

The view that post-war style offered young people an opportunity to construct new identities not bound by tradition or habit (Featherstone, 1991a) but rather by a newly experienced consumer reflexivity is also supported by Chambers (1985), who suggests that: 'In contrast to the anonymous drudgery of the working week, selected consumer objects provide the possibility of moving beyond the colourless walls of routine into the bright environs of an imaginary state' (p. 17). Similarly, Miles (1995), in considering the CCCS's equation of consumption with resistance, argues that such an approach 'concentrate[] on

bolic aspects of sub-cultural consumption at the expense of the actual meanings that young consumers have for the goods that they consume' (p. 35). Finally, Frith (1983) suggests that:

The problem is to reconcile adolescence and subculture. Most working-class teenagers pass through groups, change identities, play their leisure roles for fun; other differences between them – Sex, occupation, family are much more significant than distinctions of style. For every youth 'stylist' committed to a cult as a full-time creative task, there are hundreds of working-class kids who grow up in a loose membership of several groups and run with a variety of gangs. There's a distinction here between a vanguard and a mass, between uses of leisure within subcultures. (pp. 219–20)

The issue of young people playing their 'subcultural' roles for 'fun' is never really considered by the CCCS. Similarly, the issue of passing through one's youth without ever being a committed stylist, or belonging to a group or gang, is given only a cursory mention in *Resistance Through Rituals*. Indeed, it is significant in this respect that a second edited volume on youth culture, Mungham and Pearson's *Working Class Youth Culture*, also published in 1976, has received far less attention despite its more sustained focus on the mundane practices of ordinary young people. In relation to this point, Murdock and McCron, two of the contributors to Mungham and Pearson's volume, argue that the formulation of 'class' upon which the CCCS subcultural theory is based may, in itself, be a rather oversimplistic model that glosses over significant variations in class sensibilities. Thus, they argue, the CCCS model:

tends to draw too tight a relation between class location and sub-cultural style and to underestimate the range of alternative responses. The problem is not only to explain why styles such as the mods or the skinheads developed within a particular class strata at the times and in the forms they did, but also to explain why adolescents in essentially the same basic class location adopted other modes of negotiation and resolution (Murdock and McCron, 1976, p. 25).