

Practice-Based Research Degree Students in Art and Design: Identity and Adaptation

John Hockey

Abstract

Within the United Kingdom higher education system there has been a recent growth in practice-based research degrees in art and design. This constitutes a relatively recent innovatory step in doctoral education, with students now able to submit for examination a written thesis combined with practical work in over forty academic departments. It also constitutes an intellectual innovation in terms of attempting to combine the creative impulse with traditional research criteria such as the need for systematic analysis, documentation, theorisation and so on. To-date little has been written about research

students adaptation to such practice-based research degrees, and so, in order to chart the experiences of such students, qualitative interviews were undertaken with 50 research students at various UK universities. This paper based on those interviews examines one dimension of how students adapt to this kind of study, focusing on their conceptions of identity.

Introduction

Research into the field of United Kingdom doctoral education has developed considerably in the last decade, with bodies of evidence on the student experience now available in the natural [1] and social sciences [2] as well as humanities [3]. This same period, particularly its latter half, has also seen the growth of research degrees in art and design, specifically in terms of practice-based research (as distinct from art history). It is now possible to study for a practice-based doctorate in over forty departments [4]. There is presently a small literature on this particular form of study, some of which is concerned with developing research protocols, regulations, and training programmes [5]. Attention has also been paid to supervision [6] and the provision of resources to aid students [7]. Empirical research on students' actual experience of doing art and design practice-based research is sparse to say the least [8]. Given that research on the student experience of studying for this kind of practice-based doctorate was (and still is) underdeveloped, a research project was initiated with the aim of producing some empirical literature on the topic.

The research

During 1995–97 research was carried out involving qualitative interviewing of 50 research students, who were located at 25 UK higher education institutions. Interviews were in-depth, semi-structured and tape-recorded, lasting between 60 and 90 minutes. Subsequently they were transcribed. Students interviewed covered the whole spectrum of art and design disciplines, and included: painting, ceramics, installation, photography, printmaking, sculpture, glass making and design. Those interviewed also embraced a continuum ranging from individuals in their first year of study, to those who were about to submit their work a number of years hence. In addition 20 of the students were studying part-time, and amongst these there was considerable experience of earning salaries via their creative endeavour. The purpose of these interviews was to gain an understanding of student experience

and the interview agenda covered such topics as: relationships with supervisors, relationships between practice (making) and theory, between practice and peers, between practice and the self, conceptions of identity and between practice and writing. Given the paucity of the information available on these students, the aim of the project was not statistical in terms of producing generalisations. Rather, the focus was upon uncovering something of the complexity of students' academic lives as they toiled toward doctoral status. In common with much qualitative research, extrapolation from the data relies on the validity of the analysis rather than the representativeness of the events [9]. Data analysis was carried out via the constant comparative method [10]. Data collection and data analysis were sequential, hence as data was collected, it was also analysed through an ongoing process of coding. Subsequently, the detailed coding allowed the generation of key thematic categories and subcategories of the students' lived experience. This process of analysis continued until no new categories, in terms of social processes, practices and conceptions, were emerging from the data [11]. What follows is based on data emanating from the aforementioned interviews, and focuses upon a central dimension of student experience, namely the impact this kind of degree study has upon their identity, and how that impact is managed.

Creative identity

When interviewed, students predominantly expressed a particular way of describing themselves, which was central to their individual and collective biography, and which heavily influenced their experience of doing graduate research. All of them had been initially socialised via their undergraduate degree [12] into the world of creative practice. As a result, without exception, they individually described themselves as a creative person or individual, often also depicting themselves as a sculptor, painter, designer, photographer and so on.

As Jenkins [13] notes, the concepts 'self' and 'identity' can be argued to be co-terminous and that self is 'each individual's reflexive sense of her

or his own particular identity, constituted *vis a vis* others in terms of similarity and difference.' This internal understanding of a fully reflexive self is simultaneously then a product of social interaction, out of which it emerges [14]. The data thus revealed that a creative identity was paramount to those interviewed. Central to this conception was the activity of creative practice, without which their conception of identity seemed to be problematic. They constantly stressed the importance of the process of 'making' for the ongoing validation of the creative self. Students repeatedly articulated the meaning of using their hands creatively in many ways, and there was much emphasis upon the hands-eyes relationship and the importance of being skilled in visual language. Seeing and then doing with the hands (in a multiplicity of forms) constituted the core of their creative identity. Whilst there was also involvement in subsidiary activities such as teaching, selling their work or curatorial activity, which also helped substantiate this identity, it was evident that self-validation hinged upon the 'making'. Overwhelmingly all their experience of academia was permeated by a concern with the visual both in terms of making and of language. In effect, they saw the world in a very particular way, viewing it via a particular disciplinary lens [15]. In the UK, undergraduate degrees in art and design have paid less attention to the development of writing skills, than in other disciplines. Indeed at Masters level, practice-only degrees are also widespread, so it is possible for students to complete two degrees with only a minimal written component. With two exceptions (whose background was primarily in art history), the students interviewed could not be considered skilled in academic writing.

In a sense the interviewees constituted a 'naive' population in relation to the rigours of completing a research degree. Whilst a certain naivety is characteristic of graduate research students in general, the specific problem for the art and design students was to develop new skills in creating text and to combine these with their

familiar creative practice. Whilst practice was undoubtedly central to their research, so also was the analytical portrayal and contextualisation of that practice. This constituted the demonstrable evidence required of a research degree. In this context, writing and analysis are combined in a single process. This was encountered as a new demand upon students to engage with a different kind of practice, full of unknown and little understood elements. Developing the craft of academic writing is a difficult enough task for students whose disciplines demand a high facility in writing at undergraduate level, but for art and design students it constitutes a particularly daunting task, which produces a reality 'shock' [16] to their artistic identity. This 'shock' was composed of a number of elements, some of which will be examined.

The elements of 'shock'

At its most general level, this shock can be attributed to the fact that students suddenly find themselves in a situation of unfamiliarity. The processes of art and/or design are known territory to them, and they are skilled in negotiating the pathways to successful making. Whilst there might on occasion be considerable struggle with the making, there is also an intimacy with it, and a confidence in their creative ability; an understanding of the boundaries they need to extend; a knowledge of the possibilities and limitations of the materials with which they work. In contrast, when encountering 'research', where they must defend their work to an academic audience in a particular analytical fashion, students were suddenly faced with an unfamiliar situation in which they were in the main largely inexperienced to say the least.

This new status had a considerable impact upon most of the students interviewed, many of whom had, in one way or another, made their living as practising artists and designers. However, in relation to research methodology, conceptual and theoretical resources, and the central craft of analytical writing, they were novices. An unfamiliar intellectual terrain stretched before them,

which they needed to chart and to combine with their traditional making, in order to gain a research degree. Whilst some of these problems could, and would be remedied by the institution, for example by the provision of general research methods courses (which, however, were often not well orientated towards art and design students), the craft of analysis and writing remained a daunting challenge. Individual and collective confidence was suddenly under threat. The contrast with students' 'artistic' status, experience and feelings prior to commencing the research degree was particularly marked. The following interview extract illustrates this realisation:

It may sound a bit big-headed but I know I'm known in the artistic world. I've had a lot of shows of my work and I know that it's well regarded.. The problem with doing this (research degree) is you are suddenly nothing!... What it means is that I am a novice at doing research, it's a bit disconcerting ... The contrast is a bit difficult because I am struggling with it and of course I feel inept.

In conjunction with this kind of anxiety another fear haunted students throughout their period of study. Despite their involvement with academic research, none of the group interviewed had altered their conception of identity, as above all, being a creative person remained paramount to them. As a result, the evaluation of the wider artistic community of peers remained an important concern. The interviews revealed a continuing anxiety that prolonged involvement in research work might eventually be to the detriment of their practice, so that the wider community would judge negatively the creative component of the research degree. Students feared that they would also fail against their own criteria. The sheer amount of time and energy necessary for the practice of research is initially and continually a shock to students; time and energy which, from their perspective, could be devoted solely to propelling the creative practice.

A further shock to students was the regulatory framework of a research degree, the most constraining element of which is usually a formal registration document, which outlines in some detail the proposed project. This document imposes certain kinds of boundaries to the research at its onset, and from the students' viewpoint this immediately constrains their creative expression, which hitherto has been largely unfettered. Moreover, in some instances students claimed that the nature of the regulatory framework, and the predominance of non art and design staff upon the scrutinising committees, pressured them into devising research projects which were more conservative than they would have wished:

I didn't have the freedom I had before just to make things as I felt... Well I had to justify everything and timetable it and all that. I sort of felt a slave to it, and to some extent still do, you know, caged in. The whole business of getting it (the project) through committees, and conforming to regulations is constraining.

Disquiet at the constraints imposed by such institutional frameworks is perhaps inevitable, for, as Bourdieu [17] has noted of people in the creative arts:

The pure intention of the artist is that of a producer who aims to be autonomous, that is entirely the master of his (sic) own products, who tends to reject not only the programmes imposed a priori by scholars and scribes, but also... the interpretations superimposed a posteriori on his (sic) work.

Regardless of the type of project they were undertaking, eventually all the students encountered the problem of analytic documentation and recording of demonstrable evidence in some form or another. Whilst artists and designers have traditionally kept notepads and sketchbooks, the systematic reflexivity of practice required by formal research enquiry was a surprise to all the interviewees. When asked about progress in the

process of their making they articulated its nature with words such as, 'momentum', 'on a run', 'on a roll', and 'seamless', conditions which approximate Csikszentmihalyi's [18] concept of flow. In such circumstances, when the act of making reaches its zenith, students become at one with it, lost in it, fused with it and creative output is achieved.

For those interviewed, systematic analytic documentation posed a large problem as it required breaking the flow, disturbing the momentum of making, and tearing oneself away from an activity central to artistic identity. Whilst some of the projects were more amenable to systematic documentation (for example, the design of functional objects or the testing of particular materials), others which fell towards the fine art end of the spectrum, were much less so. Moreover, regardless of the kind of project pursued, the breaking of momentum in order to undertake analysis was initially disturbing and always difficult. This was particularly so when the making was going well, headway was being achieved, and the creative boundaries were being extended, for then analytical documentation constituted a distraction, a step backwards from being engaged with materials, objects and processes. The quality of such making generates fulfilment for the maker, so there was inevitably considerable reluctance to break the creative momentum.

Such movement from what might be termed the subjective to more objective dimensions entailed other problems. Having to shift one's thinking towards explanation and evidence generated fears that, by coming to understand analytically and in considerable detail how their making was constructed and how it was situated within wider intellectual contexts, the essence of student's creative powers would be diminished. There were fears that creativity would be frozen by objectivity. This fear was intimately connected to the level of self-disclosure, in terms of ideas and emotions, and their relationship to making. The levels of self-disclosure with which individuals were comfortable varied with the kind of

projects undertaken. For students whose main focus was the actual process of making per se (e.g. ceramics development), such anxiety was at a relatively low level. In contrast, for those concerned primarily with the impact of what they created upon an audience (e.g. fine art), the anxiety was more intense:

I'm used to nudes but this is like being nude in a different way...I find it all a bit difficult, recording all this stuff about my motives, influences, about my choices, you know colour and shape and what not. And I'm also scared about what all this is doing to the work...You have to have some mystery you know, what's art without a little mystery? And that's not just for people who are going to come and look at it. I need some mystery for me, I need to keep some of it, and because it's from here that the spark comes!

In sum, students encounter a number of problems which collectively generate a shock and challenge to their artistic identity, for they have to engage with unfamiliar research processes and procedures, which have a disturbing impact upon that identity in the ways illustrated. How students engaged with, and resolved the encounter with the previously unexplored dimension of research will now be depicted.

Forms of adaptation

Analysis of the interviews revealed three principal ways in which students engaged with undertaking research, ways in which their creative identity came to terms with this new activity. Firstly, there was a small minority of full-time students within whose vocabulary of motives [19] the possession of a research degree was a low priority. Their primary reason for working at an educational institution was not to pursue research, nor to acquire an advanced qualification, but rather the pursuit of their creative practice. This was their central motive and other motives were either assigned a low priority or were absent entirely. These students had been attracted to the prospect of

three years of funding, enabling the further development of their creative practice. This was an attractive proposition, particularly in a context of the financial difficulties that normally face most artists and designers in the UK. In addition, the level of resourcing, in terms of materials and studio space allocated to them as part of their bursary, was also a considerable incentive.

To these individuals, pursuing a research degree was to some extent incidental. In a sense they did not take seriously their formal involvement, what one might term their institutional contract. Their objective was to push the boundaries of their creative practice as far as possible in the time in which they received funding and resources. They either held this stance initially, viewing their studentship as too good an opportunity to miss, regardless of the concomitant expectations; or in contrast, they developed this position as the realities of doing research started to impinge upon their creative work and identities, as previously depicted. In both cases the costs of research in terms of time, energy, creative freedom, and methodological exposure, were viewed as too high to bear. As a result, such individuals were essentially 'passing' [20] as graduate students. They harboured no serious intent to pursue their declared research project; their concern was to enhance their practice. However, paradoxically, where they were seriously engaged was in relation to the work required to continue passing, and thus to continue to receive institutional support. Their capacity to 'pass' was helped by operating in a context where there were few experienced supervisors and little development in research methodology specific to practice-based art and design. So, delay, deception, and minimal research activity were tactics deployed within the general strategy [21] of passing, as one student explained:

The truth is I'm not here to get a PhD, I'm here to do my work, and I've never thought otherwise. Getting any money to do art is very difficult and I saw this studentship advertised so I just went for

it... I have to do just enough to satisfy X (supervisor) and that way, I'll keep on getting my grant. Sometimes I feel a bit guilty about it because he's a nice person, but not enough for me to give up this chance to progress with my work. It didn't take me very long to understand that these kind of practice-driven degrees are new here and because of that staff are working in the dark a lot.

Amongst those interviewed were students who had accomplished such passing for two years, and were hopeful of a third. However, another student interviewed subsequently had his bursary withdrawn on the grounds of 'insufficient progress'. In this case his ability to 'pass' had reached its limit. As a group, these students had made a decision not to let the research process impinge upon their work and upon their sense of self, their creative identity.

One of the reasons for taking on these kinds of students may be a certain lack of quality control at the admission stage. Practice-based degrees and their supervision are still at a relatively early stage of their development in the UK, a state of affairs endured at one time or another by other disciplines [22]. It is therefore perhaps not surprising that there should be some evidence of uncertain quality control in the selection of research students at this stage of development. After all, the social sciences, with over fifty years of experience of research degree work, were found wanting in terms of the performance of doctoral students and have been complying with quality control measures enforced by the ESRC since 1985 [23].

A second kind of adaptation to the demands of research was evident from the interviews, where students were prepared to grapple with both the objective and subjective dimensions of combining systematic analysis with creative expression. After a process of struggle, they had come to terms with this necessary synthesis, and had developed a method particular to their own projects. As a result they were making headway in their study, chapters were being written,

artefacts created, and processes understood. From their point of view some competence had been achieved in mastering previously unfamiliar research skills, via much hard work and considerable soul-searching.

This achievement had, however, involved costs in relation to their creative work. They viewed their creative work as being either in stasis or propelled in directions they would not have wanted, due to the demands of the research. There was evidence in the interviews of considerable ambivalence towards the acquisition of research skills and the progress of their research degree. Whilst there was some satisfaction at having achieved new competencies, at the same time students experienced uneasiness at the costs of that achievement. These students displayed considerable pragmatism and instrumentalism [24] in pursuing research degrees. Once the shock of new demands had been encountered, they adapted by conforming and meeting the criteria necessary for success, many motivated by the perception that a research degree would aid in acquiring an academic position. The long-term prospect of pursuing their creative practice, with institutional support, was indeed an attractive proposition to many, even if it required shorter term sacrifices. This is a similar perspective to some of the jazz musicians studied by Becker [25], who, out of economic necessity played more conservative music than they would have chosen. Like those musicians, the students had to handle their feelings about such compromises, whether in relation to their making, or the way they had devised a research methodology for their project that restricted or diverted the direction of their work, for example:

Well that more or less coincided with living in a house with a bunch of postgrad scientists, and finding out from them about the ways they go about testing things, you know materials, conditions, all those sort of procedural things. I saw that I could apply that way of doing things to my research, if I changed its emphasis. In a way it's

copping-out because the actual making has gone nowhere... I took the easy way out and I am not happy about that, it's as if I have become timid.

In coming to terms with these kinds of feelings about themselves and their work, students used a general device, as became apparent from interview analysis. In a sense, students perceived the period of their research degree as a suspension of their true creative activity, and of their true creative selves. Phrases such as, 'this is not really my art', and 'this is not really me,' were commonly used to describe a state of separation, a divorce of what was happening, from what should be happening. The future was presented as the site of a resurrection, beyond the constraints of the research degree process, when the real creative self would once again flower, unfettered, unrestrained by the bureaucratic, the analytic and the pragmatic.

These responses constitute a 'technique of neutralisation' [26], or in Goffman's [27] terms methods of role distance used to justify to the self and to an external audience the choices which have been made. Such neutralisation serves to ease the sense of loss, the sadness and even the guilt that often accompanies enforced pragmatic behaviour. There is a distancing of the earlier, relatively spontaneous, uninhibited self from the constrained, pragmatic self and its more instrumental making. By this means the truly creative self is not lost but rather suspended in limbo until the research degree process is completed. For whilst there is a neutralisation, there is also an optimism present, for what one was before, one will eventually return to in the future. Interestingly, research as a process was seen by these students, as a 'one time', *ad hoc* endeavour, because from their perspective the creative costs of involvement in it were judged to be too high, and unlikely ever to be repeated.

A third kind of adaptation to the new research status involved students undergoing a series of struggles and tribulations in trying to marry research with creative endeavour, and success-

fully to incorporate the two aspects in intellectual and practical terms. For these students there was also an additional change in their subjectivity. They began to connect in an emotional way with being both a researcher and a creative person. Rather than viewing the costs of involvement in research as too much to bear, the struggle with research and its linkage to their making came to be viewed as essentially productive. This gain was made not just in pragmatic terms (furthering the research degree) but also in creative headway. Rather than distancing themselves from the research component, these students positively embraced it. Thus students not only learned how to do research in practical terms, but also began to identify with being researchers. This identification was fostered by a number of factors.

Gradually, as this group of students struggled with new skills and procedures and began to understand the nature of research, they learned to see its creative possibilities by using these new research elements more fully to understand and give momentum to their making. They begin to trace affinities between the actual making and the research process itself:

There's colours, shapes, forms and textures. You have to weave them all, so the difficult thing is in making the choices and then putting it all together, working out how they are all going to fit with each other. It took me some time and then I realised that's what doing research is like, it's like a collage, you fit things together, you look at the bits and you move them around, and then you try again until you are satisfied. I was much happier when I made that connection.

Once this realisation was reached, students began to conceptualise research itself as a creative process, not just a mechanical or technical one, and similarities between their making and this new endeavour gradually became evident. This affinity helped foster increased empathy towards the research. Interestingly, the term which was widely used by students once

they had reached this position, was that of likening research to a craft; a point long ago made by Mills [28].

Analytical writing subsequently became perceived as a central practice by which their making was understood and communicated; a practice which is creative per se, and which enhances both visual and practical creativity. As a result, the students concerned felt empowered by their involvement in research. The capacity to understand their work via formal analysis permitted them to propel their work in directions they had not previously envisaged. Moreover, this deeper understanding of their work helped build increased confidence: in situating the work within its wider context or history, in describing its precise amalgamation of elements and in the choices made in its construction.

This analytic confidence resulted in a more developed capacity to articulate and justify their making, both to themselves and within the public domain. The result of this new understanding and empowerment was that students began to see themselves as individuals possessing an analytic as well as a creative capacity. In this sense they begin to identify with being researchers and to incorporate that identification within their traditional identity of being a printmaker, photographer, designer, sculptor and so on. For this group of students, the gains had been greater than the costs of doing a research degree and they held essentially optimistic views about undertaking further research in the future.

Conclusion

When individuals enter a new domain requiring new skills and processes, there are often gains to be made, and on occasion negative consequences to be avoided or tolerated. Studying for a practice-based research degree in art and design harboured both of these possibilities. For all the students studied, engagement in academic research involved some degree of risk, either in terms of failure to pass and consequent dénouement, or in terms of the negative impact

of critical analysis upon their creative capacity. As Kickbusch [29] has noted, taking certain risks may be essential to constructing particular social identities, and for some of the students interviewed, out of the process of risk and struggle was forged the basis for identification not only with the role of creative person, but also with that of researcher. Studying for this kind of research degree consequently constitutes an opportunity for a partial transformation of the self [30]. In essence it is possible to view the three forms of student adaptation to engaging with this particular form of research degree study, as the ways in which the individuals interviewed sought to achieve authenticity, of being true to self in that particular context [31]. In terms of identity salience [32] the act of making was articulated as foremost by all students interviewed, and thus of fundamental importance to their creative identity. As perhaps should be expected, the lack of a really prolonged exposure to the new craft of research, meant that even in the case of students who eventually began to identify with that craft, the composite self which emerged was one which always depicted itself as maker/researcher rather than researcher/maker.

Acknowledgement

Many thanks to Jacquelyn Allen Collinson, the other member of the research team, for her helpful comments, and to Barbara Muldarney for sterling transcription.

References

1. Pole, C. (1998) 'Technicians and Scholars in Pursuit of the PhD: Some Reflections on Doctoral Study,' *Research Papers in Education: Policy and Practice*, Vol. 15, no. 1, pp.95–111.
2. Hockey, J. (1994) 'New Territory: problems of adjusting to the first year of a social science PhD,' *Studies in Higher Education*, 19, No. 2, pp.177–190.
3. Graves, N. & Varma, V. (Eds) (1997) *Working for a Doctorate. A Guide for the Humanities and Social Sciences*. London: Routledge.
4. Candlin, F. (2000) 'Practice-based Doctorates and Questions of Academic Legitimacy', *International Journal of Art and Design Education*, Vol.19, No. 1, pp . 96–101.
5. United Kingdom Council for Graduate Education (UKCGE) (2001) *Research Training in the Creative & Performing Arts & Design*. Dudley: UKCGE.
6. Hockey, J. & Allen-Collinson, J. (2000) 'The Supervision of Practice-based Research Degrees in Art and Design,' *International Journal of Art and Design Education*, Vol.19, No. 3 , pp.345–355.
7. Newbury, D. (1996) *The Research Training Initiative: Six Research Guides*. Birmingham: Birmingham Institute of Art and Design.
8. Macleod, K. (1998) 'Research in Fine Art: theory, judgment and discourse,' *Drawing Fire*, Vol.2 , No. 2 , pp. 33–37.
9. Mitchell, J.C. (1983) 'Case and Situation Analysis,' *Sociological Review*, Vol. 31, No. 2, p. 190.
10. Glaser, B. [1993] *Basics of Grounded Theory Analysis*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
11. Creswell, J.W. (1998) *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design*. London: Sage.

12. Wayte, G. R. (1989) *Becoming An Artist: the professional socialisation of art students*. PhD thesis. University of Bristol.
13. Jenkins, R. (1996) *Social Identity*. London: Routledge, p.29.
14. Mead, G.H. (1934) *Mind, Self, and Society*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
15. Zolberg, V.L. (1990) *Constructing a Sociology of the Arts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
16. Dornbusch, S.M. (1955) 'The Military Academy as an Assimilating Institution', *Social Forces*, Vol. 33, No. 4, pp.316–321.
17. Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, p.3.
18. Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1975) *Beyond Boredom and Anxiety*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
19. Mills, C.W. (1940) 'Situating actions and vocabularies of motive', *American Sociological Review*, 5, (December), pp. 904–913.
20. Goffman, E. (1973) *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, p. 92.
21. Crow, G. (1989) 'The use of the concept strategy in recent sociological literature,' *Sociology*, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp.1–24.
22. Simpson, R. [1983] *How the PhD Came to Britain*. Guildford: Society for Research in Higher Education.
23. Collinson, J. & Hockey, J. (1995) 'Sanctions and Savings: some reflections on ESRC doctoral policy,' *Higher Education Review*, Vol.27, No. 3, pp.56–63.
24. Hill, S. (1981) *Competition and Control at Work*. London: Heinemann.
25. Becker, H.S. (1963) *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. New York: The Free Press, pp.79–100.
26. Sykes, G. & Matza, D. (1957) 'Techniques of neutralization: a theory of delinquency,' *American Sociological Review*, 22, (December), pp.664–670.
27. Goffman, E. (1961) *Encounters*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
28. Mills, C.W. (1975) *The Sociological Imagination*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
29. Kickbusch, I. (1988) 'New perspectives for research in health behaviour,' in Anderson, R. (Ed) *Health Behaviour Research and Health Promotion*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp.237–243.
30. Fox, N. (1998) 'Risks', 'Hazards' and Life Choices: Reflections on Health at Work', *Sociology*, Vol. 32, No 4, pp.665–687.
31. Howard, J.A. (2000) 'Social Psychology of Identities,' *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, pp.367–393.
32. Stryker, S. (1980) *Symbolic Interactionism: A Social Structural Version*. Menlo Park, CA: Benjamin-Cummings.