



Public spaces as infrastructures of care: mundane doings of/in ordinary places

Miriam Williams, Justine Lloyd, Harriet Narwal, Nerida Carter, Donna Houston, Kate Lloyd & Bronwyn Rennex

To cite this article: Miriam Williams, Justine Lloyd, Harriet Narwal, Nerida Carter, Donna Houston, Kate Lloyd & Bronwyn Rennex (2025) Public spaces as infrastructures of care: mundane doings of/in ordinary places, *Australian Geographer*, 56:4, 613-630, DOI: [10.1080/00049182.2026.2620149](https://doi.org/10.1080/00049182.2026.2620149)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00049182.2026.2620149>



© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 10 Mar 2026.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 448








View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Public spaces as infrastructures of care: mundane doings of/in ordinary places

Miriam Williams ^a, Justine Lloyd ^b, Harriet Narwal ^a, Nerida Carter^b,
Donna Houston ^a, Kate Lloyd ^a and Bronwyn Rennex^a

^aGeography and Planning, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia; ^bSociology, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia

ABSTRACT

Public spaces support and frame the economic, cultural, ecological and political lives of city dwellers. Much emphasis has been placed on how public spaces can be designed well to generate conviviality, as well as facilitate wellbeing and economic activity. At the same time, exclusion from public space can be 'built in' at the level of infrastructure. This article positions public spaces as infrastructures of care. Drawing on a series of vignettes reflecting on experiences of public space during and after the COVID-19 pandemic, we develop an expansive understanding of public space as relational and performed, and as supporting infrastructures of care (or, at times, creating barriers to access care). The paper demonstrates how thinking with and paying attention to care as a mundane doing of – and in – ordinary places, foregrounds the power of such infrastructures as scaffolds to social connection and interaction. We posit that scholarly and policy attention to public space as a care infrastructure is crucial in the face of recent challenges to both universal public access to public space and ongoing struggles to address unevenness in the public distribution of care.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 14 June 2024
Accepted 18 January 2026

KEYWORDS

Care; public space; cities; infrastructures of care; Australia; storying; third places

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic of 2020 and 2021 (hereafter Pandemia)¹ highlighted the important contributions public spaces make to health and wellbeing (Feng and Astell-Burt 2022; Lin et al. 2023a). As governments worldwide put public health orders in place and closed regular spaces of indoor exercise, people used parks, streets and sidewalks for recreation. Walking, running or cycling in green spaces became a regular pastime (ABC News 2020). When the private space of homes became all-encompassing places of work, schooling and recreation for some, local public spaces became an important space of respite; a place to experience care, caring for others and self in multiple, contingent ways.

CONTACT Miriam Williams  miriam.williams@mq.edu.au

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

However, the 2020–2021 period of pandemic also exposed the inequities of public spaces in Sydney (Feng and Astell-Burt 2022; Iveson 2020; Nicholas 2021) and elsewhere (Kallianos and Karathanasis 2021; Mundell et al. 2024; Reinwald et al. 2021). Local government areas (LGAs) with higher concentrations of relative socio-economic disadvantage experienced harsher lockdowns, slower vaccine roll outs, inadequate green space access and poor maintenance of public infrastructure (Lin et al. 2023b; Nicholas 2021). Places with dense urban populations saw intensification of public space use, revealing the inadequacy of public space provisioning, particularly in areas of relative socio-economic disadvantage² (Lin et al. 2023b; Mundell et al. 2024; Reinwald et al. 2021). Mental and emotional impacts of such public health restrictions were uneven, particularly for those people with ‘less access to private space’ compared to those who could retreat to single detached dwellings with private backyards (Iveson 2020, n.p.). Residents of different parts of the city, particularly Sydney’s Southwest, were racialised and targeted in public space (Rachwani 2021). During July and August 2021 there were reports of police interrogating parents about their children playing in the front yard of their houses (Rachwani 2021) and soldiers and helicopters patrolling the streets of Fairfield (Al Timimy 2021). Increased policing reinforced the fragility of norms around freely occupying public space and its importance for the life of our cities (Iveson 2020).

Pandemia times, which are still being experienced, bring into sharp relief the possibility and problems of public spaces as sites of care and lacking care. Understood as an ordinary practice, politics and ethics that maintains, continues and repairs our worlds, care is a ‘species activity’ which is vital to the continuation of life (Tronto 1993). Places and materialities especially mediate care or care-lessness (Power and Williams 2020; Williams 2020; Williams et al. 2025). Care is not a neat concept, it is messy, contested and troubling (Puig de la Bellacasa 2017). Feminist care ethicists draw on the concept to expose inequalities and burdens of care as well as racialised and gendered injustices of who is doing the work of care (Lawson 2007; 2009; Power and Williams 2020; Puig de la Bellacasa 2017; Tronto 2017; Williams 2020). This article explores the generative potential of positioning public spaces as *infrastructures of care*, the theme of this special issue. Infrastructures of care are defined by Power and Mee (2020, 489 citing Danholt and Langstrup, 2012, p. 515) as ‘infrastructural forms that pattern the organization of care within society, “the more or less embedded ‘tracks’ on which care may ‘run’, shaping and being shaped by actors and settings along the way”’. We are not alone in making this claim about public space in these terms, as Kallianos and Karathanasis (2021) have used photography and film to document how Protomagias Square in Athens, Greece, became a socio-spatial and affective site of care during pandemic. Moreover, public health research has investigated the role of public and green space for health and wellbeing prior to and during pandemic (see, for example, Feng and Astell-Burt 2022; Lin et al. 2023a; 2023b). Our approach extends beyond a health focus, inspired by a more expansive definition of how care flows throughout the urban (Power and Williams 2020) and an understanding of public spaces not as clearly bounded sites defined by administrative definitions (parks, gardens, green spaces, etc.), but as relational and performed assemblages that also include patchworks of ambiguous and in-between spaces (Rupprecht and Byrne 2014; Williams et al. 2025).

The next section engages with literatures on both public spaces and infrastructures of care. We then draw on a series of five vignettes documenting experiences of public space in Sydney, Australia during and after pandemic-related restrictions. We recognise that, in Sydney, and across Australia, all public spaces are first and foremost Country³ (Darug Ngurra et al. 2023), where competing claims to access and care for lands and waters are continually overlapping. Inspired by *weak theory* (Sedgwick 2003) or *minor theory* (Katz 1996), explained further below, we are open to the surprises and possibilities that may emerge from stories generated by attention to small, everyday details and places on the margins that are often ignored in favour of more high-profile and valued public spaces. We conclude by reflecting upon three key domains that approaching public space as an infrastructure of care makes visible: firstly, mundane and (extra)ordinary experiences of care in public space; secondly, ongoing glitches and interruptions to care in public space; and thirdly, how both care and carelessness flow through public spaces.

Public space as infrastructures of care in/after pandemic times

Our approach to understanding public spaces as infrastructures of care transects two areas of scholarship: (1) the embodied, material and affective dimensions of public space; and (2) feminist and ethnographic approaches to infrastructures and care ethics. Rather than providing an overview of each of these literatures separately, here we focus on the intersections, tracing the ways in which public space, care ethics and infrastructures coalesce to produce specific stories, conditions and experiences of uneven care in ordinary places. We first map out some of the ways in which care troubles conventional ideas of public space that configures specific kinds of ‘publics’ (Iveson 2007). We then discuss public spaces as infrastructures of care to draw attention to what is rendered visible and invisible, what boundaries might be troubled, and ultimately provide more nuanced accounts of mundane interactions, frictions and care in the everyday life of cities.

To begin, we trace infrastructural definitions of public space as being relational, context-dependent and configured through the complex interplay of material, symbolic and political-economic elements (Low 2023; Zhang and He 2020). In the broadest definition, public spaces are understood as ‘particular places in the city that are (or should be) open to members of “the public”’ (Iveson 2007, 4) such as streets, footpaths, parks and squares. Amin (2008, 9) differentiates between three types of public spaces: open spaces (e.g. parks), closed spaces (e.g. libraries) and intermediate spaces (e.g. sporting clubs). However, as we argue here, these types of public spaces are networked and interconnected. Thus, streets, footpaths, parks, playgrounds, libraries, museums, laneways, leftover spaces, easements, rivers, open and recreational spaces, and creeks etc. can be seen as physical expressions of ‘public infrastructures’ (social, environmental and technological) that comprise the public domains of cities. The often-overlooked infrastructural qualities of public spaces register within the biophysical, socio-technical and cultural-historic dimensions of the public domain such as pipes, pavements, lights, play equipment, drains, benches, trees, books or WiFi connectivity. Collectively, these elements make up the ‘public goods’ of the city and are often the loci of design interventions (for example, accessible pathways or gender-sensitive lighting). Public

space infrastructures are linked to broader forms of ‘sociality’ because they are bound up in structural inequities, inclusions and exclusions (Amin 2014). They can also be liminal in character, at times ambiguous and patchworked or informal (Rupprecht and Byrne 2014, 598).

This sociality of public space infrastructures also has affective and performative dimensions, for example, in the ways that configurations of places, sites, bodies and objects might become public through collective practices such as civic participation, civic conversation, protest and public address. These practices are in turn linked to historical understandings of a public sphere (Iveson 2007; Low 2023; Watson 2006). Amin (2012, 10) reminds us that public spaces are places of ‘thrown-togetherness’, a term coined by Massey (2005), to capture such sites as relational encounters between ‘bodies, mass and matter’. Amin (2015, 139) also adds to this line of inquiry with his concept of ‘lively infrastructure’, bringing the taken-for-granted ‘backstage’ of cities to the fore. Such understandings emphasise what exists in, between and beyond the margins of public space and delineate the contours of what Watson (2006, 3) refers to as ‘... random, specific, contingent, symbolic, imagined and lived, visible and invisible, spatio-temporally differentiated public space’. Indeed, Watson (2006, 15) compels us to notice ‘the finer grained textures’ of everyday encounters in ordinary or ambiguous public spaces, which often slip from view in favour of more visible struggles over the commodification of public space (Rupprecht and Byrne 2014), and its often-violent infrastructural arrangements (for example, Mitchell 1995).

Paying attention to these lively infrastructural processes and textures highlights public spaces as *infrastructures of care* (Kallianos and Karathanasis 2021; Power and Mee 2020). Infrastructures of care are both political and relational, involving both human and non-human agents that participate in ‘more-than-human relations of care’ (Alam and Houston 2020, 3), whether intentionally and unintentionally (Puig de la Bellacasa 2017). As Alam and Houston (2020, 4) note, ‘human and sometimes more-than-human agencies together can be considered [as] participating in the production of care in particular time and space’.

Our approach aligns with feminist modes of theorising in minor registers as a way of working with differences and margins in generative and modest ways (Katz 1996). Drawing on feminist care ethics and new infrastructural theory, we trace connections between ordinary, intimate, contingent, situated, uneven and frictive relations in public space (Houston, McLean, and Osborne 2024). We are inspired by Power et al. (2022, 1166) who have previously brought care and infrastructures into proximity to foreground ‘efforts to trace a more comprehensive set of relations through which life is sustained across different domains’ (see also Alam and Houston 2020; Berlant 2016; Stratford and Byrne 2024; Williams and Tait 2023). This work highlights care-ethics as an ‘affective orientation’ or disposition that all life relies upon (Power and Mee 2020). It also illuminates how such ethics are entangled in uneven infrastructural configurations, which in turn involve practices of care, maintenance and repair, mediated through materialities (Alam and Houston 2020; Power and Williams 2020; Puig de la Bellacasa 2017; Williams et al. 2025). If care is a necessary condition of living in interdependent worlds (Puig de la Bellacasa 2017), then conceptualising infrastructures of care draws attention to the inner, finer grained workings of mundane doings in and of ordinary places, as well as the situated labours of sustaining urban public life, including public

spaces (Stratford and Byrne 2024). Care operates through interpersonal engagements and is mediated by forms of governance (policy, regulation and management) and materialities (design, built form, etc.), all of which Power and Mee (2020) argue constitute care infrastructures. We turn now to how this ‘caring turn’ towards public space might be distilled through storytelling as one approach to understanding ordinary public spaces as sites of care in and after pandemia.

Moments of care and public space: five vignettes or ‘small stories’

The use of storytelling as method has burgeoned since pandemia, as scholars have sought to reflect upon, and thus provide extended and creative insights into its multiple affects and effects (Wright et al. 2023). For example, Rogers et al. (2020) reflect on the ways podcasting provided a means to critically document urban experiences of pandemia. Likewise, vignettes are increasingly being used as a means of storying, a way to ‘enable researchers to convey context, complexity and richness’ (Hall 2022, 980). They also help theorise public space as an infrastructure of care from below and through the lens of weak and minor theory (Katz 1996; Sedgwick 2003). As a methodological step towards understanding the networks of care held in place, storying describes ‘act[s] of making and remaking meaning’ (Phillips and Bunda 2018, 7) in a relational and collective sense. Such vignettes tell subjective truths about experiences that are often profoundly isolating and alienating, revealing the connections and relationalities between different temporalities and spatialities contained in a single moment or site. This layering of time points to storying’s role in repair and healing moments of rupture and extraction (Foster, Paterson Kinniburgh, and Wann Country 2020, 74). The nature of public spaces as care infrastructure is often hidden until ruptured (Berlant 2016), so story-based reflection can reveal the ways that care infrastructures might simultaneously be both agentic and passive.

In what follows, we highlight infrastructures of care in public space via five vignettes written by researchers working on the *Power of Public Spaces to Connect Communities and Place ARC Linkage* grant with the NSW Government (2023–2026). Written with the themes of public space and care in mind, these vignettes are autoethnographic (Justine, Kate and Harriet), based on research conducted for a Masters of Research (Nerida), and crafted from poetry that was written and posted on Instagram during pandemia (Bronwyn). As they show, when life, the seasons, public and private spaces felt awry, the multiscale reverberations of lockdowns provided an opportunity to reflect on care and public space, to see them anew.

Justine: care in the interstices

As the pandemic public health orders came into force and restrictions on gatherings started to become something to consider in everyday life, I started to realise how much up until that point I’d taken free access to open public space and the daily interactions that they bring for granted.

Public shared spaces came into high definition as social spaces. We moved all friend and family catchups into local parks and gardens with takeaway coffee. When the rifle club wasn’t shooting on the weekends, we started to take regular walks at a local rifle range with the dog, bumping into hundreds of other dog owners with the same idea.

As the novelty and panic of the COVID southern hemisphere autumn of 2020 wore on into the grinding relentlessness of pandemic winter and more restrictive travel rules – including requirements to stay within the 5 km zone – we found it was harder to stay outside for long periods as we felt self-conscious about violating restrictions on gatherings. Even though mild by most climatic standards, the Sydney winter weather turned against us, especially during the Tugarah'tuli⁴ (cold and frosty) mornings of the Eora season of Burrugin (Echidna), during June to late July, and the strong and gusty westerly August winds Tugarah Gunya'marri of Wiritjiribin (Lyrebird) season. Our time outside was curtailed by rules requiring us to exercise and only in small groups. Sitting still for long wasn't practical anyway, even when rugged up and holding a hot beverage. We had to think of new ways to keep warm while staying within the rules around this changed modality of spending time in company.

Our solution was an innovative twenty-first century version of 'tin-can telephone', the game we used to play as kids in which two empty food cans were strung together and one person listened while the other spoke into the connected can. Our COVID winter version of this game involved going for a brisk walk in the rain or wind, then sitting in two (or more) parked cars in a public space with our phones on speaker on a group call, chatting and commenting on the passing view, or just keeping silent as we appreciated the time together in this in-between space of home and working-from-home. As the lockdowns wore on, this arrangement became more and more elaborate, until one day my brother and his partner organised a serially-auto-non-mobile birthday party complete with party hats, streamers and blowers, with a pizza for each car, all of us with the phone on to chat, and sing happy birthday. The party itself was just as much fun as watching the faces of passers-by as they noticed us and figured out what we were up to.

Justine's vignette communicates stories of connection and disconnection within public space. It begins by mentioning the glitches that shaped how once invisible or taken-for-granted infrastructures became noticed and attended to (Berlant 2016; Star 1999). Access to shared spaces as sites of care were disrupted, and people had to creatively play with restrictions to make space to gather for special occasions (Horley et al. 2024; Koch and Latham 2013; Purnell 2015). Climatic factors such as seasons shaped practice as even the relatively mild Sydney wintertime necessitated the privately-public space of a car to create a movable bubble for socialising. These bubbles then took on a networked quality as they were linked by mobile phone reception and smart phones with speakers that could 'share' the conversation among a group. The vignette highlights how care in public spaces takes place within both physical and virtual infrastructures. When seen as networked and relational, open-ended opportunities for care, leftover public spaces such as car parks come into focus as fundamentally connected to other spaces and places, from the domestic spaces where the birthday party elements were originally assembled before being taken into the public domain, to the regulatory processes that allow for limited hours of parking (and can prohibit overnight or late-night activities) and limit the use of such places by certain bodies along the lines of age, gender, ethnicity and so on (van Melik and Spierings 2020). The following vignette shifts from these individual and familial scales of social connectedness to how communities used public spaces.

Nerida: making do with leftover space

Upon first glance there is nothing remarkable about the car park located in the Waterloo Estate (Figure 1). It is scattered with a few parked cars and from several metres away I can see a clustering of tables covered with items (including clothing, jewellery, toys, plants, ceramics and small furniture items that have been sourced from the residents own



Figure 1. Car park of Turanga housing tower, site visit 29.7.22 (Source: Author).

collection or from the side of the road). Small clusters of people are gathering around the tables. As I get closer I already feel at ease and know that it is not going to be difficult to strike up a conversation, even though this is my first time visiting these community markets.

I first learned about this resident-led market from a flyer posted on the window of the Waterloo Public Housing Action Group. The flyer invited ‘New Stallholders’ to attend and, although I wasn’t wishing to be a ‘stallholder’, I was definitely ‘new’ with aspirations to become a social researcher and investigate what really was going on in the Waterloo Public Housing community, which appeared to me to be facing a barrage of Government-imposed development threatening to displace the community.

Over the next few months I was welcomed by the residents despite living on ‘the other side of the bridge’. During this time, I learnt about the residents’ resourcefulness and creativeness in utilising the spaces which were part of the public housing estate where they lived, including the car park. Such informal spaces are not recognised by the Department of Housing that is the local governing authority, but still have potential as places where community engagement and benefits can occur. I learnt about the ways residents organised to care for each other during the COVID-19 pandemic. For example, Gerard, one of the residents from the Marton tower explained to me ‘... the Wednesday’s and Friday’s food [delivery], that’s fresh fruit and veggies; with prices and things, they’re the first things [that] people take out of their diet, and they’re the first things that are going to make them get ill [to go] without’. Gerard took matters into his own hands, organising food deliveries on a Wednesday and Friday morning utilising the carpark where tables could be set up and residents could queue to collect some fresh fruit and vegetables supplied by charitable organisations

such as Foodbank and OzHarvest. Gerard would charge the residents \$1 for their bag of fresh fruit and vegetables and this would cover the cost of the delivery.

The food bank deliveries to the Waterloo residents filled an essential need during the COVID-10 pandemic lockdowns as the weekly lunches Gerard had been organising with a group of fellow residents, held in the common room of the Marton building, were shut down by the authorities. As Gerard explained, these lunches provided fellow residents with fresh fruit and vegetables along with much needed social support especially for the elderly who Gerard explained may not have any social contact otherwise. The Waterloo Public Housing residents were no ordinary community, getting by on limited resources in difficult times and transforming a car park into a public space of care and connection.

This excerpt from Master of Research fieldwork shows that access to public spaces is uneven, with pandemic highlighting how existing inequalities were exacerbated in contingent ways. Public spaces can be a lively backdrop for care – a physical resource that supports, and is connected to the work of other infrastructures of care, such as food relief provisioning (Williams and Tait 2023; Williams, Pilkington, and Parker 2024), and other forms of bridging infrastructure that connect non-government organisations to people in need of assistance (Hewitt and Cook 2023). As a space of/to/for care and an infrastructure of care (Mee 2009; Power and Mee 2020), the common areas in public housing became more tightly regulated and controlled during pandemic, and fear of the spread of the virus led to tenants being locked out of their indoor common room. Despite this, residents found a way to gather and care for each other by transforming an ordinary, unglamorous – and importantly non-commodified – car park to get by as a survival strategy (Hobart and Kneese 2020). Similarly, in the next vignette, Bronwyn reflects on how her confinement to an apartment shaped her need for public space as ‘third place’ during pandemic.

Bronwyn: everyday more-than-human attunements

I live alone in a small apartment in Sydney’s inner west. I don’t have much of an outlook, just my courtyard wall, two trees in my neighbour’s yard, some rooftops and the sky. During the COVID lockdowns, like many, I was working from home. After long days spent inside and alone, it felt that my public and private selves were being wedged apart. I took interest in the gap that arose between them. As awful as this time was, it was also an opportunity to look and think anew about the things we took (and take) for granted. In fact, we were being forced to.

As a way of passing time, and of paying attention to the everyday shifts in my inner and outer worlds, I started writing haiku and sharing them on [Instagram](#). I chose the haiku form because it’s short (so it would work online) and because, traditionally, it’s a form that explores nature, time and changes (how apt). Haiku use a three-line format, the first and third lines have five syllables, the second line has seven.

My attunement to the everyday changed. As my public and private lives drifted apart, my scale of understanding the world did too. My focus seemed to drift between the micro and macro.

alphabetised books
colour coded my towels, and
contemplated clouds

And between the sky and the sounds outside.

this morning a bird
sang the day into being
ushering in light

Days became routines.

another blue sky
another day of lockdown
another zoom call

Routines became comfort.

a warm autumn night
with two loads of washing done
the full moon hanging

Or annoyance.

just another day
of rain falling on a dog
barking in a yard

Outside, the natural world seemed to thrive in our absence.

is it just me or
do myna birds seem bolder,
like it's their town now

Re-enlivened.

a contagion too
of phone calls with old friends and
parks lush with long grass

Felt anew after all that time indoors.

laying with eyes closed
on grass in the sun watching
my wild pink eyelids

But with new rules.

coogee beach is closed
'actually, very few
were exercising'

And new barriers.

kids playgrounds are closed
 swings festooned with safety tape
 'til further notice

It's hard to keep hold of that memory of what it felt like when our worlds became strange. A big part of what public space offered me then (and now) is the experience of difference: different people, different forms of life, different shapes and different scales (sunsets, ants, flowers). Perhaps public spaces also serve as some sort of ineffable reminder of our place in the world, our interconnectedness with everyone and everything. Until you haven't been able to enjoy looking at a horizon or sitting in the shade of a tree and feeling the wind on your face, you don't realise what an essential role those sort of experiences play in our wellbeing, and how much we'd miss them if they weren't there.

As Bronwyn describes, her need to access public space as a retreat from the monotony and confines of a private dwelling was acute during pandemia. This need was amplified by being confined to the indoors. Haiku seemed an ideal form of creative expression to explore this experience of confinement and disruption. Haiku became a means to reflect upon the experience and observe shifts in spatial rules and passing of time. The more-than-human world seemed to flourish, which, when noticed, also became a source of catharsis, and deepening understandings of the health impacts of green spaces and the role of nonhumans as agents in caring practice (Alam and Houston 2020). Likewise, engagement with publics (news, media, social media) was mediated through the digital (Rogers et al. 2020) and brought awareness of rapid changes in how public space was being regulated and governed. Kate picks up similar sentiments in the next vignette, but with a perspective on the spatial inequalities of care.

Kate: uneven, unequal and (un)caring

Throughout the COVID-19 pandemic I became aware of numerous narratives of people finding comfort and connection in their local park and green spaces. My own family and I experienced some magical moments out on our bikes hunting for the best takeaway and local park within our local 5 km radius. These pockets of respite became a sanctuary, keeping me grounded as I navigated the challenges of teaching online and supporting my three young children schooling from home. However, as I listened to stories of how other families, the elderly and those living alone were managing often uneven COVID restrictions, many grappling with health issues and/or little or no access to public green space, I was struck by the stark inequalities that shaped our experiences.

These inequities became front of mind as I grappled with the logistical and pedagogical challenges of teaching a Geography and Planning field school during the 2021 lockdown. Our ongoing field school research project, conceptualised well before the pandemic, engaged second-year Geography and Planning students in exploring the restorative benefits of nature connection for enhancing wellbeing and attention restoration. Initially, the plan was for students to participate in daily sensory activities immersing themselves in the bushland and waterways of the NatureFix-designed trail on Wallumattagal Campus. They would then complete pre- and post-trail surveys and reflections to understand the impact on their wellbeing and attention restoration.

Yet, as COVID restrictions came into effect and lockdowns were issued, the sensory walks through campus trails were no longer feasible and the students were limited to their local (within 5 km) public green spaces within their LGA. Then University risk management restricted students to their residences. For some their field site transformed into their own backyard with a view of the national or local park. But for others, many in government-designated 'LGAs of concern' with extra restrictions and no access to local green spaces, their engagement was reduced to a sliver of sky obscured by adjacent buildings, a pot plant on a windowsill or in a concrete backyard. Apartment and house-bound students shared innovative ways they sought to forge a connection with green spaces outside, one student played nature scenes on his wide screen TV to replicate the sounds and feel of sitting in his local park, another re-envisioned how he engaged with his indoor surroundings, documenting the daily changes in his pot plant and the woven creations of a daddy long-legs spider in the corner of his bedroom window.

As our students continued to complete their daily sensory 'trail' activities and surveys in their new locations, vastly different experiences of this engagement became evident. In our online classes we shared how our new spaces enabled us (or not) to undertake the sensory activities and how they were impacting our well-being. Some students with easy access to their garden or local park reflected on how this was a positive experience that changed their relationship with local green spaces. These spaces became sites of comfort and many were surprised at the restorative and therapeutic value of these spaces, particularly in time of stress and uncertainty. I recall one student saying that 'before that space was just something that was outside, but now I actively go out there before I start my day and it really helps set the mood and my appreciation for everything'. In contrast, students in LGAs with limited access to green space felt isolated and cut off from nature and resented the process of reflecting on their well-being during lockdown. Others who made some valiant attempts to engage, reflected on their increased connection to the everyday things such as pot plants in their home but, despite this, they shared with the group that their mental health suffered from not being able to access local parks, green spaces and people.

These reflections were certainly not intended or designed as a comparative study, yet they revealed to me how the regulations that aimed to care for each of us were encountered so differently. As green spaces became crucial infrastructures of care and well-being during the pandemic, inadequate access and restrictions exposed the inequities and inequalities and mental and emotional impact of public health restrictions.

This vignette reminds us that, as an infrastructure of care, access to public space is unequal. How people use, or need to use, public spaces differs over the life course, culturally, by ability, due to location and form. To theorise public spaces as infrastructures of care is to contend with the multiplicity, plurality and subjectivity of experiences of public spaces as (un)caring. It necessitates theorising from below, engaging minor stories in lively ways. Highlighting importance of access to public spaces and green spaces, even modest ones, the multiple stories in this vignette show pandemia's profound and highly unequal local effects, and potential contributions to increased inequalities.

Harriet: blurred boundaries and connections

COVID-19 restrictions started to come into effect during the second year of my PhD. In the initial months I was living in a share house with two essential workers and a pet rabbit. I spent plenty of time alone on the couch or at the kitchen table trying to work on desktop tasks during what was meant to be a big year of fieldwork. As kilometre radiuses and stay-at-home orders were enforced I, like so many others, became much more aware of the public spaces near my home. During lockdown, a walk along the Cook's River – from Marrickville golf course to Tempe – became an integral part of my day. This walk, which

I started doing daily to fulfill my need for exercise and movement, afforded a series of lessons on care, connectivity and conviviality in urban places.

My starting point was in the Inner West LGA, turning off my street and into Marrickville golf course. As I followed the pebble/dirt and often puddled track next to the river I'd smile or nod at strangers I passed, trying to keep my 1.5 m distance while cyclist and walker bodies mingled at varying speeds. Before long the path led to a bridge over the river and, as I followed, I crossed into Earlwood and the Canterbury-Blacktown LGA. In 2021, this usually benign process of crossing between LGAs – over the centre line of the river – became an act marred with anguish as the State applied varying levels of 'territorial confinement' for LGAs – in particular within 'LGAs of concern'. During this time, people's access to public space and the regulation of their bodies was wholly unequal across Sydney. My proximity to the river and this type of public space was a luxury that many didn't have.

After crossing the bridge, I continued towards Tempe, traversing roads and sticking to the river's edge. In several places my eyes snagged on rubbish – plastic bags and bottles, clothing and chip packets – that clung to the mangroves or fallen tree branches around the water's edge. Large portions of this rubbish had travelled with runoff towards the river from nearby urban centres. Rubbish that had been abandoned in public spaces in other locales was now here mingling with the waters of the Cook's River and all that they hold. The connections between our places and nearby waterways are easy to forget. This daily practice of witnessing more-than-human entanglements – the good, the bad and the transcendent – forced me to broaden my thinking; to consider the connections between places.

In most parts of my walk there were opportunities to spot birds, wading through wetlands and shallows, perching on rocks and low-lying branches, floating across the surface, weaving through mangroves, or flying high while following the river like a highway. These encounters provided moments of wonder in a seemingly hopeless time. I would spend time on or off the path watching and listening. As I started to notice the places where sacred kingfishers, straited herons, royal spoonbills and Australasian darters liked to be – and as I began to know the river, my sense of responsibility for the river grew (Figure 2). I considered what practices this responsibility might elicit. I began to bring a bag with me on my walks to



Figure 2. Birds on the Cook's River (left: a sacred kingfisher perched on rubbish clad debris in Earlwood in November 2019; middle: an Australasian darter at sunset in Earlwood in March 2020; right: a royal spoonbill wading in the shallows near Marrickville golf course in April 2020) (Source: Harriet).

collect stray rubbish – in the hope that I might care for the birds and the river, as they had cared for me.

Harriet's vignette speaks to the ways in which public spaces are co-created, maintained and repaired through more-than-human encounters. Here, the care facilitated and mediated through public space was carried out in relation to more-than-human worlds as public spaces not only care but provoke human care. However, invisible, arbitrary borders also became enforced and noticeable as infrastructures of governance disrupted capacities to care and be cared for. Other types of boundaries also mattered, such as the self-imposed bodily boundary of 1.5 metres, which was often self-policed. These boundaries, now visible in the different rules imposed on those on the other side of the river, made people hyperaware of how public space would be policed (Iveson and Sisson 2023).

Concluding and reflecting on storying public space as infrastructures of care

As the immediacy of pandemic everyday life fades, its legacy lives on in the patterning of infrastructures of care that uphold and produce everyday life. Because care infrastructures shape how care is made possible (Power and Mee 2020), to understand public space as an infrastructure of care is to recognise ordinary, everyday public spaces as sites which have the potential to care with, for, give care, receive care, and mediate care. Here, we have used storying to develop an expansive understanding of public space as relational and performed (or not) as infrastructures of care. By registering our memories of the everyday and (extra)ordinary experiences during pandemic, we have foregrounded the power of infrastructures as background to social connection and interaction (Latham and Layton 2019) and showcased how public spaces also generate or restrict capacities to care. We conclude by reflecting upon three key domains related to public space as an infrastructure of care that have been made visible here.

Firstly, by reflecting on mundane and (extra)ordinary experiences of pandemic, we have proposed an understanding of public spaces not as discrete sites defined by who owns and manages them, but as relational and performed assemblages interwoven with practices of care and their material and more-than-human underpinnings. Public spaces as infrastructures are fundamentally connected to other spaces and places, and experienced differentially due to location, temporalities and subjectivities. As more than a backdrop for care, more-than-human relationships that constitute public spaces actively care for and with those who occupy them, signalling how nonhumans might mediate and be enrolled in caring practice, even if unwittingly (Power and Williams 2020; Puig de la Bellacasa 2017; Williams et al. 2025). Public spaces act as non-commercial, openly accessible 'third places' that regularly provide spaces of social connection and organise social relations more broadly, thus enabling practices of self-care and care for others. The ability to 'domesticate' public space (Koch and Latham 2013) as a form of care for others and for the social fabric itself emerged in 'pop-up', temporary ways, that could be easily dismantled or recast as 'commuting' or 'exercising' rather than lingering when needed. Pandemic served to disrupt and reconfigure access to such space, prompting creative work arounds (mobile car bubbles) and new uses of public spaces (car parks) as legitimised locations for other infrastructures of care (community BBQs).

Secondly, pandemia heightened awareness of the glitches and interruptions experienced to infrastructures of care and how such glitches persist (Berlant 2016; Power et al. 2022; Power and Mee 2020; Williams and Tait 2023; Williams, Pilkington, and Parker 2024). Access to public spaces and green spaces, even unremarkable ones such as carparks, are essential for wellbeing when they provide environments for positive interactions between individuals, provoke caring responses, and enable social connection and belonging (Finlay et al. 2019; Kuo, Barnes, and Jordan 2019). Pandemia exposed how having access to public space to use as a ‘third place’ between home and work should not be taken for granted, but was also not equitably provisioned (Purnell 2015). Moreover, public spaces during pandemia generated additional unexpected expressions of care beyond human health, including catharsis, wonder, conviviality, social connectivity and comfort, further pushing our understandings of their contribution to sustaining life beyond wellbeing outcomes.

Thirdly, we call for more scholarly and policy attention to public space as a care infrastructure, particularly to investigate the ongoing impacts of restrictions, and the potential remediations of some of the harms and forms of care-lessness canvassed here. The occupation of public space during pandemia highlights how rules, regulations and laws shape public spaces because infrastructures of care and management practices, decision-making, rules, ownership and regulation make care possible (Power and Mee 2020). Public spaces have layers of meanings and histories, which are sometimes less or more visible. Regimes of ownership and responsibilities become sharply felt when they are unevenly applied to certain bodies and forms of sociality. The lifting of pandemia-related restrictions may have lessened focus on how governance itself is a form of infrastructure that shapes capacities to care (Power and Mee 2020), yet we call for further thinking with and storying of care in public spaces.

Notes

1. We use the term *pandemia* following geographers from the Storying Geography Collective who signalled the need to acknowledge the plurality of experiences rather than singularity of *the pandemic* (Wright et al. 2023).
2. We acknowledge the problematic nature of the term *disadvantage* which has the potential to stigmatise. In addition, we acknowledge its contextual and contingent nature.
3. Tyman (2021, p. 597) notes that the term ‘Country inhabits all relationality and is used widely across Australia to describe how all land is Aboriginal land, Aboriginal Country; Country is agentic and encompasses everything from ants, memories, humans, fire, tides and research. Country sits at the heart of coming to know and understand relationality as it is the web that connects humans to a system of Lore/Law and knowledge that can never be human-centric’.
4. All references to Dharawal season names are taken from Andrews, G., F. Bodkin and G. Bodkin-Andrews. Dictionary of the d’harawal language with grammatical notes. <https://dharawalstories.com/dharawal-dictionary/>.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

This work was supported by Power of Public Spaces project, which is funded through an Australian Research Council Linkage Grant [Grant Number LP210200796].

Ethics

The research has been approved by the Macquarie University Human Research Ethics Committee. Reference No: 520231225152099 on 21/07/2023 and Reference No: 52020615822917 on 8/12/2020.

ORCID

Miriam Williams  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6017-6655>

Justine Lloyd  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5822-315X>

Harriet Narwal  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1975-0736>

Donna Houston  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3181-3517>

Kate Lloyd  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9053-0050>

References

- ABC News. 2020. *Massive Boost to Outdoor Exercise in Sydney's Green Spaces during Coronavirus, Survey Finds*. <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2020-06-28/sydneys-green-space-use-booms-during-covid-19/12400104>
- Alam, A., and D. Houston. 2020. "Rethinking Care as Alternate Infrastructure." *Cities* 100:102662–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2020.102662>
- Al Timimy, H. 2021. *Clumsy Decisions Have Left Fairfield Feeling Abandoned and Misunderstood*. <https://www.smh.com.au/national/nsw/clumsy-decisions-have-left-fairfield-feeling-abandoned-and-misunderstood-20210714-p589or.html>
- Amin, A. 2008. "Collective Culture and Urban Public Space." *City* 12 (1): 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13604810801933495>
- Amin, A. 2012. *Land of Strangers*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Amin, A. 2014. "Lively Infrastructure." *Theory, Culture & Society* 31 (7-8): 137–161. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276414548490>
- Amin, A. 2015. "Animated Space." *Public Culture* 27 (2 (76)): 239–258. <https://doi.org/10.1215/08992363-2841844>
- Andrews, G., F. Bodkin, and G. Bodkin-Andrews. 2023. *Dictionary of the D'harawal Language with Grammatical Notes*. <https://dharawalstories.com/dharawal-dictionary/>
- Berlant, L. 2016. "The Commons: Infrastructures for Troubling Times." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 34 (3): 393–419. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775816645989>
- Danholt, P., and H. Langstrup. 2012. "Medication as Infrastructure: Decentering Self-care." *Culture Unbound* 4 (3): 513–532. <https://doi.org/10.3384/cu.2000.1525.124513>
- Darug Ngurra, L., C. Dadd, H. Norman-Dadd, H. Narwal, P. Glass, S. Suchet-Pearson, E. O'Gorman, et al. 2023. "Legal Pluralism on Dyarubbin: Country-as-Lore/law in Western Sydney, Australia." *GeoHumanities* 9 (2): 355–379. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2373566X.2023.2182699>
- Feng, X., and T. Astell-Burt. 2022. "Perceived Qualities, Visitation and Felt Benefits of Preferred Nature Spaces during the Covid-19 Pandemic in Australia: A Nationally-Representative Cross-Sectional Study of 2940 Adults." *Land* 11 (6): 904. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land11060904>
- Finlay, J., M. Esposito, M. H. Kim, I. Gomez-Lopez, and P. Clarke. 2019. "Closure of 'Third Places'? Exploring Potential Consequences for Collective Health and Wellbeing." *Health & Place* 60:102225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2019.102225>
- Foster, S., J. Paterson Kinniburgh, and Wann Country. 2020. "There's No Place Like (Without) Country." In *Placemaking Fundamentals for the Built Environment*, edited by D. Hes and C. Hernandez-Santin, 63–82. Springer.
- Hall, S. M. 2022. "'It Died Once at Playgroup, I Didn't Know What to Do': Towards Vital, Vibrant, Material Geographies of the Mobile Phone in Austerity." *Social & Cultural Geography* 23 (7): 972–989. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2020.1843698>

- Hewitt, T., and N. Cook. 2023. "Bridging Infrastructure: Conceptualising non-state Organisations in Complex Refugee Settlement Service Landscapes." *Geoforum; Journal of Physical, Human, and Regional Geosciences* 138:103671. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2022.103671>
- Hobart, H. J. K., and T. Kneese. 2020. "Radical Care, Survival Strategies for Uncertain Times." *Social Text* 38 (38 (1)): 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-7971067>
- Horley, C., C. Gibson, N. Cook, P. McGuirk, A. Warren, and P. Wolifson. 2024. "Islanding as a Vernacular Creative Response to Crisis: Emotional Geographies of Pandemic Musicianship." *Emotion, Space and Society* 53:101040–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2024.101040>
- Houston, D., J. McLean, and N. Osborne. 2024. "Infrastructural Frictions: Care, Shadows, and Ruins in Multispecies Smart Cities." In *Designing More-Than-Human Smart Cities: Beyond Sustainability, towards Cohabitation*, edited by M. Foth and R. Clarke, 17–36. Oxford: Oxford Academic.
- Iveson, K. 2007. *Publics and the City*. Carlton: Blackwell Publishing.
- Iveson, K. 2020. We don't know What We've got till It's gone – We Must reclaim public space lost to the coronavirus crisis. <https://theconversation.com/We-dont-know-What-weve-got-till-Its-gone-We-Must-reclaim-public-space-lost-to-the-coronavirus-crisis-135817>.
- Iveson, K., and A. Sisson. 2023. "Transmission and Territory: Urban Bordering during Covid-19." *Political Geography* 104:102910. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2023.102910>
- Kallianos, Y., and P. Karathanasis. 2021. "Public Space as Infrastructure of Care: The Affective Dynamics of Protomagias Square during the Pandemic." *Lateral* 10 (2). <https://doi.org/10.25158/L10.2.7>
- Katz, C. 1996. "Towards Minor Theory." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 14 (4): 487–499. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d140487>
- Koch, R., and A. Latham. 2013. "On the Hard Work of Domesticating a Public Space." *Urban Studies* 50 (6): 6–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098012447001>
- Kuo, M., M. Barnes, and C. Jordan. 2019. "Do Experiences with Nature Promote Learning? Converging Evidence of a Cause-and-Effect Relationship." *Frontiers in Psychology* 10:305. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00305>
- Latham, A., and J. Layton. 2019. "Social Infrastructure and the Public Life of Cities: Studying Urban Sociality and Public Spaces." *Geography Compass* 13 (7): 1–15.
- Lawson, V. 2007. "Geographies of Care and Responsibility." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 97 (1): 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8306.2007.00520.x>
- Lawson, V. 2009. "Instead of Radical Geography, How about Caring Geography?" *Antipode* 41 (1): 210–213. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2008.00665.x>
- Lin, B. B., C. C. Chang, E. Andersson, T. Astell-Burt, J. Gardner, and X. Feng. 2023a. "Visiting Urban Green Space and Orientation to Nature Is Associated with Better Wellbeing during Covid-19." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 20 (4): 3559. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20043559>
- Lin, B. B., C. C. Chang, T. Astell-Burt, X. Feng, J. Gardner, and E. Andersson. 2023b. "Nature Experience from Yards Provide an Important Space for Mental Health during Covid-19." *npj Urban Sustainability* 3 (1): 14. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42949-023-00094-0>
- Low, S. M. 2023. *Why Public Space Matters*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Massey, D. 2005. *For Space*. London: Sage.
- Mee, K. 2009. "A Space to Care, a Space of Care: Public Housing, Belonging, and Care in Inner Newcastle, Australia." *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 41 (4): 842–858. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a40197>
- Mitchell, D. 1995. "The end of Public Space? People's Park, Definitions of the Public, and Democracy." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 85:1.
- Mundell, M., F. Andrews, R. Tucker, L. Johnson, and J. Liang. 2024. "Public Space in the Shadow of Covid-19: Placemaking for Spatial Justice in Geelong's 'Disadvantaged' Neighbourhoods." *Journal of Urbanism: International Research on Placemaking and Urban Sustainability* : 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17549175.2024.2337888>
- Nicholas, J. 2021. Sydney's 'Haves and Have-Nots': Poor Access to Green Space in LGAs of Concern. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/datablog/2021/sep/13/sydneys-haves-and-have-nots-poor-access-to-green-space-in-lgas-of-concern>.

- Phillips, L. G., and T. Bunda. 2018. *Research Through, with and as Storying*. Milton Park: Routledge Focus.
- Power, E., and K. Mee. 2020. "Housing: An Infrastructure of Care." *Housing Studies* 35 (3): 484–505. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2019.1612038>
- Power, E., I. Wiesel, E. Mitchell, and K. Mee. 2022. "Shadow Care Infrastructures: Sustaining Life in Post-welfare Cities." *Progress in Human Geography* 46 (5): 1165–1184. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03091325221109837>
- Power, E., and M. Williams. 2020. "Cities of Care: A Platform for Urban Geographical Care Research." *Geography Compass* 14 (1): 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12474>
- Puig de la Bellacasa, M. 2017. *Matters of Care: Speculative Ethics in More than Human Worlds*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Purnell, D. 2015. "Expanding Oldenburg: Homes as Third Places." *Journal of Place Management and Development* 8 (1): 51–62. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPM-D-03-2014-0006>
- Rachwani, M. 2021. "We Feel Intimidated": Residents in South-West Sydney Covid Hotspots Say Police Are Making Things Worse. <https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2021/aug/15/We-feel-intimidated-residents-in-south-west-sydney-covid-hotspots-say-police-Are-making-things-worse>.
- Reinwald, F., D. Haluza, U. Pitha, and R. Stangl. 2021. "Urban Green Infrastructure and Green Open Spaces: An Issue of Social Fairness in Times of Covid-19 Crisis." *Sustainability* 13 (19): 10606. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su131910606>
- Rogers, D., M. Herbert, C. Whitzman, E. McCann, P. J. Maginn, B. Watts, A. Alam, et al. 2020. "The City under COVID-19: Podcasting as Digital Methodology." *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie* 111 (3): 434–450. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tesg.12426>
- Rupprecht, C. D. D., and J. A. Byrne. 2014. "Informal Urban Greenspace: A Typology and Trilingual Systematic Review of Its Role for Urban Residents and Trends in the Literature." *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening* 13 (4): 597–611. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2014.09.002>
- Sedgwick, E. K. 2003. *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Star, S. L. 1999. "The Ethnography of Infrastructure." *American Behavioral Scientist* 43 (3): 377–391. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00027649921955326>
- Stratford, E., and J. Byrne. 2024. "Im/Mobilising bus Travel as an Infrastructure of Care: Student Experiences in a Mid-Size City." *Mobilities* 19 (3): 379–395. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450101.2023.2244683>
- Tronto, J. 1993. *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Tronto, J. 2017. "There Is an Alternative: *Homines Curans* and the Limits of Neoliberalism." *International Journal of Care and Caring* 1 (1): 27–43. <https://doi.org/10.1332/239788217X14866281687583>
- Tynan, L. 2021. "What Is Relationality? Indigenous Knowledges, Practices and Responsibilities with Kin." *Cultural Geographies* 28 (4): 597–610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14744740211029287>
- van Melik, R., and B. Spierings. 2020. "Researching Public Space, from Place-Based to Process-Oriented Approaches and Methods." In *Companion to Public Space*, edited by V. Mehta and D. Palazzo, 16–27. Abington, Oxon: Routledge.
- Watson, S. 2006. *City Publics: The (dis)Enchantments of Urban Encounters*. Routledge. <https://books.google.com.au/books?id=lGaMtAzPTRwC>.
- Williams, M. 2020. "The Possibility of Care-Full Cities." *Cities* 98 (March 2020): 102591–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2019.102591>
- Williams, M., J. Lloyd, H. Narwal, D. Houston, N. Carter, K. Lloyd, and B. Rennex. 2025. "Sustaining Care-Full Public Spaces." *Geography Compass* 19 (6): 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.70030>
- Williams, M., A. Pilkington, and C. Parker. 2024. "Food Relief Providers as Care Infrastructures: Sydney during the Pandemic." *Geographical Research* 62 (2): 263–278. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-5871.12633>

- Williams, M., and L. Tait. 2023. "Diverse Infrastructures of Care: Community Food Provisioning in Sydney." *Social & Cultural Geography* 24 (8): 1362–1382. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2022.2056630>
- Wright, S., J. Palis, N. Osborne, F. Miller, U. Kothari, K. P. Henrique, P. Everingham, and M. Borovnik. 2023. "Storying Pandemia Collectively: Sharing Plural Experiences of Interruption, Dislocation, Care, and Connection." *GeoHumanities* 9 (1): 1–23.
- Zhang, X., and Y. He. 2020. "What Makes Public Space Public? The Chaos of Public Space Definitions and a New Epistemological Approach." *Administration & Society* 52 (5): 749–770. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399719852897>