



Gendered Space and Spatial Discourses in Everyday Life: Exploring The Notion of Henri Lefebvre

K Pradeep¹, Jisha VG², Baiju Paul³, Paul T Benziker⁴

^{1,3,4}Department of Visual Communication, Nehru Arts and Science college, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.

²Assistant Professor, Department of English, Muslim Arts and Science College, Kanyakumari, India.

Email ID: cpradeepklee@gmail.com¹, jishapradeepklee@gmail.com², nascbaijipaul@nehrucolleges.com³, nascpaul.t@nehrucolleges.com⁴

Abstract

This paper critically engages with Henri Lefebvre's concept of space, focusing on its gendered dimensions as experienced in everyday life. Structure on Lefebvre's argument that space is socially produced and deeply intertwined with power relations, we explore how gender operates as a crucial axis in the production of space. Through a close examination of various environments like workplaces, domestic settings, and public spaces, which highlight how spatial practices and discourses perpetuate or challenge traditional gender norms. This analysis emphasizes the lived realities of navigating gendered spaces, reflecting on how these spaces are constructed through both overt social structures and subtle everyday interactions. By integrating feminist geographical approaches with Lefebvre's spatial theory, research focussed a nuanced perspective on how individuals experience, negotiate, and sometimes resist the gendered dynamics embedded in their environments. This research sheds light on the interplay between space and gender, showing how spatial arrangements both reflect and shape social hierarchies. The study explores the spatiality and spatial discourses in the society through various case across the country.

Keywords: Gendered Space, Everyday life, public space, Domestic Space, Production of Space, Lefebvre

1. Introduction

The gendered dimensions of public space have emerged as a critical focus of academic inquiry and sociopolitical activism, particularly in the 21st century. This scholarship interrogates the intricate intersections between gender, ideology, and spatial practices, foregrounding how space is not only inhabited but also constructed and perceived through gendered lenses (Gqola, 2023). The concept of space is central to understanding the social, political, and cultural dimensions of everyday life. Henri Lefebvre, a key figure in the field of spatial theory, developed the notion that space is not merely a physical or geographic entity but also a social construct that reflects and reinforces power dynamics and ideologies (Lefebvre, 1991). Among the critical dimensions of spatial discourse is the question of how gender influences the production, use, and interpretation of space. Gendered spaces refer to areas where social norms and expectations dictate the roles and behaviors of individuals based on their gender identities (Massey, 1994). Spatial discourse

surrounding these gendered spaces helps reproduce and sustain social inequalities. This paper examines gendered spaces and the ways in which spatial discourses operate in everyday life, framed through the theoretical lens of Henri Lefebvre. Specifically, it delves into how everyday spaces are both shaped by and reinforce gender ideologies, contributing to broader social hierarchies. Space is everywhere, but how these physical places represent and mediate gendered spaces is crucial. Every space is consumed and marked by gendered spatiality; some are treated as standard, while others remain unruly within power-centric, predetermined spatial discourses. Spatial determinists create spaces as gendered, and these spatial discourses are practiced from domestic settings to metropolitan cities. In domestic spaces, areas are specifically marked, such as front space, backspace, and inside space, with each space designated for particular people. This pattern continues in public spaces such as buses, bus stations, churches, temples, and mosques, where spaces are

distinctly marked and regulated for those who inhabit them. However, Massey's concept are well collected the concept of Gendered space. Doreen Massey emphasizes how space is produced through social interactions and relationships, often reflecting gendered power dynamics. For instance, she discusses the gendered division of labor in domestic spaces, where women are traditionally associated with the home and childcare, while men dominate public workspaces. [1-7] This idea is raised supported by McDowell (1999), who explores how such spatial divisions reinforce patriarchal structures. Similarly, Massey highlights how public spaces can be unequal and unsafe for women, limiting their freedom of movement. Valentine (1989) expands on this by showing how women's fear of violence in public places creates gendered geographies that restrict access. In workplaces, Massey argues that spatial hierarchies often place women in lower-paying and supportive roles. England (1993) corroborates this by examining how workplace spaces perpetuate gender-based divisions of labor, contributing to professional and income inequality. Additionally, Massey's critique extends to urban planning, where cities are often designed with male-centered perspectives. Spain (1992) shows how the built environment can marginalize women by neglecting their needs in public infrastructure, such as transportation and restroom placement. Finally, Massey's analysis of globalization reveals how global labor migration produces new gendered spatial configurations, with women from poorer countries often occupying precarious domestic or care work roles in wealthier nations. Sassen (2002) expands on this by demonstrating how global cities reinforce these gendered inequalities, with migrant women disproportionately filling undervalued service jobs.

2. Optimizing the Spatiality and Gendered Notions

Henri Lefebvre's theory of space provides a powerful framework for understanding how gendered spaces emerge and are maintained in the rhythms of daily life. Lefebvre (1991) posited that space is socially produced and exists in three interrelated forms: perceived space (spatial practices), conceived space (representations of space), and lived space (spaces of

representation). These categories emphasize that space is not neutral or passive but is actively shaped by economic, social, and political forces. Gender is a significant axis along which spaces are produced, transformed, and experienced (McDowell, 1999). Public spaces such as streets, parks, workplaces, and shopping malls, as well as private domains such as homes and bedrooms, all become arenas where gendered practices and expectations are negotiated, challenged, or reinforced. Comprehending these spaces reveals the nuanced ways in which spatial discourses govern behavior, privilege certain identities, and marginalize others. Scholars across various disciplines have explored the social construction of space and spatial discourses, emphasizing how spaces reflect power relations and societal norms [8-12]. Michel Foucault (1980) extends this by discussing how spaces function as sites of power and control through his concept of "heterotopias." Doreen Massey (1994) contributes a feminist perspective, highlighting how space is gendered, with different spatial roles assigned to men and women. Edward Soja (1996) introduces the idea of "Thirdspace," where real and imagined spatial practices intersect, challenging conventional binaries like public and private. Judith Butler (1990) explores how gender is performed in spaces, showing that space is a site where gender norms are both produced and contested. David Harvey (1989), focusing on urban spaces, argues that cities are organized around capitalist interests, leading to spatial inequalities. Together, these scholars demonstrate that space is not neutral but is actively constructed and mediated by power, gender, and economic forces. Taking the case of Marina Beach in India as an example, we see how this common public beach, like many others, underwent a transformation into a sacred space with the erection of statues commemorating M.G.R. (Marudur Gopalan Ramachandran) and others. The placement of these statues in the heart of the beach symbolically elevated it to a site of cultural and political reverence. Over time, this space transcended its initial sacred associations, becoming enmeshed in the dialectics of geopolitics. The beach, which once reflected spiritual and memorial significance, was co-opted as a site of political power, exemplified by its

evolution into a cemetery space that commemorates the wealth and influence of political figures. This shift highlights the dynamic nature of spatial production, as once-sacred spaces can be re-appropriated to serve new socio-political functions, aligning with Lefebvre's idea of space being shaped by the interplay of ideologies, politics, and power. The problem encounter in the spatial occupation is still visible the demarcation after the buried of Dr J. Jayalalitha women Chief minister, the visible demarcation and the spatial politics well determined the patriarchal power notion highly complex nature in the construction itself, Jayalalithaa's presence in this traditionally male-dominated space signals a shift in the gendered politics of memory, yet it remains shaped by the same geopolitical forces that seek to assert control over public space. The gendered nature of these memorials reveals how political power is not just enacted through leadership, but is also inscribed into the very spaces in which leaders are remembered, perpetuating both political legacies and the gendered dynamics that shape them. Henri Lefebvre's theory of the production of space is particularly useful for understanding how these burial sites reflect and reproduce gendered power structures. According to Lefebvre, space is not merely a passive backdrop but is socially produced, shaped by the ideologies and power relations that govern its use and significance. In the case of Marina Beach, the memorials of male leaders serve as physical manifestations of patriarchal authority. Their spatial dominance reinforces the idea that political power is inherently masculine, with their memorials designed to perpetuate their legacy in the public sphere [13-18].

3. The Production of Gendered Space

Lefebvre's notion of the social production of space underscores the fact that space is not merely a backdrop for human activity but an active element in the shaping of social relations. His concept of spatial practices refers to the routine ways people interact with their environments and navigate them according to societal norms. The gendered spatial practices apparent in everyday life through seemingly ordinary activities, such as the gender division of household chores, the gendered organization of office spaces, and norms governing public behavior (Lefebvre,

1991). For example, the domestic space has long been associated with femininity, reinforcing the idea that women's primary roles are as caregivers and homemakers (Tarrant & Hall, 2019). In contrast, making food and serving to the family member is the routine practice in the society, but when it comes to the hotel whether its small of lequrious the stamped routine is practiced by men. Meanwhile, public spaces such as business districts or sports arenas are often perceived as masculine domains, privileging male presence and participation. Henri Lefebvre's concept of the social production of space has been instrumental in studying how spaces are gendered, influencing the ways men and women experience and interact with different environments. Lefebvre (1991) argues that space is not a neutral backdrop but is socially produced, reflecting and reinforcing power dynamics, including those related to gender. Feminist geographers have extended this concept to explore how both private and public spaces are organized in ways that maintain traditional gender roles. For instance, domestic spaces are typically associated with femininity and caregiving, confining women to the private sphere while men dominate public and economic life. McDowell (1999) builds on this by showing how these gendered divisions of space contribute to patriarchal power structures, limiting women's roles and agency in both private and public settings. In public spaces, Lefebvre's notions which refers to commodified and homogenized spaces produced under capitalist systems, helps explain how men and women experience urban environments differently. Public spaces, such as streets and workplaces, are often designed with male users in mind, leading to issues of safety and restricted access for women. Valentine (1989) expands on this, demonstrating how women's fear of violence and harassment constrains their freedom of movement in public spaces, creating a gendered geography that reflects broader social inequalities. Similarly, in workplaces, Lefebvre's concept of representational space—spaces filled with meanings and symbols—can be applied to analyze how work environments reinforce gender hierarchies which can exemplify that manager and CeO of great organization even the political contestation in the Lok Sabha and Rajya

Sabha. England (1993) explores how spatial divisions within workplaces mirror societal divisions, with men occupying high-status areas and women being confined to lower-paying, subordinate roles, further entrenching professional inequalities. These divisions are visibly mapped in the representation of and important characterization of women and their commodification in the media industry. Moreover, Lefebvre's idea of the right to the city has been embraced by feminist scholars to argue for gender equity in urban planning and policy-making. Lefebvre emphasizes that all individuals should have equal access to urban spaces and the ability to shape them according to their needs. Phadke, Khan, and Ranade (2011) build on this, examining how women in urban environments, particularly in cities like Mumbai and other metropolitan cities, negotiate their right to public space, often challenging male-dominated spatial practices. These scholars argue that reclaiming public space is not just about physical access but about transforming the underlying power relations that dictate who gets to use and control spaces [19-23].

4. Space Power and Public Discourse

Public spaces in China, such as Tiananmen Square, serve as powerful symbols of state authority and control. These spaces are strategically designed and regulated to reflect the state's dominance, functioning as both physical manifestations of power and sites of social order. By controlling access, movement, and behavior within these spaces through legal and regulatory frameworks, the state maintains a tight grip on public expression. The symbolic weight of these monumental spaces reinforces a sense of state authority, where public life is carefully shaped and contained, turning these areas into instruments of ideological control and governance. Public spaces, while theoretically open to all, are experienced differently by men and women due to social, cultural, and safety concerns that shape their interactions. Women often face disproportionate safety risks, such as harassment and violence, which restrict their mobility, particularly in poorly lit or isolated areas, as highlighted by Yates and Ceccato (2020). In contrast, men generally navigate public spaces with fewer concerns about personal safety,

granting them greater freedom. The design of urban spaces also tends to favor a "neutral" user, often male, and overlooks the caregiving responsibilities and safety needs of women (Listerborn, 2002). This gender bias in urban planning reflects unequal power dynamics in public spaces, where men have more access and fewer restrictions. Street harassment further limits women's freedom, functioning as a tool to police their behavior in public, as Gardner (1995) argues, while men face less scrutiny. Moreover, women may avoid male-dominated spaces like bars or sports fields, contributing to informal spatial segregation (Listerborn, 2002). These gendered experiences of public spaces are compounded by women's caregiving roles, which limit their social and economic participation, reinforcing broader gender inequalities (Monk & Hanson, 1982). Together, these dynamics reveal how spatial power is unequally distributed, privileging men's use of public spaces over women's. In contrast, in the West, the intricate relationship between gender and urban environments, particularly how public spaces shape and reflect societal norms. Focusing on late-1980s Athens, the research illustrates how women's presence and mobility in public spaces were influenced by cultural expectations, patriarchal structures, and the city's physical layout. Public spaces, especially in urban settings like Athens, were often perceived as male-dominated, limiting women's access and shaping their experiences of the city (Marouli, 2024). The study emphasizes that, for many women, public spaces could be sites of discomfort, vulnerability, or exclusion due to harassment or societal judgments regarding behavior and appearance. Letizia Carrera and Marina Castellaneta explore the complex relationship between women and urban environments, offering a compelling examination of how gender dynamics shape access to and experiences within city spaces. Their work delves deeply into the intersections of gender, urbanism, and power, challenging the traditionally male-dominated narratives of urban life and planning. Researchers effectively argue that cities, historically designed with male-centric perspectives, often marginalize women's experiences. The concept of the "conquest" of urban space refers to women's efforts to reclaim

these environments, which have frequently been spaces of both oppression and resistance. Carrera and Castellaneta highlight how public spaces have been sites of restriction for women through safety concerns, societal norms, and architectural barriers but also places where women have asserted their rights and visibility (Carrera and Castellaneta, 2023). However, the space and spatial practice are visibly and invisibly marked the gendered identity and the power centric spatio temporal conscious [24-32].

5. Analysis and Discussion

Jallikattu Protests (2017, Marina Beach, Chennai), Gendered Spatial Power and Cultural Identity According to Lefebvre's concept of space as socially produced, public spaces like Marina Beach become sites where cultural identities are both asserted and contested. In the Jallikattu protests, this highly symbolic space was transformed into a platform for resistance, where Tamil protesters—both men and women—mobilized against the perceived imposition of external judicial power. The beach, historically a neutral and recreational space, became a gendered battleground of cultural preservation, where both masculinity tied to the tradition of bull-taming and broader Tamil identity were foregrounded. Gendered spatial practices are evident in how the protests invoked traditional masculine roles in the performance of Jallikattu while simultaneously creating space for women's participation in public protest. Lefebvre's notion that spaces are embedded with meaning is critical here, as the protesters' occupation of Marina Beach disrupted its normal function, transforming it into a gendered symbol of cultural survival. The state's response, initially seeking to suppress the protests, represents a patriarchal assertion of power over both the physical space and the bodies—male and female—that challenged its authority. Kiss of Love Movement (2014, Kerala), Gender, Spatiality, and Moral Policing, The Kiss of Love movement transformed public spaces into arenas for challenging patriarchal control and moral policing, directly addressing the gendered dimensions of space. Drawing on Lefebvre's idea of the social production of space, public spaces like Marine Drive in Kochi were reimagined as heterotopias—alternative spaces

where normative behaviors, especially those dictated by patriarchal moral codes, were subverted. Protestors used public displays of affection as a political tool to disrupt conservative surveillance mechanisms that govern behavior in public spaces, particularly in terms of regulating women's bodies and sexualities [33-40]. Lefebvre's framework helps us understand how the movement's occupation of public spaces was a gendered spatial practice, where women and men alike contested the moral and spatial boundaries imposed by both state and society. This spatial reclaiming by protestors effectively challenged patriarchal spatial orders that sought to control visibility and physical intimacy in public, thus turning the space into a domain of gendered resistance. Shaheen Bagh Protests (2019-2020, Delhi), Occupation of Space as Gendered Resistance Lefebvre's concept of "the right to the city" is powerfully enacted in the Shaheen Bagh protests, where largely Muslim women occupied a major public road, converting a transit space into a locus of political dissent. These women—typically marginalized both socially and spatially—challenged state power by asserting their right to inhabit and reshape public space, thereby making visible the gendered and communal dimensions of spatial occupation. By occupying the space continuously, they transformed it from a transient space of urban flow into a politically charged arena where their voices, often sidelined, could be amplified. This act of occupation underscores the gendered nature of spatial control, as the women in Shaheen Bagh turned what is conventionally a male-dominated public sphere (roads and streets) into a feminist and communal space of resistance. Their visibility in public spaces disrupted traditional gender roles and spatial practices, making their occupation not just a political act, but a gendered redefinition of space itself. Farmers' Protest (2020-2021, Delhi Borders): Gendered Spatial Resistance and Rural Identity The farmers' protests at the borders of Delhi exemplify how transit spaces—such as highways—are transformed into sites of gendered political resistance. Lefebvre's concept of space as a site of social production is especially relevant in understanding how the rural-urban dynamic was

brought into focus through this occupation. Women, who are often central to agrarian life but remain invisible in public political spaces, played a significant role in the protests. The highways, previously male-dominated spaces of mobility and commerce, became symbolic spaces of agrarian and rural identity, where both male and female farmers articulated their rights. The gendered dimensions of this spatial occupation were evident not only in women's active participation but also in their redefinition of public protest spaces—often regarded as male domains. By occupying the borders of the capital, women farmers challenged both the urban-state power and the patriarchal control over political spaces, embodying Lefebvre's idea of space as a site of class, gender, and social struggle. Arab Spring (2010-2012): Public Spaces as Gendered Sites of Political Contestation, in the Arab Spring, key urban spaces like Cairo's Tahrir Square became central nodes for revolutionary action, reflecting Lefebvre's "right to the city" and its intersection with gendered resistance. Women played prominent roles in these protests, using their physical presence in public spaces to challenge both state authoritarianism and gendered exclusion from the public sphere. These spaces, historically male-dominated, were transformed into arenas where women could visibly contest patriarchal and state authority. The space is shaped by power dynamics and social relations is crucial here, as women's participation in the Arab Spring protests signified a reconfiguration of public spaces into gendered sites of resistance. The act of occupying these spaces not only represented a political struggle against authoritarian regimes but also a gendered struggle for equal rights and visibility within the public domain. Public space functions as a dynamic arena where power relations and gendered ideological battles are played out, often reflecting broader societal struggles. Globally, these spaces are sites of contestation where dominant ideologies—rooted in patriarchy, heteronormativity, and neoliberalism—exert control, while marginalized groups challenge spatial norms. From protests in Shaheen Bagh to the global #MeToo movement, public spaces become symbolic battlegrounds where gendered bodies assert their presence and resist

exclusion. These spatial practices highlight Lefebvre's notion that space is socially produced, as power dynamics are renegotiated and reconstituted through acts of visibility, occupation, and resistance, reshaping urban and cultural landscapes [41-47].

Conclusion

The examination of gendered space and spatial discourses through the lens of Henri Lefebvre reveals the complex interplay between space, gender, and power in everyday life. Lefebvre's tripartite model of perceived, conceived, and lived space provides valuable insights into how spaces are produced and how they operate as sites of both oppression and resistance. Gendered spaces are not merely physical locations but are embedded with meanings that reflect and reinforce societal norms and hierarchies. Spatial discourses play a critical role in shaping how individuals experience and navigate these spaces, contributing to the perpetuation of gender inequality. However, Lefebvre's framework also opens possibilities for reimagining and transforming these spaces. Through acts of resistance, individuals and groups can challenge the spatial norms that sustain inequality, creating new meanings and possibilities for gendered spaces. Despite, critically engaging with spatial discourses and practices, we can move towards a more inclusive understanding of space—one that recognizes and values diverse identities and experiences. Gendered spaces are not natural but socially constructed, and they are continuously produced and reproduced through everyday practices and discourses. Lefebvre's theoretical insights offer a powerful tool for analyzing these dynamics, helping us to understand how space functions as both a medium and a product of social relations. Recognizing the role of space in shaping gendered experiences allows for a deeper understanding of the structural inequalities that permeate everyday life, providing a foundation for more equitable spatial practices and policies [48-51].

References

- [1]. Amin, A. (2008). Collective culture and urban public space. *City*, 12(1), 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13604810801933495>
- [2]. Iveson, K. (2003). Justifying exclusion: The

- politics of public space and the dispute over access to McIvers Ladies' Baths, Sydney. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 10(3), 215–228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369032000113998>
- [3]. Listerborn, C. (2002). Understanding the geography of women's fear: Toward a reconceptualization of fear and public space. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 19(4), 169–185. <https://doi.org/10.1080/140360902321122183>
- [4]. Lund, S. (2015). Re-thinking accessibility in public space: A feminist approach to city planning. *Journal of Urban Design*, 20(5), 605–623. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13574809.2015.1055651>
- [5]. Mack, K. (2017). Negotiating public space: Gender and the city. *Urban Studies Journal*, 54(8), 1818–1834. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098016634902>
- [6]. Olsson, K. (2008). The creation of informal spaces: An urban planning perspective. *City Planning Review*, 32(2), 145–158.
- [7]. Runting, H. (2018). Neutral subjects and the modernist city: A critical analysis of Sweden's planning history. *Scandinavian Journal of Urban Planning*, 45(3), 123–139.
- [8]. Sandström, K. (2019). The user as a neutral subject: A critique of modernist planning in Sweden. *Architectural Theory Review*, 23(1), 56–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13264826.2019.1578732>
- [9]. Sandström, K. (2020). Public spaces and the meeting of differences: A review of recent debates. *Urban Geography*, 41(6), 745–758. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2020.1716374>
- [10]. Vacchelli, E., & Kofman, E. (2017). The making of precarious spaces: Gender, migration and cities. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 18(5), 655–675. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2016.1242251>
- [11]. Valentine, G. (2008). Living with difference: Reflections on geographies of encounter. *Progress in Human Geography*, 32(3), 321–335. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309133308089372>
- [12]. Wikström, H. (2007). Urban informality and the politics of public space in contemporary cities. *City Research Journal*, 35(4), 201–220.
- [13]. Yates, S., & Ceccato, V. (2020). Fear of crime and gendered spaces in urban environments: An investigation of women's safety in public spaces. *Crime Prevention & Community Safety*, 22(2), 106–128. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41300-020-00086-7>
- [14]. Gardner, C. B. (1995). *Passing by: Gender and public harassment*. Sociology Press.
- [15]. Listerborn, C. (2002). Understanding the geography of women's fear: Toward a reconceptualization of fear and public space. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 19(4), 169–185. <https://doi.org/10.1080/140360902321122183>
- [16]. Monk, J., & Hanson, S. (1982). On not excluding half of the human in human geography. *The Professional Geographer*, 34(1), 11–23. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0033-0124.1982.00011.x>
- [17]. Yates, S., & Ceccato, V. (2020). Fear of crime and gendered spaces in urban environments: An investigation of women's safety in public spaces. *Crime Prevention & Community Safety*, 22(2), 106–128. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41300-020-00086-7>
- [18]. Lefebvre, H. (1991). **The production of space**. Blackwell.
- [19]. Massey, D. (1994). **Space, place and gender**. Polity Press.
- [20]. Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. Routledge.
- [21]. Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings*,

- 1972-1977 (C. Gordon, Ed.). Pantheon Books.
- [22]. Harvey, D. (1989). *The condition of postmodernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Blackwell.
- [23]. Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space* (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). Blackwell.
- [24]. Massey, D. (1994). *Space, place, and gender*. University of Minnesota Press.
- [25]. Soja, E. W. (1996). *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places*. Blackwell.
- [26]. McDowell, L. (1999). **Gender, identity, and place: Understanding feminist geographies**. University of Minnesota Press.
- [27]. Spain, D. (2014). **Gendered spaces**. University of North Carolina Press.
- [28]. Tarrant, A., & Hall, S. M. (2019). **Everyday experiences of gendered space: Geographies of home, work, and public life**. Springer.
- [29]. Valentine, G. (1989). The geography of women's fear. **Area*, 21*(4), 385–390.
- [30]. England, K. (1993). Suburban pink collar ghettos: The spatial entrapment of women? *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 83(2), 225-242.
- [31]. McDowell, L. (1999). *Gender, identity and place: Understanding feminist geographies*. Polity Press.
- [32]. Massey, D. (1994). *Space, place, and gender*. University of Minnesota Press.
- [33]. Sassen, S. (2002). Women's burden: Counter-geographies of globalization and the feminization of survival. *Journal of International Affairs*, 53(2), 503-524.
- [34]. Spain, D. (1992). *Gendered spaces*. University of North Carolina Press.
- [35]. Valentine, G. (1989). The geography of women's fear. *Area*, 21(4), 385-390.
- [36]. England, K. (1993). Suburban pink-collar ghettos: The spatial entrapment of women? *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 83(2), 225-242.
- [37]. Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space* (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). Blackwell.
- [38]. McDowell, L. (1999). *Gender, identity and place: Understanding feminist geographies*. Polity Press.
- [39]. Phadke, S., Khan, S., & Ranade, S. (2011). *Why loiter? Women and risk on Mumbai streets*. Penguin Books.
- [40]. Valentine, G. (1989). The geography of women's fear. *Area*, 21(4), 385-390.
- [41]. Marouli, C. (2024), "Women and Public Space in Late-1980s Athens, Greece: Reflections on Gender, Space and Future Cities", Demos, V.(V). and Segal, M.T. (Ed.) *People, Spaces and Places in Gendered Environments* (Advances in Gender Research, Vol. 34), Emerald Publishing Limited, Leeds, pp. 15-34. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1529-212620240000034002>
- [42]. Carrera L and Castellaneta M (2023) Women and cities. The conquest of urban space. *Front. Sociol.* 8:1125439. doi: 10.3389/fsoc.2023.1125439
- [43]. Agamben, G. (2005). *State of exception*. University of Chicago Press.
- [44]. Butler, J. (2015). *Notes toward a performative theory of assembly*. Harvard University Press.
- [45]. Chatterjee, P. (2004). *The politics of the governed: Reflections on popular politics in most of the world*. Columbia University Press.
- [46]. Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Pantheon Books. (Original work published 1975)
- [47]. Foucault, M. (1986). Of other spaces (J. Miskowiec, Trans.). *Diacritics*, 16(1), 22–27. <https://doi.org/10.2307/464648>
- [48]. Harvey, D. (2003). The right to the city. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(4), 939–941. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0309-1317.2003.00492.x>
- [49]. Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space* (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). Blackwell Publishing.
- [50]. Mitchell, D. (1995). *The end of public*



space? People's Park, definitions of the public, and democracy. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 85(1), 108–133.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8306.1995.tb01797.x>

- [51]. Sassen, S. (2008). *Territory, authority, rights: From medieval to global assemblages*. Princeton University Press.