

Review



Literature Review: Gender and Mobility

Tobias Lehmann

March 2020



"This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 741128".

Contents

Introduction.....	2
1. “Gender” and “mobility”	4
2. Transport geography and “Women’s Issues in Transportation”.....	5
3. Feminist geography, architecture, and urban studies	8
a) Cities, architecture, and spatial divisions of labor	8
b) Geographies of fear/violence	11
c) Gendered geographies and “new mobilities”	13
4. Gender and planning	14
a) Feminist planning theory.....	15
b) Cities of everyday life and the mobility of care.....	16
c) “Gender planning” and “gender mainstreaming”.....	17
Conclusion: main coordinates of feminist discourse on “gender and mobility,” research desiderata, and outlook.....	21
References.....	25

Feminist Discourse on “Gender and Mobility”

Tobias Lehmann

Introduction

“Gender and mobility” is a long-standing field of scholarship and action among feminist researchers and practitioners whose beginnings date back to the late-1970s (cf. Law, 1999; Sánchez de Madariaga, 2013a; Loukaitou-Sideris, 2016). Scholars and practitioners from a variety of fields, such as transportation research, geography, urban studies, sociology, architecture, and planning, have meanwhile analyzed differences in the travel behavior of men and women, as well as features of the built environment associated with this behavior and the ways they restrict or encourage particular mobility patterns. Such differences have been associated, to a great extent, with men’s and women’s everyday activities; related social/gender roles; typical life courses; and the social organization of production and reproduction, in general. With the emergence of the “second wave” of feminism in the 1960s, which began as a social movement in the United States, a gendered division of labor, which entails women’s unequal opportunities to participate in the labor market and thereby in public life was subject to increasing critique. The topic of “gender and mobility” thus comprised a particular component of a broader stream of feminist critique and was handled parallel to works on a range of issues seen as indicating patterns of patriarchal oppression (McDowell, 1993a).

Since the bulk of this research was carried out in urban settings of the global North, for quite some time it had a very specific focus: namely, white, middle-class households, characteristic of the post–World War II period. In the global North, in particular, an increasing participation of women in the labor market called into question predominant spatial arrangements of the gendered division of labor, the separation of private and public spheres, and corresponding architectural and urban designs. Picking up on feminist critique already formulated in other disciplines, during the 1980s, a significant body of work developed in the fields of human and transport geography (e.g., Monk & Hanson, 1982; Pickup, 1984; cf. McDowell, 1993a; Law, 1999) as well as in disciplines dealing with the built environment, such as architecture and urban planning (e.g., Hayden, 1980; Matrix, 1984; cf. McDowell, 1993a). More recently, with the advent of “gender mainstreaming” in the mid-1990s, the

topic of gender and transport has received broader societal uptake as a policy and planning issue (cf. Grieco & McQuaid, 2012; Roberts, 2013; Sánchez de Madariaga, 2013a, 2013b). While some scholars have noted an apparent decline in interest in “gender and transport/mobility” (e.g., Hjorthol, 2008), and “gender and planning” (e.g., Rahder & Altília, 2004), others have noted policy and development agencies’ active interest in the topic, which has led to the production of a sizeable grey literature (comprising empirical studies, programmatic statements, practical “toolboxes,” and good practice examples). However, this frequently occurs outside of academic publication formats (Grieco & McQuaid, 2012).

This report aims to provide an overview of main topics, discourses, and lines of argument dealt with in feminist discourse on “gender and (physical) mobility.” In this, key orientation was provided by already existing reviews of the literature, notably, on the fields of feminist (urban) geography (McDowell, 1993a, 1993b; Bondi & Rose, 2003; Little, 2007), and travel research and transport geography under the header of “women/gender and transport/mobility” (Law, 1999; Hanson, 2010; Loukaitou-Sideris, 2016). Furthermore, one explicit aim was to include practical guidelines in the report (included in section 4), to provide further resources for researchers and practitioners. The relevant bodies of literature connected to the topic “gender and mobility” are vast, in particular when considering the whole spectrum of “theory and practice” that feminist discourse and action aim to address. Thus, the overview provided in this report does not aim to be comprehensive, but is meant to introduce the paradigmatic lines of argument and cross-cutting matters of concern in feminist discourse on “gender and mobility.” Doing so, the overview is restricted to discourse on “gender and mobility” as represented in English-language literature, and overall its focus is on arguments as they have been developed for the most part with reference to urban settings, and mainly in the global North (though some references are also made to literature that deals explicitly with specifics of the situation of women in so-called developing countries).

The report is structured as follows: after a definition of the key terms focused on in the report (“gender” and “mobility”) (1), in the subsequent sections I explore several of the paradigmatic lines of research in feminist discourse on “gender and mobility.” First, studies by travel researchers on differences in men’s and women’s mobility patterns and behavior (2), which may be considered initial founding elements for a broader feminist discourse on gender and mobility. Drawing on work done in the fields of feminist (urban) geography and urban studies, architecture, and planning (3), I then outline discussions on the gendered nature of urban space and its spatial division of labor (a), the notion of “geographies of fear” as conceived early on, as a critique of patriarchal oppression restricting women’s free movement in public space (b), and conclude the section by hinting at further developments in feminist discourse on “gender and mobility,” pointing to an area of research associated with “the new mobilities paradigm” (c). While these developments may, in part, be associated with the more academic strands of feminist discourse, the next section will then sketch out some of the main developments of discourse on “gender and planning” (4), thus turning towards the practical implications of feminist engagements as they relate to “gender and mobility.” After a brief introduction to feminist planning theory (a), the notions of “cities of everyday life” and the “mobility of care” are presented as conceptual orientations in the planning of more gender equitable (urban) environments (b). Finally, the last sub-section discusses the notion of “gender mainstreaming” as major contemporary successor to earlier “gender planning” approaches which is frequently taken as a major leverage point for the implementation of gender policies to improve the conditions of women’s everyday mobility. This section also includes a listing of resources to provide practical

guidelines, best practice examples, gender audit and impact assessment methodologies, and other related tools (c). The report ends with a concluding section summing up and sketching out main coordinates and tensions in feminist discourse on “gender and mobility,” and pointing to needs for further research.

1. “Gender” and “mobility”

In the context of this report, **mobility** refers to the physical movement in geographical space, i.e., “physical mobility,” as it takes place in everyday life, enabled by various means of transport and corresponding infrastructures embedded in the built environment. What is thereby not explicitly referred to in this report are phenomena such as social or occupational mobility, migration, student mobility, or virtual mobility, although these can be connected in various ways to the issues under consideration. More specifically, the field of research in focus here lies at the intersection of travel research and transport geography, human geography and feminist theory more broadly. In an attempt to formulate an integrative research program, Robin Law (1999) has introduced “**daily mobility**” as the proper object of study for feminist scholarship which “incorporates a range of issues central to human geography, including the use of (unequally distributed) resources, the experience of social interactions in transport-related settings and participation in a system of cultural beliefs and practices.” (Law, 1999, p. 574) Hence, not only quantifiable differences regarding observable travel patterns of women and men are of interest, but in principle, the whole range of individual experiences and socio-cultural framework conditions associated with varying travel behaviors. In this sense, in a more recent collection on *Gendered Mobilities*, Cresswell and Uteng (2008, p. 2) offer a definition for a “**holistic understanding of mobility**”: “By mobility we mean not only geographical movement but also the potential for undertaking movements (motility) as it is lived and experienced – movement and motility plus meaning plus power. Understanding mobility thus means understanding observable physical movement, the meanings that such movements are encoded with, the experience of practicing these movements and the potential for undertaking these movements.”

Gender, as an analytical category, may then highlight various aspects relevant to the mobility behaviors of men and women. Roughly four ways in which the notion of “gender” comes into effect in feminist literature on gender and mobility can be distinguished, paralleling the varying meanings attributed to gender in feminist discourse at large (cf. McDowell, 1993a, 1993b; McDowell & Sharp, 1999, pp. 104–109, 132–134). In its first and most basic sense, “gender” is used to contrast the term “sex”: “Whereas sex depicts biological differences (male and female), gender describes socially constructed characteristics (masculinity and femininity)” (McDowell & Sharp, 1999, pp. 104–105). That is, instead of ascribing natural characteristics to men and women (e.g., associating men with dynamism and mobility, and women with stasis and immobility), these are seen as historically contingent, and locally specific, “social inventions” that are (can be) subject(ed) to change and variation. Social constructions of gender may then, secondly, be analyzed in terms of **gender relations**, that is, as embedded within a broader societal context, referring to the structural aspects of social order (expressed, e.g., in the notion of “patriarchy”). In this perspective, gender is linked, for instance, to the social division of (paid) productive and (unpaid) reproductive labor (with men as workers and women as caretakers), or to the normative framework of heterosexuality suggesting more and less privileged forms of life (e.g., the “nuclear family” as a defended cultural ideal, as against social arrangements deemed to “deviate” from that presumed norm). Finally, (**gender**) *identity* links

the category gender to conceptions of difference, sense of self, and performativity. In this way, gender may be associated with a late-modern abandonment of traditional social roles and norms further complexifying the underlying male-female binary often implied in theorizations of gender and gender relations: “Whereas older theories of identity posited a stable and core sense of self, often closely tied to differences of social class, recent theories have asserted the possibilities and problems associated with a more ‘hybrid’ (unstable, mixed, and multiple) notion of identity, often conceptualised in highly voluntaristic terms as part of an individual ‘lifestyle’ choice.” (ibid., pp. 132–133) Insofar as gender identity complicates conceptions of women and men as homogeneous social (and biological) groups, it may furthermore be linked to the concept of **intersectionality** that has been employed to draw attention to the intersection of different markers of identity and social inequality, such as class, ethnicity/race, age, and sexual orientation. In terms of power relations and access to resources, this implies multiple layers of privilege. For instance, in Western societies, on average, white men may be seen as more privileged than white women, but white women may still be more privileged than men of color, and the latter still more than women of color, and so on. In spatial terms, then, the notion of intersectionality directs attention to the exclusionary effects of specific spaces and their cultures, while at the same time it rejects an essentialist “adding up” of different structural categories that would determine in a definite way the experience and social position of the people to whom certain categories may be applied. Thus, “although our identities as individuals might be multiple and fluid, power operates in and through the spaces within which we live and move in systematic ways to generate hegemonic cultures that can exclude particular social groups such as women, Deaf people, lesbians, gay men, and so on” (Valentine, 2007, p. 19).

In feminist discourse on gender and mobility, theorizations of gender, gender relations, gender identity, and intersectionality, play a role to varying degrees, albeit with different emphases in different strands of research. For instance, in feminist human geography the discussion has increasingly moved to considerations of diversity and difference among women (and among men), and between women and men in different locations. In particular, qualitative approaches may allow for fine-grained considerations of, e.g., subjective (travel) experiences, identity constructions, and respective gender performances. Much travel research and transport geography, on the other hand, operates with more structural differences between men and women and their respective travel behavior on an aggregate level, attesting to “the precedence that quantitative studies and travel surveys are given in transport planning,” where “numbers are needed and categorizations need to be made whereby one category is strictly separated from another” (Joelsson & Scholten, 2019, p. 4).

2. Transport geography and “Women’s Issues in Transportation”

Research on the relation between gendered everyday activities and mobility patterns goes back to the 1970s when feminist transport geographers and urban planners began to examine differences between men and women and their respective travel behaviors (Law, 1999). In 1978, the first conference on “Women’s Travel Issues” was held in the United States, which is still the largest international, conference devoted specifically to the topic of gender and transport. The initiation of the first conference was, to a large part, linked to women’s increased entrance into the labor market, and the “dual role” of worker and housekeeper that many mothers took on. A critique was formulated against ordinary planning assumptions according to which gender as a variable was irrelevant in the

calculation of future infrastructural needs and a planning practice that was adapted to the travel needs of a male commuter with relatively simple movement patterns (from home to work and back) that didn't take into account the reproductive work women combined with their activities as part of the work force (Rosenbloom, 1978). Due to established land-use and zoning practices and suburban sprawl, a spatial division of productive (paid work) and reproductive labor (largely unpaid care work devoted to children and elderly that is consistently, statistically carried out mainly by women) was identified as putting disproportionate strains on women who, on average, had to handle a larger number of different activities during their day than men, combining household (e.g., shopping), caring (e.g., escorting), leisure, and salaried work activities (Rosenbloom, 2006). Commuting and the "journey-to-work," in particular, have occupied center stage in this line of research for a long time (cf. McDowell, 1993a; Law, 1999; Bondi & Rose, 2003; Hjorthol, 2008).

In this regard, for instance, consistently shorter work-trip lengths for women than for men have been observed, and accredited to, e.g., women's lower incomes (not being able to afford to travel longer distances), characteristics of the labor market for women (being employed in "traditionally female," i.e., service or office-related, and often part-time jobs), the effect of the division of labor within the household (where key responsibility on average is persistently allocated to women, forcing them to limit their time outside of the house), women's choice of mode of transportation (often characterized by use of public transport and limited availability of the car), or differential spatial distributions of women's and men's residential locations and employment opportunities (Hanson & Johnston, 1985). By and large, then, a number of empirical findings around differences in men's and women's travel behavior, experience, and their relation to the transport sector at large have since been consolidated. Sánchez de Madariaga (2013a, pp. 47–48) summarizes these as follows: "The significant body of research carried out since the 1970s shows consistent and significant differences in travel patterns between women and men. [...] Women tend to travel shorter distances in a geographical area close to the home; they make more trips; they travel for a wider variety of purposes, which differ to a greater extent than men's; they have less access to a car and are the main users of public transport systems; they cease driving earlier than men; they make more chained trips and more multimodal trips; their travel patterns tend to be shaped as polygons, as opposed to the commuting patterns from home to workplace prevalent among men; women are more sensitive to safety concerns and tend to self-limit their movements and activities in urban space because of perceptions of risk; women's smaller body size and strength have specific implications for the design of spaces, vehicles, and security devices that often are designed according to a standard male reference model; and many more men than women work in the transport sector, where the participation of women is particularly low in positions of responsibility."

Such differences in patterns of movement as the above-mentioned regularly appear as differentiating men's and women's mobility behavior on an aggregate level. At the same time, it is important to note that such differences may be aggravated or alleviated when more specific sub-groups of the population are compared. For example, it has been found that differences in commuting distances are much higher among women of color than among white women (Doyle & Taylor, 2000), and while in some places overall convergences between comparable groups of men and women (i.e., in terms of socioeconomic variables, life-stages) have been noted (e.g., in terms of the availability of a private car), there are still differences in mobility behavior according to sex, e.g., between households headed by either single women or men (e.g., in terms of time spent chauffeuring children) (cf. Rosenbloom, 2006). Crucially, however, regardless of how the travel behaviors of such

comparable groups differ to a greater or lesser degree, it is held that the majority of men and women are simply *not comparable*, because of the high statistical correlation between sex and a gendered division of labor (i.e., women are significantly more likely to take care of children and elders, and to perform the majority of household tasks). It is then these gendered patterns of everyday activity that go along with different mobility patterns (e.g., trip-chaining) and associated travel needs. This then raises the question of not necessarily the extent to which men and women as such behave differently and the extent to which a given transportation infrastructure caters to this behavior, but instead, how it serves the different travel purposes of productive (i.e., waged) and reproductive (usually unpaid) labor more generally, regardless of who carries out the behavior (ibid.). Recent attempts to shift transport planners' focus from commuting to trips associated with a "mobility of care" (Sánchez de Madariaga, 2013a, 2013c; see section 4) attest to this more holistic approach to societal mobility needs, which, however, was never precluded by earlier research in the field: "It can be argued that we are not really talking about women's behavior when we talk about household or family travel behavior. Yet in a significant number of cases – for historical economic reasons or as the result of culturally defined roles that might eventually change, or simply because women are the majority of people in a group on which we are focusing – gender is the most salient behavioral reference available. In some cases gender may only be serving as a proxy for other variables but until we can gather data on those variables or easily quantify them, gender is still the most useful data we have" (Rosenbloom, 1978, pp. 349–350).

In terms of its institutionalization as a research field, the most important conference series dedicated specifically to gender issues in transportation is the "Women's Issues in Transportation" (WIT) conference, which was initiated in the U.S. and took place in 1978, 1996, 2004, 2009, and 2014 when it was held for the first time outside of the U.S., in Paris, France. The next date was September 2019, again in Irvine, California. Through the development of research in the area, the conference's agenda has successfully broadened. It also became increasingly international, with the 2009 conference beginning to address international differences between the global North and South, or so-called developed and developing countries, respectively (cf. Rosenbloom & Plessis-Fraissard, 2011; Roy, 2011). The topic of "sustainable mobility" was taken up in the fifth conference.¹ Marolda and Dupont, in a report commissioned by the European Commission, reconstructed the programmatic development of the conference series, starting from the fifth conference: "The Fifth Conference on Women's Issues in Transport (WIT) focuses on bridging the gaps between men and women, between rich and poor countries, and between knowledge and policy. To this end, the conference is directed to identifying and addressing the issues at stake in the transport system to enhance women's mobility and to make transport more gender neutral. This conference builds on the achievement of previous conferences, the first of which in 1978 analysed women's travel behaviour and conditions. The second conference held almost 20 years later expanded the scope from primarily research to include policy-making, planning and engineering processes. In 2004, participants were invited from all levels –

¹ The description of the sixth conference announced session tracks that will address "women's travel behavior patterns; transportation planning and policy processes to consider women's issues; women's safety, personal security, and health considerations in transportation; and women and emerging transportation technologies. The conference provides an update on the progress and challenges in relation to women and mobility; explores how gender equality practices in transportation are increasing business and economics development; exchanges ideas on how public agencies can incorporate good gender equality policies and practices with approaches to oversee efforts and measure performance; and examines methods to address safety and security of women who are employed with or using transportation systems." (<http://www.trb.org/Calendar/Blurbs/175975.aspx> (accessed: July 7, 2019))

national, regional and local – in the public and private sectors. The fourth WIT conference in 2009 was opened to a broader international audience and focused on personal safety and security, changing demographics, crash and injury prevention, and the impact of extreme events. A key outcome of the 2009 Conference was the decision to broaden the focus to gender-neutral transport rather than to focus solely on women's issues. Defining gender-neutral transport with respect to values, needs, choice, constraints, and impacts, concepts that vary significantly with place and time, requires international collaboration. This was the inspiration to hold the 2014 conference for the first time outside the USA, in Paris with the focus on bridging the gap" (Marolda & Dupont, 2014, pp. 3–4). While it has been noted that the field of transport geography at large has been somewhat resistant to incorporate insights from social theory and feminist analyses (Hall, 2004), gender issues in transportation have nevertheless found their way into the agendas of policy-makers and international development agencies. In this regard, the last two decades have, not least, seen an increase in reports and empirical studies commissioned by local and international institutions, often as background reports in preparation for various policy initiatives (e.g., Turner, Hamilton & Spitzner, 2006, in the EU context; Peters, 2001, 2011, for the UN; Duchène, 2011; Tiwari, 2014; Ng & Acker, 2018, for the OECD's International Transport Forum, ITF).

3. Feminist geography, architecture, and urban studies

According to Law (1999), efforts in travel research initiated the now rather well-established field of feminist research on gender and mobility, by making visible quite large-scale regularities in the differences between men's and women's travel behavior: "Attention to transport offered a way to link discussions of gender relations, transport systems, public and private spaces, accessibility, and the spatial and temporal organization of human activity" (Law, 1999, p. 567). In turn, these findings initiated two main areas of research within a broader project of feminist geography particularly relevant to questions of daily mobility: one that emphasized women's fear of male sexual violence, particularly rape, as a major source of women's constrained use of public space, and another examining spatial divisions of labor and corresponding questions of urban design as factors accounting for men's and women's different uses of space and corresponding travel behavior (Law, 1999; cf. Bondi & Rose, 2003; Levy, 2013).

a) Cities, architecture, and spatial divisions of labor

In a foundational text, titled *Making Space: Women and the Man-Made Environment* (Matrix, 1984), the Matrix collective of feminist architects and planners critiqued dominant paradigms in architectural practice that were seen as incorporating male-centered, androcentric views of social relations, with the effect of inscribing traditional norms regarding the relation between the sexes into the physical environment of both individual homes, as well as urban space more broadly. Architecture, in this sense, "seems to make a physical representation of social relations in the way it organizes people in space. It does this both symbolically – through imagery and 'appropriateness of place' for a particular activity – and in reality – through physical boundaries and the spatial relationships made between activities" (Boys, 1984, p. 25). As the majority of architects were (and still are) men, prevailing arrangements were therefore interpreted to display specifically male projections of how social life should best be ordered. To open up architecture to new ways of thinking and design, a feminist analysis of architecture, according to Jos Boys (one of the members of the Matrix collective), would

thus have to address three levels of analysis: “First the way in which the physical arrangement of the built environment can reinforce women’s differential access to resources; secondly, the way in which the built environment simultaneously legitimizes and naturalizes that inequality; and thirdly, the way in which designers of the built environment consistently construct their own socialized experience as ‘the norm’” (ibid., pp. 28–29). So, while the built environment was not necessarily conceived as unalterably determining social activity that takes place within it (Boys, 1984), it nevertheless was seen to manifest a material spatial order of relations between activities associated with production (wage labor) as against reproduction (usually unpaid care work), and with public as against private (domestic) spaces (cf. Hayden, 1980; McDowell, 1983; Matrix, 1984; Spain, 2002; Day, 2011): “The city has been shaped to keep women confined to their traditional roles as wives and mothers. Suburbs are built expressly for the family; job opportunities are few for many; the public transport system is geared for the movement of commuters in peak periods and it is difficult for women to cross between suburbs; public places equipped with revolving doors or turnstiles render the woman with a pram or pushchair a ‘handicapped person’ (Harman, 1983: 104)” (quoted in McDowell, 1993a, p. 167).

The Marxist distinction between reproductive and productive labor, which runs parallel to much of transport geographers’ interest in the home-work-trip is central to 1980s feminist writing on the gendered spatial division of labor in the city. While urban structure was seen to favor men’s participation in paid labor and public life, women’s existentially vital contribution to upholding social life and order seemed systematically neglected: “In the end, if the system still ‘works’ it is because women guarantee unpaid transportation . . . , because they repair their homes, because they make meals when there are no canteens, because they spend more time shopping around, because they look after others’ children when there are no nurseries, and because they offer ‘free entertainment’ to the producers when there is a social vacuum and an absence of cultural creativity. If these women who ‘do nothing’ ever stopped to do ‘only that,’ the whole urban structure as we know it would become completely incapable of maintaining its functions (Castells, 1975: 177–78)” (quoted in McDowell, 1993a, p. 166). The devaluation of reproductive labor carried out by women was pointed out on various scales, from the spatial structures of the house to the entire urban geography. In accordance with dominant social norms, these were seen to settle women’s subordinate position, restricting their options for alternative ways of life. Within the house, for instance, gender-relations were analyzed in terms of the arrangement of different rooms. “Male spaces,” such as the living room or the library, were found to be placed close to the entrance of a house, pertaining to the symbolic representational function of such spaces, easily visible to outsiders and guests; rooms designated to “women’s activities,” on the other hand, such as the kitchen or nursery, were often located “in the back” of a house, so that their work not only became less visible (thereby also symbolically devalued), but also frequently had to be conducted in rather un hospitable, small rooms sometimes even without windows or any (visual) connection to the outside world of the house (e.g., Boys et al., 1984). On the broader scale of the city, then, established planning practices of land-use and zoning were problematized, as reinforcing a spatial division of labor corresponding to the notion that “a woman’s place is in the home.” Exemplified by the model of the modern, industrial city, characterized by suburban sprawl on the one hand, and centralized industrial sites of production on the other, such a structure was held to reinforce women’s subordinate position on the labor market as well as their isolation in the individual home where they had to take on the majority of household and reproductive work (cf. Hayden, 1980; McDowell, 1983): “In a society which has been built around individual physical mobility, women are less mobile than men because they have less money, less access to transport facilities and more

responsibility for other less mobile persons such as children and old people. Women's lack of relationship to the sites of production (their amount and range of choice of paid employment) is thus intensified, both by this relative immobility and by the physical distancing of home and work generated by the decentralization of dwellings. [...] Physical space thus exaggerates the potentially isolating quality of taking sole responsibility for childcare and/or domestic labor in a privatized way" (Boys, 1984, p. 29).²

While these analyses attest, as mentioned before, to a time of intensified transition from a "family wage" to a "dual earner" household model, with women's increased participation in the labor force highlighting the emergence of new ways of life that were seen as hardly compatible with hitherto seemingly self-evident social norms and design schemes, more recent developments in feminist theory as well as changes in the political economy at large have made the picture more complex. Thus, not only does the theorization of oppressive features of urban structure seem to have been carried out too strictly (cf. Bondi & Rose, 2003), but also the effects of neoliberal policies and their impact on socio-spatial relations have become increasingly visible and subject to consideration (Peake, 2015). In this way, not only have gender roles in the new global economy become more diversified (if not even, in part, neutralized), they also seem to have deepened global inequalities with differential impacts on women in different locales and social positions. In an ideal-typical contrast, as it were, urban sociologist Daphne Spain (2002) discusses the differences between the classical model of the modern, industrial city with that of the "postmodern," informational metropolis, and the shifting gender relations that can be seen as contributing to those apparent changes in urban structure using the example of the U.S.: "The industrial city a century ago had one central business district, mixed land uses that juxtaposed slaughterhouses and tenements, high population density, and the vertical profile of smokestacks and skyscrapers. In contrast, the contemporary informational metropolis consists of multiple centers, single-use zoning, low density, and a strong horizontal axis [...]. Most women's lives now include the home and workplace, which are separated by low-density, single-use zoning that contributes to suburban sprawl" (ibid., pp. 160–161). Accompanying this constellation of both changing urban landscapes, particularly the formation of edge cities, as well as women's overall improved societal status is not only an increasing demand for vehicles, mainly private cars – a pattern shared by men and women – but also, due to the rising costs of affording a middle-class life-style, an increase in both male and female members of a household taking on waged labor, leading to less available time for household and care-related tasks. Spain describes how vital "services once performed by women in the privacy (or seclusion) of the home have moved into the public arena: care of dependents and meal preparation," spawning more and more facilities devoted to childcare, assisted care for the elderly, and eating establishments (ibid., p. 163). As in the case of live-in domestic workers, these jobs are again either staffed mainly by women (McDowell, 2007) who generally find work predominantly in the service sector (Rosenbloom, 2006), or by other economically marginal groups, such as "immigrants, teenagers, or retirees – those who are marginal to the mainstream economy, just as women were when they prepared meals at home" (Spain, 2002, p. 164).

² "I suggest that the design of the built environment has maintained a consistent 'distancing' of women from sites of production (and for that matter from other facilities). This has combined with the general lack of access to resources suffered by women because of their social 'place' in relation to the labour market and the family, to exaggerate women's isolated position in the social structure" (Boys, 1984, p. 29).

Childcare, for instance, which has become a key public and economic issue to compensate for women's increased labor market participation (Spain, 2002; McDowell, 2007), has thus spawned a new economy of "transnational care chains": as middle-class households are able to afford to pay service workers to perform childcare, this in turn leads to the question of who takes care of those women's children; that is, the children left alone while their mothers care for their employers' offspring. The case of live-in au pairs or nannies, then, can also help to illustrate a tendency of dissolving traditional associations between femininity, domesticity, and the home in the wake of a neoliberal political economy. These associations "are being challenged by active labor market policies that insist that the key social responsibility of the ungendered individual at the center of neo-liberal policies is labor market participation. Whereas taken for granted co-presence and co-sanguinity – in particular of a mother and her children – have long been the defining characteristics, indeed constitution, of the idea of a home, the home increasingly is a space marked by absence and/or by the co-presence of people united not by ties of blood and affection but by economic exchange" (McDowell, 2007, p. 130). As a consequence, "the old idealized public/private distinction embodied in liberal thought and in the establishment of the institutions of the modern welfare state in which a gendered bargain was struck in which men cared for their dependents through participation in the public world of employment and women provided nurture and care in the home has been disrupted" (ibid., p. 133). So, at the same time as new ways of life have become possible for some, old ones are preserved and partly delegated to less privileged social groups, corresponding to new divisions of labor, and distributions of resources and privileges that have to be accounted for when considering novel gender relations and identities in their interplay with changing gendered geographies.

b) Geographies of fear/violence

Women's and men's different perceptions of risk and experiences of fear were a matter of concern for feminist scholars early on, and are considered important factors for understanding potential barriers to women's mobility and use of public space (cf. Loukaitou-Sideris, 2016). According to Law (1999), this strand of research stands out as a second major field of feminist scholarship that has shaped discourses on "gender and mobility" alongside feminist analyses of urban design and architecture associated with traditional, gendered divisions of labor. While at first the "geography of fear" discourse was centered around the question of women's oppressed status in patriarchal society, more recent developments increasingly diversify the picture, including fears associated with ethnic subgroups in connection with global migration movements (cf. Peake, 2010). At the same time, women's fear of violence can still be said to deserve special attention, particularly as the range of potential threats in comparison to those typically faced by men is extended to include that of (male) sexual violence, ranging from verbal or gestural harassment in public space to physical sexual assault, rape, or even sexual murder (cf. Bondi & Rose, 2003).

Gill Valentine, in her paper on "The Geography of Women's Fear" (1989), paradigmatically expressed in feminist discourse what is on other occasions frequently discussed as "spaces of fear," "fear of crime," or "spaces of violence." Valentine reported on her findings derived from eighty in-depth interviews and six small-group discussions with women living in a middle-class housing estate and a council estate in the town of Reading, UK. What she describes is a dynamic of male violence against women and personal experiences with such violent encounters (either first or second hand, or conveyed through media reports, or young girl's socialization processes and their parents' fear for their safety, resulting, altogether, in an increased awareness of being at risk when in public space).

Although statistically women are at a greater risk of victimization in their own homes and by men they know, it is the perceived heightened unpredictability of strangers' actions that increases the sense of vulnerability in public space. While Valentine (1989, 1990; cf. Matrix, 1984) points to particular aspects of the built environment that may add to women's fear, or are more commonly associated with perceived threats, such as dark alleys, tunnels, signs of vandalism in the environment, or deserted parks; importantly, she also highlights social factors that may, or rather should be seen as the more fundamental causes of women's fear in public space. For example, familiarity with one's social environment, i.e., the inhabitants of an estate or neighborhood, may lessen perceived risks of violent behavior as it allows for the easier identification of strangers whose behavior is perceived as more unpredictable than that of residents. Also, it is reported that a sense of community increases the chances of receiving help in emergency situations. Furthermore, temporal aspects and the way in which the daily routines of men and women are structured are of great importance: in Valentine's (1989) study, for example, women move in public space predominantly during the day-time, due to the affordances of their working lives and household tasks. Men, on the other hand, often working full-time during the day, tend to occupy public space during the evening and night, hence increasing women's sense of being at risk especially in these hours. As the use of public space in this case is tightly coupled to employment patterns of men and women, the geography of women's fear that corresponds to such patterns, among other things, unfolds a vicious circle of restricted use of public space that poses further barriers to women's emancipation: "Women's fear of male violence does not therefore just take place in space but is tied up with the way public space is used, occupied and controlled by different groups at different times. There is a vicious circle in operation. The majority of women still adopt a traditional gender role, and as a consequence are pressurized into a temporally segregated use of space. The subsequent control by men of public space in the evening means that despite the career success and independence gained by some women in the past decade (during which time there has been a significant rise in reported sexual and violent crime) the fear of male violence deters the majority of women from being independent. It robs them of the confidence to live alone, to work in certain occupations, and to socialize without a group or male chaperon. [...] Consequently this cycle of fear becomes one subsystem by which male dominance, patriarchy, is maintained and perpetuated. Women's inhibited use and occupation of public space is therefore a spatial expression of patriarchy" (ibid., 1989, p. 389).

The geography of fear discourse has, throughout its course, been strongly associated with particular places and features of the environment that are seen to be connected to feelings of unease and insecurity. In this regard, many design solutions for situational crime prevention have been devised that may not only increase women's felt sense of safety, but also prevent crime in certain situations. At the same time, feminist discourse of fear in public spaces has developed ever more nuanced approaches to the issue, cautioning against simplistic notions of "designing out fear" (Koskela & Pain, 2000), at the expense of socio-cultural and political contexts that may be seen as more fundamental causes for many women's unease in public environments (such as a prevailing macho-culture, public neglect of issues of sexual violence more generally, or the prevalence of violence in private spaces that can contribute to a heightened sense of also being at risk in public spaces), and also against stereotypical constructions of women as inherently more fearful than men (Koskela, 1997). Furthermore, attention has been drawn to the fact that quite different places can be perceived as evoking fear, for instance, deserted open spaces, as well as crowded narrow ones (Koskela & Pain, 2000); and, finally, intersections between race, age, and gender have to be taken

into account, where different subgroups can have quite different experiences of fear (Pain, 2001), with at times unexpected perpetrators, such as in the experience of veiled Muslim women in Malmö, who have been reported as frequently experiencing racist verbal assault in public by older women, as well as racialized physical violence by men (Listerborn, 2016). Therefore, with these complexities in mind, according to Listerborn who discusses recent trends in urban restructuring with an increased focus on women's safety, it is of great importance to understand which subgroups of the population (of women) are actually being addressed by relevant security measures. What she argues against is too narrow a focus on women as the only vulnerable group in need of protection, devised purely through technical design solutions, especially "when 'women' is taken to mean only white, middle-class and upwardly mobile women" (ibid., p. 257).

c) Gendered geographies and "new mobilities"

Both the spatial division of labor and the geography of fear discourse have been influential in the further development of deliberations on gender and mobility and gendered geographies, and have provided important starting points for further work in feminist geography. These discourses have generally followed a trajectory along which a sole focus on women was increasingly broadened to include queer communities as well as considerations of intersecting axes of inequality combining factors of gender, race, age, and class. Furthermore, a bias of earlier work that tended to conceive of urban structures as generally oppressive, was succeeded by more nuanced considerations that also examined possibilities for emancipation and the appropriation of public space by women as well as other hitherto marginalized groups, such as gays and lesbians (e.g., in the form of street parades, or gay bars and clubs allowing for performing sexual identities outside of the heterosexual framework). While previous work emphasized the structural constraints imposed on women by urban forms, scholarship increasingly highlighted the constitution of gender identity in the performative interplay of spatial structure and individual experience: "In very broad terms, concern with gender relations and gendered inequalities has been transformed by questions about identities, subjectivities and performances, which may be gendered but which are also marked by numerous other differences" (Bondi & Rose, 2003, pp. 231–232; cf. McDowell, 1993a, 1993b). Generally, "feminist scholarship in urban studies has thus indubitably established the centrality of gender to analysing cities and urban life. [...] It has also influenced women's studies by showing how space and place, as materially grounded social constructions, shape the ways gender identities and relations are played out, reinforced or modified. Urban form and process and locational differences within cities thus actively construct gender as well as other social relations" (Bondi & Rose, 2003, p. 232). The geography of fear discourse, in particular, "has thus moved away from questions of women's experiences and behaviors 'in' urban space, to focus instead on the mutual constitution of gendered identities and spaces," to "problematizing a panoply of emotional experiences of which fear is but one, and in overcoming a polarity between viewing urban space as either constraining or enabling for women" (ibid., p. 234; cf. Wajcman [2010] for a parallel movement in feminist theories of technology).

What has been called the "new mobilities paradigm" in the social sciences and humanities (Sheller & Urry, 2006) has emerged parallel, as it were, to a general tendency towards post-structuralist theory and methodologies in more recent feminist scholarship (which is nonetheless contrasted by work orientated more towards structural features of the contemporary political economy, e.g., Fraser, 2009, 2016). While Law (1999) had already proposed broadening the agenda of research on "gender and mobility" as practiced in transport geography, the new mobilities paradigm

seems to follow the same trajectory. Though not exclusively a feminist endeavor, the new mobilities paradigm shares many concerns with work in feminist geography. Also, more recent contributions to the field of gender, transport, and mobility explicitly draw on this recently emerged field of research (Cresswell, 2011; cf. Cresswell & Uteng, 2008; Clarsen, 2013). This has thus initiated an even further broadening of research questions and objects of study. Not only flows and movements of people and goods, but also ideas, images, cultural representations, information, bodies, forms of social life, technologies, and materialities of all forms, are analyzed – drawing mostly on theories and methods from the social sciences and humanities (cf. Sheller & Urry, 2006; Cresswell, 2011). For instance, as Sheller (2008) summarizes, discourses, geographies, and technologies and their role in shaping and being shaped by gendered power relations have been analyzed, disclosing, for instance, dominant associations of mobility with “[m]odernity, progress, and privileged forms of masculinity [...] that not only define the West as mobile and expansionist, but do so through masculine figures such as the explorer, the entrepreneur, and the frontiersman” (ibid., pp. 257–258); religious and cultural norms, rules, and fashions that have enforced and fetishized women’s immobility (such as foot-binding in China, Victorian-era corsets, or modern-era high-heels), or the different socialization of boys and girls “in which boys have more latitude for movement, activity, travel across space, and risk-taking, while girls tend to be enculturated into more sedentary activities, more circumscribed uses of space, and greater risk aversion” (ibid., p. 259); as well as the gendered nature of many developments of new (transport) technologies, where often producers, but also typical users are predominantly privileged men.

While feminist discourse and discourse on gender and mobility over the course of the last decades have both produced increasingly diverse perspectives, it is nonetheless important to note that these cannot be described in terms of a simple linear development, but rather, as the co-existence of various strands of scholarship. This is true for contemporary research on transport and mobility where, e.g., more quantitative and qualitative strands exist, as well as for feminist discourse where a broad range of perspectives on gender as an analytic tool has developed that serves as repertoire for further research, as well as planning efforts concerning gender and mobility (Joelsson & Scholten, 2019a; cf. McDowell, 1993a, 1993b).

4. Gender and planning

Already indicated by the title of the Matrix collective’s programmatic *Women in the Man-made Environment* (Matrix, 1984), even early on, feminist critiques focused not only on analyzing differences between men and women as corresponding to their (urban) environments, but also on the very processes of decision-making and planning that bring about certain spatial and transport arrangements in the first place – as well as how to productively intervene in these practices. Particularly the professions of the built environment, urban and spatial planning, and architecture, as well as transport-related occupations have historically been dominated by men, a fact that has led to a criticism of the resulting, oft-diagnosed neglect of women’s views and experiences in planning processes, and hence a systematic blindness vis-a-vis women’s needs and practical demands (Sandercock & Forsyth, 1992; Fainstein, 2005; Roberts, 2013; Sánchez de Madariaga, 2013a; cf. Matrix, 1984; Moser, 1989). In particular, a tradition of rationalist planning embedded within gendered assumptions about women’s role in society (“a woman’s place is in the home”), oriented towards (economic) efficiency, quantitative methodologies, and informed by economic ideals of

rationality choosing, self-interested actors, has since become the locus of feminist critiques (cf. Sandercock & Forsyth, 1992; Fainstein, 2005; Levy, 2013; Joelsson & Scholten, 2019a).

a) Feminist planning theory

In a broad stroke, Fainstein (2005, p. 121) characterizes the rational, economically-oriented planning model in the Euro-American tradition: “Despite differences in the locational outcomes of continental and Anglo-American planning efforts, in general, planning throughout the Western world sought to impose a rationality at odds with a sentimental view of human relations. First based in a purely physical conception of city development and then, after World War II, the application of social science methods, the male-dominated profession of city planning used criteria of order and efficiency to determine appropriate forms of spatial disposition. Building on a contractual conception of human freedom and legitimacy, planning, like political thought more broadly, did not consider the particular needs of women.” This background opens up a stark contrast between rational planning models and the aspirations of feminist approaches to planning. According to Fainstein (*ibid.*, p. 124), “In particular, the use of cost-benefit analysis that produced one favored outcome, reliance on quantitative indicators, and the application of hypothesis testing and regression analysis to planning issues all subordinated subjective feelings to measurable attributes. Further, they substituted a mechanical process (the rational model) for the evaluation of substantive results and of how those substantive results affected the most vulnerable groups in the population (Sandercock and Forsyth 1992; chapter 4).” By contrast, “Feminism implies intuitive, participatory approaches to gaining knowledge and nonrational (although not necessarily irrational) contextual solutions to planning problems. [...] Feminism introduces a perspective that starts with concepts of communal relations and incommensurable values, substitutes the development of consensus for adversarial approaches, protects the weak, and recognizes the importance of emotional bonds” (Fainstein, 2005, pp. 128, 129).

Sandercock and Forsyth (1992) note that since the 1970s, much attention had been focused on gender issues in planning practice, but connections to planning theory had been rather neglected, not least due to the difficulties in defining what is to constitute planning theory to begin with: “There is little agreement within planning as to what constitutes planning theory, as there is within feminism as to what constitutes feminist theory. [...] Just as feminists use competing theories to understand or explain the oppression and subordination of women, planners use competing theories to explain the role, practice, and effects of planning” (*ibid.*, p. 49). An important challenge for feminist approaches to planning theory is the tension between theorizations of gender that posit inequalities between men and women as central to critical social and political analysis and respective planning implications, and those that emphasize the diversity of gender relations, and see women and men as heterogeneous rather than homogeneous groups (Sandercock & Forsyth, 1992; Fainstein, 2005). Indeed, with the emphasis on multiple possible gender identities, but also the foregrounding of a variety of social variables that may entail discrimination, it has been noted that feminist efforts to further social justice have risked diluting intersectional inequalities between men and women to a rather vague discourse of acknowledging “diversity” in society (Rahder & Altilia, 2004). While symbolic representation, and recognition of diverse cultures and life-forms should not be neglected, Fainstein argues: “To the extent that left movements focus on issues of identity rather than economics and become diverted by symbolic causes, they do not provide the social force needed to create an economic context within which public policy can address their concerns. In a situation of extreme economic inequality, according privileges to the oppressed simply shuffles around who obtains higher positions in the

economic hierarchy; it does not make those positions more broadly available. [...] Planning, if it is to succeed in improving the lives of women, must have as its goal general improvement in the material situation of everyone who is relatively deprived at the same time as it delineates the particular needs of women” (Fainstein, 2005, pp. 133, 134; cf. Roberts, 2013; Sánchez de Madariaga & Neuman, 2016).

b) Cities of everyday life and the mobility of care

From the previous sections it should be clear that from the viewpoint of feminist planning theory, planning practice concerning gender and mobility should be a holistic endeavor, including procedural aspects as well as the definition of desirable goals. In terms of the latter, these relate to both visions for urban structures, as well as the re-valuation of different forms of travel, for example, as exemplified by the notions of the “city of everyday life” and the “mobility of care.”

According to Greed (2008, p. 251), “as an alternative to spread out, zoned, low density cities,” the former figures as important orientation for “many European women planners [who] would like to see the ‘city of everyday life,’ which they define as the city of short distances, mixed land uses and multiple centres as the ideal objective that would fully take into account gender considerations. Such a city structure would reduce the need to travel, create more sustainable cities that would be more accessible, whilst creating a higher quality urban environment for all. It would provide more jobs and facilities locally and help revitalise declining areas overall (Skjerven, 1993).” With reference to efforts at creating more environmentally sustainable cities, this means also taking into account potential conflicts of interest (cf. Levy, 2013), e.g., when politically imposed restrictions on the use of private cars disproportionately affect women and poorer parts of the population. Hence, it is argued that “[r]ather than introducing negative car-controlling policies first, it would be better to invest more in public transport and to use the planning control system to ensure that neighbourhoods are designed to provide local facilities, amenities and employment opportunities” as: “It is simply not realistic to carry home a week’s family shopping from the nearest, but distant supermarket, on the handlebars (or in the panniers) of a bicycle, particularly if one is working full time, is ‘time-poor,’ and cannot even guarantee to be at home if one subscribes to a home delivery service. If the full agenda of ‘sustainability’ were taken into account, rather than over-emphasising the environmental dimension, then it is likely that sustainable transport policy would prioritise different types of journeys as ‘essential,’ and more recognition would be given to the need for accessible public transport for all, whilst the routes and timetables would be reconfigured to meet the ‘off peak’ needs of women. A wider picture of travel patterns and their social value would be built up. Supporting services such as toilets, bus-shelters, creches, cycle lanes, steps, carriage of luggage, and shopping home delivery would all be integral components of the transportation infrastructure. Traffic control would be based upon the usefulness of the journey rather than the ability to pay” (Greed, 2008, pp. 251–252).

One way in which a “wider picture of travel patterns and their social value” can be developed is exemplified in Sánchez de Madariaga’s (2013a, 2013c) concept of the “mobility of care,” which is introduced as a methodological innovation, and also in terms of redefining which journeys are defined and “counted” as “essential” in travel research. The starting point for Sánchez de Madariaga’s critique is the way in which standard travel surveys systematically make invisible the amount of trips spent on care-related tasks, which frequently are hidden in categories such as “leisure,” “shopping,” or “escorting”: “Care work refers to the activities needed for the normal functioning of life, including the necessary tasks for the upkeep of the home and those required for the care of dependents, i.e. the

sick, the young, and the old. These tasks may be realized in the home or in other facilities around the city, and they imply the use of transport systems. [...] The mobility of care includes all travel resulting from home and caring responsibilities: escorting others; shopping for daily living, with the exclusion of leisure shopping; household maintenance, organization, and administrative errands, as opposed to personal walks for recreation; visits to take care of sick or elderly relatives that are, again, seen as different from leisure visits; and the like” (Sánchez de Madariaga, 2013a, pp. 52, 58). Such trips, however, are usually considered “non-compulsory travel,” which do not imply contractual obligations or financial compensation, but are therefore systematically undervalued as opposed to the notion of “compulsory or constrained travel” (such as commuting to places of work or study) (ibid., pp. 53–54). Thus, what is called for is recognition of such tasks and the complex trip-chains they involve (cf. Knoll & Schwaninger, 2020), which do not easily fit into prevailing priorities in transport planning for economic efficiency.

c) “Gender planning” and “gender mainstreaming”

“Gender planning” as an explicit concept was first conceived of in the context of developmental policy and practice during the 1980s, based on “the premise that women and gender were marginalised in planning theory and practice and therefore there was a need to develop gender planning as a planning discipline in its own right, with its own methodology” (Moser, 2014, p. 9). From a feminist viewpoint, to develop such a methodology and practice was deemed necessary for at least three reasons: First, a noted reluctance to engage with gender as an important category in planning practice, with most decision-making competencies “not only male dominated but also gender blind in orientation.” Second, feminist scholarship itself had put strong emphasis on “highlight[ing] the complexities of gender divisions in specific socioeconomic contexts, rather than to show how such complexities can be simplified so that methodological tools may be developed enabling practitioners to translate gender awareness into practice.” And finally, practitioners in planning practice itself felt it rather “difficult to ‘graft’ gender onto existing planning disciplines” (Moser, 1989, p. 1800). It is thus important to note that gender planning (as well as mainstreaming) approaches developed not only in opposition to prevailing, male-dominated planning discourses, but in part also in a tense relationship with more academic strands of feminist scholarship (cf. Roberts, 2013; Moser, 2014). While gender planning emerged as a distinct approach to urban development in the 1980s, gender mainstreaming was a later development, spurred by the 1995 Beijing Platform for Action, and the 1997 adoption of gender mainstreaming across all policy fields by the UN. With the 1998 Treaty of Amsterdam, gender mainstreaming also became a requirement in all areas of EU-policy (Moser, 1989, 2014; Roberts, 2013; Sánchez de Madariaga & Neuman, 2016). While the 1980s and 1990s, according to Moser, can be called the “‘golden age’ of gender frameworks, and their associated training methodologies” (2014, p. 12), this was followed by a diffusion of related methodologies, and the partial integration of gender planning also in the “gender mainstreaming” agenda adopted by the UN in 1997.

While there have been critical voices cautioning against a “dumbing down” of gender mainstreaming, e.g., by substituting gender analysis for substantial involvement in planning processes; neglecting long-term transformational goals at the expense of short-term problem-solving; or the reduction of gender mainstreaming to the processing of bureaucratic checklists (cf. Moser, 2014), gender mainstreaming nevertheless provides an important reference in contemporary discourse on gender, transport/mobility, and planning (e.g., Roberts, 2013; Sánchez de Madariaga,

2013a, 2013b; Sánchez de Madariaga & Neuman, 2016). Gender planning and gender mainstreaming approaches have thus resulted in a wealth of practical guides and toolboxes designed to aid policy-makers and practitioners in incorporating gender issues in planning and decision-making. Related initiatives range from gender training programs, through gender analysis and audit frameworks, participatory planning processes, and design solutions, to public campaigns against violence against women and girls. The following list contains a number of respective guidelines, toolboxes, and further resources on “gender, mobility and planning” to provide background knowledge and practical guidance:

- Tovi Fenster’s (2002) edited volume *Gender, Planning and Human Rights* collects a range of case studies from multi-cultural contexts that discuss and identify possibilities to integrate human rights issues in planning, development, and policy-making. Case studies stem from the UK, Israel, Canada, Singapore, the European Union, Australia, and the Czech Republic. Susan Fainstein and Lisa Servon’s (2005) edited volume *Gender and Planning: A Reader* contains a variety of contributions dealing with both theoretical issues and areas of application. Topics covered are theorizations of public and private space, as well as feminist approaches to planning theory; and studies on the areas of housing, economic development, and transportation. Inés Sánchez de Madariaga and Marion Robert’s (2013) edited volume *Fair Shared Cities: The Impact of Gender Planning in Europe* contains contributions on conceptual and practical aspects of gender planning and mainstreaming in urban contexts. Drawing on experiences and empirical studies from cities across Europe, the volume also includes a number of concrete urban development projects and practical experiences regarding their implementation. Christina Scholten and Tanja Joelsson’s (2019) edited volume *Integrating Gender into Transport Planning: From One to Many Tracks* contains contributions reflecting on feminist interventions in transport planning, ranging from conceptual and theoretical issues to empirical studies and the development of practical tools to improve transport planning from a gender perspective.
- Caroline Moser’s (1993) *Gender Planning and Development: Theory, Practice and Training* provides a detailed account of the rationale and methodology of the “Moser framework” of gender training for planners and practitioners. This includes a detailed Appendix on the approach and structure of practical training courses. Developed in the context of developmental policy and practice, it has achieved a paradigmatic status in gender planning approaches. Caroline Moser’s (2005) working paper *An Introduction to Gender Audit Methodology: Its design and implementation in DFID Malawi*, commissioned by the UK Department for International Development, provides the concept and methodology for a gender audit methodology, and relates it to practices of gender mainstreaming. It illustrates the components of a gender audit, its structure and content, and measurement issues.
- Carolyn Whitzman’s (2008) *The Handbook of Community Safety, Gender and Violence Prevention: Practical Planning Tools* provides a comprehensive collection of international evidence on the effectiveness of intervention strategies to prevent crime, violence, and insecurity, drawing on case studies from initiatives around the world in urban and rural areas. Practical tools include ways to obtain diagnostic information on the prevalence and impacts of violence, the development and evaluation of effective policies and programs, and the

creation of trust in partnerships. Anastasia Loukaitou-Sideris et al.'s (2009) report *How to Ease Women's Fear of Transportation Environments: Case Studies and Best Practices* published by the Mineta Transportation Institute contains the results of a comprehensive literature review and expert interviews on the perspectives and needs of women concerning safety in transit environments, an assessment whether these are met by transit agencies, and a discussion of model programs and best practice examples from cities around the world. The UN Women's (2019) *Safe Cities and Safe Public Spaces for Women and Girls Global Flagship Initiative: International Compendium of Practices* collects measures to address sexual harassment and violence against women in public spaces. Promising solutions from cities across the world involve addressing gaps in data, collaborative partnerships, laws and policies, inclusive urban and transport plans, and initiative to change social norms. The OECD's International Transport Forum's (ITF) (2018) publication *Women's Safety and Security: A Public Transport Priority* collected statements from its stakeholder on the importance of transport safety and security for women. The contributions argue for changes on different levels, from infrastructure and operational aspects, campaigns to further public awareness, the training of employees, reporting systems, data sources, women's employment in the transport sector, to new business models and the exchange of good practices among various relevant groups of stakeholders. Many of the brief statements provide weblinks for further information and resources. The Development Bank of Latin America and FIA Foundation's (2018) *Ella Se Mueve Segura: A study on women's personal safety in public transport in three Latin American cities*; Heather Allen, Marianne Vanderschuren, and University of Cape Town's (2016) *Safe and Sound: International Research on Women's Personal Safety on Public Transport* commissioned by the FIA Foundation; and the Asian Development Bank's (2015) *Policy Brief: A Safe Public Transportation Environment for Women and Girls* provide research findings from both quantitative and qualitative research, recommendations for research methodologies and planning, and good practice examples on safety and security issues relating to women's use of public transport. Karla Domínguez González et al.'s (2015) *Violence Against Women and Girls Resource Guide: Transport Brief* contains further good practice guidelines and resources.

- Antonio Corral and Iñigo Isusi's (2007) report *Innovative gender equality measures in the transport industry* published by the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions; Peter Turnbull's (2013) working paper *Promoting the employment of women in the transport sector – obstacles and policy options* published by the International Labour Office; and Jodi Godfrey and Robert Bertini's (2019) report *Attracting and retaining women in the transportation industry* published by the Mineta Transportation Institute provide examples of policy initiatives, empirical studies on barriers to women in the transportation industry, and recommendations to improve the situation of women workers in the transport sector. The International Transport Worker's Federation's (n. d.) *Women Transporting the World: An ITF resource book for trade union negotiators in the transport sector* provides guidelines, issue areas, and practical recommendations for negotiating good working conditions in the transport sector for women and men.
- The C40 Women4Climate initiative's (2019) report *Gender inclusive climate action in cities: How women's leadership and expertise can shape sustainable and inclusive cities* seeks to

integrate issues of climate and gender in urban and transport planning, providing findings from empirical case studies, strategic tools, and further recommendations.

- Heather Allen's (2018) *Approaches for Gender Responsive Urban Mobility – A Sourcebook for Policy-makers in Developing Cities*, published by the German Corporation for International Cooperation and the Sustainable Urban Transport Project provides an overview of challenges to women's mobility, methods for assessing gender in urban transport, general directions for developing gender responsive solutions, a list and analysis of good practice examples designed to improve daily mobility of women, as well as steps and a checklist for implementation. The Institute for Transportation & Development Policy's (ITDP) (2018) *Women and Children's Access to the City* reports findings from qualitative research on everyday experiences and visions of a good life especially of vulnerable groups of women in Recife Metropolitan Area (Brazil). It provides recommendations and indicators for monitoring and evaluation addressing issues of transport infrastructure and safety, housing, and service provision.
- The African Development Bank Group's (2009) *Checklist for Gender Mainstreaming in the Infrastructure Sector*; The World Bank Group's (2010) *Mainstreaming Gender in Road Transport: Operational Guidance for World Bank Staff*; the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development's (2011) *Urban rehabilitation and transport projects: Guidance Note*; and the Asian Development Bank's (2013) *Gender Tool Kit: Transport – Maximizing the Benefits of Improved Mobility for All* provide recommendations on the implementation of gender mainstreaming in urban, transport, and infrastructure projects. The guides include templates and good practice examples for all stages of the project cycle.
- In the European Union context, the CIVITAS WIKI's (2014) policy note *Gender equality and mobility: mind the gap!* and Maria-Cristina Marolda and Ariane Dupont's (2014) *She moves: Women's Issues in Transportation*, commissioned by the European Commission Directorate-General for Mobility and Transport, present empirical findings on gender inequality in transport in Europe, identify key areas of concern, and recommendations for policy and planning; the European Institute for Gender Equality's (EIGE) (2016) publication *Gender in transport* provides an overview of policy-relevant gender inequalities in transport, policy objectives at the EU and international levels, and a model for integration of gender issues in the policy cycle; Alejandro Ortega Hortelano and co-authors' (2019) report *Women in European transport with a focus on research and innovation: an overview of women's issues in transport based on the Transport Research and Innovation Monitoring and Information System (TRIMIS)* published by the EU's Joint Research Centre (JRC) provides a study on gender issues in transportation with a special focus on research and development, including an overview of existing European initiatives and regulations, the evolution of research projects on gender issues, and women's participation in transport research and development, and policy recommendations.
- The City of Vienna's (2013) *Manual of Gender Mainstreaming in Urban Planning and Urban Development* contains the City of Vienna's approach to gender mainstreaming, often referred to as exemplary in international comparison. The manual comprises conceptual aspects of gender mainstreaming, gender-relevant objectives, requirements of user groups, and quality

criteria, as well as exemplary projects, methods, and instruments, for different scales and areas of application. It includes considerations on planning objectives in two main thematic areas: urban structure, space creation, and housing quality; and public space and mobility.

- Useful Web-Links:

- A *gender audit methodology for public transport systems*, including a broad literature review and the results of focus group discussions with women on their travel experiences, was prepared by Kerry Hamilton and Linda Jenkins (cf. Hamilton & Jenkins, 2000). It is now available on the homepage of the UK Department for Transport's homepage,³ alongside further material related to "Women's transport issues."⁴
- The webpage of the network *Women Mobilize Women*⁵ launched by the Transformative Urban Mobility Initiative (TUMI) offers networking opportunities in efforts to improve transportation systems with regard to women's use of them, and provides information material and available best practice guidelines.
- The *Gendered Innovations* webpage,⁶ hosted by Stanford University, provides information material on gender dimensions in research and development processes in science, health, medicine, engineering, and the environment. Among a number of case studies⁷ presenting concrete examples for the use of methods of sex and gender analysis in research and development, some deal specifically with topics related to "gender and mobility." These include "Information for Air Travelers," "Pregnant Crash Test Dummies," "Housing and Neighborhood Design," and "Public Transportation."
- The webpage of the *European Institute for Gender Equality* (EIGE) provides information on a broad range of gender-related topics in the EU-context, including transport.⁸ Beside best practice guidelines and overviews, information on relevant EU-policies and actions in member states can be found.⁹

Conclusion: main coordinates of feminist discourse on "gender and mobility," research desiderata, and outlook

Feminist discourse on gender and mobility has come a long way, developing over already roughly five decades. Starting from transport researchers' findings on the different travel patterns exhibited by men and women, and enriched by contributions from engaged feminist architects and planners, as well as feminist human geographers, the field has spawned an impressive amount of literature. Relating to feminist discourse more broadly, then, it is important to note the theoretical and

³ <https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20091203133541/http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/inclusion/women/ptgenderaudit> (accessed: January 27, 2020)

⁴ <https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20091203102433/http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/inclusion/women/> (accessed: January 27, 2020)

⁵ <https://womenmobilize.org/> (accessed: January 27, 2020)

⁶ <http://genderedinnovations.stanford.edu/index.html>

⁷ <http://genderedinnovations.stanford.edu/fix-the-knowledge.html> (accessed: January 27, 2020)

⁸ <https://eige.europa.eu/topics/transport> (accessed: January 27, 2020)

⁹ <https://eige.europa.eu/gender-mainstreaming/policy-areas/transport> (accessed: January 27, 2020)

programmatic shifts that have occurred over recent decades to understand corresponding developments in discussions on gender and mobility.

While “[t]he 1980s witnessed some flourishing of attention to gender in policy questions in the ‘women and ... ’ literature” (Sandercock & Forsyth, 1992, p. 49), in feminist theory, “women’s issues” were gradually less the focus of attention, and instead, increasingly more complex and contextualized analyses of gender relations, gender identities, and their intersection with other social markers of inequality such as class, race/ethnicity, age, and sexual orientation became of interest (cf. McDowell, 1993a, 1993b; McDowell & Sharp, 1999, pp. 104-109; Valentine, 2007). While earlier work tended to view “women” as a relatively homogeneous (and homogeneously oppressed) group, critics (particularly women of color, and queer people) began to question the validity of what seemed to be a rather ethnocentric and relatively privileged perspective on the oppression of women (i.e., one of mainly white, middle-class, heterosexual women). Rather than operating in broad structural categories, increasingly, the diversity among women (and among men) was scrutinized, to the point of questioning the centrality of “gender” as a useful analytical (and political) concept altogether, with a tendency to substitute a concern for the recognition of “difference” (between identities, groups, and cultures) for the more traditional liberal assumptions underlying a “language of (in)equality and rights” that united most of the work concerned with “gender and urban structure” (McDowell, 1993a, p. 168). This change in perspective corresponded with a broader methodological and theoretical shift in feminist research from “feminist empiricism” to a “standpoint/antirationalist” perspective, whereby “social relations – or in Harding’s terms, the sociosexual division of labor” was the focus of the former, and “greater attention is given to gender symbolism, and to the construction of gendered identities” in the latter (ibid., p. 162; cf. Law, 1999; Bondi & Rose, 2003; Little, 2007). In this sense, feminist works in transport geography move closer to a model of “feminist empiricism” (cf. McDowell, 1993a), tending to posit “women” and “men” as rather homogeneous categories, whereas in human geography notions of difference and contextually specific gender relations and identities have increasingly come to dominate the discourse.

In attempts to systematize the diverse (feminist) contributions to discourse on “gender and mobility,” commentators have thus noted that the field of research at large has developed roughly along two broad lines of inquiry, characterized by different research interests, preferred methodological approaches, relations to developments in feminist theory, and corresponding normative-political implications. Robin Law (1999), in her review of research on “gender and transport” identifies the fields of (feminist) transport geography/travel research and human/urban geography as major contributors, with rather distinct disciplinary make-ups. While the former is more closely related to the traditional, solution-oriented approach of transport research, more policy-oriented in the pursuit of research questions, and mainly characterized by the use of aggregate quantitative data on travel behavior; the latter, feminist human geography, has been more strongly linked to and influenced by developments in feminist theory, with a preference for qualitative methods and case study approaches, as opposed to studies in transport geography, which tend to abstract from local cultural and social specificities (cf. Law, 1999; Hanson, 2010; Joelsson & Scholten, 2019a). Drawing on Susan Hanson (2010), this bifurcation of the field finds a further parallel in the way scholars have addressed the relationship between “gender” and “mobility”: on the one hand, researchers have been interested in “how movement shapes gender,” and on the other, they have been concerned with “how gender shapes movement.” That is, the former group has been interested in how the fact of being mobile or immobile, respectively, reinforces, shapes, or changes gendered power

relations (e.g., restrictions put on the freedom of movement can lower access to social, cultural, and economic resources, thereby reinforcing a subordinate societal position – and vice versa); whereas the latter have put more effort in detailed analyses of movement patterns and travel behavior, with gender as the “independent variable” (e.g., the observation that women tend to exhibit more complicated travel behavior, have less access to cars, and therefore rely more on public transport systems). The two strands of research have thus tended to emphasize one side of the “gender-and-mobility relation” at the relative expense of the other (Hanson, 2010). At the same time, however, a shared tenet of mobility research has been the basic observation that, typically, “women’s mobility is less than men’s,” which has, for the most part, been interpreted as an indicator of women’s oppression, “as a negative, as evidence of lack of equal access to opportunity and in some sense evidence of women’s subjugation” (ibid., p. 14).

While this conclusion may seem obvious, and in many cases may be convincingly argued, at the same time it contrasts calls for the contextualization of such observations. Thus, according to Hanson, the conclusion that “less mobility” can straightforwardly be equated with unjust power relations between the sexes or genders may in many cases have come about “because in most cases we have lacked knowledge of (1) whether any observed aspect of mobility or confinement in a particular social, cultural, or spatial context is the result of choice or constraint (which is often complicated and difficult to discern) and (2) what observed mobility patterns mean to people” (2010, p. 14). In other words, relying on quantitative information alone, it is often not possible to gain insight into the subjective experiences of and meanings attributed to mobility, or a lack thereof. To complicate matters further, on a global scale, “high mobility” in the “system of automobility” (Urry, 2004) may not be seen as a desirable goal for anyone, if one approaches the topic from a sustainability perspective: “It seems clear that if we are going to pursue sustainable mobility seriously, it does not make sense to posit the mobility patterns associated with masculinity as any kind of desirable benchmark with respect to personal mobility” (Hanson, 2010, p. 18). At the same time, observed differences in mobility patterns remain persistent, and have spurred ongoing research and debates.

There are also a number of research desiderata reported in the literature. To begin with, these are related to the ongoing need to further develop appropriate *methodologies* for enhancing our understanding of the varying needs and experiences of different groups in diverse social, cultural, and geographical contexts (cf. Hanson, 2010). One approach to such research is the provision of appropriate data to allow for sufficiently nuanced analyses (cf. Sánchez de Madariaga, 2013a). Such data should not only be disaggregated according to sex, but also include sociocultural categories, such as age, class, race/ethnicity, disability status, life-cycle stage, and sexual orientation. Also, metrics to account for the degree of existing inequalities in mobility, as well as existing tools, such as audit methodologies and gender impact assessments, may be tailored to better fit particular geographical contexts (Loukaitou-Sideris, 2016). Beside these quantitative approaches, increased use of and integration with qualitative methodologies, as well as inter- and transdisciplinary research are argued for (e.g., Joelsson & Scholten, 2019a, 2019b). Furthermore, as most research in the field has tended to focus on the “journey-to-work-trip,” *conceptual developments* (accompanying methodological and data-related developments) for better capturing and understanding a range of trips associated with other daily activities, such as the “mobility of care” (Sánchez de Madariaga, 2013a, 2013c) or more general “geographies of everyday mobility” (Law, 1999), are called for (cf. Loukaitou-Sideris, 2016). Also, Joelsson and Scholten (2019b) argue that the very category of “gender” needs clearer operationalization to prove effective in policy-making and planning practice. In terms of empirical

research objects, the *geographical bias* of most research on urban spaces in the Global North should be complemented by increased research efforts on both rural spaces, and spaces in the Global South, and *new technologies*, digital and mechanical (e.g., highspeed trains or smartphones), should also prompt new research questions regarding the opportunities and possible downsides they may entail. Again, geographical contexts play an important role, as new technologies may be more readily available in cities of the Global North than in other regions of the world. Also, idealizations of new “technological fixes,” such as the use of CCTV technologies to create safer public spaces, should be treated in a differentiated manner, as their employment may fail to deliver on the desired results (cf. Loukaitou-Sideris, 2016). Finally, means for proper *presentation and communication of information* to foster inclusive, democratic, and transparent processes in planning and policy-making are advocated (Joelsson & Scholten, 2019b; cf. Sánchez de Madariaga, 2013a).

As should be evident from the literature on gender planning and the considerable amount of best practice guidelines pointed to in the preceding section, there are a number of concepts and methodologies available to cater to the various gender issues at stake in the design of (urban) community spaces and traffic systems. At the same time, it has been noted that gender issues in transportation still often face difficulties in being recognized as a priority among policy-makers (Loukaitou-Sideris, 2016). In this context, the promotion of “gender mainstreaming” by the Beijing Platform for Action, which was adopted also in the Treaty of Amsterdam, is seen by many as the most promising lever for further implementing gender-related transport and urban design policies (e.g., Roberts, 2013; Sánchez de Madariaga, 2013a, 2013b; Loukaitou-Sideris, 2016; Sánchez de Madariaga & Neuman, 2016). At the same time, “gender mainstreaming” remains a disputed concept, and even more so among feminist scholars themselves. As Caroline Moser (2014, p. 14) notes with reference to the career of gender planning and mainstreaming approaches, the feminist project of integrating theory and practice always had to deal with a tension “between academics’ critique and practitioners’ positivism. While academia is more grounded in the analytical critique ‘of what’s wrong,’ the mandate of practitioners is to implement ‘what’s right,’ requiring policies to ensure virtuous rather than vicious cycles.” Correspondingly, a number of scholars have argued for the continued relevance of the category “gender” as not only one among many, but *the* most relevant marker of social inequality – and against diluting “gender” into merely one category among others in a vague “diversity” discourse (cf. Rahder & Altilia, 2004; Fainstein, 2005; Roberts, 2013; Sánchez de Madariaga & Neuman, 2016).

Arguments have furthermore asserted, in a similar vein, that many of the practical implications that could be associated with gender planning and gender mainstreaming approaches to urban and community design (such as alleviating over-reliance on private cars, strengthening public transport, facilitation of care trips, and relevant measures to be taken in the physical environment) do more than just support women as the main beneficiaries. There also exist strong synergies with concepts of “barrier free” environments and “universal design” suggesting improvements for both women and men who take on care-related tasks in the home, for friends, family, and the broader community, as well as for children, elderly, and persons with disabilities who may benefit from safer and more easily accessible spaces (cf. Loukaitou-Sideris, 2016). From this perspective, especially the notion of “care,” or “reproductive labor,” the provision of necessary resources for which to sustain social relations, order, and peoples’ wellbeing targeted by many feminist planning approaches, appears not as a luxury, but as a fundamental pillar of society: “Comprising both affective and material labour, and often performed without pay, it is indispensable to society. Without it there could be no culture, no economy,

no political organization. No society that systematically undermines social reproduction can endure for long” (Fraser, 2016, p. 99).

References

- African Development Bank Group (2009). *Checklist for Gender Mainstreaming in the Infrastructure Sector*. African Development Bank Group. <https://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Policy-Documents/Checklist%20for%20Gender%20Maintstreaming%20in%20the%20Infrastructure%20Sector.pdf>
- Allen Heather. (2018). *Approaches for Gender Responsive Urban Mobility – Sustainable Transport: A Sourcebook for Policy-makers in Developing Cities* (2nd ed.). German Corporation for International Cooperation; Sustainable Urban Transport Project. <https://www.sutp.org/publications/approaches-for-gender-responsive-urban-mobility-gender-and-urban-transport-smart-and-affordable/>
- Allen, H., Vanderschuren, M., & University of Cape Town (2016). *Safe and Sound: International Research on Women’s Personal Safety on Public Transport*. FIA Foundation. <https://www.fiafoundation.org/media/224027/safe-and-sound-report.pdf>
- Asian Development Bank (2013). *Gender tool kit: Transport: maximizing the benefits of improved mobility for all*. Asian Development Bank. <https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/institutional-document/33901/files/gender-tool-kit-transport.pdf>
- Asian Development Bank (2015). *Policy Brief: A Safe Public Transportation System for Women and Girls*. Asian Development Bank. <https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/179182/safe-public-transport-women-girls.pdf>
- Bondi, L., & Rose, D. (2003). Constructing gender, constructing the urban: A review of Anglo-American feminist urban geography. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 10(3), 229–245. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369032000114000>
- Boys, J. (1984). Is there a Feminist Analysis of Architecture? *Built Environment*, 10(1), 25–34. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23286005>
- Boys, J., Bradshaw, F., Darke, J., Foo, B., Francis, S., McFarlane, B., Roberts, M., & Wilkes, S. (1984). House design and women’s roles. In Matrix, *Making Space: Women and the Man-Made Environment* (pp. 55–80). London, UK: Pluto Press.
- C40 Women4Climate (2019). *Gender Inclusive Climate Action in Cities: How Women’s Leadership and Expertise can Shape Sustainable and Inclusive Cities*. C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group, Inc. https://w4c.org/sites/default/files/2019-02/W4C_REPORT_Gender%20Inclusive%20Climate%20Action%20in%20Cities_BD.pdf
- City of Vienna (2013). *Manual for Gender Mainstreaming in Urban Planning and Urban Development*. Urban Development Vienna. <https://www.wien.gv.at/stadtentwicklung/studien/pdf/b008358.pdf>
- CIVITAS WIKI (2014). *Gender equality and mobility: Mind the gap! (Policy Note)*. CIVITAS. https://civitas.eu/sites/default/files/civ_pol-an2_m_web.pdf

- Clarsen, G. (2013). Feminism and Gender. In P. Adey, D. Bissell, K. Hannam, P. Merriman, & M. Sheller (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Mobilities* (pp. 94–102). London, UK: Routledge.
- Corral, A., & Isusi, I. (2007). *Innovative gender equality measures in the transport industry*. European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.
https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef_publication/field_ef_document/ef0743en.pdf
- Cresswell, T. (2011). Mobilities I: Catching up. *Progress in Human Geography*, 35(4), 550–558.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132510383348>
- Cresswell, T., & Uteng, T. P. (2008). Gendered Mobilities: Towards a Holistic Understanding. In T. P. Uteng & T. Cresswell (Eds.), *Gendered Mobilities* (pp. 1–12). Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Day, K. (2011). Feminist approaches to urban design. In T. Banerjee & A. Loukaitou-Sideris (Eds.), *Companion to Urban design* (pp. 150–161). London, UK: Routledge.
- Development Bank of Latin America, & FIA Foundation (2018). *Ella se mueve segura (ESMS) – A study on women’s personal safety in public transport in three Latin American cities*. CAF; FIA Foundation.
<https://www.fiafoundation.org/media/597611/esms-toolkit-20181219-en.pdf>
- Domínguez González, K., Arango, D. J., McClearly-Sills, J., & Bianchi Alves, B. (2015). *Violence Against Women and Girls Resource Guide—Transport Brief*. World Bank Group; The Global Women’s Institute; Inter-American Development Bank; International Center for Research on Women.
http://www.vawresourceguide.org/sites/vawg/files/briefs/vawg_resource_guide_transport_brief_formattedv3.pdf
- Doyle, D. G., & Taylor, B. D. (2000). Variation in Metropolitan Travel Behavior by Sex and Ethnicity. In Battelle (Ed.), *Travel Patterns of People of Color, Prepared for U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration* (pp. 181–235). Columbus, OH: Battelle.
<https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ohim/trvpatns.pdf>
- Duchène, C. (2011). *Gender and Transport* (International Transport Forum Discussion Papers 2011/11). OECD. <https://www.itf-oecd.org/sites/default/files/docs/dp201111.pdf>
- European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (2011). *Gender I: Urban rehabilitation and transport projects – Guidance Note*. European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.
<https://www.ebrd.com/news/publications/guides/gender-1-urban-rehabilitation-and-transport-projects.html>
- European Institute for Gender Equality (2016). *Gender in transport*. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://eige.europa.eu/publications/gender-transport>
- Fainstein, S. S. (2005). Feminism and Planning: Theoretical Issues. In S. S. Fainstein & L. J. Servon (Eds.), *Gender and planning: A reader* (pp. 120–138). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Fainstein, S. S., & Servon, L. J. (Eds.). (2005). *Gender and planning: A reader*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Fenster, T. (Ed.). (2002). *Gender, Planning and Human Rights*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Fraser, N. (2009). Feminism, Capitalism and the Cunning of History. *New Left Review*, 56, 97–117.
<https://newleftreview.org/issues/II56/articles/nancy-fraser-feminism-capitalism-and-the-cunning-of-history>
- Fraser, N. (2016). Contradictions of Capital and Care. *New Left Review*, 100, 99–117.
<https://newleftreview.org/issues/III100/articles/nancy-fraser-contradictions-of-capital-and-care>

- Godfrey, J., & Bertini, R. L. (2019). *Attracting and Retaining Women in the Transportation Industry* (Report WP 19-01). Mineta Transportation Institute. <https://transweb.sjsu.edu/sites/default/files/1893-Godfrey-Attract-Retain-Women-Transportation.pdf>
- Greed, C. (2008). Are We There Yet? Women and Transport Revisited. In T. P. Uteng & T. Cresswell (Eds.), *Gendered Mobilities* (pp. 243–253). Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Grieco, M., & McQuaid, R. W. (2012). Gender and transport: An editorial introduction. *Research in Transportation Economics*, 34(1), 1–2. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.retrec.2011.12.009>
- Hall, D. (2004). Towards a gendered transport geography. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 12(3), 245–247. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2004.04.003>
- Hamilton, K., & Jenkins, L. (2000). A Gender Audit for Public Transport: A New Policy Tool in the Tackling of Social Exclusion. *Urban Studies*, 37(10), 1793–1800. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980020080411>
- Hanson, S. (2010). Gender and mobility: New approaches for informing sustainability. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 17(1), 5–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09663690903498225>
- Hanson, S., & Johnston, I. (1985). Gender Differences in Work-Trip Length: Explanations and Implications. *Urban Geography*, 6(3), 193–219. <https://doi.org/10.2747/0272-3638.6.3.193>
- Hayden, D. (1980). What Would a Non-Sexist City Be Like? Speculations on Housing, Urban Design, and Human Work. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 5(3), S179–S187. <https://doi.org/10.1086/495718>
- Hjorthol, R. (2008). Daily Mobility of Men and Women – A Barometer of Gender Equality? In T. P. Uteng & T. Cresswell (Eds.), *Gendered Mobilities* (pp. 193–210). Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Institute for Transportation & Development Policy (2018). *Women and Children’s Access to the City*. Institute for Transportation & Development Policy. http://itdpbrasil.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Women-and-Childrens-Access-to-the-City_ENG-V1_Jun-2018.pdf
- International Transport Forum (2018). *Women’s Safety and Security: A Public Transport Priority*. OECD. https://www.itf-oecd.org/sites/default/files/docs/womens-safety-security_0.pdf
- International Transport Worker’s Federation (n.d.). *Women transporting the world: An ITF resource book for trade union negotiators in the transport sector*. International Transport Worker’s Federation <https://www.itfglobal.org/sites/default/files/resources-files/Womenworld.pdf>
- Joelsson, T., & Scholten, C. L. (2019a). The Political in Transport and Mobility: Towards a Feminist Analysis of Everyday Mobility and Transport Planning. In C. L. Scholten & T. Joelsson (Eds.), *Integrating gender into transport planning: From one to many tracks* (pp. 1–22). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Joelsson, T., & Scholten, C. L. (2019b). Towards a Feminist Transport and Mobility Future: From One to Many Tracks. In C. L. Scholten & T. Joelsson (Eds.), *Integrating gender into transport planning: From one to many tracks* (pp. 271–282). Cham, CH: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Knoll, B., & Schwaninger, T. (2020). The Complexity of Care-Givers’ Trip Chains. Results from Gender Sensitive Mobility Surveys by Austrian Transport Planners and Consultants. In I. Sánchez de Madariaga & M. Neuman (Eds.), *Engendering cities: Designing sustainable urban spaces for all*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Koskela, H. (1997). ‘Bold Walk and Breakings’: Women’s spatial confidence versus fear of violence. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 4(3), 301–320. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09663699725369>
- Koskela, H., & Pain, R. (2000). Revisiting fear and place: Women’s fear of attack and the built environment. *Geoforum*, 31(2), 269–280. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7185\(99\)00033-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7185(99)00033-0)

- Law, R. (1999). Beyond 'women and transport': Towards new geographies of gender and daily mobility. *Progress in Human Geography*, 23(4), 567–588. <https://doi.org/10.1191/030913299666161864>
- Levy, C. (2013). Travel choice reframed: "Deep distribution" and gender in urban transport. *Environment and Urbanization*, 25(1), 47–63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247813477810>
- Listerborn, C. (2016). Feminist struggle over urban safety and the politics of space. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 23(3), 251–264. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506815616409>
- Little, J. (2007). Gender and geography: Developments in the United Kingdom 1980-2006. *Belgeo*, 3, 335–348. <https://doi.org/10.4000/belgeo.11216>
- Loukaitou-Sideris, A. (2016). A gendered view of mobility and transport: Next steps and future directions. *Town Planning Review*, 87(5), 547–565. <https://doi.org/10.3828/tpr.2016.38>
- Loukaitou-Sideris, A., Bornstein, A., Fink, C., Samuels, L., & Gerami, S. (2009). *How to Ease Women's Fear of Transportation Environments: Case Studies and Best Practices* (MTI Report No. 09–01). Mineta Transportation Institute. <https://transweb.sjsu.edu/sites/default/files/2611-women-transportation.pdf>
- Marolda, M.-C., & Dupont, A. (2014). *She moves: Women's issues in transportation*. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/c923ddff-636c-4ba8-87c2-07d2f06cd709/language-en>
- Matrix (1984). *Making Space: Women and the Man-Made Environment*. London, UK: Pluto Press.
- McDowell, L. (1983). Towards an understanding of the gender division of urban space. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 1(1), 59–72. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d010059>
- McDowell, L. (1993a). Space, place and gender relations: Part I. Feminist empiricism and the geography of social relations. *Progress in Human Geography*, 17(2), 157–179. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030913259301700202>
- McDowell, L. (1993b). Space, place and gender relations: Part II. Identity, difference, feminist geometries and geographies. *Progress in Human Geography*, 17(3), 305–318. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030913259301700301>
- McDowell, L. (2007). Spaces of the Home: Absence, Presence, New Connections and New Anxieties. *Home Cultures*, 4(2), 129–146. <https://doi.org/10.2752/174063107X208993>
- McDowell, L., & Sharp, J. P. (Eds.). (1999). *A Feminist Glossary of Human Geography*. London, UK: Arnold.
- 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>
- Moser, C. O. N. (1989). Gender planning in the third world: Meeting practical and strategic gender needs. *World Development*, 17(11), 1799–1825. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X\(89\)90201-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(89)90201-5)
- Moser, C. O. N. (1993). *Gender planning and development: Theory, practice, and training*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Moser, C. O. N. (2005). *An introduction to gender audit methodology: Its design and implementation in DFID Malawi*. Overseas Development Institute. <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/1818.pdf>

- Moser, C. O. N. (2014). *Gender planning and development: Revisiting, deconstructing and reflecting* (165/60; DPU60 Working Paper Series: Reflections). University College London. <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/bartlett/development/sites/bartlett/files/wp165.pdf>
- Ng, W.-S., & Acker, A. (2018). *Understanding Urban Travel Behaviour by Gender for Efficient and Equitable Transport Policies* (International Transport Forum Discussion Papers 2018/01). OECD. <https://doi.org/10.1787/eaf64f94-en>
- Ortega Hortelano, A., Grosso, M., Haq, G., Tsakalidis, A., Gkoumas, K., van Balen, M., & Pekár, F. (2019). *Women in European transport with a focus on research and innovation: An overview of women's issues in transport based on the Transport Research and Innovation Monitoring and Information System (TRIMIS)*. European Commission; Joint Research Centre. http://publications.europa.eu/publication/manifestation_identifier/PUB_KJNA29833ENN
- Pain, R. (2001). Gender, Race, Age and Fear in the City. *Urban Studies*, 38(5–6), 899–913. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980120046590>
- Peake, L. (2010). Fear, Geographies of. In B. Warf (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Geography* (Vol. 3, pp. 1088–1089). Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412939591.n418>
- Peake, L. (2015). The Twenty-First-Century Quest for Feminism and the Global Urban. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 40(1), 219–227. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12276>
- Peters, D. (2001). *Gender and Transport in Less Developed Countries: A Background Paper in Preparation for CSD-9*. UNED. <https://www.ssatp.org/sites/ssatp/files/publications/HTML/Gender-RG/Source%20%20documents/Issue%20and%20Strategy%20Papers/G&T%20Rationale/ISGT4%20Gender%20and%20transport%20in%20LDCs%20UNED%2001.pdf>
- Peters, D. (2011). *Gender and Sustainable Urban Mobility. Official Thematic Study for the 2013 UN Habitat Global Report on Human Settlements*. UN-HABITAT. <http://rgdoi.net/10.13140/RG.2.1.4746.9287>
- Pickup, L. (1984). Women's Gender-Role and its Influence on Travel Behaviour. *Built Environment*, 10(1), 61–68. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23286009?seq=1>
- Rahder, B., & Altília, C. (2004). Where is Feminism in Planning Going? Appropriation or Transformation? *Planning Theory*, 3(2), 107–116. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095204044777>
- Roberts, M. (2013). Introduction: Concepts, Themes and Issues in a Gendered Approach to Planning. In I. Sánchez de Madariaga & M. Roberts (Eds.), *Fair shared cities: The impact of gender planning in Europe* (pp. 1–18). Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Rosenbloom, S. (1978). The need for study of women's travel issues. *Transportation*, 7(4), 347–350. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00168035>
- Rosenbloom, S. (2006). Understanding Women's and Men's Travel Patterns: The Research Challenge. In Technical Activities Division, Transportation Research Board, & National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (Eds.), *Research on Women's Issues in Transportation. Volume 1: Conference Overview and Plenary Papers* (pp. 7–28). Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/23274>
- Rosenbloom, S., & Plessis-Fraissard, M. (2011). Women's Travel in Developed and Developing Countries: Two Versions of the Same Story? In Technical Activities Division, Transportation Research Board, & National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (Eds.), *Women's Issues in Transportation: Summary of the 4th International Conference, Volume 1: Conference Overview and Plenary Papers* (pp. 63–77). Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/22901>

- Roy, A. (2011). Gender, Poverty, and Transportation in the Developing World. In Technical Activities Division, Transportation Research Board, & National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (Eds.), *Women's Issues in Transportation: Summary of the 4th International Conference, Volume 1: Conference Overview and Plenary Papers* (pp. 50–62). Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/22901>
- Sánchez de Madariaga, I. (2013a). From women in transport to gender in transport: Challenging conceptual frameworks for improved policymaking. *Journal of International Affairs*, 67(1), 43–65. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24461671>
- Sánchez de Madariaga, I. (2013b). Looking Forward, Moving Beyond Trade-Offs. In I. Sánchez de Madariaga & M. Roberts (Eds.), *Fair shared cities: The impact of gender planning in Europe* (pp. 325–333). Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Sánchez de Madariaga, I. (2013c). Mobility of Care: Introducing New Concepts in Urban Transport. In I. Sánchez de Madariaga & M. Roberts (Eds.), *Fair shared cities: The impact of gender planning in Europe* (pp. 33–48). Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Sánchez de Madariaga, I., & Neuman, M. (2016). Mainstreaming gender in the city. *Town Planning Review*, 87(5), 493–504. <https://doi.org/10.3828/tpr.2016.33>
- Sánchez de Madariaga, I., & Roberts, M. (Eds.). (2013). *Fair shared cities: The impact of gender planning in Europe*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Sandercock, L., & Forsyth, A. (1992). A Gender Agenda: New Directions for Planning Theory. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 58(1), 49–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944369208975534>
- Scholten, C. L., & Joelsson, T. (Eds.). (2019). *Integrating gender into transport planning: From one to many tracks*. Cham, CH: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sheller, M. (2008). Gendered Mobilities: Epilogue. In T. P. Uteng & T. Cresswell (Eds.), *Gendered Mobilities* (pp. 257–265). Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2006). The New Mobilities Paradigm. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 38(2), 207–226. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a37268>
- Spain, D. (2002). What Happened to Gender Relations on the Way from Chicago to Los Angeles? *City & Community*, 1(2), 155–169. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6040.00014>
- The World Bank Group (2010). *Mainstreaming Gender in Road Transport: Operational Guidance for World Bank Staff* (Transport Papers TP-28). World Bank. <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTTRANSPORT/Resources/336291-1227561426235/5611053-1229359963828/tp-28-Gender.pdf>
- Tiwari, G. (2014). *Planning and Designing Transport Systems to Ensure Safe Travel for Women* (International Transport Forum Discussion Papers 2014/04). OECD. <https://doi.org/10.1787/5jz40rjgtjxx-en>
- Turnbull, P. (2013). *Promoting the employment of women in the transport sector—Obstacles and policy options* (Working Paper No. 298). International Labour Office. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_dialogue/---sector/documents/publication/wcms_234880.pdf
- Turner, J., Hamilton, K., & Spitzner, M. (2006). *Women and Transport Study: Provisional Version*. European Parliament.

http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2004_2009/documents/dv/tran20060912_womentransportstudy/tran20060912_womentransportstudy.pdf

- UN Women (2019). *Safe Cities and Safe Public Spaces for Women and Girls Global Flagship Initiative: International Compendium of Practices*. UN Women. <https://www.unwomen.org/-/media/headquarters/attachments/sections/library/publications/2019/safe-cities-and-safe-public-spaces-compendium-of-practices-en.pdf?la=en&vs=2609>
- Urry, J. (2004). The 'System' of Automobility. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 21(4–5), 25–39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276404046059>
- Valentine, G. (1989). The Geography of Women's Fear. *Area*, 21(4), 385–390. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20000063>
- Valentine, G. (1990). Women's Fear and the Design of Public Space. *Built Environment*, 16(4), 288–303. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23286230>
- Valentine, G. (2007). Theorizing and Researching Intersectionality: A Challenge for Feminist Geography. *The Professional Geographer*, 59(1), 10–21. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9272.2007.00587.x>
- Wajcman, J. (2010). Feminist theories of technology. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 34(1), 143–152. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cje/ben057>
- Whitzman, C. (2008). *The handbook of community safety, gender and violence prevention: Practical planning tools*. London, UK: Earthscan.