: https://www.medway.gov.uk/info/200188/jobs/744/how_were_doing_with_apprenticeships. [Accessed on 11.06.2019].
- Miller, D. (2008) *The comfort of things*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Misztal, B. (2003) *Theories of social remembering*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Nayak, A. (2006) Displaced Masculinities: Chavs, Youth and Class in the Post- Industrial City. *Sociology*, 40[5]: 813- 831.

Newman, K. (1993) *Declining fortunes: The withering of the American dream*. New York: Basic Books.

Noon, M. and Blyton, P. (1997) *The Realities of work*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Nusbaum, P. (1978) A Conversational Approach to Occupational Folklore: Conversation, Work, Play, and the Workplace. *Folklore Forum* 11(1):18-28.

Office of National Statistics (2019a) Labour Market Profile - Chatham And Aylesford Parliamentary Constituency 2018. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/wpca/1929379937/report.aspx#tabpop1664>. [Accessed on 11.06.2019].

Office of National Statistics (2019b) 1981 Census - Special Workforce Statistics. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/query/getFile.aspx?filename=22696921.htm>. [Accessed on 11.06.2019].

Office of National Statistics (2019c) 1991 Census – Special Workforce Statistics. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/query/asv2htm.aspx>. [Accessed on 11.06.2019].

Pahl, R. (1984) *Divisions of Labour*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Pahl, R. (2005) Are All Communities Communities in the Mind? *Sociological Review*, 53: 621–40.

Penn, R.D. (1986) Socialization into skilled identities: an analysis of a neglected phenomenon. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Economics*, 1[3]: 163-173.

Petes, M. (2003) Tourism and Nationalism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30[1]: 125- 142.

Phillips, A. and Taylor, B. (1980) *Sex and Skill: Notes towards a feminist economics*. *Feminist review*, 6: 79-88.

Portelli, A. (1991) *The death of Luigi Trastulli and other stories: Form and meaning in Oral History*. Albany: State University Press of New York.

Portelli, A. (2005) "This Mill Won't Run No More": Oral History and Deindustrialization. In: Russo, J. and Linkon, S. eds. *New working class studies*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, pp 54- 63.

Rafkin, L. (1998) *Other People's Dirt. A Housecleaner's Curious Adventures*. Chapel Hill, NC: Algonquin Books of Chapel Hill.

Reay, D. (2017) *Miseducation: Inequality, education and the working classes*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Reay, D., David, M. and Ball, S. (2005) *Degrees of Choice, social class, race and gender in higher education*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books Limited.

Rifkin, J. (1995) *The End of Work*. New York: Jeremy Tarcher/ Putnam.

Ritchie, D. ed. (2011) *The Oxford Handbook of Oral History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, I. (1993) *Craft, Class and Control. The Sociology of a Shipbuilding Community*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Roy, D. (1959) "Banana Time" Job satisfaction and Informal Interaction. *Human Organization*, 18[4]: 158-168.

Russo, J. and Linkon, S. (2003) Collateral Damage: Deindustrialization and the Uses of Youngstown. In: Cowie, J. and Heathcott, J. *Beyond the Ruins. The meaning of Deindustrialisation*. US: Cornell University Press, pp 201-219.

Russo, J. and Linkon, S. (2005) What's new about working class studies. In: Russo, J. and Linkon, S. eds. *New working class studies*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, pp 1- 19.

Ryan, L. and Lőrinc, M. (2018) Perceptions, prejudices and possibilities: young people narrating apprenticeship experiences. *British Journal of sociology of Education*, 1-16.

- Ryan, P. and Unwin, L. (2001) Apprenticeship in the British 'Training Market'. *National Institute Economic Review*, 178[1]: 99-114.
- Saatcioglu, B. and Ozanne, J. (2013) Moral Habitus and Status negotiation in a marginalized working class neighbourhood. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40[4]: 692- 710.
- Samuel, R. (2012) *Theatres of Memory. Past and Present in Contemporary Culture*. London: Verso.
- Sanderson, M. (2007) Education and the Labour market. In: Crafts, N. Gazeley, I and Newall, A. Eds. *Work and Pay in Twentieth Century Britain*. Oxford, pp 264- 300.
- Savage, K. (2003) Moments of a Lost Cause: The Post-industrial campaign to Commemorate steel. In: Cowie, J. and Heathcott, J. Eds. *Beyond the Ruins. The meaning of Deindustrialisation*. US: Cornell University Press, pp 237 – 259.
- Savage, M. (2005) Working class Identities in the 1960s: Revisiting the affluent worker study. *Sociology*, 39[5]: 929-946.
- Savage, M. (2008) Histories, Belongings, Communities. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 11(2): 151–62.
- Sayer, A. (2005) Class, Moral Worth and Recognition. *Sociology*, 39[5]: 947- 963.
- Schrager, S. (1983) What is social in oral history? *International Journal of oral history*, 4[2]: 76- 98.
- Segal, L. (1997) *Slow Motion: Changing masculinities, changing men*. London.
- Sennett, R. (1998) *The Corrosion of character: The personal consequences of work in the new capitalism*. London: Norton.
- Sennett, R. (2008) *The Craftsman*. London: Penguin Books.
- Sennett, R. and Cobb, J. (1972) *The Hidden Injuries of Class*. W.W. Norton and Company: London.

Sinha, S. and Back, L. (2014) Making methods sociable: dialogue, ethics and authorship in qualitative research. *Qualitative research*, 14[4]: 473-487.

Skeggs, B. (1997) *Formations of class and Gender. Becoming respectable*. London: SAGE.

Skeggs, B. (2001) The toilet paper: Femininity, class and mis-recognition. *Women's studies international forum*, 24[3-4]: 295-307.

Skeggs, B. (2004) *Class, Self, Culture*. London: Routledge.

Skeggs, B. (2011) Imagining personhood differently: person value and autonomist working class value practices. *The Sociological Review*, 59[3]: 496- 513.

Skeggs, B. (2016) Class: Disidentification, Singular Selves and Person-Value. In: Sallum, B., Schwarcz, L., Vidal, D. and Catani, A. Eds. *Identidades*. Sao Paulo: Universidade De Sao Paulo, pp. 145-173

Skeggs, B. and Loveday, V. (2012) Struggles for value: Value practices, injustice, judgement, affect and the idea of class. *British Journal of Sociology*, 63[3]: 472- 490.

Smith, L. (2006) *Uses of Heritage*. London and New York: Routledge.

Smith, L. Shackel, P and Campbell, G. Eds. (2011) *Heritage, Labour and the Working Classes*. New York: Routledge.

Smith, R. (2012) *A Dockyard Apprentice's Story*. Gloucestershire, England: Memoirs Publishing.

Standing, G. (2011) *The Precariat. The New dangerous class*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Strangleman, T. (1999): The nostalgia of organisations and the organisation of nostalgia: past and present in the contemporary railway industry. *Sociology*, 33(4), 725-746.

Strangleman, T. (2004) *Work identity at the end of the line: Privatisation and cultural change in the UK rail industry*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Strangleman, T. (2005) *Class Memory: Autobiography and the Art of Forgetting*. In: Russo, J. and Linkon, S. Eds. *New working class studies*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, pp 137 – 151.
- Strangleman, T. (2011) Working class autobiography as cultural heritage. In: Smith, L. Shackel, P and Campbell, G. Eds. *Heritage, Labour and the Working Classes*. New York: Routledge, pp 147-160.
- Strangleman, T. (2012) Work identity in crisis? Rethinking the problem of Attachment and Loss at work. *Sociology*, 46[3]: 411- 425.
- Strangleman, T. (2013) "Smokestack Nostalgia," "Ruin Porn" or Working class Obituary: The Role and Meaning of Deindustrial Representation. *International Labor and Working class History*, 84[1]: 23-37.
- Summerby- Murray, R. (2007) Interpreting Personalized Industrial Heritage in the Mining Towns of Cumberland County, Nova Scotia: Landscape Examples from Springhill and River Hebert. *Urban History Review*, 35(2): 51- 59.
- Theil, D. (2007) Class in construction: London building workers; dirty work and physical cultures. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 58[2]: 227- 251.
- Theil, D. (2012) Builders, bodies and bifurcations: How London construction workers 'learn to labour'. *Ethnography*, 14[4]: 412- 430.
- Thompson, E.P. (1982[1968]) *The Making of the English Working Class*. Harmondsworth: Pelican Books.
- Thompson, P. (1988) *The Voice of the Past*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thornley, C. (1996) Segmentation and inequality in the nursing workforce: re-evaluating the evaluation of skills. In: Compton, R. Gallie, D. and Purcell, K. Eds. *Changing forms of employment: Organisation, Skills and Gender*. London: Routledge, pp 160-181.
- Todd, S. (2014) *The People. The rise and fall of the working class*. London: John Murray.

Trouillot, M.R. (1995) *Silencing the Past: Power and the production of history*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Unwin, L. and Wellington, J. (2006) Reconstructing the Work-based Route: lessons from the Modern Apprenticeship. *The Vocational Aspect of Education*, 47[4]: 337 – 352.

Vecsey, G. (1974) *One sunset a week: The story of a coal miner*. New York: Saturday Review Press / E.P. Dutton & Co.

Vickerstaff, S. (2007) 'I was just a boy around the place'. What made apprenticeships successful? *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 59[3]: 331- 347.

Walkerdine, V. (2009) Steel, Identity, Community: Regenerating identities in a South Wales Town. In: Wetherell, M. Ed. *Identity in the 21st Century: New Trends in Changing times*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, pp 59- 76.

Walkerdine, V. (2010) Communal Beingness and Affect: An exploration of Trauma in an Ex-Industrial Community. *Body and Society*, 16[1]: 91-116.

Walkerdine, V. (2015) Transmitting class across generations. *Theory and Psychology*, 25[2]: 167-183.

Walkerdine, V. and Jimenez, L. (2012) *Gender, work and community after deindustrialisation: A psycho-social approach to affect*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Walley, C. (2013) *Exit Zero. Family and Class in Post-industrial Chicago*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Ward, M. (2015) *From Labouring to Learning*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Waters, M. (1999) The Dockyard men speak out: Petition and Tradition in Chatham Dockyard, 1860-1904. In: Lunn, K. and Day, A. Eds. *A History of Work and Labour relations in the Royal Dockyards*. London: Mansell Publishing, pp 87- 99.

Wedgwood, T. (2009) History in two dimensions or three? Working class responses to history.

International Journal of Heritage Studies, 15[4]: 277- 97.

Wedgwood, T. (2011) A working town empowered. Retelling textile history at Cooleemee, North Carolina. In: Smith, L. Shackel, P and Campbell, G. Eds. *Heritage, Labour and the Working Classes*. New York: Routledge, pp 119- 136.

Wilcock, R. and Franke, W. H. (1963) *Unwanted workers: Permanent layoffs and long-term unemployment*. New York: Glencoe Free Press, pp 165- 185.

Willis, P. (1977) *Learning to Labour: How Working- Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*. London: Saxon House.

Wilson, C. (1979) *Jokes form, content, use and function*. New York: Academic Press.

Wolkowitz, C. (2006) *Bodies at Work*. London: Sage.

Young, M. (2003). National Qualifications Frameworks as a Global Phenomenon: a comparative perspective. In: *Journal of Education and Work*, 16 [3]: 223–37.

Zerubavel, Y. (2011) Social memories: steps towards a sociology of the past. In: Smith, L. Shackel, P and Campbell, G. eds. *Heritage, Labour and the Working Classes*. New York: Routledge, pp 221-225.

Appendix A: Sample Information

Name	Trade	Apprenticeship Location	Apprenticeship Start Year	Age (at time of interview)	Date of Interview	Place of Interview
Norman Gifford	Shipwright	Chatham Dockyard	1942	90	03/02/2017	Chatham Dockyard Historical Society Office
Richard Boorman	Engine Fitter	Chatham Dockyard	1952	80	10/04/2017	Richard's home
Peter Sargison	Shipwright	Chatham Dockyard	1953	78	07/11/2016	Chatham Dockyard Historical Society Office
Gary Brooker	Engine Fitter	Chatham Dockyard	1954	77	18/10/2016	Gary's home
John Nash	Joiner	Chatham Dockyard	1954	77	31/10/2016	Medway Kent University Campus
Dave Venus	Engine Fitter	Chatham Dockyard	1957	74	10/11/2016	Dave's home
Alex Routen	Boilermaker	Chatham Dockyard	1958	73	02/04/2017	Alex's home
Tony Gutteridge	Electrical Engineer	Chatham Dockyard	1960	71	09/01/2017	Tony's home
Bob Dennis	Boilermaker	Chatham Dockyard	1961	70	14/03/2017	Bob's home
Mark Whittaker**	Machine Tool Development	Adams	1961	55	14/11/2016	Adams
Brian Peters	Ship fitter	Chatham Dockyard	1962	69	17/11/2016	Medway Kent University Campus
Stuart Pollitt	Electrical Engineer	Chatham Dockyard	1964	67	15/11/2016	Stuart's home
Alan West	Electrical Engineer	Chatham Dockyard	1964	67	06/02/2017	Medway Kent University Campus
David Wray*	Yard Service Maintenance	Not Apprentice	1965	66	29/03/2017	Medway Kent University Campus
Paul Vandapeer	Technician	Chatham Dockyard	1970	61	19/11/2016	Paul's home
Chris Willing	Boilermaker	Chatham Dockyard	1972	59	07/03/2017	Interview conducted via Skype
Paul Reynolds	Electrical Engineer	Chatham Dockyard	1972	59	20/03/2017	IPS
David Johnson*	Labourer	Not Apprentice	1972	59	16/01/2017	Medway Kent University Campus
Tony Oakes*	Store supplies	Not Apprentice	1977	54	14/11/2016	Adams
Mark Foster	Machinist Apprentice	Chatham Dockyard	1979	52	11/03/2017	Medway Kent University Campus
Simon Sandys	Shipwright	Chatham Dockyard	1979	52	18/11/2016	Simon's home
Laurence Goater	Electrical Engineer	Chatham Dockyard	1980	51	19/12/2016	Medway Kent University Campus
Adrian Turner	Coppersmith	Chatham Dockyard	1980	51	14/11/2016	Adams
Mark Colyer*	Tug Worker	Not Apprentice	1981	50	11/02/2017	Medway Kent University Campus

Name	Apprenticeship Course	Apprenticeship Location	Apprenticeship Start Year	Age (at time of interview)	Date of Interview	Location of Interview
Nathan Tillet	Mechanical Engineering	Adams	1990	41	14/11/2016	Adams
Ben Taylor	Metrology	Adams	1999	32	14/11/2016	Adams
Simon Cranfield	Train Engineer SE	IPS	2013	19	20/03/2017	IPS
George Emberley	Electrical Engineer	Adams	2014	22	14/11/2016	Adams
Henry Metcalfe	Electrical Engineer	IPS	2014	18	20/03/2017	IPS
Jacob Day	Multi-Skilled	IPS	2014	18	20/03/2017	IPS
David Hicks	Industrial refrigeration	IPS	2014	22	20/03/2017	IPS
Joshua Gull	Electrical Engineer	Adams	2015	18	14/11/2016	Adams
Jack Aspland*	Fault finding engineer SE	IPS	2015	17	20/03/2017	IPS
Robert Fieldwick	Chromatography	IPS	2015	24	20/03/2017	IPS
Liam Sampson*	Multi-Skilled SE	IPS	2015	17	20/03/2017	IPS
Jack Goudie	Metrology	Adams	2015	18	14/11/2016	Adams
Cara Barnard	Control and Implementation	IPS	2015	18	20/03/2017	IPS
Simon Morris*	Electrical Instrumentation	IPS	2016	16	20/03/2017	IPS
Luc Debont	Mechanical Technician	IPS	2016	18	20/03/2017	IPS
Matthew Daly	Multi-Skilled	IPS	2016	18	20/03/2017	IPS
George Taylor	Multi-Skilled	IPS	2016	18	20/03/2017	IPS
Harry Garner**	Multi-Skilled	IPS	2016	16	20/03/2017	IPS
Steven Adams*	Industrial refrigeration	IPS	2016	16	20/03/2017	IPS
Cameron Jamieson	Train Engineer SE	IPS	2016	18	20/03/2017	IPS
Joe Foley	Electrical engineer	IPS	2016	19	20/03/2017	IPS
Rupert Wimbeugh	Pharmaceutical	IPS	2016	18	20/03/2017	IPS

*Pseudonym given as participant was under 18 at the time of interview.

Appendix B: Information Sheet

RESEARCH INFORMATION SHEET

Title of Project: Changing Manual work cultures in the Medway Towns

Researcher Name: Emma Pleasant

#



Thank you for your interest in taking part in my research.

Before you decide that you are happy to proceed, please ensure you read the following information carefully. Importantly, remember that your participation is voluntary, and you are free to withdraw at any time without giving any reason.

THE RESEARCH

- This research looks at how manual work cultures in the Medway Towns have changed in light of the closure of the Dockyard at Chatham. I hope to gather people's thoughts, memories and feelings about their work both past and present to develop a picture of how work cultures are formed and to see if any changes have occurred since 1984. This research will form my PhD Thesis for the University of Kent, Canterbury.
- The results will be published in my PhD thesis, in academic papers and will be offered for donation for public viewing at the Dockyard heritage site. All participants will be sent a brief summary of the findings and will be given the opportunity to view other papers that emerge from them.
- Your involvement in this research will assist in developing our understanding of how manual work in Medway has changed since the loss of the dockyard. This will not only benefit academic perspectives but will help develop the story of Medway for community viewing.

THE INTERVIEW

- The interview will be informal and more in keeping with a conversation. Largely I will be encouraging you to talk, reflect, describe and remember all that you are happy to share. I will however be making brief notes which are only to serve as aids to my own memory but if you find this uncomfortable, please do ask me to stop and I will happily do so.
- The interview will be recorded with an audio recording device. If you have any queries about this, please feel free to ask me before we begin.

YOUR INFORMATION

- If you are happy for me to do so, I will like to be maintain the authenticity of your interview by keeping any changes to your story to a minimum. If you would prefer me to anonymise your information, please make this clear in your consent form.

If you would prefer me to do so, I will change your name and any information that could be traceable to you in any written records. I will also refrain from sharing any oral accounts of your information.

- I also intend to donate the oral histories to the dockyard heritage museum to enable the community to enjoy the life stories and learn more about the people of Medway. Again, if you are not happy for me to donate your recording, please make this clear and I will not do so.
- I may also make use of things you say to me outside of the interview. Again, if you are not happy for your name and traceable information to be used, this will all be anonymised.

If you have any questions about any part of the research that are not answered here, then please do not hesitate to get in touch with me, either by email (E.L.Pleasant@kent.ac.uk) or by phone (07985155312).

Once again, I appreciate your interest in taking part in the research. I hope to make your potential involvement an enjoyable experience and look forward to working with you.

Best wishes,

Emma Pleasant

PhD Student, School of Sociology, Social Policy and Social Research (SSPSSR) at the University of Kent.

E.L.Pleasant@kent.ac.uk

Appendix C: Consent Form (Over 18s)

RESEARCH CONSENT FORM

Title of Project: Changing Manual work cultures in the Medway
Towns

Researcher Name: Emma Pleasant



**Please initial to
indicate consent**

I am happy for my information to be recorded in audio and written form and to use my recorded testimony for academic purposes (publication, archiving and presentation of information).

I consent for my name and my interview to be used for the purposes stated above. (If consent is not given, pseudonyms will be used).

I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet for the above study and have had the opportunity to ask questions.

I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving reason.

I agree for photographs to be taken of any artefacts I may wish to show the researcher.

Participant Name: _____ Date: _____

Participant Signature: _____

Researcher Signature: _____

Appendix D: Consent Form (Under 18s)

RESEARCH CONSENT FORM

Title of Project: Changing Manual work cultures in the Medway Towns

Researcher Name: Emma Pleasant



**Please initial to
indicate consent**

I am happy for my son/ daughter's information to be recorded in audio and written form and to use their recorded testimony for academic purposes (publication, archiving and presentation of information).

I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet for the above study and have had the opportunity to ask questions.

I understand that my son/ daughter's participation is voluntary and that we are free to withdraw at any time, without giving reason.

I understand that my son/ daughter will be given anonymity and that a pseudonym will be assigned to them in all written documents.

Participant Name: _____ Date: _____

Parent Signature: _____

Participant Signature: _____

Researcher Signature: _____

Appendix E: Interview Questions (Dockyard)

Early School

- What was your childhood like?
- When did you leave school?
- Why did you decide to do an apprenticeship?
- Did many of your friends/ family members go for the Dockyard apprenticeship?
- Can you talk me through the day of your entrance exam?
- How was your first day of your apprenticeship?
- What was an average day in your first year like?
- What trade did you end up focusing on, why that?

Later School

- What do you remember about your final year?
- How was it in comparison to the first?
- How were your final exams?
- At the time, did you expect to spend your whole work life there?
- What were your friends like?
- Were there many friendship groups at the Dockyard? Were they friends outside of work?
- Did you stay in the same friendship group throughout your apprenticeship?
- Did your friends go for different roles?
- Were some roles preferred over others? Why?
- What did you and your friends do for fun
- Can you tell me about your friends outside of the apprenticeship?
- Did you have a sports club? - Where you a member?
- Did you have social events?
- Did you get much opportunity to explore the whole dockyard? Can you remember what it was like?
- Did you ever get into trouble with the dockyard police? Did you hear about anyone else?
- Did you meet your wife whilst working at the dockyard? How did you meet?
- What is your fondest memory of the apprenticeship programme?

Your
Work

- Can you talk me through your first day on the job?
- What were your colleagues like?
- Do any particular days stand out to you? Why?
- What was a typical day like?
- What were break times like? What were lunch times like?
- Was it easy to get a promotion? How did that come about?
- What was your favourite position throughout your work? Why that one?
- Were there many rivalries between roles?
- Do you think you were a part of a work culture?
- Were there things that you did in your trade group that other trades didn't?
- Did you ever have to go to another yard? Can you describe that day to me?
- Did you notice any differences in how they worked compared to your group?
- Did you ever interact with another trade group? Can you describe that day to me?
- Did you notice any differences in how they worked compared to your group?
- Do you think it takes a particular type of person to do the work you did?

Teaching

- Did you teach at the apprenticeship school? Why?
- How was your first day of teaching? Can you describe it to me?
- Did any students stand out to you? Why?
- What was your favourite thing to teach?
- Were you keen to teach the students the lessons you learnt about dockyard life?

Closure

- Can you tell me about where you were when you heard about the closure?
- Did different trade groups have different responses?
- Were unskilled workers more worried than others?
- Was it easier for certain trades to get new jobs than others?
- Can you talk me through your last day?
- How do you think the community felt about the closure?
- Did you notice any immediate effects? - Do you notice any effects still going on now?
- Do you see the dockyard closure as similar to the closures of the mines?

Heritage

- Can you talk me through the first time you came here when it was a heritage site?

Appendix F: Interview Questions (Post-Dockyard)

Early School

- When did you leave school?
- Did you want to go into [your trade]?
- Why did you decide to do an apprenticeship?
- What did you know about your trade before you started there?
- Did many of your friends go for the same apprenticeship?
- Can you talk me through your first day of your apprenticeship?
- Can you talk me through an average day in your first year?
- What trade did you end up focusing on? Why?

Later School

- What do you remember about your final year?
- How was it in comparison to the first?
- How were your final exams?
- At the time, did you expect to spend your whole work life in that trade?
- What were your friends like?
- Were there many friendship groups in your trade? Were they friends outside of work?
- Did you stay in the same friendship group throughout your apprenticeship?
- Did your friends go for different jobs?
- Were some roles preferred over others? Why?
- What did you and your friends do for fun?
- Can you tell me about your friends outside of the apprenticeship?
- Did you have a sports club? - Where you a member?
- Did you have social events?
- Did you ever get into trouble during your apprenticeship? Did you hear about anyone else?
- Did you meet your wife/ partner whilst training? How did you meet?
- What is your fondest memory of the apprenticeship programme?

Your
Work

- Can you talk me through your first day on the job?
- What were your colleagues like?
- Do any particular days stand out to you? Why?
- What was a typical day like?
- What were break times like? What were lunch times like?
- Was it easy to get a promotion? How did that come about?
- What was your favourite position throughout your work? Why that one?
- Were there many rivalries between roles?
- Do you think you were a part of a work culture?
- Were there things that you did in your trade group that other trades didn't?
- Did you ever have to go to another site? Can you describe that day to me?
- Did you notice any differences in how they worked compared to your group?
- Did you ever interact with another trade group? Can you describe that day to me?
- Did you notice any differences in how they worked compared to your group?
- Do you think it takes a particular type of person to do the work you did?

Teaching

- Did you teach at the apprenticeship school? Why?
- How was your first day of teaching? Can you describe it to me?
- Did any students stand out to you? Why?
- What was your favourite thing to teach?
- Were you keen to teach the students the lessons you learnt about dockyard life?

Dockyard

- What do you know about the work that was done at the Dockyard?
- Do you know anyone who worked at the Dockyard?
- What do you think the work they did was like?
- Could you imagine working here? What do you think you would do?
- Do you think you would have liked to work here? Why/ Why not?
- Do you recognise any tools that you use?
- Do you feel that you could do the same work they did (build the ships etc)?