Paradigm Academic Press
Art and Society
ISSN 2709-9830
JUL. 2025 VOL.4, NO.6

How Capsule Wardrobe Discourse on Social Media Feminizes Minimalism and Aestheticizes Self-Restraint

Min Zhang[1]

[1] Massey University, New Zealand

Correspondence: Min Zhang, Massey University, New Zealand.

doi:10.63593/AS.2709-9830.2025.07.001

Abstract

This paper critically examines the cultural phenomenon of capsule wardrobe discourse on social media, arguing that it feminizes minimalist aesthetics and aestheticizes self-restraint within a neoliberal framework. Drawing from feminist media theory, Foucault's concept of governmentality, and critiques of digital consumer culture, the essay explores how capsule wardrobes serve not only as a fashion strategy but also as a symbolic system of aesthetic, emotional, and ethical labor. The analysis reveals how self-restraint is rebranded as empowerment, how unpaid curatorial labor is romanticized as feminine virtue, and how digital platforms reward visual coherence as a proxy for moral character. Capsule wardrobe influencers are shown to embody the ideal neoliberal subject—self-regulating, optimized, and perpetually productive—while simultaneously erasing the classed, racialized, and gendered dimensions of this aesthetic labor. The paper argues that the seemingly apolitical act of reducing one's wardrobe functions as a performative ethic of aestheticized austerity, entrenching broader ideologies of digital femininity, self-branding, and consumer virtue under the veil of simplicity and style.

Keywords: capsule wardrobe, gigital femininity, aesthetic labor, neoliberalism, governmentality, minimalism, self-restraint, emotional labor

1. Introduction

The capsule wardrobe—once a utilitarian concept rooted in mid-century fashion pragmatism—has undergone a remarkable transformation in the digital age. On platforms like Instagram, YouTube, Pinterest, TikTok, and lifestyle blogs, it is no longer simply a clothing strategy. It has become a cultural artifact, a visual lexicon, a system of belief. In curated images of tastefully sparse closets, in step-by-step guides on how to "build your perfect capsule," in soothing voiceovers accompanying folding rituals, the capsule wardrobe emerges as more than just a stylistic solution. It is an aspirational narrative wrapped in beige linens and soft lighting, embedded in a broader matrix of gender, consumption, and ethics.

What appears at first glance as a neutral or even empowering lifestyle choice, upon closer inspection reveals an undercurrent of ideological tension. The language of "streamlining," "intentionality," and "curation" obscures the ideological labor at work: a disciplining of the female subject through aesthetic performance. A discourse that presents itself as freeing is in many ways a re-domestication of the self under the soft tyranny of visual culture and digital capitalism. This aesthetic of less—minimalism as lifestyle, as virtue, as status—functions within a regime of neoliberal governance where personal optimization replaces collective politics, and where restraint is coded not only as admirable but beautiful.

Social media plays a decisive role in this transformation. It does not merely transmit the capsule wardrobe ideal; it reshapes and amplifies it. The wardrobe is no longer private. It is a site of public performance, endlessly photographed, filtered, narrated, and monetized. It is part of the influencer economy and also of what can be called the "aesthetic economy"—an affective system where labor is visual, affect is commodified, and moral

worth is signaled through curation. In this sphere, self-restraint is not just a personal virtue. It is an aesthetic imperative. To "have less" is no longer about survival, scarcity, or even sustainability. It is about demonstrating control, taste, intelligence, and ethics, all while adhering to an unspoken visual standard that is racialized, classed, and gendered.

The feminization of this discourse is particularly significant. Though capsule wardrobes can technically be adopted by anyone, the overwhelming representation of this lifestyle online is female. From vloggers and stylists to minimalist lifestyle influencers, it is women who perform and circulate the labor of simplification. The aesthetic of capsule wardrobe content—neutral tones, natural lighting, soft textiles, flat-lays of carefully folded garments—often invokes a feminized softness, care, and calm. This soft minimalism is not simply an aesthetic preference. It reflects a deeper cultural association between femininity and order, femininity and domestic control, femininity and moral rigor. The woman who masters her closet is portrayed as mastering herself. She is not out of control, not indulgent, not chaotic. She is calm, composed, measured, and elegant. She is ideal.

This ideal comes with a cost. The social media celebration of capsule wardrobes encourages a kind of performative self-restraint that is intimately tied to neoliberal subject formation. In the neoliberal logic, the individual is constantly called upon to regulate and optimize every aspect of their life. Health, career, relationships, and even closet choices become fields of micro-governance. The self is a project to be endlessly improved, and every choice becomes a reflection of moral character. In this context, the capsule wardrobe becomes a site of neoliberal morality. To choose fewer clothes is not simply practical; it is ethical. To reduce one's fashion footprint is not simply sustainable; it is noble. To refuse fast fashion is not simply political; it is self-improving. The language of simplicity masks a deeper system of internalized discipline and self-surveillance. The subject of this discourse is both governed and self-governing.

This self-governance is gendered. The burden of aesthetic and ethical labor in the realm of capsule wardrobes is feminized through and through. Women are positioned not only as the primary adopters of this lifestyle but also as its most visible practitioners and disseminators. The digital architecture of capsule wardrobe content relies on emotional resonance, visual pleasure, and persuasive narration. These are traditionally feminized modes of labor—care work, emotional attunement, attention to detail, aesthetic refinement. To participate in this discourse is to take on a form of unpaid and largely unacknowledged labor that merges lifestyle with work, ethics with performance, identity with consumption. Even as it claims to resist capitalist excess, it seamlessly fits within the frameworks of social media economies where visibility, influence, and aesthetic capital translate into real financial value.

The aestheticization of self-restraint within this discourse deserves particular scrutiny. In a culture of excess, to choose less becomes a radical gesture—but only when that less is framed beautifully. The aesthetics of capsule wardrobes rarely depict poverty or lack. They depict abundance in restraint, elegance in scarcity, power in silence. Self-restraint is not visualized as austere or severe but as warm, soft, and sensual. The colors are muted but never drab. The textures are natural but never coarse. The images are minimal but never bare. What emerges is an aesthetic of quiet luxury—simplicity that signals class, taste, and refinement rather than need or sacrifice. Minimalism here is not merely less; it is the right kind of less, the curated and consumable less. It is less that still costs something, less that still looks good on camera, less that signifies more.

This signaling is embedded in a wider cultural shift where visual platforms dominate how values are communicated and understood. A person's ethics, intelligence, and competence are now often read through visual cues—what they wear, how they organize their space, how they present their lifestyle. The capsule wardrobe, in this sense, is not just a set of clothing. It is a symbolic economy. It operates like a language, encoding messages about self-control, sustainability, and sophistication. But unlike traditional symbolic economies, its power lies in its disavowal of spectacle. It claims transparency, authenticity, and simplicity. It disclaims excess and drama. Yet its very success depends on visual mastery, on aesthetic legibility, on performative curation. It is spectacle disguised as anti-spectacle.

What makes this even more complex is the way this discourse interacts with racial and class dynamics. The minimalist aesthetic celebrated in capsule wardrobes is deeply entwined with whiteness and upper-middle-class sensibilities. The favored palette—ivory, camel, soft greys—is associated with Eurocentric ideas of cleanliness, purity, and refinement. The labor of simplifying one's wardrobe is often framed as voluntary, desirable, and refined. For many marginalized populations, minimalism is not a choice but a condition. Yet the aesthetics of capsule wardrobes rarely acknowledge this disparity. They universalize a privileged experience and mask structural inequalities under the guise of ethical lifestyle design. The visual field becomes sanitized, aspirational, and implicitly exclusive.

Within this sanitized field, the moralization of consumption is subtly enforced. The "bad" consumer is one who indulges in fast fashion, who follows trends blindly, who buys too much, who fails to "curate." The "good" consumer is she who resists, who edits, who knows better. This distinction carries ethical weight, implying that

one's consumption choices reflect not just style but character. Yet this morality is selective. It condemns excess while remaining silent about labor conditions, global supply chains, or the racialized and gendered labor that supports even ethical brands. The capsule wardrobe discourse allows the consumer to feel virtuous without engaging with the material complexities of fashion production. It turns political urgency into aesthetic choice.

What emerges, then, is a deeply ambivalent cultural formation. The capsule wardrobe on social media offers a fantasy of control in an era of overwhelming choice. It promises clarity amidst chaos, coherence amidst clutter. It reassures its practitioners that they are making better choices, that they are better people. It cloaks itself in the language of ethics and the imagery of elegance. Yet beneath this surface, it reinscribes the very structures it claims to challenge: capitalist consumption, gendered labor, visual culture, moral individualism. It turns self-restraint into performance, performance into influence, and influence into capital.

In this essay, I propose to read capsule wardrobe discourse not merely as a fashion trend or a lifestyle choice but as a cultural text—one that reveals the entanglements of gender, aesthetics, and neoliberal morality. This text is not static. It is animated through daily performances, through images and stories, through rituals of folding, sorting, photographing, and posting. It is alive in hashtags and algorithms, in affiliate links and Pinterest boards, in Reels and minimalist haul videos. It is produced through labor, sustained by attention, and circulated through desire. It feminizes the act of having less by draping it in softness, calm, and visual coherence. It aestheticizes the act of restraining the self by making it look beautiful, tasteful, and ethical.

The capsule wardrobe is not just what we wear. It is how we signal who we are, what we believe, and how we belong. It is a moral performance in visual form. And like all performances, it requires a stage, an audience, and a script. The social media platforms that host this discourse provide the stage. The followers, likes, and shares provide the audience. And the feminized language of restraint, curation, and aesthetics provides the script. It is a script worth reading carefully—because within its folds, we find not just clothes, but the contours of contemporary subjectivity.

2. Aesthetic Minimalism as Gendered Performance

The aesthetic dimension of minimalism in capsule wardrobe discourse on social media is not merely a visual preference—it constitutes a deep terrain of gendered performance. At first glance, minimalist imagery—neatly arranged beige coats, monochrome palettes, subdued lighting—appears neutral and universal. Yet when situated within its digital cultural context, minimalist aesthetics emerge as highly coded, participating in broader ideologies of femininity, restraint, domestic order, and affective labor. Minimalism, far from being a negation of visual culture, becomes a meticulous practice of aesthetic display. In the world of capsule wardrobes, it takes the form of stylized documentation, mood boards, flat-lays, and narrated closet tours, where each act of organizing, filming, and posting becomes a gendered ritual.

A central premise in the capsule wardrobe phenomenon is that less is not only more but also better: better organized, more ethical, more beautiful. Yet this "better" is not abstract. It is performed and circulated through highly feminized aesthetic codes. These include the use of soft textiles, natural lighting, and neutral palettes—colors and textures that recall both a feminine domestic ideal and a modern, post-industrial aesthetic of middle-class taste. In this aesthetic performance, femininity becomes synonymous with control, balance, and discretion. As M. Petersfield notes in her study of digital self-imaging practices, social media reshapes feminine ideals through visual scripting that equates the female body—and, by extension, her wardrobe—with harmony, purity, and measured form (Petersfield, 2024).

Minimalism, when filtered through social media, performs what E.L. Murphy identifies as a shift from political critique to lifestyle aesthetic (Murphy, 2018). The visual strategies employed to signal minimalism—cleared surfaces, carefully chosen objects, a consistent color scheme—no longer speak to resistance against consumerism, but to the ability to perform self-restraint with elegance. This shift is particularly gendered when applied to the capsule wardrobe. Women are hailed as responsible for not just reducing their material possessions, but also narrativizing this reduction through digital media. Each item kept is framed not simply as practical, but as meaningful. Each item discarded becomes evidence of maturity, discernment, and ethical clarity.

What appears as a personal choice is in fact tightly structured by cultural narratives about ideal womanhood. Z. Ye's work on sustainable HCI and fashion minimalism underscores how discourses surrounding capsule wardrobes encode gendered social values—care, moderation, domestic management—into the digital representation of clothing systems (Ye, 2023). These values are not imposed externally; they are internalized and aesthetically articulated by women who must visually perform them for legibility in a digital economy that rewards emotional and aesthetic labor. The performance is deeply affective. It demands not only the reduction of material goods, but the transformation of that reduction into content—into stories of growth, intentionality, and inner peace.

Such labor, as J.L. Neumann argues, should be understood as both affective and relational (Neumann, 2018). The

woman creating a capsule wardrobe video is not only organizing her clothes. She is producing intimacy with her viewers, offering vulnerability, care, and trust in the form of wardrobe transparency. This communicative labor relies on historically feminine modes of expression—openness, empathy, domestic attention—and transforms the closet from a private space into a public performance of authenticity. In doing so, it also renders aesthetic minimalism as a soft form of gender governance. The performance of taste becomes a proxy for the performance of virtue.

Visual consistency across capsule wardrobe content is not simply a stylistic choice but a marker of compliance with the aesthetic economy of femininity. A. Duda's corpus-based analysis of minimalist discourse highlights how minimalism relies on the repetition of specific signifiers—clarity, light, balance—that serve to stabilize the minimalist subject as calm, composed, and morally correct (Duda, 2023). This discursive architecture intersects with digital algorithms that reward aesthetic coherence, making the act of minimalism both an ethical and algorithmic imperative. Women must not only live simply but be seen to live simply, in ways that are digestible to the platform and appealing to the gaze.

Such visual labor is materially and emotionally taxing. It requires sustained attention to detail, knowledge of photography and video editing, engagement with fashion trends (ironically), and ongoing self-surveillance. G. Heger's phenomenological study of capsule closet practices notes that many participants experienced not liberation but anxiety about "getting it right"—choosing the right items, presenting them correctly, narrating their value effectively (Heger, 2016). This reflects the deep tension within aesthetic minimalism: it offers relief from chaos, yet requires high levels of organization, planning, and self-policing, all of which fall disproportionately on women.

Minimalist aesthetics also intersect with norms of race and class, further complicating the gendered labor they entail. The dominant imagery of capsule wardrobes online is overwhelmingly white, middle-class, and Western. Neutral palettes, Scandinavian furniture, and artisanal materials become signifiers of taste that are not culturally neutral but deeply classed and racialized. As L.L. Bradshaw suggests, digital domesticity increasingly reflects "21st-century femininity" as a curated lifestyle of wellness, clarity, and self-care—a lifestyle that is inaccessible to many and exclusive in its representation (Bradshaw, 2015). Women of color, working-class women, and disabled women are largely absent from the capsule wardrobe narrative, which universalizes a feminine ideal built on specific socio-economic privileges.

This racialized and classed dimension is crucial, because it reveals how aesthetic minimalism cloaks inequality in personal choice. A capsule wardrobe is framed not as an effect of economic necessity but as a virtuous lifestyle. It masks austerity as elegance. It hides discipline behind grace. It asks women to take up the labor of reducing and curating their material lives and then to make that labor invisible through visual ease. The entire discourse hinges on erasing effort, which is itself a historical demand placed on women. Femininity, in this context, becomes not just a way of dressing or behaving, but a style of laboring: invisible, affective, aestheticized, unpaid.

These gendered expectations are amplified by the platform-specific dynamics of social media. On Instagram, TikTok, and Pinterest, the capsule wardrobe is not just an idea but a performance metric. Likes, views, shares, and engagement rates turn private lifestyle choices into public assets. E.K. Mahlakaarto and Y. Suanse analyze how women's consumer identities are shaped by influencers and digital performance, noting that gender discourse is increasingly "materially constructed" through these networks (Mahlakaarto & Suanse, 2024). A minimalist wardrobe posted on Instagram is no longer simply about personal taste. It becomes a node in a system of social validation, branding, and monetization. The woman becomes both subject and product—performing minimalism for the gaze of an audience whose attention is the new currency.

This transformation is not incidental. It reflects a neoliberal logic in which every element of the self—appearance, ethics, aesthetics—is up for optimization. The capsule wardrobe thus becomes a technology of the self in the Foucauldian sense, where women are encouraged to govern themselves through the language of empowerment, while adhering to invisible scripts of gender conformity. A. Duda's recent work on maximalist vs minimalist discourse reveals how minimalism leans heavily on an imagined moral superiority, creating a dichotomy where restraint signals intelligence and maximalism signals indulgence (Duda, 2025). This binary upholds gender norms by positioning the minimalist woman as in control, responsible, and worthy of emulation—precisely because she has internalized the logic of restraint and made it beautiful.

To understand aesthetic minimalism as gendered performance is to see beyond its clean lines and soothing tones. It is to recognize the invisible scripts that guide its presentation, the emotional labor that sustains its visibility, and the cultural norms that frame its desirability. It is to notice how beauty becomes a method of discipline, how ethics are aestheticized, and how women are called upon to perform an ideal that is as exhausting as it is elegant.

3. Self-Restraint as Empowerment

The cultural discourse surrounding capsule wardrobes on social media transforms the act of self-limitation into an aspirational and empowering practice. At the heart of this transformation lies a distinct ideological mechanism: the elevation of aesthetic discipline and consumer restraint as signs of freedom, autonomy, and feminine mastery. By narrowing one's wardrobe, the individual is invited to believe that they are expanding their agency. This belief is less a contradiction than a strategic reframing embedded within the broader apparatus of neoliberal subjectivity.

Capsule wardrobe culture operates as a terrain of symbolic choice. The curated closet is portrayed not merely as an efficient system but as a manifestation of clarity, ethical maturity, and liberated selfhood. This form of self-regulation has been aptly described by Michel Foucault as *governmentality*, a structure of power that exerts control not through direct coercion but through the shaping of subjectivity, nudging individuals to govern themselves through internalized norms and ideals. The capsule wardrobe subject is not compelled to restrict their consumption; they are encouraged to choose restriction as a mode of personal growth, of ethical expression, of aesthetic superiority. Power works best, Foucault suggested, when it is felt as freedom.

Under this model, women are subtly encouraged to align restraint with empowerment. The act of paring down is not viewed as capitulation to austerity but as an enlightened rejection of chaos. The consumer who adopts the capsule wardrobe model is not simply spending less; she is seen as choosing wisely, with elegance and principle. She is credited with resisting fast fashion's temptations, resisting trend-chasing, resisting material clutter. This resistance is framed not as deprivation, but as a sophisticated form of agency. It is a kind of agency that demands moral discipline and aesthetic refinement, a gendered agency that rewards taste, control, and ethical consumption—ideals that mirror the feminine virtues long associated with domestic order and emotional containment.

C.S. Dawson argues that such frameworks of feminist consumerism allow women to "express ethical concern and personal empowerment simultaneously" through seemingly apolitical acts like wardrobe reduction (Dawson, 2024). This merging of ethics and aesthetics has a powerful appeal. The capsule wardrobe, in its digital form, suggests that self-control is not only virtuous but pleasurable. Visual narratives on Instagram, TikTok, and YouTube depict the act of reducing one's closet as a calming ritual, often coupled with slow music, natural lighting, and verbal affirmations. The tone is therapeutic, the visuals are clean, and the message is consistent: to own less is to be more whole, more mindful, more empowered.

Such messaging fits seamlessly into the ideological contours of neoliberal feminism. Here, the language of empowerment is closely tied to the individual. Liberation is imagined not through collective struggle or structural transformation but through the optimized choices of the self-regulating subject. To consume "better"—less, more ethically, more aesthetically—is seen as evidence of feminist consciousness. This shift has profound implications. It displaces attention from labor exploitation, ecological crisis, and global inequalities, and recenters moral responsibility on the isolated, empowered consumer. The capsule wardrobe becomes a tool not for social critique but for self-branding. It signals a type of womanhood that is both disciplined and desirable, both ethical and fashionable.

W. Anderson's reading of Foucauldian dispositifs in contemporary aesthetic culture supports this view. He notes that modern subjects are governed "not through visible restraint but through desire" (Anderson, 2024). In this model, the appeal of self-restraint lies in its aesthetic pleasure and moral clarity. It is not that the minimalist consumer is punished for excess, but that she is seduced by the calm, the order, the dignity that comes with less. This seduction is visible across capsule wardrobe content, where closet organization becomes a form of spiritual alignment and decluttering is narrated as emotional purification.

Social media platforms, in their algorithmic logic, intensify this seduction by rewarding content that embodies visual coherence and personal transformation. Videos showing dramatic wardrobe downsizing or before-and-after closet makeovers are algorithmically favored, reinforcing the notion that visible change equals moral progress. This structure encourages subjects to perform their restraint publicly, to aestheticize their ethical choices, and to narrate consumption not as indulgence but as curatorship. The subject thus becomes both consumer and curator, both product and brand. Her self-restraint becomes a content strategy. Her aesthetic discipline becomes her social capital.

This performance is deeply gendered. It draws on long-standing associations between femininity and care, between women and domestic order. In the case of capsule wardrobes, these associations are reframed in postfeminist terms. The woman who simplifies her wardrobe is not simply tidying; she is asserting her identity. She is not simply eliminating clutter; she is aligning her values. This symbolic work relies heavily on visual labor—the creation of aesthetically pleasing layouts, the careful folding of garments, the selection of a "signature palette." It also involves emotional labor—maintaining the tone of serenity, authenticity, and empowerment that the audience expects.

What is framed as minimalism is thus, in practice, maximal in labor. Women are invited to find empowerment not in freedom from domestic and aesthetic labor, but in perfecting its performance. The visual rhetoric of minimalism suggests ease and simplicity, but the affective infrastructure beneath it is complex and demanding. It is a labor of appearances, of curating meaning from less, of signaling virtue without saying a word. This makes capsule wardrobe discourse a striking example of what Sara Banet-Weiser calls "empowerment as a brand" — an individualized, market-compatible form of feminism that is less about challenging structures and more about perfecting the self (Banet-Weiser, 2018).

The paradox is clear: empowerment is found not in breaking free of norms, but in excelling within them. The empowered subject is not unruly, unkempt, or uncontained. She is efficient, edited, elegant. She follows the rules of neoliberal governance—self-improvement, visibility, productivity—while cloaking them in personal meaning. Her closet becomes her practice space. Her feed becomes her portfolio. The fantasy of liberation is repackaged in soft beige and linen textures, bathed in natural light and narrated in ASMR tones. It is a freedom with no friction, a liberation that leaves power untouched.

This mode of empowerment thrives under digital capitalism. Social media's architecture demands content that is both personal and shareable, both emotionally resonant and visually coherent. The capsule wardrobe is ideal for this system because it is endlessly narratable. It allows for transformation stories, personal testimonies, how-to guides, and daily updates. It also allows for monetization: affiliate links, brand sponsorships, e-books, and aesthetic consulting. What begins as a practice of reduction often expands into a digital micro-enterprise. The performance of restraint becomes a way to accumulate followers, clout, and income. The irony is that self-restraint generates excess—of attention, of engagement, of value.

This productive tension between less and more is not accidental. It reveals the adaptability of neoliberal ideology, its ability to absorb critiques of consumerism and turn them into new markets. The capsule wardrobe becomes a commodity not despite its ethic of reduction but because of it. Its language of simplicity resonates with broader environmental and ethical concerns, yet its function is often to neutralize those concerns by channeling them into aestheticized self-management. The user is not asked to organize for justice or reduce for solidarity. She is asked to curate for serenity, to consume for clarity, to optimize for herself.

This rhetoric of optimization is especially potent among women. It offers an antidote to the chaos of contemporary life—a way to reclaim control, to demonstrate mastery, to become the kind of woman who "has it together." The minimalist aesthetic of capsule wardrobes symbolizes more than fashion taste; it symbolizes composure, discernment, and maturity. These qualities are deeply gendered. They reflect an ideal of femininity that is composed, restrained, ethical, and attractive—not because it challenges systems, but because it makes them beautiful.

Self-restraint, in this discourse, becomes a language through which power speaks softly. It does not demand sacrifice. It whispers choice. It offers less as more, order as peace, curation as identity. It invites the subject to participate in their own subjection—and to enjoy it. This is not false consciousness. It is the mechanism by which neoliberal subjectivity is formed and sustained: through the seamless integration of pleasure, ethics, aesthetics, and discipline.

In the context of capsule wardrobes, this integration is both seductive and exhausting. The promise of clarity is powerful, especially in a world of over-saturation. But clarity here is not just visual. It is moral and emotional. It asks the subject not only to simplify her closet but to narrate that simplification as growth. It demands coherence not only in color palette but in personality. To participate in this discourse is to become a moralized brand, a curated self, an aesthetic project. The capsule wardrobe is not just a set of garments. It is a performance of life as legible, ethical, and beautiful—despite the structures that remain unexamined and unchanged.

4. Feminized Labor and the Neoliberal Ethos

In the digital landscape of capsule wardrobe discourse, aesthetic and emotional labor are coded as natural, even pleasurable extensions of feminine identity. This labor—photographing outfits, color-coordinating closets, writing captions about ethical consumption—is positioned not as work but as self-expression. The seamless blend of personal routine and digital performance masks the degree to which unpaid, affective labor underpins the visibility and circulation of minimalist aesthetics online. Though it presents as therapeutic, this form of labor is tightly tethered to neoliberal imperatives: self-branding, productivity, optimization, and visibility. It is through these imperatives that capsule wardrobe content reproduces a mode of gendered labor that is normalized, idealized, and invisibilized.

The visual economy of capsule wardrobe culture demands consistency, curation, and affective appeal. On platforms such as Instagram and TikTok, success is measured by engagement—likes, saves, comments, and follows—which depend upon the labor-intensive construction of an aesthetic self. This self is not simply well-dressed. She is organized, self-aware, reflective, and emotionally available. She offers insights into her

decisions to discard items, reflections on her evolving relationship with fashion, and quiet joy in her simplified surroundings. In this ecosystem, the feminine subject is not only seen but must see herself as a project. She is required to labor on her appearance, her surroundings, and her voice—making the ethics of her wardrobe legible and aspirational to others.

This form of digital labor aligns closely with what JL Neumann identifies as "communicative, relational, and affective labor" within fashion and lifestyle blogging. Neumann notes that female influencers often frame their work as a "personal calling," concealing the extensive labor that goes into crafting an image of authenticity and emotional connection with their audience (Neumann, 2018). In capsule wardrobe discourse, this labor manifests in the meticulous staging of minimalism—not just as a visual style, but as a coherent life philosophy. What appears as a snapshot of effortless calm is the result of multiple hidden layers of effort: organizing, photographing, editing, reflecting, writing, posting, and monitoring feedback.

The ideology that renders this labor invisible is neoliberalism itself, which frames all labor as choice, all productivity as self-care, and all branding as empowerment. Neoliberal discourse encourages women to internalize entrepreneurial values, turning their identities into marketable assets. In this framework, unpaid labor becomes not exploitation but opportunity. As S. Greene illustrates in her dissertation on self-branding and social media aesthetics, digital platforms have enabled subjects—especially women—to "perform the branded self" through tools like fashion and beauty, producing content that is at once intimate and strategic (Greene, 2019). The capsule wardrobe influencer typifies this logic. Her minimalist closet is not only an expression of restraint but also a form of branding—conveying sophistication, mindfulness, and taste.

This labor, despite its intense demands, is often described by practitioners as meditative or fulfilling. This affective framing is part of what makes the aesthetic labor of capsule wardrobes so ideologically powerful. It constructs discipline as self-love and content creation as emotional nourishment. Aesthetic minimalism becomes a site where neoliberal discipline masquerades as pleasure. JL Moultrie's work on neoliberal multiculturalism in advertising underscores how visual culture invites individuals to see their consumption and self-presentation as "conscious," framing corporate-aligned behaviors as emancipatory acts (Moultrie, 2019). In capsule wardrobe culture, this framing manifests as pleasure in the act of simplifying—yet the simplification is rarely simple.

Behind the soothing tones and curated feeds lies a vast amount of unpaid labor that is feminized and depoliticized. Women are encouraged to perform care for the self and others through their wardrobe choices, creating tutorials, writing captions about intentional living, and linking ethical products—all without formal compensation. This labor is emotional, because it involves creating and maintaining digital intimacy. It is aesthetic, because it requires mastery of color theory, spatial organization, and camera work. It is communicative, because it demands constant engagement with followers through messages, comments, and Q&A content. Yet despite this multidimensionality, it is rarely recognized as labor. Instead, it is perceived as a "lifestyle."

A. Vesey contextualizes this erasure by pointing to the increasing feminization of "relational labor," where connection-building is central to visibility and brand survival. Though her study focuses on the music merchandise space, Vesey identifies a broader trend: women are encouraged to monetize relationships rather than products, and in doing so, they obscure the intensity of their own labor (Vesey, 2024). Capsule wardrobe creators enact this relational labor daily. Their posts are not just fashion advice; they are reflections, reassurances, and narratives of growth. The work of connecting is work, even if it is performed under the banner of authenticity.

This ideology is especially potent in its intersection with the optimization ethos. Neoliberalism teaches subjects that every aspect of life should be curated and made productive. Time, emotions, space, and even clothing must be managed for maximum efficiency and value. The capsule wardrobe adherent is not simply stylish—she is organized, efficient, and future-proof. Each item in her wardrobe is chosen not only for its utility but for its symbolic value: versatility, timelessness, ethical origin. In this way, the closet becomes a site of micro-governance. It is optimized for daily routines, content creation, and moral performance. What looks like simplification is actually intense systemization. Each choice is a mini-strategy. Each item performs multiple functions.

This systemization mirrors the logic of contemporary entrepreneurship, where women are expected to turn every life activity into content and every passion into a hustle. Capsule wardrobes fit perfectly within this logic. They invite followers to reflect, reorganize, and then share their results. They encourage blog posts, YouTube series, e-books, and online courses. They incentivize monetization through affiliate links and brand collaborations. The closet becomes a classroom. The lifestyle becomes a business model. Feminized labor is rebranded as aspirational entrepreneurship.

But this entrepreneurship is structured by exclusion. Not all women can participate in capsule wardrobe discourse equally. The aesthetic norms of capsule content—clean spaces, natural lighting, access to ethically

made garments—are coded as white, middle-class, and able-bodied. The labor of minimizing one's wardrobe presumes access to surplus and the discretionary time required to sort, photograph, and style. It also presumes access to the platforms where this labor can be performed and rewarded. These assumptions are rarely acknowledged, creating an ideology of minimalism that appears universal but is grounded in structural privilege.

This structural privilege is amplified by the algorithmic demands of social media platforms. The visibility of capsule wardrobe content depends on consistency, novelty, and visual appeal—all of which require time, knowledge, and unpaid aesthetic labor. Creators who fail to meet these visual standards often see their content buried, regardless of its ethical intent. This creates a feedback loop where those who can afford to labor unpaid—and do so within dominant visual norms—gain more visibility and influence. Those who cannot remain invisible. The aesthetic and emotional labor of minimalism thus becomes a filter of class and race, as well as of gender.

And yet, within this highly constrained structure, capsule wardrobe creators continue to frame their labor as liberation. This contradiction is the essence of the neoliberal ethos. It turns unpaid work into empowerment and structural inequality into personal failure or success. Women are invited to treat labor as leisure, to find meaning in optimization, and to frame restraint as self-expression. They are encouraged to remain productive at all times—organizing, editing, writing, posting—while believing that they are simply "being themselves."

This belief is powerful. It creates the illusion that labor can be fully expressive, that unpaid work is free of exploitation if it is self-chosen, and that lifestyle can be political without collective action. Capsule wardrobe discourse thus obscures the boundaries between living and working, relaxing and branding, caring and marketing. It produces a feminine subject who is always on-brand, always in control, always working—but never "working," at least in the traditional sense.

By situating capsule wardrobe labor within this ideological terrain, it becomes clear how deeply intertwined aesthetic minimalism is with neoliberal governance. The act of minimizing is not outside capitalism; it is capitalism's latest affective strategy. It asks women not to escape consumption but to manage it aesthetically. It asks them not to resist discipline but to embody it beautifully. It asks them not to reject labor but to love it—especially when that labor is unpaid, invisible, and feminized.

5. Conclusion

The capsule wardrobe, as it manifests on social media platforms, is not merely an assemblage of neutral-toned garments or a pragmatic fashion solution. It is a densely layered cultural form, one that crystallizes intersecting ideologies of gender, labor, consumption, and identity under the aesthetics of restraint. It traffics in the language of choice and control, while staging those performances against an aesthetic backdrop so carefully composed it erases its own contradictions. Minimalism, as it is rendered here, is not just the absence of clutter. It is the disciplined presence of femininity reimagined through digital platforms as optimization, refinement, and self-containment. This feminized aesthetic of austerity, wrapped in linen and haloed by soft lighting, conceals not only structural power but the emotional and aesthetic labor that sustains its image.

To understand the capsule wardrobe as a social phenomenon requires more than examining personal fashion choices. It demands attending to the political economies of visibility, the ideologies of neoliberal empowerment, and the gendered burdens of curation. In the digital economy, attention is capital, and aesthetics become a currency. The social media user who constructs a capsule wardrobe does not simply reduce their closet; they create a legible brand of selfhood. This brand—calm, ethical, minimalist—relies on a visual consistency that is neither natural nor spontaneous. It is governed by unspoken rules about color, space, mood, and time. These rules are not neutral. They are steeped in class privilege, racial aesthetics, and gendered expectations.

JL Neumann describes the labor behind this curated minimalism as affective and relational—work that is unpaid, feminized, and disguised as play (Neumann, 2018). The social media content creator does not just perform fashion; she performs a way of being that appears meditative, ethical, and superior to the chaotic consumer culture she seems to reject. Yet the labor she performs—sorting, recording, editing, responding—is intense and continuous. She is never off the clock, even when folding t-shirts. The minimal closet becomes a maximal project, one that converts personal virtue into public value.

This value is defined within the architecture of neoliberal capitalism, which recodes austerity not as scarcity but as agency. Neoliberalism does not force reduction; it encourages it as a lifestyle. It reframes economic restraint as ethical optimization, inviting subjects to internalize market logic and perform it willingly. Capsule wardrobe discourse exemplifies this shift. The subject does not simply abstain from consuming; she demonstrates how well she can abstain. This demonstration becomes content. This content becomes brand. This brand becomes capital—cultural, social, and sometimes literal. What was once a constraint becomes an opportunity. Self-denial becomes a pathway to visibility and influence.

Yet this visibility is tightly managed. Only certain types of minimalism are rewarded by the algorithmic eyes of

Instagram and TikTok. The aesthetic of the capsule wardrobe is deeply racialized and classed. It privileges Eurocentric color palettes, Scandinavian design tropes, and a photographic language of softness and serenity. Greene's study on branded selves underscores how digital fashion cultures discipline subjects through aesthetic norms while presenting them as personal choices (Greene, 2019). Within this economy, the visibility of a capsule wardrobe creator often depends on her ability to produce not just content, but content that aligns with unspoken racialized standards of beauty and propriety.

This aesthetic regulation is a form of soft governance. It does not prohibit deviation, but it withholds visibility and influence from those who cannot or will not conform. Foucault's concept of governmentality is helpful here—not as a top-down form of power but as a diffusion of norms that subjects internalize and enact. In capsule wardrobe discourse, subjects govern themselves through routines of editing, curating, and sharing. They discipline their closets and, by extension, their identities. This governance is not felt as repression but as clarity, freedom, and lightness. As W. Anderson puts it, neoliberal dispositifs work best when they make governance feel like pleasure (Anderson, 2024).

Pleasure, in this context, is a function of aesthetic coherence. The appeal of minimalism lies not in its ideological depth but in its visual rhythm. Beige, white, and taupe are not just colors; they are signals of control. Empty hangers are not just organizational tools; they are icons of moral victory. Simplicity itself becomes content. This aesthetic pleasure conceals the emotional and material complexity beneath it. Behind every curated image is a series of decisions, labor hours, and affective investments. The more seamless the image, the more invisible the labor that sustains it.

Digital femininity, under these conditions, is defined not by freedom from labor but by the mastery of it. The capsule wardrobe influencer is not liberated from domestic responsibilities; she has perfected them. She is not resisting the demand to be organized, calm, and composed; she is performing those qualities at a level that becomes aspirational. She is the optimized subject: a woman whose ethics are visible, whose restraint is desirable, whose labor is affective, and whose life is content. Her closet is not merely functional; it is symbolic. It signifies self-control, wisdom, and virtue. It becomes the altar at which the feminine subject proves her moral worth.

This symbolism is dangerous in its subtlety. It asks women to identify with the discipline that governs them. It asks them to perform labor without naming it as such. It asks them to be productive while appearing peaceful. It asks them to convert critique into aesthetic. The rejection of fast fashion becomes an Instagram reel. The critique of clutter becomes a TikTok tutorial. The promise of ethical living becomes a blog post that links to affiliate programs. Every act of resistance is monetized. Every act of reduction is expanded into content. The cycle is endless, but its surface remains calm.

This calm is a performance, and like all performances, it has costs. It excludes those whose lives are not orderly, whose homes are not well-lit, whose closets are not photogenic. It marginalizes the messy, the excessive, the non-conforming. It transforms economic necessity into moral failure and aesthetic lack into personal deficit. The minimalist subject is not only idealized; she is policed. Those who fail to embody her aesthetic are marked as less ethical, less evolved, less capable. This judgment is rarely spoken but always seen—in the silence of the algorithm, in the absence of likes, in the invisibility of difference.

Yet the appeal of capsule wardrobe culture endures because it offers not just a style but a worldview. It promises clarity in a cluttered world. It promises meaning in consumption. It promises that by having less, one can be more. This promise is seductive, especially in a time when chaos is ambient and choices are endless. The capsule wardrobe cuts through noise. It organizes the self, visually and ethically. It offers the illusion of mastery in an economy that otherwise breeds fragmentation. But that mastery is costly. It demands constant labor. It rewards only certain bodies. It sustains only certain aesthetics. It performs liberation while demanding control.

The concept of "austerity in silk" captures this paradox. The capsule wardrobe is not about poverty. It is about aestheticized restraint. It is not about lack. It is about strategic visibility. It is silk, not sackcloth. It is soft, luxurious, and morally upright. It is the kind of austerity that photographs well. The kind that performs ethics without confronting systemic injustice. The kind that sells empowerment while preserving inequality. This is not a coincidence. It is the logic of neoliberal culture, where the self becomes the site of all improvement, all morality, all transformation. Structures are backgrounded. Systems are aestheticized. The closet becomes the world. In this world, ethics are curated. Labor is hidden. Femininity is optimized. Minimalism is monetized. And empowerment is always branded.

References

Anderson, W., (2024). *Spectacles of waste*. John Wiley & Sons.

Banet-Weiser, S., (2018). *Empowered: Popular feminism and popular misogyny*. Duke University Press.

Bradshaw, Lara L., (2015). Well-Being Domesticities: Mediating 21st-Century Femininity Through Physical, Mental, and Emotional Lifestyles. University of Southern California ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, 11012516.

Dawson, C. S., (2024). Politics en Vogue: An exploration of entanglements of US consumer capitalism, feminisms, and environmental concerns.

Duda, A., (2023). The discourse of minimalist lifestyle: A corpus-based approach. *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics, 19*(2). https://doi.org/10.1386/macp_00081_1

Duda, A., (2025). Lifestyles, identities and aesthetics in the discourse of maximalists and minimalists. A critical discourse analysis with the use of corpus linguistics methods. *Educational Media International*, *62*(2), 143–169. https://doi.org/10.1080/09523987.2025.2486938

Greene, S., (2019). Performing the branded self: Harajuku fashion and South Korean cosmetics as tools of neoliberal self-branding on social media. McGill University (Canada) ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, 28265675.

Heger, G., (2016). The capsule closet phenomenon: A phenomenological study of lived experiences with capsule closets.

Mahlakaarto, E. K., & Suanse, Y., (2024). How women's consumer identity is shaped by social media and influencers in the beauty and lifestyle industry? Bachelor's thesis, Lund University. Lund University Publications.

Moultrie, J. L., (2019). Commodifying consciousness: A visual analysis and discussion on neoliberal multiculturalism in advertising. University of Illinois.

Murphy, E. L., (2018). Less is more work: A governmentality analysis of authenticity within minimalism discourse. Master's thesis, Carleton University.

Neumann, J. L., (2018). #Fashioningidentity and #Performingauthenticity: Communicative, relational, and affective labor in the digital frontier of fashion and lifestyle blogging. Master's thesis, University of Denver.

Petersfield, M., (2024). Virtual femininity: a photographic exploration of the idealised body in digital self-imaging practices. University of Tasmania. Thesis. https://doi.org/10.25959/25874491.v1

Vesey, A., (2024). *Extending play: The feminization of collaborative music merchandise in the early twenty-first century*. Oxford University Press.

Ye, Z., (2023). Sustainable HCI: Fashion minimalism and human-robot companionship. Indiana University ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, 30686664.