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Introduction

Responsibilities, priorities, roles, activities and mobility all shift when people become parents. Caring for children necessitates new activities and mobilities in the city (Aitken 1998; Pain, Bailey and Mowl 2001; Parker and Rubin 2017). Choices such as where children should go to school, where adults should work and other daily decisions have profound impacts on the spatial footprints (understood as the distance and direction that a person, household etc travels over the course of a period of time and measures how far and for how long they travel (Boessen 2014), of households (Luzia 2010), creating parental geographies of care.

This paper builds on earlier work of geographies of care and parental care that traces the relationship between gender, parenting and mobility (Hanson 2010; Dowling 2015). Parenting is highly gendered and spatialized but we argue that the construction of what it means to be a ‘good’ mother or a ‘good’ father is a relational and relative social norm. These identities, coupled with
the specifics of urban morphology, explain the daily spatial footprints of care in the Gauteng city-region (GCR), South Africa.

We examine three key elements in this paper: 1) the social and cultural norms and moral ideologies of parenthood; 2) the everyday practices of childcare; and 3) the mobility patterns and spatial footprints of parents. We argue that daily decisions that constitute the spatial footprints of caregivers are deeply entrenched in moral geographies and thus in the ideas that people have about what constitutes being a ‘good’ parent. We develop the existing literature on ‘good’ parenting, by demonstrating that these ideas are culturally and socially relative and overlain by class as well as geographic location. Spatiality, combined with ideology and identity, shape not only how we care but how we are able to care, which in turn reinforce notions of ‘good’ parenting.

The GCR case offers an example of city-regions in the global south, illustrating the complexities of care in a context of state absence in daily life and the consequent need for high levels of privatised responsibility (Raghuram 2016). The paper locates the study within the broader realms of Geographies of care, parental care and mobility literature before drawing out some of the distinctive features of the GCR. We begin with an exploration of the ways in which our participants define a ‘good’ parent and parenting norms. Followed by how these notions of parental ideology and identity intersect with the specifics of Gauteng’s urban morphology and spatial legacy to shape the daily activities, divisions of labour and thus the spatial footprints of parents in the city-region. Our analysis shows how gendered relations of care within the domestic sphere influence mobility patterns, transport choices and spatial footprints at the urban scale.
Gender, parenting and mobility

Hanson (2010, 6) writes that gender and mobility are ‘completely bound up with each other, to the point of almost being inseparable’ and that gender is both shaped by and shapes mobility. Uteng and Cresswell (2008: 2) note that ‘How people move (where, how fast, how often etc.) is demonstrably gendered and continues to reproduce gendered power hierarchies’ (Uteng and Cresswell 2008, 2). Women’s immobility by social convention has been well-recorded, and this immobility has been a key feature of the female experience across the globe (Wilson 1992). Masculinity was conversely deeply entwined with ideas of activity, movement and mobility, roving from the domestic space of the home to the masculinized spaces of work and recreation (Benjamin 2010). City planning and the automobilised body were both connected to the material experiences of men and their need to move from one space to another.

The different roles and responsibilities of fathers and mothers as well as their different constraints and supports influence their movement through and across cities (Barker 2011; McLaren and Parusel 2015; Schwanen 2007; Waitt and Harada 2016). The combination of parenting, gender and mobility, termed, ‘parental mobility care’, is defined by McLaren and Parusel (2015, 1426) as ‘a complex set of domestic routines and responsibilities that focus on children’s mobilities’. As a mundane domestic practice, parental mobility care includes escorting and chauffeuring, coordinating with household members and others, preparing children for travel, negotiating children’s use of public space, and safeguarding children from traffic (McLaren and Parusel 2012).

However, parental mobilities of care are highly gendered and in many cases the arrival of children cement gender-normative roles and their attendant spatialities (Aitken 1998). In
concrete terms this translates into situations in which ‘fathers … were less involved than mothers and that their practices were often different from mothers’ (McLaren and Parusel 2015, 1428). Due to the continued influence of patriarchal power relations, mothers, relative to fathers, are burdened by escorting responsibilities and are more integrally involved in the daily cycles and movements of their children (Barker 2011; Dowling 2000; Luzia 2010). For Boyer and Spinney (2016, 1119), mobility is a defining element of motherhood: ‘It is through being mobile that mothers: learn how to use particular objects to hone their parenting skills; introduce their children to new experiences; test out their emerging and evolving identities, and come to know their new “parented” body’.

Despite a robust literature on masculinity, relatively little has focused on fathering and mobility (Meah and Jackson 2016). What has been produced has considered fathering and mobility on the larger scale looking at transnational (Hondagneu-Sotelo and Avila 1997; Parrenas 2008) and intra-regional movement and the distances that men travel to support their families, recognizing that providing for their families is often core to men’s mobility (Aure 2018). More nuanced analyses have also shown that physical distance does not mean emotional absence (Aure 2018; Palkovitz 1997; Willerton et al. 2011). In the global north, fathers have engaged in chauffeuring activities, as some men take their children to school in the mornings (Barker 2011). However, these models of men’s mobility and distance entrench gendered family relations with mothers taking the brunt of day-to-day parenting and fathers maintaining the role as the main breadwinner and financial provider for their families (Aure 2018:1232).

Mobility and gender have also been linked to discourses of what constitutes ‘good’ mothering (Dowling 2000; Goodwin and Huupatz 2010; Barker 2011). Drawing on Hays’ (1996) definitive work on intensive mothering Johnston and Swanson (2006, 510) note that this is the dominant
mothering ideology of the middle class, framed as an ideology of ‘child-centered, expert-guided, emotionally absorbing, labor intensive, financially expensive and highly gendered as mothers are primarily responsible for the nurture and development of the sacred child and in which children’s needs take precedence over the individual needs of their mothers’. A woman’s ‘ability to care for kin’, her ‘Maternal competency’, (Clement and Waitt 2017, 1194) can be tied to the ways in which she uses cars to move through space to provide the best opportunities for her children (Dowlings 2000).

However, relatively little has been written about what constitutes a ‘good’ father, or the geographical and spatial manifestations of ‘involved fathers’. Scholars have focused on men providing ‘financially for their families since there is a perceived association between good fathering and breadwinning’ (Meah and Jackson 2016) with some work highlighting the importance of fathers ‘being there’ for their children (Lemay et al. 2010). How ‘good’ fathers move around cities and spatialize their care is relatively absent from the literature (Aure 2018; Barker 2011).

Some aspects of parenting have been hashed out in the feminist discussions in which women of colour have challenged white, northern-trained feminists ‘to reflect more critically on their ethnocentric assumptions about gender relations and identity’ (Walker 1995, 419). Feminist geographers highlight the question of intersectionality and difference when thinking about questions of mobility, gender and parenting (Doucet 2013). The result has been a move towards a deeper consideration of intersectionality and its relationship with spatiality (Mollett and Faria 2018) and to ‘take seriously the aim of intersectionality to de-center whiteness, to understand the imbued spaces of violence in development, and to see the production of space through multiple
power formations’ (ibid., 571). This work highlights the importance of considering the relationship between mothering and fathering and is an approach we have adopted in this study.

Intersectional identities of social class, race, economic position, and geographical location within cities (which we argue are of vital importance in the global south), all agglomerate to influence and affect men and women’s daily experiences of mothering and fathering and their abilities to move around cities. From this extensive body of literature we construct a framework that looks to the concept of ‘good’ parenting as a fundamentally gendered and intersectional notion.

Parenting is related to social identities and is relative to cultural norms ‘highly variable across time, space and culture, [and shaped] by factors of socio-economic class, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and other factors’ (Boyer and Spinney 2016, 1118) that in turn leads to a set of spatial practices. However, such practices are not overlain onto a passive landscape, but rather access to resources, the nature of the built environment in which people live, as well as modes of transport that are available impact the daily practices of parenting. Thus ‘the materiality associated with travel “pushes back” on subjects to shape experiences of mobility and identity construction’ (Boyer and Spinney 2016, 1119). This constructs a recursive relationship between identity and practice: the identity of being ‘good’ parents shapes mobility but daily activities and actions of parents as they move through the city to take care of their children shapes and reinforces identities as a ‘good’ parent.

**Parenting in the South African context**

Historically, South African scholarship on mothering has focused on the politics of mothering: the nature of power and power distribution of mothers in society, juxtaposed with paternalism and patriarchy, as well as the role of women in the multitude of political movements during and after the apartheid era. A clear stereotype persists in the description of mothers in South Africa: the
‘African mother’ as ‘the pivot of family life’ in contemporary townships (Campbell 1990, 5). There is also a conflation of women’s identities in that ‘the respect and authority a woman is accorded comes to her by virtue of her role as a mother - and falls strictly within the sphere of the household’ (Campbell 1990, 11). Although the roles of black mothers were still constrained, political movements and the struggle for freedom provided more progressive constructions of women’s roles than were afforded their white counterparts (Lewis 1993; Walker 1995). In this way, studies of mothering in South Africa have long been intersectional, considering both race and gender but have largely focused on political engagement with little investigation of the mothering practices or the role of mothers’ social identity.

Equally, the discussion around fatherhood has had clear racialised dimensions in South Africa. Black fathers are significantly impacted by apartheid policies and their legacies leaving highly fragmented, women-headed households where men were, and remain, mostly absent as fathers and partners (Hosegood and Timaeus 2016). ‘[M]en’s definition and performance of their gender identity impacts their practices of fatherhood and vice versa’ (Enderstein and Boonzaier 2015, 513), thus whereby fatherhood is directly linked and sustained by the notion of hegemonic masculinity in what Pleck (2010) calls a Fatherhood-Masculinity model. This hegemonic masculinity is a common feature across racial and geographical lines and was ‘synonymous with problematic male attitudes and behavior, such as violence and abuse of women and children, substance abuse, and risky sexual behaviors’ (Morrell et al, 2012, 13). These problematic attitudes and behaviours are exacerbated by the complex interstice in South African men of providing for a family (a key dimension of masculine and fathering identities) and high levels of unemployment, which damage men’s sense of self (Makusha et al. 2019). Men’s inability to provide causes shame and embarrassment and reduces their familial involvement (Morrell 2006; Hunter 2006). However,
much of the withdrawal and the best attempts at provision are rooted in deep-seated discourses of paternal care (Makusha et al. 2019).

While there is increasing work in the Global South on questions of identity and intersectionality (Hopkins and Noble 2009; Mollet and Faria 2018) the work in South Africa has focused largely on the discursive nature of parenting. Few studies have engaged with the practices of parenting and the everyday lived and mobilised experiences of caring in the urban context. In this paper we bring together the everyday practices of parenting in conversation with the identities and ideologies of parents.

Defining a ‘good’ father or a ‘good’ mother is culturally and contextually relative where ‘mothers’ and fathers’ “moral” responsibilities as carers and earners remain differently framed and experienced’ (Doucet 2004, 278). What constitutes a “good” mother or a “good” father is gender specific and socially determined with penalties for not subscribing to these social roles.

Given this state of the literature we extend this notion of what constitutes a ‘good’ parent in three ways: first, to move beyond understanding a ‘good’ mother as just providing care for her children; second, to demonstrate that ‘good’ parents have a variety of spatial footprints and modes of transport; and that, men are also engaged in questions of what constitutes a ‘good’ father which in turn influences their spatiality and mobility on a daily basis.

**Gauteng as a city region in the Global South**

The GCR, which includes the cities of Johannesburg and Pretoria, is a major urban centre with a quarter of South Africa’s population (approx. 15 million) and producing a third of the country’s Gross Domestic Product. The population is diverse and includes many migrants from South African provinces as well as from sub-Saharan Africa. As mentioned briefly above, South Africa’s
history of migration and urbanisation have strongly shaped the formation of families and households: with high rates of children in the care of grandparents or other relatives in rural homesteads whilst parents migrate to urban centres (Budlender and Lund 2011).

Despite the city-region’s relatively wealthy status and location situated within a medium-income country, the GCR does not enjoy many of the benefits of the global north, especially very few public institutions designed for the care of children. The state’s primary provision is a child support grant, largely paid to the female primary carers of children (Patel and Hochfeld 2011), and some state-subsidised early childhood development (ECD) centres although insufficient to meet demand. This means that households have to find the funds for children to attend private ECD centres. School facilities are better subsidised and the majority of public primary and high schools in Gauteng do not charge tuition (Parker, Hamann & de Kadt 2021). While some schools provide feeding schemes, the majority of school activities such as scholar transport, after school activities, special needs, recreational and sporting facilities— all have to be paid for and almost all of them are privately run. Households consistently pay for anything that is beyond the most basic aspects of education.

Aside from the privatisation of many of the aspects related to child-care, which is common across the Global South (Raghuram 2016), the GCR also maintains a racialized spatial geography. This is a legacy of the apartheid and colonial policies where poorer people remain on the periphery in townships and informal settlements of the major centres requiring significant commutes to economic, educational and other opportunities. These sites, despite substantial state investment in the post-apartheid era, remain under-serviced in terms of healthcare, recreation and other facilities, infrastructure, and services.
This geography is compounded by the fact that transport is poorly integrated and expensive. Paratransit, mostly in the form of minibus taxis, has become the dominant mode of transport while public transport infrastructure remains fragmented and inefficient. Post-apartheid provincial and local governments have invested in several key transit interventions in the GCR: including metro-scale Bus Rapid Transit (BRT); the Gautrain, a rapid rail project; and a minibus taxi recapitalisation project (Harrison, et al 2019). However, transport continues to be expensive and arduous and impacts poor households disproportionately while also constraining the choices available to all parents and their children with their wider range of mobility and accessibility needs.

**Method**

This is the second study on parenting and spatiality we have undertaken. Two of our project team members are parents themselves and we have drawn on some of their personal experiences. However, as the team is middle-class, educated and white, we were alert to the limitations of these experiences, conscious of the range of different experiences within the South African context and the need for nuanced and intersectional approaches when studying parenting and spatiality. The case study research was undertaken between March 2019 and February 2020 using a mixed method-approach that included focus groups, a mobile phone mobility app, mapping and qualitative interviews. In the first phase, we engaged 5 focus groups, ranging in size from 6-22 people, the size was dependent on who we were able to access that fitted our criteria. We were largely dependent on gatekeepers and that sometimes restricted the size of the groups. The focus groups were intended to introduce the project, get some general background on questions of mobility and recruit people for the second phase of the study. Thus from the original focus group attendants a subset of 43 people : 27 mothers and 15 fathers, were chosen for the second phase, of
interviewing and using the mobile phone app (details provided in Table 1). They were selected in
order to try and get as diverse a range of parenting and household configurations as possible i.e.
partnered heterosexual couples, single parents, multi-generational households that were co-
parenting as well as different age groups.

The second phase, involved giving participants (8-10 people in each neighbourhood) smartphones
with a preloaded app. Attempts were made to give phones to two people in the same household to
try and understand the differences that gender, age and other factors may play in daily movements
and mobility. The app tracked mobility for a period of two weeks. Every few days, we also asked
respondents a different question through the mobile communication platform, Whatsapp, and
requested that they write, send us voice notes, images and videos. At the end of the two weeks, the
mobility data and Whatsapp communication was used as the basis for a longer qualitative
interview, asking people about their movements and choices and understanding the motivations
and drivers of the mobility and decision-making. The focus groups were mostly held in English
whilst the interviews were held in a range of South African languages including seSotho and
isiZulu and were translated by the interviewer. All of the material (interviews together with the
maps, focus group data, Whatsapp information) was transcribed and then collectively coded using
an online shared platform (Google docs) and a set of predetermined themes as well as an inductive
approach when themes arose from working with the material and engaging with the literature. The
collective approach was productive as the authors could cumulatively build on each other’s
insights.

Table 1: Summary of general profiles and participant information of the five case study areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denver</th>
<th>Edenvale</th>
<th>Lenasia</th>
<th>Mamelodi</th>
<th>Bertrams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


In total, five sites across Gauteng were chosen: Mamelodi, Bertrams, Denver, Lenasia and Edenvale; (Figure 1). The legacy of apartheid unfortunately means that locations in the GCR remain largely racially, and increasingly economically, segregated (Ballard and Hamann, 2021). Thus the five neighbourhoods were chosen as a proxy for different socio-economic conditions and demographic profiles. We also selected for access to varying levels of transport amenities, settlement and housing typology, geographic spread and relations of centrality and peripherality across the GCR.
Table 1 provides some comparative information about each case study area. To offer more detail:

Denver is an industrial area east of Johannesburg’s central business district and is wedged between major arterial roads and the east-west railway line. Many of the families were fragmented; split across dwellings, locations and generations. The majority of our participants were unemployed or had informal jobs. And most of our families were migrants from KwaZulu Natal. In contrast, Edenvale, is a suburban area on the western edge of Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality and accommodates a variety of housing typologies and densities with some racial diversification since the end of apartheid. Most of the participants were middle-class professionals and employed and many had been born in Gauteng.
Our third case study area, Lenasia, was established under apartheid as an area for people from, or descendants of, Indian and south Asian descent. Today it is a racially mixed residential area and the majority of households were working or middle class. Mamelodi is a former apartheid township for Black Africans located east of the Pretoria central business district in Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality. The majority of participants were working class with a variety of household configurations. Our last case study, Bertrams, is an old suburb located close to Johannesburg’s central business district with a variety of housing typologies. In the last 30 years the area has seen significant demographic shifts and is now largely inhabited by African immigrants.

**Spatial practices and lived experiences of ‘good’ parents**

‘Good’ parenting is defined by personal ideologies of parenthood, motherhood and fatherhood, and the values within the household (Althusser 1984). These ideologies include ‘patterns of beliefs, ideas, opinions, and values that are used to create meaning’, defining ‘what exists, what is good, and what is possible’ (Johnston and Swanson 2006, 509). These are not ephemera but the social and power relations which shape how decisions are made in households, how resources are allocated and the city accessed and navigated (Lawson 2007). For parents this subjective reality informs a set of practices of care: what they should do on a daily basis and how they should or should not behave towards their children, thus defining what constitutes the moral imperative of ‘good’ parenting. This goes beyond care as practice and becomes care as ethic (Popke 2006) which is ‘tied up in normative notions of what good care looks like’ (Raghuram 2016, 516).

However, care as ethic needs to be contextualised and layered onto the spatial and material realities in which households operate (Cooper 2012). Care is produced through spatial as well as social relations: 'how objects, bodies, buildings, or materials are enrolled and how they shape the nature
and possibility of care’ (Power & Williams 2019, 3). Each of our case study areas has a different environment (Table 1), which results in varied amenities and opportunities for parents and their children. The ways in which parents navigate these challenges is a constant dialogue between their ideologies and various environmental conditions. Thus, there is a recursive relationship between care as ethic and the materialities of the built environment, ultimately impacting patterns of mobility.

**Absence and presence**

As in other parts of the world, our respondents described ‘good’ parents as being present in their children’s lives (Lemay et al. 2010). One father who does not live with his 4 year old son stated that proximity meant being able to care for a child properly:

> So, living far from your child is not good at all. I know it happens to a lot of people… from my perspective it is not good. As a parent you must always know what is happening in your child’s life even the smallest events like playing…you would want to watch and see that they are okay. (D1, African father, 27, Denver, 2019)

This is significant because several of our respondents, both men and women, did not have their children living with them, for various reasons. This reflects some of the fluid household dynamics prevalent in the GCR, in large part because of the pervasiveness of migration (Seekings 2008). Several of our participants were interprovincial or transnational migrants, demonstrating how the process of urbanisation is tied to notions of ‘good’ parenting. B2 left her home in Mozambique and travelled across borders to support her son who was left at home with relatives. She notes: ‘when you have to think for another person you do not just think for yourself…that’s the reason that made me move to South Africa from that side to try to find a better life for him… I mean to try to make sure that he will have everything that he needs’ (B2, African mother, 55, Bertrams,
But such migrations come with high prices, and migrations mean that ‘... you have to sacrifice a lot. You sacrifice being close with your family. I sacrificed my friends...everything to come here. To start afresh, with nothing’ (B2). Respondents in Mamelodi speak of their profound loneliness and dissociation that they experience by living away from their families. It also means changes in the parents’ mobility and having to find the time and money to return ‘home’ to their families as often as possible to see their children and sometimes spouses. One mother tried to go home every month, which meant long and dangerous inter-provincial commutes just so that her child would not be separated from her for long periods: ‘I tend to visit once or twice in a month.... [and to bring] , money and groceries’ (M3, African mother, 41, Mamelodi, 2019). Thus, the scale of spatial footprints of parents is continuously influenced by big decisions to migrate and smaller everyday decisions to visit children and partners and provide for them.

Such migrations result in a fluid household dynamic where children and partners may move between home locations elsewhere and the urban home in the GCR, thus continuously shaping the everyday spatial footprints of parents. A further reason for these fluid household dynamics, especially in Denver, was the poor quality of the urban environment. Denver with its lack of facilities and hazards was considered an unsuitable space for children and a better option was for children to be cared for by other family members in the rural areas.

Of course, because they [her children] would struggle if they were here with me [in the informal settlement]... there is a lot of negative energy where I am from. So, the children are better living with their fathers (D4, African mother, 33, Denver, 2019).

D2, a father of 10 children, lived in an old mining hostel in difficult conditions, sharing a very small space with his cousin so that he could save on rent and transport (he walked to work nearby). Conventionally, care is framed in the literature as a relationship of proximity: that ‘Care does not,
at first sight, seem to respond well to distance’ (Robinson 1999, 43). However, placing children with relatives and sacrificing daily interactions in order to provide for one’s children and keep them safe, or migrating across borders were all seen to be ways of carrying out the role of a ‘good’ parent, and profound acts of care (Milligan and Wiles, 2010). This separation also shapes the choices of where parents live and how they live, with parents often willing to compromise their own safety and comfort by living in slums and undertaking dangerous work so that they can send home larger sums to their families.

**Breadwinning and resource provision**

Key to their parenting role, ‘good’ mothers and fathers also saw the need to provide at the very least basic material goods for their children: ‘making sure you're a good parent is making sure... a child's basic needs are met. So that education, food, good place to sleep, that's being a good parent’ (L6, Indian/Asian father, 27, Lenasia, 2019). Providing is typically seen to be the role of the father, reflected in the Fatherhood-Masculinity model (Pleck 2010), and we found strong evidence of this amongst the male participants from each of our case study areas. One father spoke of how his two wives and ten children returned to his rural home after he lost his job. He now works as an artisanal miner (which are miners that work old or disused mines informally without licenses or the technologies generally associated with the formal mining) in precarious circumstances and told us how this had changed his role and identity as a father:

D2: [...] I am a father but a weak father [...] You are weak because you cannot survive with your woman without money. She survives on the children’s grant money which she gets for them. They [the mothers] are the good parents...

Interviewer: What makes a good father good?
D2: Being employed and having an income. Having my wife obey me. If I follow their rules, I am no longer a father. I am a broke, weak father. There is nothing I can do. (D2, African father, 49, Denver, 2019).

Providing money for his families is key to his status as a ‘good’ father and D2 expressed a profound loss of voice when he was unable to provide: ‘You see the situation is that you notice that you are heard very clearly when you are employed. They understand everything that you say but when you are unemployed and don’t give them money you are senseless to them. There is nothing to tell them if you are penniless’ (D2). His response was to take up the dangerous work of artisanal mining and to live in the nearby men’s-only hostel which meant he could walk to ‘work’ and reduce his costs. Figure 2 demonstrates just how small his spatial footprint is, with small trips in and around Denver for work and food. Through this adaptation, D2 has managed to maximise the money he can send to his families, fulfilling the role of masculine provider, but at great personal cost to his own quality of life.
For our Denver respondent, D1, who does not live with his son and is unemployed, handing out his CV and searching for work becomes a key manifestation of his masculinity and role as father. Where he looks for work is determined by his access to transport (see Figure 3). He relies heavily on the trains (which only travel east-west from Denver) because the trains are very cheap or sometimes free (if he uses the ‘illegal way’) and is currently being supported financially by his mother. However, the trains are notoriously unsafe for commuters with gangs who rob people. D1’s mobility and spatial footprint is driven by his need to find work to provide but severely constrained by the materialities of living in an informal settlement with limited affordable transport options.
Although the male provider was a dominant ideology for fathers, many women also felt that providing was part of their responsibility as mothers, unlike findings in the Global North. Female respondents maintained that a ‘good’ mother is ‘Being employed and ensuring that your children have money. It would be hard to call myself a mother if I could not feed my children and grandchildren’ (D5, African mother, 46, Denver, 2019). However, with high levels of unemployment affecting both men and women, it was also clear that being a ‘good’ parent who provides was sometimes impossible. The challenge to provide love or the basic necessities causes enormous stress and discord in people’s homes. M8, an African mother from Mamelodi, described how hard she found it to maintain calm as a single mother of two children when the money and food runs out:

[Love] lacks, even with our children, you would tell yourself that you love them but because you do not have money it lacks, when you do not have money, loving your child
becomes hard. It is like when you know you need to buy bread, you need to face your hungry children, or face their unsupportive fathers, the fathers do not give you money. It is not right, how do you expect the children to feel, they would feel unloved. I would tell them that I love them but my words pierce them especially when my back is against the wall I would scream ‘Your father did not give me money!’ (M8, Mamelodi, African mother, 46, 2019).

Thus lacking the financial and material resources has a direct impact on having the necessary emotional reserves to be a ‘good’ parent, especially self-identified ways of being a ‘good’ mother and brings up emotions of guilt and shame, leading to feelings of failure. In the previous section, we saw how some women live away from their children, crossing borders and leaving their children in family members’ care to fulfil this providing role, much like many of the men. These women combine the reproductive role with the productive one and return home as often as possible to make sure that their children do not have to do without their maternal care. This framing of motherhood is not without conflict as the experience of migrant mother B2 illustrates above but the difference is that it is not a conflict of identity between woman as worker and woman as mother, as has been frequently shown in other research (Raskin 2006). Thus for these mothers, their identity as mothers includes providing as well as nurturing, even if the provider role is less prominent.

For both our mothers and fathers, the ideology of providing frequently intersected with the materialities of the urban environment: access to transport or employment determining the ways in which parents could provide for their children. The role of provider strongly shaped the mobilities and spatial footprints, although with varying affects. Some parents had very large footprints that spanned borders while others had very small footprints in order to save money.
Scale, gender and geography

Although there were commonalities of ‘good’ parenting across the different case study neighbourhoods, there were also differences that emerged at the intersections of gender, geography and scale. The different geographies and materialities of each case study combined with gendered roles to shape the mobility and the scale of the spatial footprints of our parents. Households in Lenasia described how they were far from educational and employment opportunities and due to the lack of public transport had to use private transport for children to access ‘better’ schools outside of the area. This enlarged their spatial footprints: ‘We travel [because we are] too far away from civilisation’ (L8, Indian/Asian mother, 55, Lenasia, 2019). The lack of adequate public transport also constrained parents’ choices: a couple living in Lenasia with an academically gifted daughter chose a private school in the south of Johannesburg because ‘[…]in terms of transport it had to be practical. There is a school bus from Lenasia to St Martins [School]’ (L8, Indian/Asian mother, 55, Lenasia, 2019). However, parents also described how they worried about their children commuting long distances on South Africa’s unsafe roads but that they had to trade off hard decisions about distance and safety with the idea that ‘good’ parents give their children the best education possible.

This geography of Lenasia, where Islam is the predominant religion, intersected with culture and gender. Women traditionally do not have driver’s licenses or own cars and as a consequence, they have very small spatial footprints, centred mostly on their homes and surrounding areas in which they can walk. They also tend not to chauffeur their children. Longer trips require being accompanied by male members of the household. The women’s small spatial footprints contrast with the larger spatial footprints of their male partners and children and indicate how these domestic ideologies shape varied mobilities for different household members.
Conversely, in some of the more middle income households and areas, women do the majority of fetching and carrying of children, no matter their circumstances, breaking up their working days to fetch children from school or take them to extramural activities or healthcare appointments. A teacher with two children described the emotional and physical labour of her everyday:

I wake up kind of like earlier than the whole family does. Then it sort of is almost trying to get them [her children] up and deal with school. Um, try and get some breakfast into them and then I go off to school, but then it is worrying about who’s fetching kids..., if someone is fetching them or if I'm going to leave them at school and then kind of try to rush there quickly, so that that’s a little bit of a stress. (E8, white mother, 40, Edenvale, 2019).

These activities outside of the home can have a substantial impact on the spatial footprints of mothers. In order to be able to balance all of her domestic and productive roles, one middle-class mother and her family chose to reduce her spatial footprint, access facilities and family support by moving to Edenvale:

[My husband] just had this idea one day 'cause I was traveling a lot for school runs - and he just said..., “what will make you happy?” Like, I was trying to explain to him why I was struggling. I was also working seven hour days. Um, and he's like, “what? What would fix this? How am I going to fix you. You're no good!” And he, just, the words he said were “your life needs to get smaller.” And when he said that, I said “yes!” like in so many ways, my life needs to get smaller. And then we thought about it for a couple of days and then he said, “maybe your life could get smaller if we moved to Edenvale.” Well, that's actually not a bad idea. We'll live next to good government schools, we're close to your parents.
Um, we'd go back into a community and a church of good friends and everybody's, like, we'd just be moving back into support. (E7, white mother, 39, Edenvale, 2019).

Thus for this mother, there was choice to move to an area that facilitated this ‘smaller’ life, so the family moved to a former ‘white’ suburb, where she could walk her children to school or drive short distances to access amenities. The materiality of her suburb enabled her to tackle all of her domestic responsibilities within a small spatial footprint but it was gendered roles of parenting that framed the problem, in the words of her husband, as being ‘no good’ and the change bringing about the ‘good’ mother once again.

The spatial footprints of middle income mothers were smaller and more repetitive than their partners’, demonstrating regular routines and patterns that go with child-care and domestic responsibilities. Mother’s footprints focused on domestic spaces and chauffeuring children, whereas their husbands’ footprints were much larger and spanned the entire city or in one case numerous cities (See Figure 4). Mothers were responsible for everything that happened between picking up and fetching children from school to scheduling and taking children to doctor’s appointments and recreational activities, constraining their time and shaping their movements while fathers had two consistent activities in relation to childcare: dropping children off in the morning at school and assisting with homework in the evenings. Most fathers felt empowered to participate in child care when they want to be involved and this can be seen in their spatial footprints - they fit children into their schedules before and after work with more ‘masculinised’ forms of child-care (Pedersen 2012, 242).
However, the option to reduce a parent’s spatial footprint is not always available because, ‘Mothering is not just gendered, but also racialized’ (Nakano Glenn 1994, 7) and we would argue spatialised. Distance and time cannot be easily negotiated for this Black African woman with three disabled children living in Denver, ‘When we [she, her mother and three disabled children] go to Charlotte Maxeke [Hospital], we use taxis. When we do not have taxi fare we walk… During summer we leave exactly at 5 am and past 5 am during winter. We cross George Goch [Hostel] and we get there around 9 am or 10 am’ (D5, 48 year old, Black mother, 2019). This 4 or 5 hour walk is largely because Denver, as an old industrial area with a mining hostel and informal
settlement, does not have any clinics or hospitals and poorer households are forced to walk or to take paratransit to access the more distant health facilities. As such, for this poorer woman, living in an informal settlement, she had no choice but to have a large spatial footprint, dictated by her socio-economic conditions and the materiality of her environment.

Thus, the spatial footprints of parents are shaped by their gendered values and ideologies of ‘good’ parenting as well as the constraints of the urban environment in which they live. This occurs at the scale of the city-region, as parents navigate school-runs, vaccination appointments and paid work across the city but for some parents, the parental geography of care extends beyond the city to rural homes or homes in other countries. This parental geography of care is equally shaped by the close proximity of fellow caregivers and children as it is by caregivers and children who are absent from the urban home.

Conclusions

Care as ethic within the domestic sphere manifests in the mobility patterns, transport choices and spatial footprints at the urban scale. Parents love and care for their children, but depending on the socio-economic circumstances, this can look vastly different - anything from living with children and being a stay at home parent to leaving children with relatives to find work and better opportunities. The consequence is a set of highly heterogeneous mobility patterns, where spatial footprints are influenced by the concatenation of factors: how men and women understand their roles as ‘good’ parents, the materialities of their physical environments in which they live, the intersectional aspects of their identities and the modes of transit that are available.

Not only is there a connection between the gendered identities of parents and their movement, which is well-established (Barker 2011; McLaren and Parusel 2015; Schwanen 2007; Waitt and
Harada 2016) but that there is a relationship between how parents understand their roles as ‘good’ mothers and fathers and how that influences their daily movements and life choices within the constraints of their physical environments. One commonality for nearly all parents was a desire to ‘be there’ for or be present with their children but a wide range of obstacles such as unemployment, cultural practices and migration frequently made it difficult for parents to achieve this. This had a significant impact on spatial footprints with some families and households stretching across provincial and international borders.

Both mothers and fathers identified the need to provide for their children in order to be a ‘good’ parent but this manifested in different and gendered ways. The male respondents were often caught up in this father-provider nexus which meant that their mobilities focused almost exclusively on the task of earning money or finding work. Most mothers incorporated earning an income among their many other childcare and domestic tasks, influencing their spatial and daily-decision-making.

Gendered notions of parenting also influenced the daily movements of parents with fathers caught up in parenting before and after work, during weekends and holidays whilst women took on the tasks of caring for children during the course of the day. However, these gendered notions were overlain with intersectional issues of identity as race, socio-economic position and location which all influenced how men and women were able to make the notion of a ‘good’ parent manifest.

The paper offers empirical work of what spatiality looks like and means in a city-region in the Global South, where care is not always proximate and parents often have to make difficult decisions in order to battle against the lack of resources, hazards within their environments and poor opportunities within their home environments. It is these environments that ‘push back’ and influence the ways that parents see themselves and either reinforce or repel ideas of ‘good’ parenting. Thus there is a recursive relationship between the ideologies of care and the moral
geographies that parents are able to undertake in their everyday lives. Sometimes the environment, infrastructure and good fortune enable ‘good’ parenting such as when a family moves to a neighbourhood that reduces a mother’s stress and spatial footprint. More often, though, these factors are disabling – forcing parents to choose some aspects of ‘good’ parenting such as providing financially, at the cost of being present or nurturing and in turn leading to feelings of not being a ‘good’ parent.

As such, the paper demonstrates there are many ways to care about and for children and that care as ethic and the gendered notion of ‘good’ father or mother are not simple ideologies but rather that these identities inform and influence spatial decision-making and in turn the spatialities influence people’s sense of identity. Ideologies of care, should not just be seen as ethereal and ephemeral but as the foundations for decision-making that has clear spatial and physical consequences. In emphasizing the everyday practices of care, we demonstrate that ideologies have ‘real world’ impacts and suggest that similar to ‘affect’ they should be given due consideration when trying to map and understand the daily movements and experience of parents in cities, particularly in the Global South.
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