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Abstract:

This article takes the case studies of music and clothing collections in the home to explore the possibilities for developing comparative research into everyday consumption by focusing upon personal collections. Drawing on two empirical research projects, it challenges dominant understandings of collections as ‘special’ or separated off from daily practices by considering music and clothing collections as the site for everyday consumption practices as well as the locus of memories. Collections are reframed as ‘assemblages’ to explore the diverse materialities and temporalities that constitute the collections. Agency is distributed through the assemblage which allows for a problematisation of notions of individual consumer choice as the article explores the logics of the collections themselves. Focusing upon ‘collections’ paves the way for comparative work on different genres of consumption and to explore the diverse materialities of things and their relationalities. It widens our understanding of consumption to incorporate the use of things both in the enactment of daily life and which are kept or stored.
Introduction

This article builds on accounts of consumption which see it as embedded in everyday life, relationships and practices (Miller, 2009) rather than as a stand-alone field that is understood from the point of view of an individual making decisions over what to buy. A particularly influential theoretical framework within sociology has been the application of practice theory to explore consumption as the use of things in the enactment of social practices (Halkier, Katz-Gerro & Martens, 2011; Warde, 2005, 2014). This approach has paved the way for a theoretical and empirical shift from the individual consumer who is engaged in expressive acts of identity construction or differentiation to the practices of consumption that are embedded in the organisation of social and domestic life. However, if consumption is understood as the uses to which things are put, this does not fully accommodate the complexities of things that people keep but no longer ‘use’ any more. By drawing upon the case studies of music and clothing, this article demonstrates that focusing upon ‘collections’ allows us to widen our understanding of everyday domestic consumption beyond the enactment or cessation of social practices. The collection of things at rest in a wardrobe or music collection is the domain for the multifarious use of things, yet also contains items that are not worn or listened to. Focusing upon collections entails considering the totality of things - used, unused, treasured or forgotten about -
which opens up a series of issues that are central to understandings of contemporary consumption. These range from how things externalise individual and social biographies, the dynamic temporalities of consumption and storage practices through to how things accumulate in domestic spaces. Collections have been defined as a deliberately curated group of ‘special’ items (Belk, 1995) which are separated off from everyday acts of consumption. This understanding of the term would seem to preclude the use of the term ‘collection’ to understand a wardrobe, which people select clothes from daily. However, in this article we suggest that focusing on everyday collections, such as a music collection, offers important insights into the diverse temporalities of consumption (as things are used habitually or not at all) and paves the way for new methodological and empirical approaches to the study of everyday consumption. Developing this approach entails thinking differently about how we understand the term ‘collection’ in a way that is not separated off from use, and may incorporate a range of diverse temporalities, materialities and practices. We aim to rethink collections as a kind of *assemblage*, drawing from Jane Bennett’s discussion of ‘heterogeneous assemblages’ (2009: 23), where groupings include ontologically diverse members, such as people and things. Through the porosity of things and of people, things such as our clothes are not entirely separated from us as they externalise memories, former selves or
relationships. In Bennett’s formulation, the assemblage is made up of the relationships between materially vibrant elements, and it is precisely because they are vibrant that the assemblage is not permanent, but shifts. When an everyday collection is framed as an assemblage, it has the virtue of allowing a focus on the ways in which it is dynamic and shifts over time in terms of its constitution, as well as its ‘uneven topographies’ (Bennett, 2009: 24) as different constellations of things can have more power over us at different times. This dynamism arises from how we choose things, such as which CD we want to listen to, but also how things ‘call out’ to us, or we are overwhelmed by the extensiveness of a collection and ‘end up’ listening to what we usually listen to. In Bennett’s framing, agency is distributed throughout the assemblage and this theorising will be extended here to explore how everyday collections as a whole can be said to have agency, as well as individual items within this. This allows us to start to unpick notions of ‘choice’ as items in the wardrobe are actively selected from, yet also things ‘present themselves’ to people. Wardrobes and music collections have emergent properties that are open to change, stemming from what is bought and the logics of the collection itself, whether clothing spills out of drawers or socks are neatly regimented in drawers.

This article aims to demonstrate the insights afforded by adopting this theoretical approach to everyday collections and to explore future applications
to consumption studies. Firstly, we outline how approaching everyday collections as assemblages allows an understanding of both the materiality of particular things as well as the materiality of the collection as a whole. This approach allows us to think through everyday collections as incorporating things that are still materially vibrant as they age, clutter up a space, or have the power to affect people through the memories they encode. We argue that as the everyday collection is temporally dynamic - including things that are rarely used, never used or regularly drawn upon - it allows an understanding of consumption in terms of both practices of selection as well as things which accumulate or are stored. Secondly, we highlight the potential applications of this approach, as the comparative empirical work on music and clothing may pave the way for comparative research into different genres of consumption (such as music, clothing, books or films), which is an under-developed field. The article makes a case for both comparative research as well as work which widens the remit of consumption research to consider the relationships between habitually used, rarely used, and never used things. This is an empirical, theoretical and methodological approach, as we highlight the methodological impact of using collections as a basis for comparative research, and suggest that ‘collection inventories’ (a version of ‘object inventories’ exemplified in the wardrobe
interview approach, see Klepp & Bjeck, 2012) is an instructive approach to understanding everyday patterns of consumption.

**Ordinary consumption; reframing collections as dynamic assemblages**

This paper builds on the more recent shift away from an emphasis upon the ‘special’ in theories of consumption as a means of differentiation towards considerations of the ‘ordinary’, mundane and routine (cf. Gronow & Warde, 2001). These approaches critique previous emphases upon consumption as a means for the construction of identities or of individual distinction, and instead explore the ordinary in consumption which has been enabled by developments in practice theory and its application to the field of consumption (following Warde, 2005). Although neither of the empirical projects discussed in this paper are explicitly framed by a practice theory approach, they build upon the insights of this approach in the emphasis upon routines, the material and also the embeddedness of consumption practices within the organisation of domestic life. Although not a unified field, practice theory approaches share a focus upon social practices as the core unity of social analysis (Reckwitz, 2002). Social existence emerges through practices rather than through verbalised discourses, theories of social interaction or internal mental capacities. Empirical studies of consumption which adopt this approach (such as Halkier et al., 2011) explore
the multiple elements that practices entail such as bodily and mental activities, knowledges (Reckwitz, 2002) and importantly also objects and technologies (Shove et al., 2012).

Practice theory approaches entail an emphasis upon the routinized character of everyday material practices (Reckwitz, 2002) and highlight the importance of the temporal relations of what people do with material goods (see Shove et al, 2009), and fits with the approach espoused by Gronow and Warde (2001) which points towards a need to understand the ‘ordinary’ in consumption. The ordinary and mundane are still temporally dynamic even as practices persist and change over periods of time, and a person’s life course. The empirical study of wardrobes and music collections discussed in this article form part of this shift from an emphasis upon buying and consumer ‘choice’, to how consumption is embedded in everyday practices. We also share the interest in the routine as dynamic and will focus on how clothing and music are used in the present moment and in relation to future planned uses. From a practice theory framework exploring things that are kept but no longer used would be framed in terms of the cessation of particular practices, yet we would like to extend our understanding of the collection in terms of how things may embody past times and memories and relationships (such as Marcoux, 2001).
This interrogation of how relationships and former selves are embodied in clothing and music is made possible by drawing on material culture approaches which challenge an understanding of consumer goods as simply symbolic wherein objects passively ‘reflect’ an individual’s identity. Miller’s (1987) theory of objectification is useful in exploring the practices and processes of consumption. In Miller's sense, objectification can be applied to understanding consumption as this is a process through which objects are pivotal to self-construction. The self is both externalised through consumer goods and this is in turn ‘re-appropriated’ (Miller, 1987: 28), seen for example, when people refer to an item of clothing as ‘me’. How practices and selfhoods are materialised has been developed by writers such as Watson (2008) who points to the centrality of goods in the creation and maintenance of everyday life. The work of Dittmar (1991, 2004) has also demonstrated how material goods are used by people as a means of ordering and organising their daily lives as they situate themselves in their social networks. We aim to consider the things (items of clothing, vinyl/CDs) themselves as material, yet also consider the collection as a material entity. This will be developed through thinking about collections as assemblages. However, before we turn to this, we will first explore the specific literature on fashion and on music.
Music and clothing: comparative work

Both music and clothing have interdisciplinary ‘stand alone’ literatures (such as Entwistle, 2000, Crewe & Gregson, 2003 for fashion and Allett, 2012, DeNora, 2000 for music), yet as will be discussed there is a lack of direct comparative work. The approach to ordinary consumption has much resonance for studies of the consumption of clothing. The literature on the consumption of fashion and clothing has historically been trapped in a dichotomy between being seen as an overarching top-down fashion system (the legacy of Veblen, 1918 and Simmel, 1971) and the understanding of fashion as it ‘bubbles up’ (Polhemus, 1994). Recently, there has been a diversification and fragmentation of research into the multiple domains of fashion, of which consumption is one. In the wake of Barthes (1985) textual and semiotic understandings have dominated, which position fashion as communicative, whether applied to the textual analysis of magazines, or even to worn clothing (cf. Lurie, 1992), which assumes that clothing is necessarily symbolic. This mirrors wider concerns within the general sociology of consumption that we have already discussed; accounts have started to move towards an understanding of the ordinary and mundane practices of the consumption of clothing (Kuechler & Miller, 2005; Klepp & Bjerck, 2012). Entwistle’s (2000) theoretical account proposes an approach to
dressing as situated bodily practices, allowing for an understanding of fashion in terms of ordinary consumption. However, approaches such as this still consider clothing as worn and part of a presentation of the self, rather than more recent work on wardrobes investigating clothing as it is stored (Cwerner, 2001), how items are selected (Woodward, 2007, Klepp & Bjerck, 2012), and clothing that is no longer worn (Banim & Guy, 2003).

Exploring the literature on music, a similar shift can be found towards examining ‘ordinary’ modes of consumption through explorations of the multi-sensorial experiences of listening to music in everyday life. Hirschman & Holbrook’s (1982) work on hedonic consumption, which challenges traditional consumer behaviour models, has been extended to investigate music consumption in terms of multi-sensory, affective experiences (Lacher & Mizerski, 1994). Studies exploring this include Sloboda (1999) who mapped the ‘functional terrain’ of everyday music listening situations; and the ethnographic work of DeNora (2000) which focused on the role of music in the lives of American and British women in the late 1990s. In DeNora’s research (2000), music was utilised by women to change how they felt, based on both the type of music and experiences of listening and re-listening, highlighting the ways in which music is seen to be agentic (cf. Gell, 1998). DeNora’s work signifies a shift towards emphases on the everyday uses of music, and this has been picked up in recent work by
Allett (2012) whose explorations of attachments to extreme metal music using a music elicitation method have further highlighted the importance of considering sensory and affective responses to music. Magaudda (2011) engages more specifically with the question of materiality and music; by adopting a ‘theory-of-practice’ framework (cf. Warde, 2005) he explores the appropriation of digital music technologies in daily life through comparison between multiple technologies of listening to music (iPod, hard drive, vinyl records). Everyday music practices are understood as multi-sensory and materially diverse. Born (2011) explores theoretically how music materialises identity; her suggestion that it is a ‘distributed materiality’ (2011: 377) could be extended to explore the totality of a music – or clothing – collection.

There are obvious connections between the literatures on clothing and music that suggest the possibilities of a comparative approach through the focus upon the everyday, upon materiality and the multi-sensory. As it stands, there is a lack of comparative work on the consumption of these different genres of material culture (and indeed comparative work on any genres of consumption). McRobbie (1999) compares fashion, music and art in the creative industries through the examples of fashion designers and drum and bass DJs rather than the consumers of either genre. More common within the literature are considerations of fashion and music as part of the same life world, such as sub-
cultural style (Hodkinson, 2002), or works which explicitly aim to explore the affinities between the two (seen in Davis’ 2006 book on modernism). Ethnographic research, with its emphasis upon a holistic and contextualised understanding of a particular cultural context, means that it offers accounts of consumption which includes multiple genres of material culture. However, ‘holistic approaches’ rarely compare genres of consumption directly; instead particular forms of consumption practices are taken together as constituents of a specific culture, or shared norms. In Bourdieu’s sense (1977), multiple genres of material culture and consumption are facets of a particular class specific habitus that underpins these practices (see also Bennett et al., 2009).

Both Calefato (2001) and Miller (2011) offer a more direct exploration of the relationship between fashion and music. Calefato (2001) explicitly contrasts the two as if both were ‘languages’, mirroring the semiotic approach which dominates as an approach to fashion. Although implying she will consider the sensory, in the end this remains very immaterial by virtue of her overall semiotic stance. In Miller (2011), who adopts a predominantly textual approach, the focus tends to be upon how music and fashion styles cohere; consumption is considered in terms of fandom, rather than the ‘ordinary’ material consumption that this article aims to explore. This article contrasts two forms of consumption explicitly, allowing for an understanding of both similarities and also the possible
dissonances in the role each may have in the ordering of everyday life. We suggest that comparing the collections of music and clothing is a fruitful means of developing comparative approaches.

Re-framing ‘collections’

As we have suggested, much work on consumption is upon things in use by people, yet we argue that we need to look at things at rest in order to develop a wider understanding of consumption. Belk (1995) defines collections as ‘the process of actively selecting and passionately acquiring and possessing things removed from ordinary use and perceived as part of a set’ (p. 67), as items once considered mundane are redefined as having a ‘special’ status. Belk makes a contrast between the non-collector, who may hoard stuff but is not selective and items are valued for functional reasons, and the collector, who show more complex patterns of categorisation, competition, specialisation, and selectivity. Whilst there is some support for Belk’s conceptualisation of the ‘collector’ as having defined characteristics (e.g. de la Heras, 1997), this is not applicable to the ordinary wardrobe or music collection that is the source of things people may use everyday or keep and not use – problematizing any straightforward notion of ‘use’. Everyday ‘collections’ are dynamic through the
multiple practices that surround them (Gregson & Beale, 2004), and even things categorised as ‘special’ at some point may shift through changes in daily practices.

This dynamism, however, does not just come from what people do with things, as the things themselves are not passive. Bennett’s (2009) understanding of assemblages of vibrant matter offers a route into thinking about personal collections as dynamic and shifting. In Bennett’s discussion, assemblages are heterogeneous, including diverse elements of things and people, which she applies to examples such as an electricity grid (where elements include humans, trees, wind, electromagnetic fields, electrons), things washed up in a drain and to hoarders. If we think of a wardrobe as an assemblage, elements could include items of clothing, people, the wardrobe itself, dust, light and plastic clothes bags. People are part of the assemblage, as there is not always a clear separation between us and our clothing. Albeit in a different formulation, this links to Belk’s proposition that objects collected become part of the owner’s extended self (Belk, 1995), which extends temporally to past, current and future facets of the self (Hoskins, 1998). The elements within an assemblage are materially vibrant and so assemblages as a whole change. When applied to wardrobes or music collections, these everyday collections change as things
are bought or thrown out, yet also things ‘end up’ in the collections (also see Hurdley on mantle-pieces, 2013). These changes are not just as a product of human agency, as clothes may become moth eaten, or CDs damaged through light, as agency is distributed through the assemblage. Collections spill out of their storage spaces and things or groups of things draw us in or repel us through their ‘thing power’ (Bennett, 2009) as the wardrobe or CD as a whole is agentic. The relative power of things changes through what Bennett calls the ‘uneven topographies’ (Bennett, 2009: 24) of assemblages as our relationships to things changes as an item of clothing or particular CD has more power over us at different times. The power of the assemblage as a whole matters in our relationships to individual things; for example, how things are ordered, what they are placed next to, or where they ‘end up’ affects whether we will listen to a particular CD or wear an item of clothing. This approach allows us to think through everyday collections as incorporating things that are still materially vibrant as they age, clutter up a space, or have the power to affect people through the memories they encode.

**Approaches and methods**

This paper compares the consumption of clothing and music drawing on our own in-depth research into the content and rationale of clothing and music
collections. The wardrobe study was based on an in-depth ethnography over 15 months which took place in London and Nottingham, working only with women - for predominantly practical reasons of intimacy - incorporating object interviews, wardrobe audits, photography, clothes diaries and general observations of clothes practices. 27 women were part of the ethnography and the majority of these were connected to each other through social networks (such as friendship groups, families or work colleagues). The music study was a qualitative study with 12 men and 11 women from a variety of locations including Leicestershire, Staffordshire and the West Midlands, and included interviews, music collection audits, and an exploration of music practices through selecting and listening to CDs.

Both research projects took as their starting point the collection as a means to understand everyday consumption practices, which entailed exploring the totality of either clothing or music within the home, as each project attempted an audit of all the clothing/music respectively. The clothing research documented (photographing and obtaining a narrative for) every item of clothing in the wardrobe that women were willing to talk about/show. In the music research, the attempt was not to get details of every single piece of vinyl, CD album, or MP3 file (as this spanned thousands of items in some cases), but to log the full range of styles and artists that were present. In both cases the collection was
conceived as extending beyond a single storage space; for music, participants were asked to ‘dig out’ older items in their collection (e.g. vinyl stored in the roof or garage); similarly for the wardrobe research, although the initial interview took place in front of the main wardrobe, this also entailed looking at clothing in other places within the home (e.g. clothes stored in the wardrobes of partners, children). In both cases the collection was seen as dynamic, and as the locus of shifting practices of selection and trying on and wearing or listening to. In the clothing ethnography the emphasis was upon observing (and capturing through clothes diaries) how women assembled outfits on a daily basis for a number of different occasions – such as work, casual leisure or a ‘special’ occasion – including what women rejected as much as what they ended up wearing. The music study focused on everyday listening practices, and also required participants to select albums from their collection according to specific criteria (e.g. an album they had listened to a lot recently, an album they had not listened to in a while, an album with which they had a particularly strong emotional attachment, vinyl/CDs chosen at random by the researcher) to facilitate in-depth accounts.

Both research projects centred upon the ‘stuff’ itself. Although more explicit in the clothing research, both projects saw the things, clothing and music, as multi-sensorial, emerging from specific material engagements. Clothing matters not
only through its visual appearance, but also through its smell, touch and sound; attention was paid to both the physical condition of clothing (e.g. stored pristine in a bag or fraying and torn) and also how women physically engaged with clothing in the interviews and through wearing. Similarly, music is important not only through its acoustic dimension, which was explored by asking participants to listen to music from their collection within the context of the interview, but the physical condition of the items (e.g. tattered vinyl sleeve) how it is organised spatially (same for clothing), visually (e.g. the appearance of a collection or arrangement of music on a shelf), and kinaesthetically (e.g. patterns of active engagement with and uses of music).

Each project took place in the home to give context to daily practices and to allow a focus upon what often forms ‘unseen’ consumption practices. The collection proved to be a useful way to explore everyday, domestic practices as it confronts the individual every time they are in their most intimate and frequently-inhabited locus, the home (cf. Hennion, 2001). Conducting research in the home relies upon rapport with participants; this was particularly marked for the clothing ethnography which required the researcher to be present in the room when women were trying on clothing and describing their everyday practices. This rapport allowed an elicitation of, and sensitive awareness of, issues that may be hard to talk about, such as memories attached to items of
clothing or music or feelings of embarrassment, though this is more pronounced with clothes as it is bound up with perceptions of ideal versus actual body size and how this has changed over time.

**Comparing music and clothing collections**

*Order and disorder of collections*

In music collections there were some examples of people ‘collecting’ in Belk’s sense (1995), as they bought all of the albums by a particular artist(s), almost feeling they had to, through the collection’s logic of completeness. For example, one man described his collection of Radiohead albums, the acquisition of which had not occurred in chronological order (i.e. starting with the first released album) but rather had progressed through recommendations of friends (e.g. *OK Computer*), changes in preference for electronic styles (e.g. *Kid A, Amnesiac*), acquiring older albums he remembered his friends listening (e.g. *Pablo Honey, The Bends*) and newer albums (e.g. *Hail to the Thief*) as he felt he had to complete the set. There were no examples of wardrobes forming a collection in this manner yet collections still had their own logics. For example, one woman in the clothing ethnography bought a new black dress – the first dress she owned – and then had to buy the tights, shoes, bag and cardigan to go with it.
This is both an example of the Diderot effect (McCracken, 1988), wherein other items of clothing appear shoddy in light of a new item, as well as sense of an aesthetic where outfits have to ‘go’ together. This raises the importance of considering the logics of the collections as a whole and the relations between things as core to understanding clothing or music consumption as the ‘relational configuration’ of things becomes an object of analysis in itself (cf. Harvey & Knox, 2014).

For both clothing and music, the degrees of physical organisation of the collections were extremely varied. For music, organisation ranged from those whose CDs were randomly scattered with CDs in the wrong cases, to those with no specific organisation but felt they knew roughly where everything was, to those who had some items ordered in shelving units but others strewn around the home, to those who had their entire music collection organised in very specific ways (such as alphabetically by artist or record label). Similarly for clothing, whilst some participants knew where all their clothing was kept and regularly organised it, other participants were surprised when we did the wardrobe inventories at finding items they had forgotten stuffed in the bottom part of a wardrobe or at the back of a drawer. Everyone had some process of ordering related to what they wore and how often, yet the degree to which people felt in control of their clothing varied significantly. In some instances,
women had wardrobes full of clothes that were spilling out of drawers that could not be shut, even though their wardrobes were full of things that they rarely, if ever, wore. The attempts by all participants to order and control their clothing collections, and in many instances failing to do this, attests to the agency of the assemblage, as the collection is seen to have a capacity to expand, get messy and spill out.

Collections were often ordered to facilitate the practice of getting dressed or choosing music to listen to. For wardrobes, core forms of organisation were into social domains (such as work, home), what clothing ‘does’ (such as ‘fun’ clothing) and how often things are worn - habitual and non-habitual clothing. For music, the main modes of organisation centred on musical styles (such as rock, classical), self-regulation strategies (such as mood-regulation), activities and contexts (such as housework, travelling) and how often things are listened to. For many women, clothes they wore all of the time never made it to the wardrobe but instead hung on the outside of a wardrobe, or over the back of a chair in the bedroom. A similar process for music was observed with one woman alphabetising her collection to allow quick location of CDs when she wanted to listen to them, but also having a pile of ‘currently played’ CDs out next to the sound system in the lounge. These were separated from albums upstairs that she didn’t listen to anymore. One man had a separate rack for the
‘crème de la crème’ of his music collection. For both music and clothes, the collections expanded into spare rooms, or were piled in the bedroom or living room as extensions of the collection, as well as break away collections. Having a pile of things that are worn every-day or listened to all the time means that people do not have to negotiate the totality of the collection, as they can feel overwhelmed by the amount of things in it. This has a consequence that people ‘end up’ wearing the same things all the time as they cannot be bothered to think about what to wear and feel overwhelmed by having to choose from the whole wardrobe.

A common theme for both music and clothing was that many people had items of music or clothing that they kept but knew they would never listen to or wear again. In some instances items were kept specifically for the memories they materialised, such as a former pregnancy dress which had been placed in a plastic bag to preserve the item, memories and former identities. There were examples for both clothing and music where things that are never worn or listened to, (often as they know they never will, such as clothes they no longer have the lifestyle for or music on vinyl). This can be a deliberate act of keeping or a feeling that people are not able to get rid of things simply by virtue of having had them for a long time.
There are key differences between collections of music and clothing; music collections span multiple material forms: CDs, vinyl and digital music. Different types of clothing have different materialities, such as shoes or cotton pajamas, but clothing is always a tactile garment taking up space. Even for those who have extensive music collections that have to be managed and dealt with, if they are in digital form, it is unlike an excess of clothing that spills out of the wardrobe, and stops drawers from closing. There were some examples of women ordering their wardrobe aesthetically – into colour shades rather than social domains or frequency of wear – as the wardrobe as a whole was curated as a particular aesthetic. For women who did this, this aesthetic was important to the experience of dressing, as, for example one woman had reordered her wardrobe aesthetically and talked about how much more enthusiastic she was about her clothing.

The digital collections of music are framed within techno-spatial assemblages (Magaudda, 2011) as advances in music technology mean that music collections are organised in an increasingly structured manner, into folders on the computer, or into playlists on miniaturised, portable equipment such as MP3 players and iPods. For some people this was done through computer programs such as Windows Media and iTunes that categorise music as it was ripped or uploaded onto computer. Such programs search for information (such as artists'
names, and track titles) on the Internet and label the music accordingly, though participants expressed dissatisfaction with this as it failed to account for cross-over in musical genres. This is contrastive to clothing which, in this study, was never organised into brands or styles. For others, music was organised manually, more akin to the ordering of clothes. For example, one woman organised her music on the computer; her playlists contained an eclectic mix of different styles and songs which were ordered with reference to time (time of day; day of the week) or feelings that the music induced (e.g. songs from childhood when homesick). One man organised his music on an MP3 player; his playlists centred on musical styles (e.g. rock, secular songs, worship songs) as well as contexts in which the music is listened to (e.g. driving, songs played at particular clubnights). Thus the technologies are not prescriptive in how they are used. Organising music in terms of the feelings it may induce is as acknowledgement of the ‘thing-power’ (Bennett, 2009) of the music even as it resides in a collection.

*Practices of selection*

Personal collections are dynamic, and are the basis for daily consumption practices (Gregson & Beale, 2004); for this reason, the collection should always be viewed in relation to the practices it enables and facilitates. Dressing and listening to music arise from active selections, yet these selections are
suggested and framed by the dynamism and ordering of the collections themselves. One of the core dynamics of wardrobes was the relationship between habitual – things worn all the time that women ‘knew’ how to wear – and the non-habitual – items that could be transformatory but involve a self-conscious engagement with them. The habitual is worn all the time both as women ‘know’ it suits them and a social occasion, yet also often as it is hanging at the front of the wardrobe or on a chair next to them. They ‘end up’ wearing things which arises from both previous embodied experiences as well as spatial ordering of the wardrobe; one woman rarely wore the items on the outer sides of her hanging wardrobe as she has slide doors that she rarely slid fully open (due to them being a bit stiff). For others, wearing the same things all the time is a reaction to feeling overwhelmed by all of the things they had in the wardrobe. Often the more things that women tried on, the more likely they were to fall back on things they wore all the time, as they become overwhelmed by the clothing. Their personal collection of clothing comes to appear alien to them. In the music study, a similar dynamic in relation to habitual/non-habitual listening was found. Participants reported listening to some tracks/albums hundreds of times (the physical condition was often cited as a marker of the extent of usage) and these items tended to be easily accessible (e.g. next to the stereo in the kitchen, in the car) whereas other items were listened to one or twice a year, or even less
frequently, and these items tended to be harder to reach (e.g. back of a drawer, high shelving). There were differences in everyday practices of selection ranging from those who mainly listened to the radio rather than selecting items from their collection (thus leaving the choices to someone else), to those who listened to a mixture of the radio and selecting items from their collection, to those who felt that listening to the radio was antithetical to their everyday musical engagement. Regarding this latter point, one man asserted that he knew his collection ‘inside out’, always knowing where items were, and the effects that listening would have on him. This level of awareness was highlighted at different levels of abstraction, from broad styles to specific tracks; for example, when discussing the album A Heart Shaped Heartbreak by the band Kings of Leon, one woman selects different tracks for different reasons (‘Four Kicks’ energises me, ‘Milk’ makes me think and feel more, ‘Soft’ makes me laugh, ‘The Bucket’ reminds me of my sister).

Occasions when women wanted to wear something different could be sparked by a new purchase or by an item in the wardrobe ‘calling out’ (Bennett, 2009); one woman who had a walk in wardrobe full of dresses, decided she ought to wear some of them. She runs her hands through them, looking at them. A parachute silk blue dress catches the light as she touches its softness and she decides to wear it. The lights, the softness of the fabric, the crinkle as you touch
it, and the colour of the dress all come together to connect her to the dress. In other cases the purchase of a new item involves a rethink of what is in the wardrobe, as one woman held up her new lime green jumper against the skirts and trousers in the wardrobe as they were considered anew through the possibilities they might ‘go’ with the top. With regards to music, selecting something ‘different’ tended to arise from satiation with music currently being listened to, and music is ‘put away’ for short- (e.g. weeks) and long- (e.g. months, years) time periods as a result. Selection practices typically focus on the immediately visible collection, and rarely from fetching CDs from the roof or garage (a space reserved for those items that are kept but no longer engaged with).

When the collection expanded into garages or attics it was things that were not listened too, yet the opposite was true in occasions where people were able to select from the collections of others. For both clothing and music there were examples of wardrobe sharing/music collection sharing. In the wardrobe ethnography, in one house, the four young women who lived there all had their own wardrobes, but if they were feeling a bit bored with their own clothes they would go and look through each others’ wardrobes. For music, there was one house with several young men living in it, who had all of their computers networked so they could access each others music collections. Whilst there was
still a defined sense of an individual’s own collection (music or clothing) the boundaries of this become porous on occasions when they are able to select from the collections of others and the process of exchange facilitated shared values and friendship, as well as enabling them to work with limited budgets. This example highlights core differences between the materiality of clothing and music as music can be listened to different people simultaneously, but a particular item of clothing can only be worn by one person at a time. Moreover, in raiding the wardrobes of others, they had to go to the other person’s room to look in it, whereas the music could be accessed from the young men’s own rooms.

The tactility of clothing in relationship to the body matters in how people select clothing, feel comfortable, and remember other people, yet unless worn at home alone, clothing has a visibility to others that has to be negotiated. Whether worn out in public or not, clothing is usually tried on the body as selecting clothing entails the negotiation between things hanging in a wardrobe (often folded up, or hanging side on) and the touch and look of them on our moving bodies. One key difference between clothing and music is that the clothing ‘collection’ (even if it is just clothes on the chair) has to be engaged with everyday. Irrespective of the levels of investment in fashion/clothing, everyone wears clothes everyday. In contrast, whilst some people listen to music everyday – to the extent that
some reported having the same music in different formats (vinyl, CDs MP3s) to ensure that they could select that music in any context and whilst accompanying any activity – the ‘disengaged’ do not have to.

Multiple temporalities: Dynamic collections

Collections are temporally dynamic, they include things that have been owned for decades, other that are relatively new, items worn all the time and those that are never worn. The relationship between long-term and short term practices of keeping things is central to understanding the dynamics of everyday collections; tastes may develop over a lifetime, yet these stand aside ephemeral preferences for a particular song or item of clothing that will pass within months. This dynamic is evidenced in thinking about personal collections as a material form of personal biography which, when considered through both music and clothing, is not linear, but rather as participants revisit ‘old’ clothes and music and use them in different contexts, or, in the case of clothing combine an old item with a new one, the past becomes a resource for the present. Through re-wearing and re-listening, a biography that is externalised in the personal collection is dynamic and shifting. Both music and clothing have agency in producing changes and allow people to make changes in their social lives, thus
in turn changing their biography. Neither music nor clothing simply reflects a past or future as we need to pay heed to what they can do.

Both can produce an effect, such as one woman talking about her favourite jacket always making her feel more confident when she puts it on, and one man reporting that a particular album by Sizzla Kalonji puts him into a ‘comfortable frame of mind within a few beats’. Music is explicitly ordered by some into moods it induces or corresponds to. The capacity of music and clothing to change mood and cause people to act differently attests to its transformatory capacity. In one example in the clothing ethnography, a woman who had been through breast cancer and the subsequent radiotherapy was feeling particularly low, and a shopping trip with her father led her to try on a new jacket. The process of trying on and subsequently wearing the jacket had made her look at her reflection in a different way and initiated feelings of confidence and positivity. She described this as a turning point in her life. A similar example can be found in the music study. One woman reported an epiphany experience in her late forties whilst listening to the band Hanson for the first time. She had recently undergone a hysterectomy and reported that she had found the band’s music ‘youthful’ at a time when she felt her youth was slipping away. The listening experience kick-started her into appreciating music in exciting ways (‘youthful’ as opposed to ‘heavy and serious’), and had given her confidence to try new
things rather than being ‘stuck’ with what she thought was her. She also learned to use a computer from scratch in order to find out about the band.

The dynamic nature of the collection is highlighted when individuals have explicitly chosen to get rid of items from their collection because they no longer felt those items ‘belonged’. For example, one young man disposed of albums by the band Muse (who had been a favourite band for many years) when his religious faith had grown stronger on the grounds that the band’s lyrics were ambiguous, and therefore he was unaware of what he was singing along to. There were examples like this in the clothing study: one woman who was studying fashion design uncovered a pair of cropped beige trousers stuffed at the bottom of her wardrobe that she had bought before coming to university. As they were in a ‘cheap-looking, shiny’ fabric she had never worn them as they don’t ‘go’ with the rest of her wardrobe – an aesthetic which aspires to being fashionable and ‘funky’ – and so she chose to dispose of them.

In other instances people keep clothing they no longer wear as they feel unable to get rid of it, as it may externalise facets of the self (Belk, 1995; Gell, 1998). There are differences between music and clothing in relationship to memory, as people assert the importance of ‘re-experiencing’ music, and may listen for nostalgia or to laugh at their past musical tastes or recapture particular feelings (Sloboda, 1999). Through clothing, although women kept things to remember,
very rarely do they try things on again, often as they cannot get into it or if they can it fits differently, so usually it is through touching and looking at the garment, or often through looking at old photographs. There are also differences in the issue of repeat practices, as with music the same song can be listened to again and again; although clothing can be worn day after day, no one would try it on and take it off and then try it on again repeatedly. The temporal cycles are therefore different as a song lasts on average for four minutes, yet clothing is usually worn for a period of a few hours to a whole day.

Conclusions

This article has taken music and clothing as case studies to explore the possibilities of focusing on personal collections in the study of consumption and of developing a comparative approach between different genres of cultural consumption. In focusing on the collections of things, as well as practices of selection and wearing/listening to clothing/music, the approach we have adopted has much in common with practice theory (Warde, 2005, 2014) as the collections and the related practices incorporate multiple elements - bodies, knowledges, technologies, and things. Yet we depart from this approach by focusing on the totality of things owned in order to broaden understanding of
consumption beyond that which is actively used to explore memories, relations to others and how things can evoke feelings in people. Through re-framing collections as assemblages to explore the material vibrancy of things and the distributed agency of the collection as a whole, our approach allows us to adopt a relational understanding of things as a means to understand everyday consumption practices. We have also focused on what people do with these things, allowing greater space for human subjectivity than approaches such as assemblage theory sometimes do. This builds on existing work which highlights that increasing ‘choice’ increases anxiety amongst consumers (Miller, 2009, Salecl, 2011), as people adopt strategies to minimise the choices they have to make. Insights gained from our comparative approach add to this critique by highlighting the agency of things and assemblages of things, as people ‘end up’ making selections based upon how things are stored.

Empirical comparisons highlighted core similarities and differences in music and clothing collections. In terms of similarities, both are characterised by an attempt to ‘order’ the collections (to different degrees by different participants) which related to the ordering and organisation of life through subsequent practices of selection. What emerged was a clear difference between ‘ordering’ a collection in terms of clear spatial categorisation of things, and the ‘order’ of a collection, which emerges in part through what people do with the stuff, as well
as where things ‘end up’ and the relations between things in the collection which brings about effects (such as whether you listen to/wear certain things).

Both examples highlighted a lack of boundedness of the collection as things spill out of the wardrobe, are piled up on a chair or by a CD player, or selected from others’ collections in the home. There are also differences between music and clothing which in part emerge from the different materialities of clothing and music; music, for most collections, exists in physical (CD or vinyl) as well as digital form, yet clothing is always material in people’s wardrobes, taking up space, as unless women had spare rooms for its storage, as collections grew they either spilled out of wardrobes, or had to be culled. Clothing collections always have to be engaged with every day, whether people are interested in clothing or fashion, whereas music collections – for the less engaged – may not be. There are also clear differences around embodiment – as clothing is worn on the body – and temporality as music can be re-listened to again and again, whereas clothing has a slower ‘repeat’ temporality.

We suggest that the approach adopted has the potential to be extended to wider genres of consumption, such as books, films or kitchen utensils. This approach is one that can open out the study of everyday consumption to incorporate both how things are utilised in the enactment of everyday life, yet also how and why people keep things that are not currently used. Looking at
collections allows an insight into how consumption practices include acts of remembering, forgetting, constructing relations to others as well as disbanding them. Focusing upon the whole collection also entails engaging with the specific materiality of genres of consumption and the ways in which these can allow particular practices/strategies. The emphasis upon materiality in this approach is one that could be extended in further research to explore sensory engagements with things, the ways in which objects act as aide mémoires, and how practices of sorting, storing and selecting can also act as triggers for further consumption. Finally, the approach has methodological implications; we suggest that adopting the approach of ‘collection inventories’ is one that builds upon the possibilities of object inventories, to start to access that which is forgotten about, and the power of things in our everyday lives.
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