

The Gendered Nature of Urban Space, Placemaking Processes and Landscape Planning

Ramona Mihăilă | ORCID: 0000-0003-2406-7616

Dimitrie Cantemir Christian University, Bucharest, Romania

ramona.mihaila@ucdc.ro

Isabel Lousada | ORCID: 0000-0002-7652-8544

NOVAFCSH-CICSNOVA, Lisbon, Portugal

isabel.lousada@fcs.unl.pt

Onorina Botezat | ORCID: 0000-0002-2735-1957

Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Romania

onorina.botezat@gmail.com

Efstratia Oktapoda | ORCID: 0000-0002-0969-6783

Sorbonne University, Paris, France

Efstratia.Oktapoda@paris-sorbonne.fr

George Lăzăroiu | ORCID: 0000-0002-3422-6310

Spiru Haret University, Bucharest, Romania

phd_lazaroiu@yahoo.com

Abstract

With growing evidence of social institutions furthering an interconnected notion of normatively gendered behaviour and differentiation across urban space, there is a pivotal need for comprehending social stratification in relation to particular urban gender roles and ethical identities in placemaking processes and landscape planning. This research shows that the urban gendering of ethical citizenship, civic spaces and landscape planning, in addition to the civic institutions of urban performance, are pivotal in gender unfolding throughout sociopolitical power and contributes to the literature by indicating that gendered relationships enable the organizing principles of spatial urban performance and placemaking processes. Throughout October 2022, a quantitative literature review of the Web of Science, Scopus and ProQuest databases was performed, search terms including “urban space + gender”, “placemaking

processes + gender”, and “landscape planning + gender”, that is, the most employed words or phrases in the inspected literature. As research published between 2018 and 2022 was investigated, only 424 articles met the suitability criteria. By excluding unconvincing or imprecise findings, outcomes unsubstantiated by replication, too inconclusive content, or having comparable titles, 88 empirical sources were selected. The intricacy and multifaceted character of gendered meanings, networks, and ideologies of urban geography and landscape planning, together with gender politics, codes, positions, roles and relations, shape the spatialization of urban etiquette. Spatially specific rules of power fashion the gendered map of urban landscapes, and thus the social construction of gendered patterns and gender divisions, composition and performance develop the gendering of spatial organizations and the construction of gender and of the social relations of sexuality as an urban performance and placemaking process. Further developments should clarify whether gendered power relations, norms and institutions can be articulated and configured within deeply inscribed contexts of urban performance, thus normalizing sexual identity, social distinction and reshaped behaviour.

Keywords

normative – behaviour – sociopolitical power

1 Introduction

The objective of the systematic review is to inspect the recently published literature on the gendered nature of urban space, placemaking processes and landscape planning and to integrate the insights articulated on gender dynamics and unequal socio-spatial power relations and sociocultural norms. Our main purpose is to indicate that spatial production, social structures and placemaking processes impact cultural bonds, resulting in a complex network of heterogeneous lifestyles across urban dynamics in terms of gendered place identities. By investigating the most recent (2018–2022) and relevant (Web of Science, Scopus and ProQuest) sources, this study endeavours to prove that social identities are configured and challenged across claimed, regulated and bound public urban spaces, processes and structures through sociopolitical power relationships and intersections, articulating normative societal expectations and attitudes in terms of gender and reproduction issues.

In this systematic review, previous findings have been accumulated, clarifying that the social logic as urban planning, design and sustainability configures

a gender pattern of public activities. The identified gaps move forward convergence of sexualities and gender that are essential to the shared reconfiguration of citizens and places. This research contributes to the literature on spatial urban performance and placemaking processes by explaining that power imbalances, gender roles and urban governance arrangements impact environmental and social diversity and equity, restorative activities and decision-making processes. This research endeavours to elucidate that gendered structures, sociocultural background, aesthetic values and place of residence shape individual landscape preferences in terms of sociopolitical power planning and management. Our contribution is by assimilating research results indicating that the urban behaviours of gendered identities display a normative public representation of the socio-spatial landscape. The actuality and novelty of this chapter are configured by addressing urban gender roles and ethical identities in placemaking processes and landscape planning, that is, a hot emerging topic. Our research problem is whether an urban environment can be perceived or experienced as a spatial area in which gender or sexual diversity can be articulated.

2 Theoretical Overview of the Main Concepts

Power relations and mechanisms (Gamlin, 2021; LaFrombois, 2019; Maclean, 2018; Navarrete-Hernandez et al., 2021; Shirazi, 2019) shape social divisions, local identity and participatory landscape planning processes. Social and ecological sustainability (Cover et al., 2020; Gauvin et al., 2020; Heynen, 2018; Koleth & Temenos, 2022; Mashhoodi, 2021) requires citizen-oriented sound urban planning practices. Environmental placemaking (Albert et al., 2021; Carter, 2019; Cook & Butz, 2018; Escobedo et al., 2022; Sklenicka & Zouhar, 2018; Solecka et al., 2022) is a fluid, hybrid, unbounded and multi-actor social process (Ali & Newbold, 2021; Caillol, 2018; Guo et al., 2022; Lata et al., 2021; Srinivasan, 2020) integrating heterogeneous ecological routines and routes of belongingness. Gender norms are progressively modified (Iaquinto, 2020; Mansilla & Milano, 2022; Spruce, 2020; Vaughan et al., 2021; Wise et al., 2021) in socially and culturally accepted areas. Citizens develop the standard regions of public space through performative and challenging relational placemaking mechanisms (Adams et al., 2018; Buhr, 2018; Mollett & Faria, 2018; Pellicer-Chenoll et al., 2021; Reid-Musson, 2018) as social networks, place frames, subject constitution and the practical experiences (Bassi et al., 2019; Ernoul et al., 2018; Huang et al., 2020; Kalaycı Önaç & Gönüllü Sütçüoğlu, 2021; Zoderer et al., 2019) of symbolically embodied routines. Memory, the sense of place,

affect, spatiality, movement, displacement, shared engagement and power networks as practices of belonging and placemaking (Chica, 2021; Platt, 2019; Purkis, 2019; Ramli & Ujang, 2021; Zhou et al., 2021) are integrated in urban materialities. Women can establish their urban social identities and can be pivotal in normative placemaking (Gotfredsen et al., 2021; Manzi et al., 2019; Sen & Nagendra, 2019; Wilkinson et al., 2021; Yu & Blain, 2019), configuring the performance of their own spatial agency. Participatory processes in local governance (Lee & Blackford, 2020; Mokhles & Sunikka-Blank, 2022; Phan, 2022; Van Eck, 2021; Zhou et al., 2023) influence sociopolitical power, mapping and decision-making (Bagheri, 2019; Johnson et al., 2019; Keleg et al., 2021; Riechers et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2021) associated with environmental management. Placemaking represents a kind of public involvement that shapes community development (De Jong & Steadman, 2021; Hansasooksin & Tontisirin, 2021; Li & Whitworth, 2022; McClinchey, 2021; Salzman & Lopez, 2020) by developing social capital and furthering public policy. Perceptions and meanings of the urban dynamic landscape (Browne, 2021; Butler, 2018; Erfani, 2021; Marlowe & Chubb, 2021; Özogul & Tasan-Kok, 2018) impact socio-environmental conservation. Awareness, liveliness and involvement (Conrad et al., 2019; Garekae & Shackleton, 2020; Liu et al., 2020; Nawrath et al., 2019; Samuelsson et al., 2018) shape perceptions of normative placemaking. Women can perform visible actions (Casagrande, 2021; Ewalt, 2018; Fisker et al., 2021; Stewart et al., 2019; Tarr & Alvarez León, 2019) by accessing public urban spaces. Participatory decision-making (Chazdon et al., 2021; Häfner et al., 2018; Inoue et al., 2022; Jackson et al., 2021; Leite et al., 2019; Lim et al., 2021) is required in landscape protection, administration and planning. Landscape planning (Calderon & Butler, 2020; Fagerholm et al., 2019; Santé et al., 2019; Schirpke et al., 2019; Schurr et al., 2020; Xu et al., 2020) can optimize the restorative consequences of urban environments. The manuscript is organized as following: (1) introduction, (2) theoretical overview, (3) methodology, (4) gender dynamics and unequal socio-spatial power relations and sociocultural norms, (5) gendered relations of power and placemaking processes, (6) gendered cultures, power structures and landscape planning, (7) discussion, (8) synopsis of the main research outcomes, (9) conclusions and, finally, (10) limitations, implications and further directions for research.

3 Methodology

We elucidate, by cumulative evidence, prior empirical research demonstrating how cultural participation and social activities and processes as engagement

patterns can enhance significantly creative placemaking values and urban design in terms of inclusiveness and diversity. Throughout October 2022, a quantitative literature review of the Web of Science, Scopus and ProQuest databases was performed, search terms including “urban space + gender”, “placemaking processes + gender”, and “landscape planning + gender”, that is, the most employed words or phrases in the inspected literature. As research published between 2018 and 2022 was investigated, only 424 articles met the suitability criteria. By excluding unconvincing or imprecise findings, outcomes unsubstantiated by replication, too inconclusive content or having comparable titles, 88 empirical sources were selected (Tables 3.1 to 3.3). Extracting scholarly sources as evidence, no institutional ethics approval was needed before the research began. We employed Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis (PRISMA) guidelines, and thus our research is comprehensive, transparent and replicable. A Shiny app was harnessed to produce the flow diagram. Methodological quality assessment tools used include AMSTAR (for systematic reviews), AXIS (for cross-sectional studies), Dedoose (for mixed methods research), Distiller SR (for literature collection, screening and evaluation), Mixed Method Appraisal Tool (for systematic mixed studies reviews) and Systematic Review Data Repository (summary data from systematic reviews). Dimensions and VOSviewer were harnessed as data visualization tools (bibliometric mapping and layout algorithms) (Figures 3.1–3.5).

TABLE 3.1 Topics and types of scientific products identified and selected

Topic	Identified	Selected
urban space + gender	164	20
placemaking processes + gender	115	35
landscape planning + gender	145	33
Type of paper		
Original research	335	88
Review	22	0
Conference proceedings	26	0
Book	24	0
Editorial	17	0

SOURCE: PROCESSED BY THE AUTHORS. SOME TOPICS OVERLAP

TABLE 3.2 General synopsis of evidence as regards focus topics and descriptive outcomes (research findings)

<p>Cultural and gendered underlying forces organize social capital influencing urban space. Spatial structuring, planning and use of urban locations integrate gendered divisions of labour by the use of natural resources and public infrastructure.</p>	<p>Gamlin, 2021; LaFrombois, 2019; Maclean, 2018; Navarrete-Hernandez et al., 2021; Shirazi, 2019</p>
<p>Gender relations develop within urban space and socionatural processes. An urban environment can be perceived or experienced as a spatial area in which gender or sexual diversity can be articulated. Gender and sexuality in the public realm can perform as urban processes, negotiating identities. Gender norms are progressively modified in socially and culturally accepted areas.</p>	<p>Cover et al., 2020; Gauvin et al., 2020; Heynen, 2018; Koleth & Temenos, 2022; Mashhoodi, 2021 Ali & Newbold, 2021; Caillol, 2018; Guo et al., 2022; Lata et al., 2021; Srinivasan, 2020</p>
<p>Gender dynamics and unequal socio-spatial power relations and sociocultural norms underpin public involvement in community-based governance and decision-making processes. Gendered types of civilization and racial and classed power function as mechanisms of gendered development and space building.</p>	<p>Adams et al., 2018; Buhr, 2018; Mollett & Faria, 2018; Pellicer-Chenoll et al., 2021; Reid-Musson, 2018</p>
<p>The gendered character of unconstrained creative placemaking mechanisms assimilates urban practices and processes. Cultural participation and social activities and processes as engagement patterns can enhance significantly creative placemaking values and urban design in terms of inclusiveness and diversity.</p>	<p>Chica, 2021; Platt, 2019; Purkis, 2019; Ramli & Ujang, 2021; Zhou et al., 2021</p>
<p>Gendered relations of power are configured across placemaking within commitment and vulnerability associated with material conditions. Women can establish their urban social identities and be pivotal in placemaking, configuring the performance of their own spatial agency.</p>	<p>Gotfredsen et al., 2021; Manzi et al., 2019; Sen & Nagendra, 2019; Wilkinson et al., 2021; Yu & Blain, 2019</p>
<p>Temporalities and environments are pivotal in the urban planning of placemaking processes, enhancing the liveability of communities and entailing spatial materiality. Spatialized territorialization and the urban strategies of neighbourhood development can articulate a sexual geography.</p>	<p>Iaquinto, 2020; Mansilla & Milano, 2022; Spruce, 2020; Vaughan et al., 2021; Wise et al., 2021</p>

TABLE 3.2 General synopsis of evidence as regards focus topics (*cont.*)

<p>Heterogeneous geographies of place, urban fabrics and sociocultural norms influence women's practices as regards social interaction, infrastructure and mobility. Spatial production, social structures and placemaking processes impact cultural bonds, resulting in a complex network of heterogeneous lifestyles across urban dynamics in terms of gendered place identities. Gendered performances in terms of inclusions and exclusions shape urban renewal and placemaking. Multicultural values, spatial practices and networks, place identities and a sense of belonging in urban areas improve civic participation, social capital and sustainability, everyday placemaking and identity creation.</p>	<p>Lee & Blackford, 2020; Mkhles & Sunikka-Blank, 2022; Phan, 2022; Van Eck, 2021; Zhou et al., 2023</p>
<p>Gendered sociocultural and geopolitical locations are grounded in urban knowledge and practices. Convergence of sexualities and gender are essential to the shared reconfiguration of citizens and places. Gendered urban places require granular spatial data. Relational placemaking configures a spatial system of networked social meanings integrating the sense of place and community practices of spatial contagion. Gender influences the assessments of landscape values and of community development processes in terms of urban planning and design. Power imbalances, gender roles and urban governance arrangements impact environmental and social diversity and equity, restorative activities and decision-making processes.</p>	<p>De Jong & Steadman, 2021; Hansasooksin & Tontisirin, 2021; Li & Whitworth, 2022; McClinchey, 2021; Salzman & Lopez, 2020</p> <p>Browne, 2021; Butler, 2018; Erfani, 2021; Marlowe & Chubb, 2021; Özogul & Tasan-Kok, 2018</p> <p>Casagrande, 2021; Ewalt, 2018; Fisker et al., 2021; Stewart et al., 2019; Tarr & Alvarez León, 2019</p> <p>Chazdon et al., 2021; Häfner et al., 2018; Inoue et al., 2022; Jackson et al., 2021; Leite et al., 2019; Lim et al., 2021</p>
<p>Gendered cultures and power structures require intersectional equality, urban equity and social justice. Gendered structures, sociocultural background, aesthetic values and place of residence impact individual landscape preferences in terms of planning and management.</p>	<p>Calderon & Butler, 2020; Fagerholm et al., 2019; Santé et al., 2019; Schirpke et al., 2019; Schurr et al., 2020; Xu et al., 2020</p>
<p>Gender and mobility are conjointly constitutive social mechanisms. Gender relations influence mobility patterns in certain socio-spatial contexts.</p>	<p>Albert et al., 2021; Carter, 2019; Cook & Butz, 2018; Escobedo et al., 2022; Sklenicka & Zouhar, 2018; Solecka et al., 2022</p>

TABLE 3.2 General synopsis of evidence as regards focus topics (*cont.*)

Spatial planning, policymaking processes and landscape management configure sociocultural valuation of urban data. Landscape planning can optimize the restorative consequences of urban environments.	Bassi et al., 2019; Ernoul et al., 2018; Huang et al., 2020; Kalaycı Önaç & Gönüllü Sütçüoğlu, 2021; Zoderer et al., 2019
Gender equity in terms of sociocultural practices and norms can result in optimized urban well-being and economic development. Women's spatial mobility integrates the construction, negotiation and perception of self as well as the sociocultural production of public space and meaning.	Bagheri, 2019; Johnson et al., 2019; Keleg et al., 2021; Riechers et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2021
Landscape planning and development need to consider environmental protection and urban sustainability. Social and ecological sustainability requires citizen-oriented sound urban planning practices.	Conrad et al., 2019; Garekæ & Shackleton, 2020; Liu et al., 2020; Nawrath et al., 2019; Samuelsson et al., 2018

SOURCE: PROCESSED BY THE AUTHORS

Co-authorship correlations (Figure 3.1) show that the social logic as normative urban planning, design and sustainability configures a gender pattern of public activities. Incessant movements and changes do not support the building of a sense of placemaking and community as rooted networks. Collaborative landscape governance integrates normative local-level planning routines, community values and spatial tools and patterns. Citation correlations (Figure 3.2) show that the gender disparity patterns of utilization and spatial distribution are related to network compactness and criticalness. Citizens develop the standard regions of public space through performative and challenging relational placemaking mechanisms as social networks, place frames, subject constitution, and the practical experiences of symbolically embodied routines. Bibliographic coupling correlations (Figure 3.3) show that placemaking integrates the social arrangements that create, consolidate and develop places and agency through historical and actual processes, urban networks, social antagonism and the built environment. Normative placemaking processes incorporate spatial empowerment, place dependence and identity, and community planning, development and integration. Co-citation correlations (Figure 3.4)

4 Gender Dynamics and Unequal Socio-spatial Power Relations

Cultural and gendered underlying forces (Gamlin, 2021; LaFrombois, 2019; Maclean, 2018; Navarrete-Hernandez et al., 2021; Shirazi, 2019) organize socio-political power and social capital influencing urban space. To optimize investment performance, urban design and planning strategies across the public realm should integrate a gendered view. Social identities are configured and challenged across claimed, regulated and bound public urban spaces, processes and structures through relationships and intersections, articulating societal expectations and attitudes in terms of gender and reproduction issues. Spatial structuring, planning and use of urban locations integrate gendered divisions of labour by the use of natural resources and public infrastructure.

Gendered mobility patterns, urban affordances and socio-economic determinants (Cover et al., 2020; Gauvin et al., 2020; Heynen, 2018; Koleth & Temenos, 2022; Mashhoodi, 2021) are intertwined. Gender relations develop within urban space and socionatural processes. Swift urban growth and changes shape social reproduction across gendered spaces. An urban environment can be perceived or experienced as a spatial area in which gender or sexual diversity can be articulated. Disproportionate gender representation is displayed as unfair treatment in access to green areas in terms of environmental justice.

Gender and sexuality in the public realm can perform as normative urban processes (Ali & Newbold, 2021; Caillol, 2018; Guo et al., 2022; Lata et al., 2021; Srinivasan, 2020), negotiating identities. Gender norms are progressively modified in socially and culturally accepted areas. Women can perform visible actions by accessing public urban spaces. Urban realm vitality develops on spatial social interactions. Uneven economic areas and gendered vulnerability are spatially patterned.

Gender dynamics and unequal socio-spatial power relations and socio-cultural norms (Adams et al., 2018; Buhr, 2018; Mollett & Faria, 2018; Pellicer-Chenoll et al., 2021; Reid-Musson, 2018) underpin public involvement in sociopolitical power, community-based governance and decision-making processes. Gendered types of civilization and racial and classed power function as mechanisms of gendered development and space building. Co-articulated and contingent processes, experienced utilization of space and regularized and reconditioned boundary transgressions support social categorization and injustice as gendered structures and interconnections, integrating spatialities and subjectivities. Heterogeneous urban experience and spatial integration configure gendered place and locality (Table 3.3).

TABLE 3.3 Synopsis of evidence as regards focus topics and descriptive outcomes (research findings)

<p>Cultural and gendered underlying forces organize social capital influencing urban space. Spatial structuring, planning and use of urban locations integrate gendered divisions of labour by the use of natural resources and public infrastructure.</p>	<p>Gamlin, 2021; LaFrombois, 2019; Maclean, 2018; Navarrete-Hernandez et al., 2021; Shirazi, 2019</p>
<p>Gender relations develop within urban space and sociocultural processes. An urban environment can be perceived or experienced as a spatial area in which gender or sexual diversity can be articulated.</p>	<p>Cover et al., 2020; Gauvin et al., 2020; Heynen, 2018; Koleth & Temenos, 2022; Mashhoodi, 2021</p>
<p>Gender and sexuality in the public realm can perform as urban processes, negotiating identities. Gender norms are progressively modified in socially and culturally accepted areas.</p>	<p>Ali & Newbold, 2021; Caillol, 2018; Guo et al., 2022; Lata et al., 2021; Srinivasan, 2020</p>
<p>Gender dynamics and unequal socio-spatial power relations and sociocultural norms underpin public involvement in community-based governance and decision-making processes. Gendered types of civilization and racial and classed power function as mechanisms of gendered development and space building.</p>	<p>Adams et al., 2018; Buhr, 2018; Mollett & Faria, 2018; Pellicer-Chenoll et al., 2021; Reid-Musson, 2018</p>

SOURCE: PROCESSED BY THE AUTHORS

5 Gendered Relations of Power and Placemaking Processes

The gendered character of unconstrained creative placemaking mechanisms (Chica, 2021; Platt, 2019; Purkis, 2019; Ramli & Ujang, 2021; Zhou et al., 2021) assimilates normative urban practices and processes. Cultural participation and social activities, and processes as engagement patterns, can enhance significantly creative placemaking values and urban design in terms of inclusiveness and diversity. Space constraints experienced ordinarily by underprivileged groups and genders can be dissimilar in terms of spatial behaviours and social contexts, reproducing and underpinning discriminatory power relations and roles. Community social capital and sociopolitical power impact the planning and management of placemaking processes.

Gendered relations of power are configured across placemaking (Gotfredsen et al., 2021; Manzi et al., 2019; Sen & Nagendra, 2019; Wilkinson et al., 2021; Yu

& Blain, 2019) within commitment and vulnerability associated with material conditions. Engaged relations to urban places develop a sense of belonging, responsibility and care, resulting in commitments to place as embodied spatialities of community having social bonds and differentiations, in addition to meaningful relations and routines. Environmental placemaking is a fluid, hybrid, unbounded and multi-actor social process integrating heterogeneous ecological routines and routes of belongingness. Women can establish their urban social identities and be pivotal in normative placemaking, configuring the performance of their own spatial agency.

Temporalities and environments are pivotal in the urban planning of normative placemaking processes (Iaquinto, 2020; Mansilla & Milano, 2022; Spruce, 2020; Vaughan et al., 2021; Wise et al., 2021), enhancing the liveability of communities and entailing spatial materiality. Claims to place-based, site-specific belonging engage with gendered principles of relocation and penalizing. Awareness, liveliness and involvement shape perceptions of placemaking. Interconnected practices influence social and environmental values across urban creative placemaking. Spatialized territorialization and the urban strategies of neighbourhood development can articulate a sexual geography. Memory is a placemaking routine that enables citizens to claim belonging. Placemaking policies are social processes and practices shaping the urban fabric of neighbourhood environmentally, symbolically and structurally, leading to the production and consumption of spatial centralities.

Heterogeneous geographies of place, urban fabrics and sociocultural norms (Lee & Blackford, 2020; Mokhles & Sunikka-Blank, 2022; Phan, 2022; Van Eck, 2021; Zhou et al., 2023) influence women's practices as regards social interaction, infrastructure and mobility. Spatial production, social structures and placemaking processes impact cultural bonds, resulting in a complex network of heterogeneous lifestyles across urban dynamics in terms of gendered place identities. Setting up sustainable communities in terms of aesthetic values of bonds with urban places as public spaces are instrumental in perceived placemaking outcomes. The restructuring capacities of urban social networks and of sociopolitical power illustrate the organic character of creative placemaking in terms of resources, performance and expectations. Placemaking processes and outcomes integrate localized public place-based development bonds.

Gendered performances in terms of inclusions and exclusions (De Jong & Steadman, 2021; Hansasooksin & Tontisirin, 2021; Li & Whitworth, 2022; McClinchey, 2021; Salzman & Lopez, 2020) shape urban renewal and placemaking. Multicultural values, spatial practices and networks, place identities and a sense of belonging in urban areas improve civic participation, social capital and sustainability, everyday placemaking and identity creation. Placemaking represents a kind of public involvement that shapes community development

by developing social capital and furthering public policy. Networked socio-spatial placemaking practices of the neighbourhood set up territorialities as spatial relationality and physical proximity as relationships between functional and social units. Regional-scaled policies, social interactions, spatial nodes and connections, place identity and coherent physical design assist in the process of neighbourhood constitution as placemaking.

Gendered sociocultural and geopolitical locations (Browne, 2021; Butler, 2018; Erfani, 2021; Marlowe & Chubb, 2021; Özogul & Tasan-Kok, 2018) are grounded in urban knowledge and practices. Spatial reconfiguration and attachment, power relations, placemaking practices, social processes, sense of place and control patterns impact normative urban planning and redevelopment. Physical co-presence dislocation and separation shape community development in terms of encounters, dispositions and representations. Placemaking is pivotal in developing and adjusting citizen-oriented urban space and the sociopolitical power by building up forces throughout spatial planning and governance. Convergence of sexualities and gender are essential to the shared reconfiguration of citizens and places.

Gendered urban places (Casagrande, 2021; Ewalt, 2018; Fisker et al., 2021; Stewart et al., 2019; Tarr & Alvarez León, 2019) require granular spatial data. Normative placemaking processes and deeply embedded cultural and social meanings related to the network society develop on stability, steadiness, continuity and reconfiguration in spatial flows. Memory, the sense of place, affect, spatiality, movement, displacement, shared engagement and power networks as practices of belonging and placemaking are integrated in urban materialities. Placemaking is a practice of developing urban arrangements. Relational placemaking configures a spatial system of networked social meanings integrating the sense of place and community practices of spatial contagion (Table 3.4).

6 Gendered Cultures, Power Structures and Landscape Planning

Gender influences the assessments of landscape values and of community development processes (Chazdon et al., 2021; Häfner et al., 2018; Inoue et al., 2022; Jackson et al., 2021; Leite et al., 2019; Lim et al., 2021) in terms of urban planning and design. Sociopolitical power imbalances, gender roles and urban governance arrangements impact environmental and social diversity and equity, restorative activities and decision-making processes. Perceptions and meanings of the urban dynamic landscape impact socio-environmental conservation. Community participation in decision-making can conserve local values, preserve cultural beliefs and practices, improve environmental sustainability and increase gender equality. Spatial policy, local governance and landscape

TABLE 3.4 Synopsis of evidence as regards focus topics and descriptive outcomes (research findings)

<p>The gendered character of unconstrained creative placemaking mechanisms assimilates urban practices and processes. Cultural participation and social activities and processes as engagement patterns can enhance significantly creative placemaking values and urban design in terms of inclusiveness and diversity.</p>	<p>Chica, 2021; Platt, 2019; Purkis, 2019; Ramli & Ujang, 2021; Zhou et al., 2021</p>
<p>Gendered relations of power are configured across placemaking within commitment and vulnerability associated with material conditions. Women can establish their urban social identities and be pivotal in placemaking, configuring the performance of their own spatial agency.</p>	<p>Gotfredsen et al., 2021; Manzi et al., 2019; Sen & Nagendra, 2019; Wilkinson et al., 2021; Yu & Blain, 2019</p>
<p>Temporalities and environments are pivotal in the urban planning of placemaking processes, enhancing the liveability of communities and entailing spatial materiality. Spatialized territorialization and the urban strategies of neighbourhood development can articulate a sexual geography.</p>	<p>Iaquinto, 2020; Mansilla & Milano, 2022; Spruce, 2020; Vaughan et al., 2021; Wise et al., 2021</p>
<p>Heterogeneous geographies of place, urban fabrics and sociocultural norms influence women's practices as regards social interaction, infrastructure and mobility. Spatial production, social structures and placemaking processes impact cultural bonds, resulting in a complex network of heterogeneous lifestyles across urban dynamics in terms of gendered place identities.</p>	<p>Lee & Blackford, 2020; Mokhles & Sunikka-Blank, 2022; Phan, 2022; Van Eck, 2021; Zhou et al., 2023</p>
<p>Gendered performances in terms of inclusions and exclusions shape urban renewal and placemaking. Multicultural values, spatial practices and networks, place identities and a sense of belonging in urban areas improve civic participation, social capital and sustainability, everyday placemaking and identity creation.</p>	<p>De Jong & Steadman, 2021; Hansasooksin & Tontisirin, 2021; Li & Whitworth, 2022; McClinchey, 2021; Salzman & Lopez, 2020</p>
<p>Gendered sociocultural and geopolitical locations are grounded in urban knowledge and practices. Convergence of sexualities and gender are essential to the shared reconfiguration of citizens and places.</p>	<p>Browne, 2021; Butler, 2018; Erfani, 2021; Marlowe & Chubb, 2021; Özogul & Tasan-Kok, 2018</p>
<p>Gendered urban places require granular spatial data. Relational placemaking configures a spatial system of networked social meanings integrating the sense of place and community practices of spatial contagion.</p>	<p>Casagrande, 2021; Ewalt, 2018; Fisker et al., 2021; Stewart et al., 2019; Tarr & Alvarez León, 2019</p>

SOURCE: PROCESSED BY THE AUTHORS

planning shape normative urban politics. Sociocultural and attitudinal perception and preference of heterogeneous and structured urban landscapes affect their visual representation and aesthetic value.

Gendered cultures and power structures (Calderon & Butler, 2020; Fagerholm et al., 2019; Santé et al., 2019; Schirpke et al., 2019; Schurr et al., 2020; Xu et al., 2020) require intersectional equality, urban equity and social justice. Power relations and mechanisms shape social divisions, local identity and participatory landscape planning processes, impacting inclusiveness and consensus building. Participatory decision-making is required in landscape protection, administration and planning. Gendered structures, sociocultural background, aesthetic values and place of residence impact individual landscape preferences in terms of planning and management. Urban landscape management, dynamics, assessment, development decision-making, design, wide-ranging changes and planning are perceived according to physical and psychological demands, cultural background and preferences. Local knowledge is needed for public involvement in landscape planning.

Planning and decision processes (Albert et al., 2021; Carter, 2019; Cook & Butz, 2018; Escobedo et al., 2022; Sklenicka & Zouhar, 2018; Solecka et al., 2022) influence scenic perception and environmental consequences. Participatory processes in local governance articulate mapping and decision-making associated with environmental management. Gender and mobility are conjointly constitutive social mechanisms. Perceived landscape aesthetic quality and environmental value can assist in optimizing spatial planning and management and natural connectedness. Inequality processes and social relationships influence conservation goals. Governance and decision processes articulate normative landscape and urban planning. Gender relations influence mobility patterns in certain socio-spatial contexts.

Spatial planning, policymaking processes and landscape management (Bassi et al., 2019; Ernoul et al., 2018; Huang et al., 2020; Kalaycı Önaç & Gönüllü Sütçüoğlu, 2021; Zoderer et al., 2019) configure sociocultural valuation of urban data. Urbanization routines that disregard social features lead to transformation and uniformity of the standard of living, undermine cultural values and affect the perception of the natural landscape. Places having heterogeneous landscapes are instrumental in enhancing citizens' standard of living and can foster local development and environmental awareness. Landscape planning can optimize the restorative consequences of urban environments. Urban management options can be assessed, visualized, and geolocated through planning tools by incorporating heterogeneous landscape values.

Gender equity in terms of sociocultural practices and norms (Bagheri, 2019; Johnson et al., 2019; Keleg et al., 2021; Riechers et al., 2018; Zhang et al.,

2021) can result in optimized urban well-being and economic development. Environmental and social changes affect the sustainable development of urban areas as regards space planning and cultural ecosystem services. Women's spatial mobility integrates the construction, negotiation, and perception of self, and the normative sociocultural production of public space and meaning. Social and cultural acceptance of symbolic image and meanings influences the urban sociocultural identity dynamics of communities and aesthetic experiences as regards sustainable landscape transformation. Landscape preferences, motivations and values impact activity choices.

Landscape planning and development (Conrad et al., 2019; Garekae & Shackleton, 2020; Liu et al., 2020; Nawrath et al., 2019; Samuelsson et al., 2018) need to consider environmental protection and urban sustainability. Social and ecological sustainability requires citizen-oriented sound urban planning practices. Urban landscapes develop according to land-use policy and planning decisions. Urban green planning should consider environment-friendly mobility approaches. Local landscape features are related to meaningful place bonding and sociopolitical power (Table 3.5).

7 Discussion

We integrate the systematic review throughout research clarifying how places having heterogeneous landscapes are instrumental in enhancing citizens' standard of living and can foster local development and environmental awareness. Spatialized territorialization and the urban strategies of neighbourhood development can articulate a sexual geography. Normative placemaking is a practice of developing urban arrangements. Networked socio-spatial placemaking practices of neighbourhood set up territorialities as spatial relationality and physical proximity as relationships between functional and social units. Environmental and social changes affect the sustainable development of urban areas as regards space planning and cultural ecosystem services. Perceived landscape aesthetic quality and environmental value can assist in optimizing spatial planning and management and natural connectedness. Urban landscapes develop according to land-use policy and planning decisions. Urbanization routines that disregard social features lead to transformation and uniformity of the standard of living, undermine cultural values and affect the perception of natural landscape. Engaged relations to urban places and to sociopolitical power develop a sense of belonging, responsibility and care, resulting in commitments to place as embodied spatialities of community having social bonds and differentiations, in addition to meaningful relations and routines.

TABLE 3.5 Synopsis of evidence as regards focus topics and descriptive outcomes (research findings)

<p>Gender influences the assessments of landscape values and of community development processes in terms of urban planning and design. Power imbalances, gender roles and urban governance arrangements impact environmental and social diversity and equity, restorative activities and decision-making processes.</p>	<p>Chazdon et al., 2021; Häfner et al., 2018; Inoue et al., 2022; Jackson et al., 2021; Leite et al., 2019; Lim et al., 2021</p>
<p>Gendered cultures and power structures require intersectional equality, urban equity and social justice. Gendered structures, sociocultural background, aesthetic values and place of residence impact individual landscape preferences in terms of planning and management.</p>	<p>Calderon & Butler, 2020; Fagerholm et al., 2019; Santé et al., 2019; Schirpke et al., 2019; Schurr et al., 2020; Xu et al., 2020</p>
<p>Gender and mobility are conjointly constitutive social mechanisms. Gender relations influence mobility patterns in certain socio-spatial contexts.</p>	<p>Albert et al., 2021; Carter, 2019; Cook & Butz, 2018; Escobedo et al., 2022; Sklenicka & Zouhar, 2018; Solecka et al., 2022</p>
<p>Spatial planning, policymaking processes and landscape management configure sociocultural valuation of urban data. Landscape planning can optimize the restorative consequences of urban environments.</p>	<p>Bassi et al., 2019; Ernoul et al., 2018; Huang et al., 2020; Kalaycı Önaç & Gönüllü Sütçüoğlu, 2021; Zoderer et al., 2019</p>
<p>Gender equity in terms of sociocultural practices and norms can result in optimized urban well-being and economic development. Women's spatial mobility integrates the construction, negotiation and perception of self, and the sociocultural production of public space and meaning.</p>	<p>Bagheri, 2019; Johnson et al., 2019; Keleg et al., 2021; Riechers et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2021</p>
<p>Landscape planning and development need to consider environmental protection and urban sustainability. Social and ecological sustainability requires citizen-oriented sound urban planning practices.</p>	<p>Conrad et al., 2019; Garekæ & Shackleton, 2020; Liu et al., 2020; Nawrath et al., 2019; Samuelsson et al., 2018</p>

SOURCE: PROCESSED BY THE AUTHORS

Our research complements recent analyses on the gendered nature of urban space, placemaking processes and landscape planning (e.g. Iaquinto, 2020; Mansilla & Milano, 2022; Spruce, 2020; Vaughan et al., 2021; Wise et al., 2021), indicating how co-articulated and contingent processes, experienced utilization of space and regularized and reconditioned boundary transgressions support social categorization and injustice as gendered structures and interconnections, integrating spatialities and subjectivities. Urban management options can be assessed, visualized and geolocated through planning tools by incorporating heterogeneous landscape values. Normative placemaking integrates the social arrangements that create, consolidate and develop places and agency through historical and actual processes, urban networks, social antagonism and the built environment. Relational placemaking configures a spatial system of networked social meanings integrating the sense of place and community practices of spatial contagion. Placemaking processes and deeply embedded cultural and social meanings related to the network society develop on stability, steadiness, continuity, and reconfiguration in spatial flows. Community social capital impacts the planning and management of placemaking processes. Gender and mobility are conjointly constitutive social mechanisms. Urban realm vitality develops on spatial social interactions. Local landscape features are related to meaningful place bonding. Placemaking policies are social processes and practices shaping the urban fabric of neighbourhood environmentally, symbolically, and structurally, leading to the production and consumption of spatial centralities. The capacity to become more vigorously associated with an urban place is determined by intersectional subjectivities. Inequality processes and social relationships influence conservation goals. Uneven economic areas and gendered vulnerability are spatially patterned. Local knowledge is needed for public involvement in landscape planning.

8 Synopsis of the Main Research Outcomes

Swift urban growth and changes shape social reproduction across gendered spaces. Community participation in decision-making can conserve local values, preserve cultural beliefs and practices, improve environmental sustainability and increase gender equality. Urban landscape management, dynamics, assessment, development decision-making, design, wide-ranging changes and planning are perceived according to physical and psychological demands, cultural background and preferences. Normative placemaking experience can incorporate cultural empowerment and sexual identity and fulfilment. Social and cultural acceptance of symbolic image and meanings influences the urban

sociocultural identity dynamics of communities and aesthetic experiences as regards sustainable landscape transformation. Sociocultural and attitudinal perception and preference of heterogeneous and structured urban landscapes affect visual representation and aesthetic value. Normative regional-scaled policies, social interactions, spatial nodes and connections, place identity, and coherent physical design assist in the process of neighbourhood constitution as placemaking. Space constraints experienced ordinarily by underprivileged groups and genders can be dissimilar in terms of spatial behaviours and social contexts, reproducing and underpinning discriminatory power relations and roles. Urban green planning and sociopolitical power should consider environment-friendly mobility approaches. Gender relations influence mobility patterns in certain socio-spatial contexts.

9 Conclusions

Recent research on the gendered nature of urban space, placemaking processes and landscape planning (e.g. Browne, 2021; Butler, 2018; Erfani, 2021; Marlowe & Chubb, 2021; Özogul & Tasan-Kok, 2018) has investigated whether heterogeneous urban experience and spatial integration configure gendered place and locality. Spatial structuring, planning, and use of urban locations integrate gendered divisions of labour by the use of natural resources and public infrastructure. We prove that placemaking processes and outcomes incorporate spatial empowerment, place dependence and identity, and community planning, development and integration, integrating localized public place-based development bonds. Spatial reconfiguration and attachment, normative power relations, placemaking practices, social processes, sense of place and control patterns impact urban planning and redevelopment. This systematic literature review presents relevant peer-reviewed sources covering interconnected practices that shape social and environmental values across urban creative placemaking. We show that placemaking is pivotal in developing and adjusting citizen-oriented urban space by building up forces throughout spatial planning and governance, and thus spatial policy, local governance and landscape planning shape urban politics. Setting up sustainable communities in terms of aesthetic values of bonds with urban places as public spaces are instrumental in perceived placemaking outcomes. The research results drawn from the above analyses clarify that collaborative landscape governance and sociopolitical power integrate local-level planning routines, normative community values and spatial tools and patterns. Incessant movements and changes do not support the building of a sense of placemaking and community as rooted networks. We specifically clarify that multicultural values, spatial practices and

networks, place identities and a sense of belonging in urban areas improve civic participation, social capital and sustainability, everyday placemaking and identity creation, with landscape preferences, motivations and values impacting activity choices.

10 Limitations, Implications and Further Directions for Research

By inspecting only sources published in journals indexed in the Web of Science, Scopus and ProQuest databases between 2018 and 2022, significant articles on the gendered nature of urban space, placemaking processes and landscape planning may have been left out. Limitations of this systematic literature review include certain types of publications (original empirical research and review articles) while excluding others (conference proceedings articles, books, and editorial materials). Our study also does not advance how women's spatial mobility integrates the construction, negotiation and perception of self, and the sociocultural production of public space and meaning. Subsequent analyses should develop on how to optimize investment performance, urban design and planning strategies across the public realm should integrate a gendered view. Future research should thus investigate how the restructuring capacities of normative urban social networks illustrate the organic character of creative placemaking in terms of resources, performance and expectations. Attention should be directed to how governance and decision processes articulate landscape and urban planning.

References

- Adams, E. A., Juran, L., & Ajibade, I. (2018). "Spaces of exclusion" in community water governance: A feminist political ecology of gender and participation in Malawi's urban water user associations. *Geoforum*, 95, 133–142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.06.016>.
- Albert, C., Brillinger, M., Guerrero, P., Gottwald, S., Henze, J., Schmidt, S., et al. (2021). Planning nature-based solutions: Principles, steps, and insights. *Ambio*, 50, 1446–1461. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-020-01365-1>.
- Ali, W. K., & Newbold, K. B. (2021). Gender, space, and precarious employment in Canada. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 112(5), 566–588. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tesg.12488>.
- Bagheri, N. (2019). Tehran's subway: Gender, mobility, and the adaptation of the "proper" Muslim woman. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 20(3), 304–322. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2017.1356364>.

- Bassi, I., Gori, E., & Iseppi, L. (2019). Assessing environmental awareness towards protection of the Alps: A case study. *Land Use Policy*, 87, 104028. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.104028>.
- Browne, K. (2021). Geographies of sexuality 1: Making room for lesbianism. *Progress in Human Geography*, 45(2), 362–370. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132520944494>.
- Buhr, F. (2018). Using the city: Migrant spatial integration as urban practice. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 44(2), 307–320. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2017.1341715>.
- Butler, T. T. (2018). Black girl cartography: Black girlhood and place-making in education research. *Review of Research in Education*, 42(1), 28–45. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X18762114>.
- Caillol, D. (2018). The spatial dimension of agency: The everyday urban practices of Filipina domestic workers in Amman, Jordan. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 25(5), 645–665. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2018.1472555>.
- Calderon, C., & Butler, A. (2020). Politicising the landscape: A theoretical contribution towards the development of participation in landscape planning. *Landscape Research*, 45(2), 152–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01426397.2019.1594739>.
- Carter, A. (2019). “We don’t equal even just one man”: Gender and social control in conservation adoption. *Society & Natural Resources*, 32(8), 893–910. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2019.1584657>.
- Casagrande, O. (2021). Towards a *tuwin wariache*? Place-making and creative acts of traversing in the Mapuche city. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 27(4), 949–975. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9655.13647>.
- Chazdon, R. L., Wilson, S. J., Brondizio, E., Guariguata, M. R., & Herbohn, J. (2021). Key challenges for governing forest and landscape restoration across different contexts. *Land Use Policy*, 104, 104854. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.104854>.
- Chica, C. M. (2021). Toward a sociology of global comparative placemaking. *Sociology Compass*, 15(8), e12911. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12911>.
- Conrad, E., Fazey, I., Christie, M., & Galdies, C. (2019). Choosing landscapes for protection: Comparing expert and public views in Gozo, Malta. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 191, 103621. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2019.103621>.
- Cook, N., & Butz, D. (2018). Gendered mobilities in the making: moving from a pedestrian to vehicular mobility landscape in Shimshal, Pakistan. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 19(5), 606–625. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2017.1294702>.
- Cover, R., Aggleton, P., Rasmussen, M. L., & Marshall, D. (2020). The myth of LGBTQ mobilities: Framing the lives of gender- and sexually diverse Australians between regional and urban contexts. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 22(3), 321–335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2019.1600029>.
- De Jong, A., & Steadman, C. (2021). (Re)crafting belonging: Cultural-led regeneration, territorialization and craft beer events. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 24(2), 292–310. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2021.1939126>.

- Erfani, G. (2021). Visualising urban redevelopment: Photovoice as a narrative research method for investigating redevelopment processes and outcomes. *Geoforum*, 126, 80–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2021.07.021>.
- Ernoul, L., Wardell-Johnson, A., Willm, L., Béchet, A., Boutron, O., Mathevet, R., et al. (2018). Participatory mapping: Exploring landscape values associated with an iconic species. *Applied Geography*, 95, 71–78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2018.04.013>.
- Escobedo, F. J., Bottin, M., Clerici, N., Camargo, S. G., & Feged-Rivadeneira, A. (2022). Evaluating the role of spatial landscape literacy in public participation processes and opinions on environmental issues and ecosystem services. *Environmental Management*, 69, 244–257. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-021-01591-7>.
- Ewalt, J. P. (2018). Cultivating consubstantiality with the land institute: Organizational rhetoric and the role of place-making in generating organizational identification. *Communication Monographs*, 85(3), 380–398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2018.1427880>.
- Fagerholm, N., Eilola, S., Kisanga, D., Arki, V., & Käyhkö, N. (2019). Place-based landscape services and potential of participatory spatial planning in multifunctional rural landscapes in Southern highlands, Tanzania. *Landscape Ecology*, 34, 1769–1787. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-019-00847-2>.
- Fisker, J. K., Kwiatkowski, G., & Hjalager, A.-M. (2021). The translocal fluidity of rural grassroots festivals in the network society. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 22(2), 250–272. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2019.1573437>.
- Gamlin, J. (2021). Coloniality and the political economy of gender: Edgework in Juárez City. *Urban Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00420980211003842>.
- Garekae, H., & Shackleton, C. M. (2020). Urban foraging of wild plants in two medium-sized South African towns: People, perceptions and practices. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 49, 126581. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2020.126581>.
- Gauvin, L., Tizzoni, M., Piaggese, S., Young, A., Adler, N., Verhulst, S., et al. (2020). Gender gaps in urban mobility. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 7, 11. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-020-0500-x>.
- Gotfredsen, A. C., Enlund, D., Goicolea, I., & Landstedt, E. (2021). Precarious leisure in a teenage wasteland? Intertwining discourses on responsibility and girls' place-making in rural Northern Sweden. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 25(10), 1350–1366. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2021.1957086>.
- Guo, X., Yang, Y., Cheng, Z., Wu, Q., Li, C., Lo, T., et al. (2022). Spatial social interaction: An explanatory framework of urban space vitality and its preliminary verification. *Cities*, 121, 103487. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2021.103487>.
- Hansasooksin, S. T., & Tontisirin, N. (2021). Placemaking as an urban development strategy for making the Pattaya Innovation District. *Regional Science Policy & Practice*, 13(6), 1930–1950. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rsp3.12400>.
- Häfner, K., Zasada, I., Van Zanten, B. T., Ungaro, F., Koetse, M., & Piorr, A. (2018). Assessing landscape preferences: A visual choice experiment in the agricultural

- region of Märkische Schweiz, Germany. *Landscape Research*, 43(6), 846–861. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01426397.2017.1386289>.
- Heynen, N. (2018). Urban political ecology III: The feminist and queer century. *Progress in Human Geography*, 42(3), 446–452. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132517693336>.
- Huang, Q., Yang, M., Jane, H., Li, S., & Bauer, N. (2020). Trees, grass, or concrete? The effects of different types of environments on stress reduction. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 193, 103654. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2019.103654>.
- Iaquinto, B. L. (2020). Understanding the place-making practices of backpackers. *Tourist Studies*, 20(3), 336–353. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468797620927308>.
- Inoue, T., Manabe, R., Murayama, A., & Koizumi, H. (2022). Landscape value in urban neighborhoods: A pilot analysis using street-level images. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 221, 104357. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2022.104357>.
- Jackson, R., Shiferaw, A., Taye, B. M., & Woldemariam, Z. (2021). Landscape multifunctionality in (and around) the Kafa Biosphere Reserve: A sociocultural and gender perspective. *Landscape Research*, 46(1), 50–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01426397.2020.1831460>.
- Johnson, O. W., Gerber, V., & Muhoza, C. (2019). Gender, culture and energy transitions in rural Africa. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 49, 169–179. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2018.11.004>.
- Kalaycı Önaç, A., & Gönüllü Sütçüoğlu, G. (2021). Effect of urban change on place attachment: Evidence from two locations from a city in Turkey with similar historical landscape values. *Arabian Journal of Geosciences*, 14, 990. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12517-021-07318-6>.
- Keleg, M., Watson, G. B., & Salheen, M. A. (2021). The path to resilience: Change, landscape aesthetics, and socio-cultural identity in rapidly urbanising contexts: The case of Cairo, Egypt. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 65, 127360. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2021.127360>.
- Koleth, E., & Temenos, C. (2022). “Let them sing!” The paradoxes of gender mainstreaming in urban policy and urban scholarship. *Urban Geography*, 43(6), 944–955. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2021.1888556>.
- LaFrombois, M. E. H. (2019). (Re)Producing and challenging gender in and through urban space: Women bicyclists’ experiences in Chicago. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 26(5), 659–679. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2018.1555142>.
- Lata, L. N., Walters, P., & Roitman, S. (2021). The politics of gendered space: Social norms and purdah affecting female informal work in Dhaka, Bangladesh. *Gender, Work, & Organization*, 28(1), 318–336. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12562>.
- Lee, J., & Blackford, B. (2020). Does placemaking lead to a resident’s greater place dependence and place identity in rural communities? Empirical evidence in Indiana. *State and Local Government Review*, 52(2), 71–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0160323X20979698>.

- Leite, S. K., Secretti Vendruscolo, G., Renk, A. A., & Kissmann, C. (2019). Perception of farmers on landscape change in southern Brazil: Divergences and convergences related to gender and age. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 69, 11–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2019.04.008>.
- Li, Y.-T., & Whitworth, K. (2022). Reclaiming Hong Kong through neighbourhood-making: A study of the 2019 Anti-ELAB movement. *Urban Studies*, 59(7), 1372–1388. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00420980211014448>.
- Lim, H., Niwa, Y., & Tange, M. (2021). Landscape planning based on EBPM: Location prioritization of green space management. *Regional Science Policy & Practice*, 13(3), 708–728. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rsp3.12373>.
- Liu, Q., Wu, Y., Xiao, Y., Fu, W., Zhuo, Z., & Konijnendijk van den Bosch, C. C., et al. (2020). More meaningful, more restorative? Linking local landscape characteristics and place attachment to restorative perceptions of urban park visitors. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 197, 103763. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2020.103763>.
- Maclean, K. (2018). Envisioning gender, indigeneity and urban change: The case of La Paz, Bolivia. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 25(5), 711–726. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2018.1460327>.
- Mansilla, J. A., & Milano, C. (2022). Becoming centre: Tourism placemaking and space production in two neighborhoods in Barcelona. *Tourism Geographies*, 24(4–5), 599–620. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2019.1571097>.
- Manzi, M., Ojeda, D., & Hawkins, R. (2019). “Enough wandering around!”: Life trajectories, mobility, and place making in neoliberal academia. *The Professional Geographer*, 71(2), 355–363. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00330124.2018.1531036>.
- Marlowe, J., & Chubb, L. A. (2021). Social media and (im)mobility: Implications for community development. *Community Development Journal*, 56(4), 587–607. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsab029>.
- Mashhoodi, B. (2021). Feminization of surface temperature: Environmental justice and gender inequality among socioeconomic groups. *Urban Climate*, 40, 101004. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.uclim.2021.101004>.
- McClinchey, K. A. (2021). Contributions to social sustainability through the sensuous multiculturalism and everyday place-making of multi-ethnic festivals. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(11/12), 2025–2043. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1853760>.
- Mokhles, S., & Sunikka-Blank, M. (2022). “I’m always home”: Social infrastructure and women’s personal mobility patterns in informal settlements in Iran. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 29(4), 455–481. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2021.1873743>.
- Mollett, S., & Faria, C. (2018). The spatialities of intersectional thinking: Fashioning feminist geographic futures. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 25(4), 565–577. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2018.1454404>.
- Navarrete-Hernandez, P., Vetro, A., & Concha, P. (2021). Building safer public spaces: Exploring gender difference in the perception of safety in public space through

- urban design interventions. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 214, 104180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2021.104180>.
- Nawrath, M., Kowarik, I., & Fischer, L. K. (2019). The influence of green streets on cycling behavior in European cities. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 190, 103598. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2019.103598>.
- Özogul, S., & Tasan-Kok, T. (2018). Exploring transformative place-making within the comprehensive spatial governance of Toronto. *disP – The Planning Review*, 54(4), 59–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02513625.2018.1562798>.
- Pellicer-Chenoll, M., Pans, M., Seifert, R., López-Cañada, E., García-Massó, X., Devís-Devís, J., et al. (2021). Gender differences in bicycle sharing system usage in the city of Valencia. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 65, 102556. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2020.102556>.
- Phan, A. N. Q. (2022). Sojourning as a wife, a mother and a daughter: A critical autoethnography of a Vietnamese doctoral student in New Zealand. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 31(1), 114–124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2021.1988531>.
- Platt, L. C. (2019). Crafting place: Women's everyday creativity in placemaking processes. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 22(3), 362–377. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549417722090>.
- Purkis, S. (2019). Invisible borders of the city for the migrant women from Turkey: Gendered use of urban space and place making in Cinisello/Milan. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 20, 261–278. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-018-0600-2>.
- Ramli, N. A., & Ujang, N. (2021). The functions of urban design social attributes in creative placemaking: The case of Kuala Lumpur event festivals. *Open House International*, 46(2), 230–249. <https://doi.org/10.1108/OHI-12-2020-0172>.
- Reid-Musson, E. (2018). Intersectional rhythm analysis: Power, rhythm, and everyday life. *Progress in Human Geography*, 42(6), 881–897. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132517725069>.
- Riechers, M., Barkmann, J., & Tschardtke, T. (2018). Diverging perceptions by social groups on cultural ecosystem services provided by urban green. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 175, 161–168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2018.03.017>.
- Salzman, R., & Lopez, J. (2020). Toward understanding the prevalence and purpose of placemaking among community development institutions in the United States. *Community Development*, 51(4), 387–400. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2020.1789182>.
- Samuelsson, K., Giusti, M., Peterson, G. D., Legeby, A., Brandt, S. A., & Barthel, S. (2018). Impact of environment on people's everyday experiences in Stockholm. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 171, 7–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2017.11.009>.
- Santé, I., Fernández-Ríos, A., Tubío, J. M., García-Fernández, F., Farkova, E., & Miranda, D. (2019). The Landscape Inventory of Galicia (NW Spain): GIS-web and public participation for landscape planning. *Landscape Research*, 44(2), 212–240. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01426397.2018.1444155>.

- Schirpke, U., Tappeiner, G., Tasser, E., & Tappeiner, U. (2019). Using conjoint analysis to gain deeper insights into aesthetic landscape preferences. *Ecological Indicators*, 96, 202–212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2018.09.001>.
- Schurr, C., Müller, M., & Imhof, N. (2020). Who makes geographical knowledge? The gender of geography's gatekeepers. *The Professional Geographer*, 72(3), 317–331. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00330124.2020.1744169>.
- Sen, A., & Nagendra, H. (2019). The role of environmental placemaking in shaping contemporary environmentalism and understanding land change. *Journal of Land Use Science*, 14(4/6), 410–424. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1747423X.2020.1720841>.
- Shirazi, M. R. (2019). Mapping neighbourhood outdoor activities: Space, time, gender and age. *Journal of Urban Design*, 24(5), 715–737. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13574809.2018.1458607>.
- Sklenicka, P., & Zouhar, J. (2018). Predicting the visual impact of onshore wind farms via landscape indices: A method for objectivizing planning and decision processes. *Applied Energy*, 209, 445–454. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.11.027>.
- Solecka, I., Rinne, T., Caracciolo Martins, R., Kytta, M., & Albert, C. (2022). Important places in landscape – Investigating the determinants of perceived landscape value in the suburban area of Wrocław, Poland. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 218, 104289. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2021.104289>.
- Spruce, E. (2020). LGBTQ situated memory, place-making and the sexual politics of gentrification. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 38(5), 961–978. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775820934819>.
- Srinivasan, D. (2020). Exploring gender in South-Asian cultural memory through artistic process. *World Futures*, 76(5/7), 383–406. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02604027.2020.1778341>.
- Stewart, W. P., Gobster, P. H., Rigolon, A., Strauser, J., Williams, D. A., & Van Riper, C. J. (2019). Resident-led beautification of vacant lots that connects place to community. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 185, 200–209. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2019.02.011>.
- Tarr, A., & Alvarez León, L. F. (2019). Will review for points: The unpaid affective labour of placemaking for Google's "Local Guides". *Feminist Review*, 123(1), 89–105. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0141778919879763>.
- Van Eck, E. (2021). "That market has no quality": Performative place frames, racialisation, and affective re-inscriptions in an outdoor retail market in Amsterdam. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12515>.
- Vaughan, J., Maund, K., Gajendran, T., Lloyd, J., Smith, C., & Cohen, M. (2021). Determining and representing value in creative placemaking. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 14(4), 430–445. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPM-07-2019-0069>.
- Wilkinson, C., Wilkinson, S., & Saron, H. (2021). "Wearing me place on me face": Scousebrows, placemaking and everyday creativity. *Fashion Theory*, 25(3), 395–418. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1362704X.2019.1628525>.

- Wise, N., Durkin Badurina, J., & Perić, M. (2021). Assessing residents' perceptions of urban placemaking prior to hosting a major cultural event. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, 12(1), 51–69. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEFM-04-2020-0020>.
- Xu, M., Luo, T., & Wang, Z. (2020). Urbanization diverges residents' landscape preferences but towards a more natural landscape: Case to complement landsenses ecology from the lens of landscape perception. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, 27(3), 250–260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504509.2020.1727989>.
- Yu, H., & Blain, H. (2019). Tongzhi on the move: Digital/social media and placemaking practices among young gay Chinese in Australia. *Media International Australia*, 173(1), 66–80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1329878X19837658>.
- Zhang, H., Yan, L.-J., Zhang, J.-G., Meng, M.-H., Richey, M., & Sun, Z. (2021). Rural landscape preferences and recreational activity inclination assessment from the tourist perspective, as linked to landscape values, in Deqing, China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 26(5), 488–503. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2020.1871386>.
- Zhou, L., Cheng, X., Wall, G., & Zhang, D. (2023). Entrepreneurial networks in creative tourism place-making: Dali village, Wuhan, China. *Tourism Geographies*, 25(1), 220–242. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1866056>.
- Zhou, L., Wall, G., Zhang, D., & Cheng, X. (2021). Tourism and the (re)making of rural places: The cases of two Chinese villages. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 40, 100910. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2021.100910>.
- Zoderer, B. M., Tasser, E., Carver, S., & Tappeiner, U. (2019). An integrated method for the mapping of landscape preferences at the regional scale. *Ecological Indicators*, 106, 105430. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2019.05.061>.