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Abstract

Repair work is essential if we are to develop environmentally sustainable societies, but repair activity has largely disappeared in advanced economies. Where it survives, work in repair is typically ‘dirty’ and undesirable. This article asks how repair work can be experienced as ‘good work’, drawing on the accounts of 20 trainees on a classic car restoration course. We observe that two features made repair ‘good work’ in their eyes: craft and love. Craft skills enabled trainees to imagine improved employment futures, but also engendered emotional satisfactions. What the trainees emphasized even more was love, in four distinct ways. First, there was ‘object love’ for the classic car. Second, love was evoked as repair reconnected them with ‘authentic’ younger selves. Third, love was claimed to be a prerequisite to do the work. Fourth, love mediated market relationships, connecting repairers and clients in a ‘community of enthusiasm’. Our discussion contributes to studies of workplace emotions, which typically focus on feminized work, by showing how love also matters in experiences of masculine work. Identifying the attractions of repair, we also consider the liminal context of training and highlight the key conditions for the survival and growth of repair as paid ‘good work’.
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Introduction

This article discusses how repair work, typically ‘dirty work’ associated with ‘bad’ or at best ‘mundane’ jobs, can be seen and pursued as ‘good work’ (henceforth without quotation marks) by potential workers, when it is seen and understood as skilled, craft-like work and infused by love. How a certain form of repair work gets elevated and becomes seen as desirable, worthy of the investment of time, effort and money in training is investigated through the case of trainees in a classic car restoration course in a post-secondary school College in the United Kingdom (henceforth the UK).

Repair work has increasingly disappeared from advanced capitalist economies (Cooper, 2005; Carr and Gibson, 2016; Carr, 2017), which operate on a linear principle of use-and-discard supported by designed-in obsolescence. A growing concern with the ecological impact and resource implications of ever-expanding production informs recent awareness that, despite having become marginalized and redundant, ‘the ability to work with materials, and to make, repair or repurpose physical things, are vital skills’ as natural resources become increasingly limited (Carr and Gibson, 2016: 298). In the Global North, however, material repair work is increasingly peripheral to the formal economy (ibid.), not least because it is labour-intensive and often expensive relative to the purchase of new goods. While there has been renewed enthusiasm for repair from amateur repairers (encouraged by initiatives like Repair Cafés), it is doubtful that an overall growth in repair activity is possible if the workforce with requisite skills continues to decline.

This article considers what inducements exist to become skilled in repair work. Through the case of trainees in classic car restoration, it explores how repair comes to be seen as good work, either because it provides good employment or because it provides other satisfactions. Cars are one of few objects that are routinely repaired in advanced economies like the UK. Classic cars, as we detail below, accentuate some key attractions of repair work.
and as repair objects especially informative for understanding how repair and repair work can come to be understood as worthwhile. The formal course information and recruitment materials provided by the College, as well as the tutors in their interviews, talked about the attractiveness of the course in terms of job opportunities in a purportedly growing market. By contrast, trainees provided much more complex sets of motivations. They provided highly emotional accounts of their paths into the course and projections for the future, and most notably emphasized ‘love’. The other key referent in trainees’ depictions of repair work as good work was craft, including technical skills and competencies involved in doing the work ‘properly’. As they gained embodied repair skills (Wolkowitz 2006:62-3) this engendered emotion too, especially fulfilment.

We follow the premise that ‘how people talk about their work and careers matters’ (Berkelaar and Buzzanell, 2015:157), and probe how workers reflexively narrate activities as worthwhile primarily, or even only, to themselves (Ezzy, 1997). In studying this in the accounts of trainees – a population in transition; consciously deliberating occupational entry - we ask how repair work becomes attractive first as an idea and hence a pursuit.

**Good work, craft skills and love**

The polarisation of work and its rewards in liberal market economies has been debated extensively (Goos and Manning, 2007; McGovern et al, 2004), partially around a rubric of good vs. bad jobs (Kalleberg, 2011; Warhurst et al., 2012; Vidal, 2013). In economics this is typically reduced to high vs. low wage jobs (Acemoglu, 2001), but a sociological conceptualisation takes into consideration more, including the subjective dimensions of work and the self-understanding of the worker (Ezzy, 1997). Taking a wide view, Hesmondhalgh and Baker (2013) claim that good work involves ‘autonomy, interest and involvement, sociality, self-esteem, self-realisation, work-life balance and security’
Thus, good work can occur where low pay is bundled with high autonomy and skill, such as in the media jobs they studied. Others have shown that good work may be carved out of ‘bad jobs’, for example the ‘dirty work’ of rubbish collectors, where workers find dignity and construct positive identities (Bailey and Madden, 2015).

Since most paid employment is in mundane jobs (Bozkurt, 2015) it is important to ask how jobs can be experienced as good work, whether through comparatively favourable material conditions of employment or ‘experiences of enchantment’ in mundane work (Endrissat, Islam and Noppeney, 2015). Such an effort is particularly worthwhile in relation to working class men, whose labour market standing and status have been substantially worsened in contemporary market economies (Nixon, 2009). A part of any sociological understanding of good work must moreover identify those transformative elements which render jobs ‘good’ in the view of those who decide to pursue them.

In advanced capitalist economies most jobs are in the service sector, with the making of goods extensively reduced and moved to other parts of the world (Gibson and Carr, 2016:298). Of course, mechanisation and the erosion of traditional craft skills (Bailey and Madden, 2017: 6) long predated this period, and was a defining feature of industrial capitalism. Despite this long decline, a ‘craft-based mode of creative production’ (Gibson, 2016:66) that draws upon skilled artisans’ embodied knowledge of hand-made production has survived (O’Connor, 2007), including in ‘transient’ forms in the service sector in the production of intangible objects like haircuts (Holmes, 2015). Recent growth of activity in craft-based manufacturing (Warren, 2014) has dovetailed with the renewed interest in a scholarly understanding of craft and craftsmanship (Adamson, 2007; Sennett 2008).

Early commentary on the ‘somewhat surprising phenomenon’ (Inkson, 1987:163) of the persistence and re-emergence of craft focused on enthusiasts. This has continued in more recent studies, which have insightfully unearthed the skilled manual work and craft practices
that survive and thrive in non-work contexts, for example in the custom-car scene (Warren and Gibson, 2011), among classic motorcycle restorers (DeLyser and Greenstein, 2017), and in the homes of retired industrial workers (Carr, 2017). The ‘DIY focus’ of extant research has meant that craft has rarely been considered in relation to paid employment (Holmes, 2015:480). There are, however, exceptions, recognizing that in some contexts craft-based jobs have survived (Warren, 2014) or even re-emerged (Gibson, 2016). Gibson argues that the embodied knowledge, or ‘haptic skills’ retained by former factory workers have been a key part of the ‘mythology of making’ in which manual labour is fetishized (ibid.:66), especially by consumers seeking to bypass mainstream consumer culture, potentially giving skilled manual workers ‘renewed agency’ (Gibson, 2016:64-6). Warren (2014:2314) sees scope for good work for these workers with rewarding jobs and flexible work leveraged by ‘subcultural capital, job hopping, work slow-downs, and connections to consumers’, notwithstanding the sectoral jeopardy posed by mass production.

From studies located outside the realm of paid work, we can identify intrinsic aspects of craft practice that render it rewarding and that may point to how craft skills relate to good paid employment. For instance, Inkson (1987: 164) notes that in its ideal form the practice of craft ‘gives meaning to the work, facilitates the development of skills, engrosses and delights the worker, gives pride in personal achievement, exercises and extends the creative faculty, and establishes the worker as the controlling agent in the process of work’. This highlights the dual aspect of craft activity, which goes back and forth between process (skills, control, and creativity); and emotion (such as delight, pride, meaning). Studies of good work and even meaningful work have, however, paid little attention to emotion to date. We argue that, in particular, there has been a lack of attention to love.

Love and emotions were ‘rediscovered’ as the subject of sociological study as feminist scholarship focused attention on private lives (Bolton, 2000:155). Academic study of
love has since focused overwhelmingly on interpersonal love, particularly in relation to romance, intimacy and sexuality (Giddens, 1992; Jackson, 1993; Jamieson, 1998; Johnson, 2005). But discussions of love have also involved a broader range of personal relationships such as ‘friendship, kinship, communities’ (Morrison et al., 2012), as well as love for nonhumans, for example for pets (Nast, 2006) and animals (Cook, 2015). Following Ahmed’s (2004) depiction of emotions as ‘directed’ towards objects, scholarship has furthermore begun to recognize the ‘affective, emotional and sensual relationship between people and things’ (Geoghegan and Hess, 2014: 449) including ‘object-love’ (Macdonald, 2002), that is, the love for inanimate objects.

These debates on love have to-date had little impact on workplace studies of emotion, which remain dominated by a focus on emotional labour (Hochschild, 1983). This has produced extensive scholarship on aspects of workers’ emotional experiences and identities targeted by management, but little inquiry into workplace emotions that pre-exist, or exist alongside, managerial control. We contend that emotion, in particular love, is central to understanding worker experiences as well as expectations of good work, especially in repair. Taking love as ‘a combination of care, commitment, trust, knowledge, responsibility and respect’ (hooks, 2000:7-8) and recognising its constitutive relationship to time and space (Morrison et al., 2012), we see the role of love in the workplace closely linked to debates on the economy of care (England, 2005). Care requires practical support – workers care for others – and emotional expenditure – they care about others. Indeed such affective attachment can be used to exploit workers, for example as observed in relation to the low-pay care industry and its predominantly female workforce (Folbre and Nelson, 2000; Palmer and Eveline, 2012). Care has typically been used to characterise female occupations. Yet as Nelson (2015:6) notes, ‘care in the sense of concern and in the sense of carefulness’, which he sees as intertwined in the form of ‘husbandry’, can be identified and remains critical.
within ‘masculine-encoded identity and activity’ (ibid.). In work activity such as classic car repair, we contend that love, like care, is intertwined with the practical activity, or skill, involved in performing the work. Our discussion below therefore contributes also to the effort to dispel ‘the false binary between a feminized, community-engaged emotional labo(u)r of crafting and a hypermasculine solo skilled labo(u)r of machine restoration’ (DeLyser and Greenstein, 2017:1475).

**Repair work and cars**

Repair activity is central to recent calls for a transition away from a make-use-dispose linear economic model by keeping goods in use for far longer periods, and more effective for waste prevention than reuse and recycling (Gregson and Crang, 2015: 227; Cooper, 2005). Yet the ‘processes of maintenance and repair that keep modern societies going’ have been ‘neglected by nearly all commentators as somehow beneath their notice’ (Graham and Thrift, 2007:1)

Beyond being key to a more environmentally-sustainable economic system, repair can also create skilled, rewarding work (Dant, 2010), with elements of ‘problem solving and problem finding’ that Sennett (2008:11) highlights as defining craft found in repair. As Dant (2010) notes ‘the work of repair takes ingenuity in identifying the problem and then a wide range of skills and tools to make the object useable again; it involves a mixture of perceptual, cognitive and manual skills that are normally associated with handcraft’. Being ‘contingent’ in the sense of entailing skilful rapid and creative responses and/or deep specialisms, repair (and maintenance) work ill fits ‘prevalent depictions of industrial labour as repetitive and alienating’ (Carr, 2017:3).

Cars are informative about the nature and experiences of repair work, since cars are the most regularly repaired of mass produced goods (Borg 2007; Dant 2010; Edgerton 2006).
Automotive manufacturing was a powerful driver of 20th century capitalism and one from which key concepts for understanding the development of capitalism have emerged (Sheller and Urry, 2000), with auto-factory work examined as the quintessential example of standardized work, involving the increasing removal of skill, discretion and craft from the labour process (eg. Elger and Smith, 2010, Beynon, 1973). The sector’s repair side, however, has received less attention, despite being both widespread and voluminous, with car repair carried out in a myriad of locations and sites (Edgerton 2006:80-83; Mellström, 2002; Borg 2007).

Unlike the ‘alienating work of machine based manufacture’ (Dant, 2010) that defines car production, car repair retains a ‘human, artisanal character’ (ibid.) and requires relatively long training periods and the deployment of complex skills (ibid.). For those within the sector, experienced mechanics may be respected as ‘craftsmen’, as in the example of a tutor in a motor vehicle maintenance course studied by Brockmann (2010:67). Yet at least in the British context, car repair is also ‘dirty work’ (Dant and Bowles, 2003) and pay is low, as is social status. Concomitantly, the recruitment of trainees into work as car mechanics follows a pattern common to much manual vocational work in the UK: attracting relatively uneducated young boys and reproducing working class masculine identities.

Classic car repair resembles modern car repair, but also differs from it due to the technical features of the objects of repair and the cultural and subjective meanings attached to them. Officially, a ‘historic vehicle’ in the UK is 40 years old (for example for tax and safety inspection purposes). Although what counts as a ‘classic’ is widely debated, typically, the technology of classic cars is distinguished by mechanical simplicity and especially the absence of complex electronics. This, and the rarity of original spare parts imposes particular skill demands in classic car repair, including craftsmanship in the making of parts. Classic motoring is primarily a leisure activity, but like many such activities it also constitutes a
substantial economic sector. In the UK the value of historic vehicles has been estimated at £17.8 billion and the annual spend on historic vehicle related activity at over £5.5 billion (FBHVC, 2016). The popularity of classic cars has been bolstered by a growing number of cultural products and varied media outlets, with classic motoring events attracting over five million participants annually (ibid.). The best estimate is that the sector included 31,100 paid full-time or part-time jobs in 2016 – a 25 percent increase from 2011 – with an additional 3,800 trainees or apprentices (FBHVC, 2016: 59). Hence, while much repair work is carried out around classic cars as a hobby by enthusiasts, there is also a substantial labour market in the sector. The same survey revealed that 40 percent of employers experience problems in recruiting staff with the requisite manual skills and knowledge, and 50 percent expect these problems to get more acute. This echoes the frequent predictions from enthusiasts and sector forums of an imminent skills shortage (Bozkurt, 2016), related to the aging of the current workforce. Exploration of how entrants may come to see restoration work as attractive, good work is, therefore, timely.

Research context and methods

At the time of research, the College where the interviews were carried out was the only full-time Further Education course in classic car restoration that the researchers could locate in the UK. Further Education (henceforth FE) in the UK involves all post-secondary study that is not part of higher education, including vocational and continuing education. The 9-month program included tuition in metal body work, paint work and mechanics. It comprised some theoretical content, but focused on workshop-based practical learning. Successful completion led to a Level 2 qualification (in a qualification scheme with nine levels, from Entry to PhD), but in Paint, since at the time there was no dedicated qualification in classic car restoration. Applied training in the UK remains decentralized and ad hoc. A few
apprenticeship schemes in the heritage divisions of high-end car marques like Aston Martin and Jaguar Land Rover are highly publicized but small in scope. The few dedicated training courses that exist typically target hobbyists seeking to work on their ‘project car’, often run as one-off sessions over a day or weekend. Several FE courses offering accreditation at Level 2 and 3 in classic car restoration and repair have been discontinued. The course studied was, therefore, exceptional, rather than representative of a wider population.

One of the authors initially met the course leaders in November 2014 at the UK’s largest annual classic motoring show, where they ran demonstrations, publicizing the course. First interviews were carried out in May 2015 with four members of the course delivery team including the course director and an ex-tutor who had helped set up the course. Later in the same month 16 out of the 22 students in that year’s cohort were interviewed during the final week of instruction. This was the only time available when the teaching delivery team could assist the researchers and arrange a meeting space. The trainees were able to take part in the interviews in-between taking turns to use the paint room for their final, voluntary, project. All trainees who were at the college during the research visit and indicated an interest were interviewed. Interviews lasted 30 to 70 minutes. The interview schedule comprised open-ended questions about life and career histories including past employment, motivations for joining the course, experiences on the course, including likes and dislikes, comparison of classic car work with real or imagined alternatives, and future plans. Both authors were present in all 16 student and all tutor interviews carried out in 2015. One interview was carried out with two students together, all others were individual. In May 2016 one of the authors returned to the College for an update on developments and the move to a new campus. Four students from the new cohort were interviewed during this visit, including the only female trainee across both cohorts. This allowed us to assess whether first cohort of trainees interviewed were typical, despite considerable variety in their backgrounds. The
second group of four trainees had individually distinct trajectories into the course, but echoed themes discussed by the previous cohort and gave us greater confidence in our findings. All interviews were audio-recorded and all recordings were transcribed by professionals. Pseudonyms are used for all participants and in all discussions of the study.

The authors made observations of the workshop space, shared with other machine related courses, and of college facilities like the staff room and the student cafeteria. They also observed the classic car restoration trainees prepare vehicles for the full paint task and witnessed the ‘reveal’, of the completed paint job. This provided rich context, but did not comprise full participant ethnography. This study does not, therefore, claim to explore the nonverbal communication central to practical learning contexts (eg. Marchand, 2008; 2010), nor provide a ‘first hand experience of the pedagogical milieu’ (Downey et al., 2015: 183).

Initial ideas were developed through discussion by the two authors who reviewed both responses on the topics in the interview guide and the untargeted themes that emerged. These discussions were then developed into key themes using an iterative process, involving conversation as well as joint and individual examination and coding of the transcripts.

Findings

The course tutors repeatedly emphasized that classic car restoration trainees stood out from the general student profile at the College, especially the regular motor vehicle course students, underscoring their greater focus and commitment. The trainees’ diversity distinguished them from typical FE students, in terms of age, employment history, education, and previous training, as shown in Table 1. Two interviewees had retired from professional careers. Others came from self-employment, restaurant management, a family business, cabinet making, ski-lift engineering, hatchery work or university, alongside a host of lowly paid retail, call-centre, and manual labour as well as unemployment. Compared to others at
the College the group were older and of much more diverse ages, from 20s through 60s. Both cohorts were all-male, with one exception in 2016. A minority were from the local area, most had moved from elsewhere in the country or arrived from abroad. Some commuted weekly from other cities in England. We note this variability, both from typical FE students and within the group, as our first finding. It informs variability in whether repair work was seen as good work, but also serves to highlight what is shared among otherwise substantially different workers.

--------------------------------------

Insert Table 1 here

--------------------------------------

Albeit distributed very unequally, it was possible to identify four paths onto the course, which we label and refer to hereon. The largest group of interviewees, 13 out of the 20, comprised the *Career Changers*, previously gainfully employed in other careers which, for various reasons, they no longer wanted to continue. Working with classic cars was a consciously defined alternative career path and their narratives emphasized the idea of choice. Most had relocated to train. Many were single, but a few had moved with partners and, in one case, young child. By contrast the four participants we call the *Career Seekers* had less stable career histories, either not having been in employment for long or having alternated between periods of unemployment and precarious work. They lived locally and had partners and children, needing to earn a living for their households. Only one interviewee fell into our third category of *Career improver*. He already worked in the sector, running a parts business for Minis in Switzerland, and sought the certification from the course for commercial requirements there. The final group were the *Hobbyists*, the two retirees, one from the RAF the other from a university, now having the time and resources to invest in
training in their hobby, a project car and a workspace. Although the four trajectories varied across individuals, and at times overlapped, each trainee was clearly on one or other trajectory. In the discussion below, we highlight differences and similarities between trainees on different trajectories where these matter in depictions of repair and understandings of good work.

Craft skills and classic car repair as good work

One immediate theme that emerged in the way trainees talked about how they saw classic car repair had to do with the positive value they placed on the craft skills they associated with it, often contrasted with working with modern cars. Their discussions touched upon a range of technical, manual, codified and tacit skills entailed in carrying out the physical, material, haptic work of repair. They reflected on the range of skills that they had been taught on the course, with distinct preferences about what they enjoyed most and self-appraisals of what they felt they could do best. This discussion was then tied to instrumental concerns related to employment, on the one hand, and emotional responses related to the experience of the possession and exercise of said skills, on the other.

The argument linking the skills to employment and more or better job opportunities echoed the formal promise of the course, as declared in the information leaflet, that trainees would ‘gain an excellent foundation of knowledge from which to build a career or business within classic car restoration’. Skills and upskilling are generally associated with new technology (Acemoglu, 1998), but in this context the claim was that skills that became scarcer with changing technology of cars and the shrinking number of mechanics familiar with older cars would now be in demand. This is similar to the situation of artisan bootmakers that Gibson (2016) talks about, but also different in seeing in old skills employment opportunities for new workers. According to the course leader, for example, a
mechanic trained 40 years ago ‘would be able to understand the workings of a modern car’ but not vice versa. While ‘some mechanical car components like brakes had evolved’ but remained ‘recognisable’ to modern mechanics, other aspects had changed so much as to require specialist training for repairing obsolete models. Furthermore, classic cars typically require restoration rather than part replacement and modern mechanics, taught how to remove damaged components but not to weld or hand-manufacture parts, may be unable to cope. The course director recognized classic car repair is a niche sector, but claimed that it offered jobs as the popularity of classic cars and their financial worth continued to increase.

Menelaos, a Career Seeker and serial entrepreneur, who had already secured a permanent post in a highly prestigious British car restoration garage while still on the course, reflected this rationale:

MENELAOS: ‘More and more, as car values go up, because they’re being used as commodity investments […] there's gonna be more call for the skills that I'm trying to learn. Because these kind of cars, you can't just go and buy parts from a shop, you have to make them.’

Other trainees made similar points, although they had not necessarily ‘tested’ whether jobs were forthcoming and when pressed were typically vague about the evidence for their labour market assessments. That the repair skills would lead to a good job was presented more as a general belief, rather than precise calculation.

Critically, the craft skills that in the trainees’ views elevated work on classic cars were also seen as acquirable, notwithstanding clear individual differences in self-reported talent and inclination for specific types of skills. Somewhat paradoxically, while classic cars were revered for being superior to modern cars because of their ‘craftsmanship’, the skills they
required for repair were also described as ‘simple’ and more ‘accessible’. Two younger trainees discussed this in their joint interview:

MATEJ: At the earlier days of motoring having a car was a big deal […] cars were built to a much higher standard, whereas now modern cars are treated as disposable goods […] The craftsmanship just isn’t what it used to be, the quality isn’t there, it is not made to last that long.

ALFIE: With older cars, they are designed so anyone can work on them. They are so basic and so easy, there is no electrical to them, they are designed for people like us to just take the hood up and take it apart, strip it down and rebuild it. […] whereas the new cars are all electrical, you need computers.

Here, Alfie does not even get the terminology quite right – he meant ‘electronic’ rather than ‘electrical’ – but he and Matej empathically agreed, nodding, in depicting classic cars as products of crafts-skills and learning to repair them as ‘easy’. This was a sentiment shared by many, for example Kirk, who was looking for a career change after many years of working in construction in the Middle East, and Richard, who had had stretches of unemployment alternating with warehouse and other low pay work:

KIRK: [What made you think that classic cars were the way to go?] It appealed to me more … it’s just easier, they’re an easier … you’re not talking about onboard computers and things like that. I knew if I was going into modern cars I was going to have to do a full apprenticeship.
RICHARD: Why did you decide you would go towards classic cars rather than modern cars? Easier to work on.

What they and others repeatedly underscored was the computer-dependent nature of contemporary cars, including in the identification of faults, which demoted repair to removing and installing parts. By contrast, they could see, touch, feel, and figure out how classic cars worked, or when they did not, what the fault was, which provided both an opportunity for problem-solving and a human, rather than computer-led, course of action for repair. Crafts skills and simplicity were not opposing concepts in this context, but interdependent, in fact mutually enforcing. This highlights that while repair, and craft, require extensive knowledge, they often involve relatively ‘simple’ objects – objects over which a single worker can gain mastery.

Even when the craft skills were linked to good work in the form of employment in the trainees’ vision of the future, the formal qualification did not seem to matter. Mark, the only Career Improver among the trainees, was also the only one who needed and sought the certification and this was because of trading legislation in Switzerland, where he was based. Rather, while the skills learnt could open employment opportunities in garages, they needed demonstration, typically through portfolios of work and trial runs with willing employers. This both echoes Brockmann’s (2010) observation that practical work can involve a different, but equally rewarding kind of learning for mechanics-in-making but also highlights the contradistinction between craft skills and professions built on theoretical knowledge and signalled with accreditation.

A second reason why skills in the craft of classic car repair were seen to promise good work was because they were thought to allow for the pursuit of greater control over working hours and discretion over the pace of work. In this idealised view voiced by several of the
Career Changers (though not among the Career Seekers), artisanal self-employment generating a modest but sufficient income, romantically linked to harmonious lifestyles that fit around family figured prominently:

MATTHEW: I would like to move back to Switzerland because my wife can work out there as an anaesthetist […] I would like build a house with a barn on the side, the barn is going to be my garage and is going to blend into the countryside. I want to restore cars in my own time, just make enough money to survive and make myself smile while I am doing it.

DYLAN: I don’t want Monday to Friday 9.00 AM to 5.00 PM slog out, four weeks off, we don’t want that anyway. I would rather do a project maybe Monday to Friday for four weeks and then have a week off, work/life balance[…] That’s why I want to do my own thing. I don’t want to have to say somebody ‘Can I go on holiday?’ If I want to go away, if the weather is nice, the two of us then we will go away.

The craft skills that characterised classic car repair mattered not only for employment reasons but for how they made the trainees feel. Two key themes in trainees’ talk about the craft skills they had been learning were, first, enjoyment of the embodied, tactile creation, associated with a minimal separation between process and product and, second, the fulfilment and pride of ‘doing it properly and ‘getting it right.’ The former was brought up recurrently in discussion of metal fabrication for bodywork, a core part of the training, and a part that trainees often pointed as having especially liked:

MAHAD: ‘You’re just creating by your hands, you know, the body of the car. That
fascinates me. That’s what I like.

KEVIN: It is tactile, it is working with your hands and you have an end product.

SARAH: I don’t mind getting my hands dirty as well, [...] I like bashing metal. [...] I think it’s the fact that at the end you can see it come from a flat piece of metal to actually forming it, and the satisfaction of knowing that you’ve done that, you know, at the end when you think, ‘My Gosh I’ve done that’, you know. I’ve done that, you know.

UMAIR: ‘Yes, the really interesting things I found about it was the fabrication, you know, how from a flat piece of metal, you can make so many shapes and how you can shrink the metal and how you can stretch it and, if you’ve made a mistake, you can always go back and correct that mistake. So that’s the most interesting thing about, the one [thing] I found about restoration, is how you can play so much with the metal. [...] it’s never-ending, you can always bring the metal back.

As is apparent in these quotes, trainees move back and forth between a focus on an embodied and creative process - ‘tactile’; ‘bashing’; ‘play’ – and a focus on the thing created or end product. This highlights how a feature typically associated with craft production, the close interplay and connection between process and product, is similarly experienced in and indeed required for repair and marks repair as both craft and, potentially, good work.

A linked, but distinguishable, emotional response by the trainees to the craft elements of their work was fulfilment, pride and satisfaction in learning the skills to ‘do things properly’ and ‘get things right’. Mark’s account is one of many that convey such a sensibility:
MARK: I am spraying my car, there is a big hole in it, everybody said to me ‘get a new door’, and I was like, ‘No, do it properly.’ So I spent two days. I cut it out and I put a new piece in and it was a long job, a very long job, but at the end of it I had satisfaction out of it: ‘I have done that’.

Precision and getting things exactly right are technical aspects of repair as craft, but also, for Mark, infused with satisfaction. Kirk, who initially provided one of the more instrumental accounts for choosing to do the course, similarly highlighted that an appeal of repairing classic cars was the requirement to do it ‘100 percent correct’:

KIRK: What I found really interesting is the amount of preparation work, […] It starts at the bottom, and it’s layer upon layer of getting everything right and each layer has to be correct each time. In construction you can put pipework in behind a wall and then there’s plasterboard, so nobody knows what it looks like in behind and you can cosmetically make it look better after. […] Whereas with the cars, everything is precisioned, from the very start […] I like getting things correct, 100 percent correct.

For our two Hobbyists restoration work was entirely unrelated to employment plans and they were particularly notable for their emphasis on skill acquisition as an end in itself. For Craig, a retired educational psychologist, paint and fabrication had been the most appealing parts of his time at the College:

CRAIG: Just learning a skill, it is having a skill that you know you can do, you can approach the job, you know how to go about it, you know when it is a good job or not a good job, just knowing how to do a skill.
Craig’s account does not refer to tangible outcomes like employability, and in fact he later stated that he would ‘hate to do it [restoration] as a job’. Yet being skilled (and indeed the process of becoming skilled) in the craft of repair delivered emotional forms of satisfaction to him. The ability to perform and recognise a ‘good job’ was a reward in and of itself.

*Love and classic car repair as good work*

While the craft skills of classic car repair delivered emotional rewards and were seen as linked to potential employment opportunities, trainees’ talk about what made this good work put still greater emphasis elsewhere, namely on love. Love was present among the emotional satisfactions in the exercise of craft-skills, as discussed above, but it also emerged as salient within four other distinct, yet related, contexts. First, love for the repair object, the classic car, was key in the explanation of why this work would be better than other types of work or even repair of other objects, specifically modern cars. Second, love made this good work because it indicated a return to an authentic self, an honest embrace of one’s original desires, in contrast with previous experiences of unloved work. Third, trainees saw love as often necessary to perform the work, or even develop the requisite skills. Finally, love was also seen to underpin and colour relationships around the classic car, particularly those with clients. As such love could potentially transform pure market relationships, revealing underlying social relationships and engendering community.

The narrative around ‘object-love’ (Macdonald, 2002; Geoghean and Hess, 2015), that is, for the classic car as a repair object, had two aspects: one rooted in the qualities of the classic car itself as having been conceived with love, its aesthetics, its craftsmanship, and how it feels to the touch, sounds to the ear and appears to the eye; the other in the personal, familial and social history and identity it evoked.

Menelaos’ description of his feelings during his first visit to the specialist
garage where he secured a job was one of many examples of the way trainees expressed highly emotional reactions and indeed childlike wonder at the sight of classic cars:

MENELAOS: Well, as he was showing me around, it was like Charlie and the Chocolate Factory. […] It was a weird…it’s unexplainable. It’s kind of, you get to a stage in life where stuff shouldn’t excite you so much, but I was so excited, that I couldn’t breathe.

Trainees’ strong sentiments at the sight of classic cars were not always easily verbalised. For Aaron, it was an intangible ‘something’ that made classic cars special, his difficulty in explaining exactly what highlighting the extra-rational ways in which they are appreciated.

AARON: There is just something about them, I don’t know what it is. It is just the way they look, in comparison to a lot of modern cars. They (modern cars) are very bland. And that’s why I particularly like the American ones because they are so much more, they are bit more in your face I think and I think that is what I like.

Classic car love was often specific, meaning trainees loved a type of vehicle, whether named marques and makes like a Mini; genres like Aaron’s American muscle cars; or any categorisation that individually resonated. Love of the classic car was also often expressed in embodied, sensual ways (Wolkowitz 2006). For instance, when Sarah talked about her first experiences of driving a classic car she highlighted its olfactory and auditory appeal:
SARAH: I loved it, absolutely loved it. Bombing it down the road, and the smell of the leather, you don’t get that in modern cars, and the dashboard and everything. In modern cars everything is plastic - the dashboards are plastic. But you go into a Mini or a Beetle and it’s like a metal… or in a Mini it’s wood or something […], so that’s why. I love the sound of it, the engine’s rumble. [How do they sound?] It’s a weird sound, it’s like a pop. A popopopop! You rev and you know you’re revving a proper car, because modern cars are so silent because of noise pollution, you can’t really hear them. My neighbours are going to hate me but I like the revving of the engine.

Classic cars were also loved objects because they were meaningful in relation to personal histories, memories and identities. Åberg and Hedlin’s (2015) study of construction trainees suggests that types of practical work may engender ‘joy’, in part through re-engaging trainees in a ‘tinkering culture’ first encountered when they were younger and participated in practical work with male relatives and friends (ibid.: 529). In our study, too, many trainees described early interest in cars, including cars that would now be considered ‘classics’ (but were not then), and remembered childhoods spent tinkering on their own or on relatives’ cars. In these stories the ‘car’, in its larger, symbolic meaning and cultural significance (Sheller, 2004; Urry, 2006) was interwoven with individual personal histories.

MATTHEW: My first memories are me staying at my best friend’s house and we used to sit there and get the car books out and point at the cars and look at the pictures and that’s where it stayed all my life.

KIERAN: Me and Dad would go to football matches, we’d watch rugby together and we’d talk about cars. When we were talking it would be talking
about cars. He’d bring home a magazine and I’d bring it up to my bed.

This last example nicely highlights the centrality of cars in men’s early familial relationships. Like Kieran, many trainees recalled talking about cars or working on cars with their fathers. Thus, car-love was rooted in early experiences of masculine love and friendship.

Related to but nevertheless distinct from these types of object-love was a love narrative linked with the idea of going back to a loved way of being. Love here was not about the car itself, but about reclaiming a more authentic working self. In this context, entering the field of classic car restoration was not just underwritten by love, but was the realisation of longstanding dreams that had been foiled by a range of obstacles – for example, for Sarah by gendered social norms and for Matthew by classed familial expectations:

SARAH: When I left high school I wanted to do this course, I wanted to do classic car restoration or build a hot-rod. […] But I felt that in my eyes, girls didn’t do that kind of stuff.

MATTHEW: I once decided that I really wanted to go into mechanics …and my whole family were against it completely, they were like, ‘Why do you want to do that? You have studied engineering; you should have higher aspirations.’ They even sent me to a garage and they got a mechanic to speak to me: ‘Look at my hands. It is a dirty job. It is a horrible job.’ And I thought, ‘Well of course they are older than me. They know what they are doing. Yeah, I will go back. I will study engineering. I will do what you want.’

For others the twists and turns in previous career paths may have been outcomes of
rational deliberations, but these entirely reasonable choices were now counter-poised with love. Framing past employment in this way the career change into restoration was posited as righting a wrong to realise an earlier set of ambitions. Menelaos suggested that he was now, at 43, following his ‘natural path’:

MENELAOS: I should’ve been doing this when I left school. I’m finally doing something that I should be doing, instead of doing something that I thought, ‘This is where the money (is)’.

Although less explicitly tied to an origin story, Silvio similarly framed his decision to pursue restoration work as a response to previous employment that was not chosen with love:

SILVIO: When my first job start, went a little bit bad, I take a bit of issue. So I said, ‘Okay, I need to stop things, I need to change my life and I need to do what I really love to do’.

There was, however, considerable variation in how trainees deployed ‘origin stories’ and the extent to which they framed their current career choice as love-driven. Notably, the Career Seekers had far less elaborate accounts of a self that had always been ‘meant’ to do something and tended not to present tales of stymied opportunities or paths-not-taken. This may have been in part because their life-histories involved fewer choices and more drifting into and between various forms of training, unemployment and low-paid work. In contrast, Career Changers employed love-saturated origin narratives, presumably either because they were most strongly moved by love, which had impelled them to make large life changes, or because a narrative engagement with love helped justify these large life changes to
themselves and to others, including family on whom some were now, albeit they hoped temporarily, financially dependent.

Third, while love was seen as a reward of working on a loved object and/or achieving a previously denied identity, it was also discussed as a prerequisite for being able to do the work, and do it well. A case in point is Adrian, who had left a stable and relatively well-paid job as an emergency call handler to register on the course. His ambition was to specialise in the repair of ‘rubbish cars’, that is, very cheap cars otherwise headed to the scrap heap. He saw these as lacking in love and needing care. Yet it was only through looking at them with (a certain degree of) love that they become repair-worthy objects, requiring work:

ADRIAN: Basically [rubbish cars are] just unloved junk. Everyday cars. [...] they turn from a car that you want, you have bought a brand new car, you love this car, you have done everything to it, you have paid it, you picked the colour, you did everything. But slowly along down the line it becomes either rare, rubbish, no-one cares and then at the end of the day they end up getting scrapped [...] Stuff dies off that you never see them again [...]. Just, ‘What is this random car that you have got?’, ‘Oh I paid like 50 quid for it, but it is one of 50 million and there is about three left’. [...] Just unloved rubbish.

Within this framing, restoration work became a process of re-inscribing love through careful husbandry (Nelson, 2015). For other students, such as Alberto, love facilitated giving the unglamorous part of the work the attention required. For example, love turned a task that many trainees talked about as testing their patience and one prone to frustrating mistakes into something enjoyable:
ALBERTO: I like the preparation of [the car for painting], where you need to stroke the shape and you need to use your hand to feel. That I love. It’s the part that I enjoy the most.

By imbuing the work with care, Alberto transforms a potentially tedious manual job, the preparation of a car for paint, into an opportunity to caress and restore the smooth veneer of an object of beauty. Later in the interview he insisted that to do work properly it was necessary to ‘be a maniac’, or care deeply.

Finally, love was believed to mediate the marketplace in which trainees’ future labour would be exchanged (i.e. sold as a service), elevating the work from its objective material context – most likely to involve relatively low hourly wages (notwithstanding talk about expected skills premiums) and fluctuating custom. In part this occurred because the cars, from their inception, were seen as imbued with ‘heart input’ by ‘artist’ makers and therefore removed from, or at least not fully reducible to, the logic of commodity production and exchange:

MARK: The car designers of the past, they were artists. […] today it’s all wind tunnel and computer design and there’s not really a heart input.

Here, repair activity was framed as not purely transactional, with clients paying for work, but rather as participation in a community of those who also ‘love’ classic cars. Such a depiction aligns with scholarship that notes how ‘maker cultures […] celebrate forms of proximate sociality […] and forge closer connections between producers and consumers’ (Warren and Gibson, 2014, cited in Carr and Gibson, 2016: 300) and that restoration ‘links skilled restorers to communities of enthusiasm’ (Delyser
and Greenstein, 2017:1461). For instance, Alberto likened car-love to love for a
daughter and expected the same or similar from future clients.

ALBERTO: It is on same level [...] as your daughter, okay? You’re dealing
with these people who are giving you their love and you need to take care of
it, and lots of people [...] they want perfection, they don’t mind. For example,
there are some restoration costs that they go over the value itself for the car,
you will never do that on a normal modern car.

The gendered nature of this coming from a childless man is notable, but for our
purposes, more relevant is the acknowledgement that classic car owners care and that
this changes the relationship into one of shared husbandry, in which value is not
directly driven by commodity pricing. The love and social meaning attached to the
repair-object by clients gave repair work a mission beyond the accrual of wages:

UMAIR: Like somebody that might have had that car so many years ago and
they might have had some memories in there and they’d like to bring them
memories back.

Unlike enthusiast vehicle restorers who ‘pursue their hobbies because they want
to, never because they have to’ (DeLyser and Greenstein, 2017:1463) and who typically
work on their own loved cars, those who seek to earn a living from repair activity may
encounter clients who are less devoted. Trainees’ positive imaginings of future work
sought to resolve this potential conflict. For instance, Roberto, one of the youngest
trainees, claimed that he would turn down large restoration jobs if they involved
working on a car that was not be appropriately loved:

ROBERTO: I would even prefer to do pieces [small jobs] because you aren’t going to spend one year or two years, even if you are well-paid, fixing a car for some guy who really doesn’t care about the car. It’s like, you spend one or two years doing a project or a research and then the guy is ‘Oh, very nice’ and puts it in a drawer.

Similarly, Matej and Alfie envisioned that they could keep their work good by avoiding clients who do not recognise the sanctity of the loved object and/or make inappropriate requests, even if in exercising such unwillingness to succumb to customer ‘sovereignty’ (Korczynski and Ott, 2006) entailed financial sacrifice:

MATEJ: …it is like this colossal thing, millions and millions of dollars for these Ferraris and then some person buys them who doesn’t even appreciate them, just the snob value for him that is it. So, no. I would rather keep it more humble and deal with people who can appreciate it and the work and stuff. That would give me the freedom to work on stuff I like to work on not on stuff that…

ALFIE: …is just going to sit in someone’s living room to look good, to impress people, they are not designed to do that.

MATEJ: I would hate to do stuff like somebody comes here and ‘okay do this car in pink for me’ and I would be like, ‘That car really shouldn’t be pink’. …I like to be able to choose, actually, clients, where I like their requests because I find some people
just don’t have a very good sense of what is appropriate to do to cars.

Yet other trainees found ways to interpret the requirement for love differently. For instance, Dylan recognized customers’ love as a legitimate reason to overcome his own reluctance to perform ‘unsuitable’ work that he felt might spoil the object:

DYLAN: I am kind of learning that other people have got their heart it in so you kind of have to put your heart in it, so I learnt that from that. […] because if you don’t love it you are not going to end up doing a good job.

In this view, the particular shape of the love for the repair object could vary as long as the love itself was real. Real love in turn was key to making work good.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

The detailed accounts we solicit in interviews from the classic car restoration trainees in their final week of instruction at the College provide a multi-layered sense of how they come to see repair as good work. The themes that emerge from their reflections closely reflect Carr’s (2016:3) observation that repair and restoration provide grounds for ‘re-valuing the prosaic skills and dispositions that industrial life has historically engendered’ and speak directly to Dant’s (2010) call to revalue repair by recognizing how it ‘involves complex human qualities, which maximise the skills and autonomy of the worker’. We observe that these complex human qualities include toiling humans as sentient beings, with trainees’ accounts providing a rich array of emotive commentary about learning to repair and restore a special object and about imagined futures practicing what they have learned. In the multifaceted emotional connotations of repair work, we note, in particular, the varied ways in
which trainees underscore love.

We consequently argue, with Nelson (2015), that masculine care, emotions, and love are chronically understudied but relevant aspects of work, and are necessary for an analysis of what makes work, especially repair work, good. In the case studied, craft skills and love were transformational, elevating mundane, dirty work through interactions with the loved-object, the classic car, through the exercise of embodied skill (Wolkowitz, 2006) and by developing confidence and legitimacy through experiential learning (Brockmann, 2010).

Our analysis has focused on repairers (and restorers)-in-training. This matters in several ways. First, although the course under study was rare rather than commonplace, the experiences of those who located it (often after much searching) and who made the commitment to pursue it (often undertaking substantial living rearrangements) are helpful in understanding how training in repair and restoration can be attractive to new entrants. The case highlights the importance of formal institutions of education and training structures for the inculcation of repair skills and the future of a repair workforce, somewhat irrespective of institutions’ role in conferring qualifications. Recent scholarship has noted that manual craft skills can survive as part of ‘material inheritances’, ‘reconfigured in place over successive generations’ (Gibson, 2016: 61), but these can prove vulnerable. As a generation of car repairers with relevant skills age out of active work, and cars evolve in ways that make them irreparable, the use of repair skills across communities (Carr, 2017) and opportunities for informal learning-by-tinkering on cars is put at risk. In this context, where repair skills are not ‘slow variables’ (Bottazzi et al., 2007:652) and can quickly disappear, institutions of vocational training and adult education become more important, and should be recognized alongside celebrated amateur enthusiasms, in the (re)production of repair and repair skills.

Second, if trainees provide a glimpse of the future workforce, a glaring feature in our case despite diversity across age, class, nationality and employment history, is the near total
invisibility of women. This mirrors the existing labour force in vehicle mechanics and repair, both classic car and modern, where women comprised only two percent according to the 2011 UK Census (Office for National Statistics, 2013). Since craft skills provide links with past traditions, the replication of traditional gender roles among new entrants to an array of craft-based work – from carpentry to knitting – remains a real possibility. Whether a resurgence of craft, including repair, can involve a more radical redefinition of such work is worthy of debate.

Third, and most substantially, trainees are an especially interesting group to study with respect to the understanding and experience of work, because they are in a liminal position. They are engrossed in work tasks as material activity yet largely abstracted from employment structures. They have projections into and expectations from the future, which in our case both explain their paths into classic car repair and their understanding of this as good work, but also foreshadow potential conflicts and tensions in their future experiences, and hence the viability of their continued work in repair. Specifically, we foresee two intertwined ‘tests’ for the love that is so central to trainees’ accounts – time and money – eternal, if clichéd, tests for love.

DeLyser and Greenstein (2017:1475) note that ‘love can be fickle – it is not always sustained over time’ and observe that a life of (vehicle) restoration demands devotion. It was too early to say how love would evolve for our trainees who, despite their age spread had not come from a lifetime of repair and restoration. Their relationship with the materiality of the classic car had been limited at the time of research and most had not yet, for example, faced resistant solutions or needed to display the patience entailed in restoration projects spanning many years, as discussed by DeLyser and Greenstein. If love is so central to rendering repair work good, waning romance or souring emotions may demote it back to being dirty, routine, disenchanted. Indeed, the possibility of love waning was visible even over the duration of
training. Aaron had joined the course from retail employment seeking good work, yet by the
time of interview had already changed his mind and enrolled at university for the ensuing
year.

The durability of love and romance in repair work, i.e. the test of time for repair as
good work, is closely related to how this is mediated by money; how repair work relates to
repair jobs and how good work relates to good jobs. If ‘restoration is a form of making
practiced by enthusiasts, one successful only with love’ (DeLyser and Greenstein,
2017:1462), can repair only be good work when it is purely a ‘labour of love’ (DeLyser and
Greenstein, 2015), freed from the demands of income generation and unfettered by a concern
with monetary returns?

For many trainees good work was at least partially, divorced from the financial
rewards of a job, but this varied significantly. For Hobbyists, retirees with a history of well-
paid work and comfortable pensions, it was entirely the case. For Career Changers it was
partly true. Often with previous experiences of relatively stable and well-paid employment,
Career Changers understood a good job as something that they (believed they) would love.
For many of them the identification of classic car restoration as a possible solution involved
looking backwards, to a childhood passion or an imagined career that had seemed irrational
or had been blocked. When they focused on employment, Career Changers tended to talk not
about good pay or job security, but on an imagined lifestyle: including the ability to work
from home; to work shorter hours; to fit their work around a partner’s. But employability was
front and centre for Career Seekers. Without previous steady work, or reliant on poorly paid
jobs, their understanding of good work was much more linked to expected access to jobs or
concrete plans for the following year such as an apprenticeship or a further year of training.
Thus, while all Career Seekers discussed the emotional and craft elements highlighted above,
and did so with enthusiasm and passion, they did so less frequently than the Career Changers.
This highlights the primacy of basic economic stability; for those without this security employability and the possibilities of a steady job remained primary goals. Love, therefore, figured in different ways in relation to the different priorities of trainees on different trajectories.

The love that for the trainees rendered classic car repair good work by allowing them to imagine relationships with future clients as not wholly transactional is also prone to be challenged in the context of repair jobs. The repair objects studied here, classic cars, already have material and social lives. They have been, and often still are, owned, used and loved (or unloved). Their repair or restoration, therefore, involves an embodied and sensual, but also social and emotional connection to the object of repair that links past and present (Carr 2016), engendering real and imagined social relations between current, previous and future owners and workers. When these relationships involve paid work they can enchant, but may also produce tensions, especially where the love of one party is judged insufficient or when there are different ways to love the same car.

This brings us to an important corrective and one worth underscoring: the argument made above, that love (or craft skills) might be a compensation – a means by which poorly paid work becomes seen as good work – is not meant to legitimate continued poor pay, nor less suggest that workers are responsible for making their work better by finding ways to love it more. We fully recognise that love is a compensation that is limited, context-specific and underpinned by workers’ alternatives, or absence of alternatives. A relevant illustration comes from research on domiciliary care where care workers report caring about their clients and score highly for job satisfaction, despite poor pay and conditions. Yet Hebson et al. (2015) have shown that such positive reports should be read in the context of predominantly working-class female workers’ seriously constrained socio-economic choice. Thus, the extent to which positive emotions enable poorly compensated work to be satisfying or good work
will vary with workers’ alternative options or lack thereof. In our case that includes trainees’ (lack of) alternative economic options, but also their previous work experiences and the constraints and possibilities imposed by coordinating with other household members. Our study serves as a reminder that we cannot simply extrapolate insights from studies of unpaid craft (e.g. Inkson 1987) or repair work (e.g. DeLyser and Greenstein, 2015; 2017) to paid work.

We need to also underline the specificity of the material object in this study. The classic car is a special repair object; the ‘material mystique of the motorcar’ (Urry, 2006) is intensified in it through aesthetic and historical distinctions. Other repair objects may not solicit the love that classic cars do and are unlikely to be as evocative, aesthetically or personally. The repair of other objects may not involve the satisfying practice of craft skills or be as learnable, and therefore be neither as fulfilling nor as viable as employment. Finally, there may not be as clearly definable, self-reflexive or love-saturated community around many other repair-objects. Lacking these qualities, an array of other repairable objects may not be deemed worthy of repair, nor seen as repair-objects in the first place. Thus, our observations about the way elements of craft, care and love render repair work good work may not be immediately or fully relevant to all forms of repair.

Nevertheless, some of the ideals underpinning trainees’ understandings of their work as good work have wider resonance, including joy in possessing and practicing craft skills, emotional engagement with objects and their personal, social and cultural evocations, and the constitution of communities around craft skills and objects of love. The future of repair work, both paid and unpaid, including whether and how it can be good work and seen to be such, will depend in large part on how repair activity is valorized, economically and socially. We hope the insights here prove helpful in such an effort.
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Table I: Interviewees, classic car restoration course trainees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Previous employment</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Previously living</th>
<th>Pathway into classic car repair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alfie</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Part-time Retail</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>South Coast</td>
<td>Career Seeker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Family’s company (vehicle components)</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Career Changer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake*</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Marquee set up, building company, fish and chip shop</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Shropshire</td>
<td>Career Changer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Unemployed, warehouse work</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Career Seeker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Part-time Retail</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Norwich / South Coast</td>
<td>Career Changer (Hobbyist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matej</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Journalism university student</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Career Changer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieran*</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Team leader at corporate office</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Career Changer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvio</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Turf business (owner); Yacht painting</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Career Changer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umair</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Call centres, warehouses, building</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Career Seeker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dylan</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Cabinet maker</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Ireland / York</td>
<td>Career Changer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Café manager</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Career Changer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah*</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Hatchery worker</td>
<td>British / Zimbabwean</td>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>Career Changer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ski lift mechanic, engineering</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Career Changer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Police Emergency call handler</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Career Changer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Construction (Middle East)</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Career Changer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahad</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Carpenter, furniture factory</td>
<td>Russia, Northern Caucasus</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Career Seeker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menelaos*</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Serial entrepreneur (IT, restaurant, catering)</td>
<td>British / Cypriot</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Career Changer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Mini parts supplier. Informal restoration</td>
<td>British / Swiss / German / French</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Career Improver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Educational Psychologist – Retired</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Peak District</td>
<td>Hobbyist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>RAF (Retired)</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Hobbyist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * Interviews conducted in Spring 2016. All other interviews conducted in Spring 2015. Pseudonyms are used for all participants.
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