2018-04-26

Between Nationalism and Neoliberalism: Problematizing Immigration in Canada and Australia

Karim, Natasha

UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

Between Nationalism and Neoliberalism: Problematizing Immigration in Canada and

Australia

by

Natasha Karim

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

GRADUATE PROGRAM IN COMMUNICATION AND MEDIA STUDIES

CALGARY, ALBERTA

APRIL, 2018

Abstract

Through conducting a critical discourse analysis of Canada's and Australia's immigration policies and national news media framing of immigration, informed by an intersectional and Foucauldian foundation, this thesis exposes and challenges the fundamental assumptions associated with the ideologies of nationalism and neoliberalism that underlie the way the notion of immigration has been conceptualized and problematized within these discourses. Furthermore, by deconstructing the structures of policy and media and the underlying principles, this study demonstrates how personal identifiers are incorporated into the dominant understanding of what it means to be an immigrant in juxtaposition to what it means to be Canadian or Australian on several levels of identification. Lastly, the findings of this study demonstrate the implications that result from how the concept of immigration has been problematized and the role that personal identifiers play for those whose existence had been framed as an issue.

Acknowledgements

There are many people that supported me through this journey and encouraged me to conduct this study. First and foremost I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Tamara Shepherd, for her continued guidance through this process. Her intellectual curiosity and intellectual humility were inspiring and helped to push my study and me as an individual further. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Jessalynn Keller and Dr. Pallavi Banerjee for taking an interest in this study and providing valuable feedback.

This thesis would not have been possible without the continued support of my family and fiancée. I would especially like to acknowledge my mom, Karima Walli, for her selflessness and ongoing dedication to my success in all aspects of my life and my brother, Shaheed Hassan Karim, for continually encouraging me to be passionate and fully invested in everything I do, which he has always done through leading by example. I would also like to thank my dad, Alnasir Karim, for always going along with my plan and supporting my decisions and last but not least, my fiancée, Karim Manji, for taking such interest in my work. His encouragement throughout this process and dedication to engaging with my unrefined ideas helped bring this study to fruition.

Dedication

This paper is dedicated to my grandparents, Gulshan and Sadrudin Walli, whose journey

to Canada and tireless effort, unwavering optimism, and continued resilience to make

Canada home for themselves and their family served as my drive to pursue and complete

this study.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: What Does it Mean to Belong?

Using an intersectional and Foucauldian lens to deconstruct the way the concept of immigration has been developed and problematized in Canada's and Australia's immigration policies and national news media framing, this thesis works to expose the ways in which these technologies of government or processes of differentiation contribute to the understanding of what it means to belong. A critical discourse analysis, informed by the theories of governmentality and biopolitics specifically, shows how these systems attempt to form the identity of those who belong to a community through defining what it means not to belong, what it means to be the Other, chiefly from a neoliberal perspective. On another level, this thesis also draws upon Collins' (1998) approach to intersectionality and the matrix of domination to argue that immigration policy and news media framing of immigration, together, through differentiating between who belongs and who does not, work to perpetuate immigration-based inequalities along intersectional lines.

Originally I had approached this study with the intent of exploring how immigrant women, despite the bio-political agendas and totalizing nature of immigration systems, strategically work to define their own identities and self worth in their new countries of residence. However, through engaging in a pilot interview exercise with my mom, who immigrated to Canada in her youth, I realized how personal this question was and the emotional toll it caused her. As a result of this experience I felt I could not justify asking other potential interviewees to relive their experiences and the trauma they had endured in order for me to write my thesis. Now looking back, the decision to refocus my thesis

was also an attempt for me to stay in my safe space. I was more comfortable addressing the relationship between immigration policy and identity from a position where I thought I could distance my history, experiences, and identity, from my work, and for a while I was able to keep up this facade. I was born and educated in Canada; I have never moved countries and so I attempted to convince myself that this study had nothing to do with me or how identified myself. However, after many attempts to write this introduction, I can no longer deny to others or myself as to how invested I truly am in this study.

47 years ago, my grandparents' toy store in Dar-e-slam, Tanzania was nationalized and they were given 24 hours to flee the country. My Nanima and her four children, one of which is my mom, caught the next ship to Pakistan where they would decide their next move. After gathering all the resources he could, my Nanabapa met the family in Pakistan, which proved to be quite unstable as a result of the civil unrest occurring at the time. In response to the current local situation and the limitations it put on the quality of life they could provide their children, the decision was made in 1976 to try and obtain a visa to come to Canada. Relying on word-of-mouth, they packed up their four children and all the belongings they could fit into their Kombi van and set out on a three-month journey from Pakistan to Barcelona, where they heard that they would be more likely to obtain a Canadian visa. With no knowledge of the cultures or languages they would encounter or laws of the countries they would travel through, they set out on their trip through Iran, parts of Central Asia, and Eastern Europe to eventually reach Madrid, where they would live in a campsite for an additional three months while trying to obtain their visa in Barcelona.

From the perspective of this study, throughout this journey, at every border they crossed, their identity was questioned, interrogated and eventually reconceptualized as the negation of what it meant to be a citizen of that country. Furthermore, the decision to leave Tanzania was made, and was further realized through this journey, with the understanding that going forward, no matter how far they went, or how long they travelled for, they would always be the "Other" – the image of what it meant not to belong. Their encounter with Canada's immigration system, which at the time was an occupation-based system, proved to be both an individualizing and totalizing experience, where all aspects of their identity, from their age to their eyesight, were broken down and redefined in the "image of the economic" (Brown, 2015, p. 10). Through this process of determining their value or worth as immigrant applicants, their potential for self-actualization, in the way it has been defined in neoliberal terms, was determined by the system. Of course, the education and work experience gained in Tanzania and Pakistan did not count for much, nor did the fact that they could speak several Indian and East African languages and dialects. Moreover, the personal experiences and skills gained from traversing through the Middle East, Central Asia, and Europe, which for them demonstrated resilience and determination, was not accepted as something that could contribute to their ability to integrate into Canada. In fact the devaluation of their skills and experience through this process worked to maintain the value of western education and the experience one gains working and living in a western country. It could also be said, and as will be demonstrated in this thesis, that their worldly experience and rich culture threatened Canada's version of multiculturalism, which is seen to maintain the social positioning of the English and French majority. Ultimately, the way Canada's

policy differentiated and categorized applicants worked to construct and maintain a social hierarchy, under the guise of neoliberalism, which established value for western attributes by devaluing qualities associated with non-westerners.

In some ways, one could view my family's life – the menial jobs they originally occupied when coming to Canada, including cleaning the university where I now write my thesis, and the low income housing they resided in for many years – and assume that the system was effective in predicting the potential ability of an applicant to integrate into, or be economically successful in, their new society. However, it would be naïve to assume that the way an applicant is categorized, the rights they are afforded or refused as a result of the position they have been placed into, and the way the system defines skill, has no implications on immigrants' ability to be successful in a neoliberal sense. From this perspective it is of the utmost importance that scholars question and problematize the policy itself and how it constructs an understanding of immigration and the identities of those who come through it rather than focus on its effectiveness and the ability of immigrants to integrate. To measure the effectiveness or ability to integrate is to essentially measure how well the system is able to maintain discrimination and the social hierarchy it constructs. Without acknowledging this, such an approach ultimately legitimizes the system and naturalizes the associations it establishes between the applicants, the categories they are placed in, and the perceived value they are deemed to have according to the system and the neoliberal understanding of skill that informs it. Moreover, by legitimizing and further naturalizing these associations, one is also effectively contributing to the dehumanization and devaluation of human beings

according to their race, gender, and ethnicity, and thus perpetuating immigration-based inequality.

This study traces the problematization of immigration in policy and news discourse as a first step toward suggesting its repercussions for individual experience. At a fundamental level this paper starts by addressing the contradiction between one's right to freedom of association and one's right to freedom of mobility (Yuksekdag, 2012). By having the right to associate, one intrinsically has the right to disassociate, which at a societal level, works to problematize the freedom of movement for those from whom society seeks to disassociate. To reiterate, it limits the right to freedom of mobility by privileging one's right to freedom of association. Moving this conceptualization of mobility forward, this study then attempts to situate this approach to immigration in the history of Canada and Australia. By applying an intersectional, governmentality, and bio-political lens to these processes, stronger understandings of what it means to belong in Canada and Australia are developed. This is followed by an in-depth analysis of Canada's and Australia's immigration policies and news media framing of immigration through conducting a critical discourse analysis, which demonstrates how immigration is currently problematized and how the identities of applicants are constructed. These facets of the larger systems of policy and media are viewed in this study as technologies of government, or processes of differentiation, which are understood to contribute to the understanding of what it means to belong to particular community. Lastly the thesis seeks to demonstrate whose existence, according to personal identifiers, is actually being problematized as result of how applicants are categorized and afforded rights.

My decision to focus on Canada and Australia specifically is largely due to the fact that both countries, being settler colonies of the British Commonwealth, have a similar historical relationship with the notion of immigration. In addition, both countries have employed a points-based economic migration system as a way to determine the eligibility of their applicants. By conducting a comparative analysis between Canada and Australia, I am not only able to identify the ways each country approaches immigration, I am also able to identify differences and parallels between the two in order to develop a nuanced understanding of the relationship between nationalism and the formation of identity, and the neoliberal ideology that informs both processes.

Overall, the objective of this study is to challenge some of the fundamental assumptions surrounding the notion of immigration in Canada and Australia. First, it aims to expose assumptions around what it means to have the right to associate and what the consequences of exercising that right are. Second, it strives to demonstrate the many ways in which immigration is framed as a problem. Third, the study intends to reveal the racial and sexist undertones of the way immigration is regulated, as well as demonstrate how immigration policy and news media framing together contribute to the perpetuation of immigration-based inequalities along the lines of race, gender, and ethnicity. Lastly, my hope is that this study will spur more critical intersectional studies on the implications of immigration problematization and applicant categorization and how the concept of immigration is framed and furthered in news media.

Chapter 2: The Problematization of the Movement of People

Immigration

The movement of people may not be a new phenomenon but the concept of immigration and how it has been defined and realized continues to evolve. Scholars have developed numerous approaches to theorizing migration, many of which have been succinctly categorized into six theory groups by Douglas et al. (1993) in their study of migration theories. This categorization has served as an effective way to break down various migration theories and explore their commonalities and differences in order to identify the essential factors that scholars link to this phenomenon.

The first theory group, composed of neoclassical economics and new economics of migration, focuses on an individual's choice to migrate, which according to theories in this category is the result of a cost-benefit analysis or a sense of relative deprivation (Constant & Massey, 2002). The second category, which includes labour market theories and world systems theory, traces migration patterns back to larger social structures, rather than individual decisions or rationales, such as specifically labour market trends and the development of capitalist practices in origin countries respectively (Brucker, Hauptmann, Jahn, & Upward, 2014 & Zinkina, & Korotayev, 2014). The third and fourth categories, social capital theory and the cumulative causation theory, move away from developing a causal relationship between migration and one specific structure or individual decision to provide a more holistic understanding by drawing connections between many forms of social capital, individual decisions, and migration patterns (Sen, Aguilar, & Bacchus, 2010).

For the purpose of this study specifically, the last two theory groups outlined by Douglas et al. (1993), which focus on the role of the state and social policy, are of particular interest (Boucher, 2016). Concerned with how the state, its discourse, and the underlying ideology that influences state decisions and policies with regards to immigration impacts global migration, these theoretical approaches provide a way for this study to connect the larger phenomenon of migration and the experiences of migrating to immigration policy and its implementation.

Immigration and the Nation

Since the rise of the nation state in the eighteenth century many formal structures, including immigration policy, have been developed to establish what Anderson in *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (1983) would call an "imagined political community" (p. 6). An imagined political community from his perspective is both "inherently limited and sovereign" (Anderson, 1983, p. 6). It is limited at both a physical and conceptual level. Physically a nation has borders to define its territory, while on a conceptual level how a nation defines itself or what it means to belong to a particular nation is often developed through determining what it is not.

This dialectical process through which a nation is defined occurs at many points including between the juxtaposition of national identity and immigration. Over time the "boundary between legitimate and illegitimate members of the community", developed through this process, becomes naturalized rather than understood as socially constructed through policy (Zylinska, 2004, p. 526). Eventually, the naturalization of this boundary

works to justify the position of the "Other" or the representation of immigrants "as the negation of the nation" in policy and public thought (Bauder, 2011, p. 46).

Sovereignty of an "imagined political community" (Anderson, 1983, p. 6), and the need to establish and maintain it, is another factor that works to further intensify the friction between nationhood and immigration. As Yuksekdag (2012) describes it, this is a tension between the right to "freedom of association" and the right to freedom of mobility (p. 264). Through the continuous process of developing and maintaining an imagined community, the right to freedom of association, which indirectly indicates the right to freedom to disassociate with others, has taken precedence over an individual's right to mobility. This prioritization allows governments to control, at one level, who are constituted as citizens and who are not, and at deeper level, what ideas, values, and ways of life are enabled to thrive in a given community.

Thus in a political community, both limited and sovereign, there is an underlying assumption that not everyone can be included in this imagined community. This suggests that the nation, as a vision or guide for a particular population, is limited in its ability to perceive the larger humanity as part of its identity. As such, through this process of developing an imagined community, one's identity and right to belong or exist has become intrinsically linked to the concept of the nation, and to a significant extent, determined by government institutions and their policies.

Immigration and Identity

The relationship between immigration policy and identity formation can occur at many levels. As highlighted above such policies play a significant role in the social

construction of what it means to be a citizen of a particular nation or a member of an imagined community (Anderson, 1983). It also has an important and perhaps less obvious position in defining what it means to be an "Other," someone who does not belong to a particular community (Bauder, 2011). But what are the implications of such definitions on the development of individual identities? Taking this analysis of the relationship between policy and identity further, some scholars have been able to expose the impact immigration policies have had at the micro level of subjectivity (Abu-laban, 1998; Boucher, 2007; Cisneros, 2015; Segal et al., 2010; Vukov, 2003)

As Vukov (2003), Boucher (2007), and Cisneros (2015) have demonstrated, what an immigration policy values, stresses, and disregards impacts how individuals, through all stages of the immigration process, develop and alter their identities and how citizens of a host country perceive them. Looking specifically at western immigration systems, there is an underlying sentiment that ideal citizens are those that are "self-actualizing and self-fulfilling" (Inda, 2006, p. 13). Furthermore they are those who hold those specific characteristics and skills that have been designated as indicators of the potential for success, according to the government's prevailing definition of what it means to be successful. Embracing this model of characteristics and skills for success, many western countries, including Canada and Australia, have shifted their focus to skilled migration over other migration streams such as family reunification or humanitarian claims. Through this transition more emphasis has been put on certain attributes – being under the age of 50, having formal skills, demonstrating high English proficiency, having completed post-secondary education and providing proof of continuous work experience

– as they are considered characteristics that an applicant with potential to achieve self-actualization would hold (Boucher, 2007).

According to Cisneros (2015), this approach and definition of ideal citizens stems from a neoliberal ideology. Neoliberalism in this context can be understood as a "normative order of reason developed over three decades into a widely and deeply disseminated governing rationality, [that] transmogrifies every human domain and endeavour, along with humans themselves, according to a specific image of the economic" (Brown, 2015, pp. 9-10). The image of the economic, according to Brown (2015), has three fundamental elements including competition, economic growth, and human capital, which are maintained through this all encompassing rationality.

Using the above definition to break down immigration policy, one can start to see how this policy has been developed under a neoliberal rationality with the intent of using the policy to contribute to the image of the economic. To start, immigration policy can be seen as a strategy that is used to spur competition. As Brown (2015) demonstrates competition is not a natural phenomenon but is rather developed through establishing "a formal game between inequalities" (p. 63). In this case immigration policy is used to establish and maintain inequality through how it creates and formalizes a distinction between the ideal citizen and Other (Bauder, 2011). Second, it is also a tool that contributes to economic growth. It does this through its use of a skills-based assessment to attract certain candidates and reject others according to their potential to contribute to the growth of the market. In this way the skills-based assessment approach to immigration can also used be viewed as a way to reduce applicants to a set of criteria, as demonstrated above, or effectively into simply human capital (Boucher, 2007). As such,

neoliberalism is not only an economic position but also a perspective that informs "strategies and techniques that are used to actively create new kinds of political and economic subjects" (Kretsedemas, 2008, p. 560).

The establishment of a skills-based ranking system of immigration applicants and the formalized prioritization of skilled migration streams through the development of a neoliberal immigration discourse, marked by a "specific formulation of economic value, practices and metrics" (Browns, 2015, p. 30), has resulted in several dichotomies. These dichotomies work to racialize, subordinate, and devalue certain applicants (Abu-laban, 1998; Boucher, 2007; Cisneros, 2015). At a basic level, having different immigration streams and giving more weight to economic migrant channels "problematizes" those coming in as family members or refugees (Abu-laban, 1998). Playing on this division between economic and non-economic migrants a dichotomy between independence and dependence is also developed (Boucher, 2007). Those who are considered secondary applicants or who come through family reunification and humanitarian streams, by being contrasted with primary economic migrants, are automatically seen as dependent. They are associated with the identity of "the ordinary immigrants" who pose a potential threat to the host country on an economic, social, and national security level (Cisneros, 2015). In other words they are considered migrants who are going to take jobs away from the citizens of the host country, and contaminate the healthy community and culture (Zylinska, 2004). Economic migrants on the other hand are the "exception" who are "exempt from concerns about sovereignty" due to their ability to reproduce neoliberal values (Cisneros, 2015, p. 371). Ultimately, the development of such dichotomies and the action of differentiating applicants according to various criteria establishes social value

for one group through devaluing "an/other" (Cisneros, 2015, p. 367). As will be further explored through this study, the establishment of social value for some through devaluing others has significant implications.

The problematization, subordination, and devaluation of some applicants as a result of the tiered system does not only discriminate according to which stream one comes through but, as a result of which criteria it values, also tends to differentiate applicants along the lines of "culture, class, and nationality" (Cisneros, 2015, p. 359). By associating the ideal citizen, an individual who embodies neoliberal characteristics and values, with the economic migrant stream, immigration policy is indirectly associating these ideal characteristics with specific races, cultures, and nationalities from the west, as a significant number of migrants who enter through this stream are from the western world (Cisneros, 2015; Boucher, 2007). Through such identification a second assumption is also made, the assumption that other cultures not represented in this stream are subordinate and incompatible. Again, over time this sentiment and the stereotypes it perpetuates are "naturalized" and used to justify political stances (Repo, 2015, p. 173), such as on what it means to be a tolerant society that is open to immigration and when it is acceptable to be intolerant or reject others on the grounds of "cultural mismatch" (Cisneros, 2015, p. 361). Furthermore, as Ong (2003) demonstrates, specifically in the context of the United States, this also justifies the struggles that many immigrants experience over generations once they have gone through the immigration system to be included in their new community. She describes this naturalized journey or concept of "ethnic succession" as "the unending process of struggle against undemocratic exclusions based on ethnicity and race, with the assumption that the social status of a particular

minority group will improve over time with cumulative increases in experiences of adversity and material gains" (Ong, 2003, p. 19). The unquestioned requirement to prove their self worth and further their position and acceptance in society does not take in account the barriers these individuals will experience due to their race that, in this case, will limit their succession.

This conceptualization of race, culture, and nationality often goes unnoticed under the current racial neoliberal thought informing many immigration systems in the west (Cisneros, 2015; Goldberg, 2009; Jones & Mukherjee, 2010). As Goldberg (2009) states, racial neoliberalism embraces individual difference while simultaneously denying racial identification and structural racism. Policymakers who have adopted this thought, by formally basing their policy on attracting skilled migration, have attempted to move past identity identifiers, and distance themselves from being seen as instruments of an institutional structure that perpetuates inequality through immigration policy. However, by applying a critical analysis to what characteristics and skills are valued and devalued by policy, what immigration streams and statuses are prioritized and who comes through each avenue and who does not, it becomes evident that some applicants will be more likely to be accepted than others as a direct result of the intersection of their personal identifiers (Boucher, 2007).

According Glenn (2010), there are two levels of acceptance that should be considered: acceptance under the immigration system and acceptance in the community. It is one thing to be accepted under the formal immigration system, but another to be acknowledged within the community, as there are also "local practices that recognize or deny standing certain groups and individuals irrespective of their formal standing," often

in response to their personal identifiers (Glenn, 2010, pp. 2-3). Looking at Menjivar and Abrego's (2012) work on "legal violence," it could also be argued that in addition to going through the immigration system one must also go through the criminal system as these systems have become more intertwined over time (p. 1381). Not only is one's societal position and experience of struggle naturalized, one experience of violence and danger during this process is also normalized (Menjivar & Abrego, 2012).

Taking the implications of immigration policy further, it is important to consider how this understanding of what an ideal citizen is permeates beyond the borders of the nation-state and its consequences. As Boucher (2007) and Segal et al. (2010) demonstrate, how a state defines an ideal citizen influences how potential, current, and past applicants see themselves, understand their value as human beings and what decisions they make as a result. A hypothetical example would be a woman choosing to become a caregiver rather than pursue another career because of the knowledge that caregivers have access to an express temporary immigration stream in Canada and because her likelihood of being accepted as an economic migrant, which interestingly enough does not consider caregiving as a skill, is slim (Githens, 2013). Unfortunately, through this process of trying to define and "assert their social worth," individual applicants as well as immigration activists who advocate for them "normalize certain forms of socioeconomic class and education as markers of the model citizen" (Cisneros, 2015, p. 367). This further perpetuates the assumption that neoliberal values and the ideal characteristics neoliberalism valorized are the gold standard and universal norm. Furthermore, despite these efforts to fit the neoliberal model and uphold certain values, the experiences that individuals will have going through the immigration process, the

societal position they will hold in their host country, and their ability to attain a higher

quality of life will be dependent, to a significant extent, on the intersection of their

identifiers.

Immigration and Gender

With the understanding that the intersection of one's attributes contribute to how

immigration policy, informed by neoliberal ideology, defines an ideal citizen, some

feminist scholars have attempted to focus specifically on the relationship between gender

and immigration policy to unearth the gender bias that is engrained within government

conceptualizations of immigration (Boucher, 2007; Githens, 2013; Phillips, 2009). As

Githens (2013) states, "while the claim is often made that immigration and refugee

policies are gender neutral, their effects can hardly be described that way" (p. 60).

Feminist public policy theory specifically challenges the assumption that policy affects

all equally (Boucher, 2007). Instead, policy in this light is seen to uphold the "systematic

bias that arises from the supposition that (elite) men's experiences represent all human

experiences" (Phillips, 1996, p. 251). Through challenging this assumption many other

stereotypical gender assumptions that inform immigration policy in the west have been

identified.

First, one can look at expanding on the dichotomy between independence and

dependence highlighted earlier. As Boucher (2007) demonstrates, the notion of

independence as a necessary characteristic for obtaining citizenship comes from

citizenship theory, which bases independence on "masculine attributes and abilities" (p.

185). Within this approach, "men, but not women, have been seen as possessing the

capacities required of individuals, workers and citizens" (Pateman, 1989, p. 185). Given the gendered ideology at the heart of immigration policy, it becomes evident why women continue to be more likely to immigrate as dependents rather than as primary applicants (Boucher 2007; Elrick & Lightman, 2014; Githens, 2013). As Githens's (2013) study shows, many women enter Canada and other western countries under the family unification program even when they qualify as independent immigrants or refugees because they will be more easily admitted as a dependent family member rather than an independent migrant. This is largely a result of what the categories imply and how they are enforced. In this case, there is an underlying assumption "of the immigrant as a male worker accompanied by a wife and children who are dependents" (Githens, 2013, p. 41), which informs how the family reunification stream is understood.

The underrepresentation of women in the economic migration flow and the feminization of channels of dependency, such as family reunification, can also be linked to how skilled migration is defined. The skilled migrant flow is often considered a progressive and gender-neutral stream for immigration. However, when analyzing the traditional, neoliberal definition of skill that informs Canada's immigration policy, which sees skill as something that resides within the individual and is harnessed through formal education and work experience, it becomes evident that this stream privileges some over others. As Boucher (2007) argues, "our understanding of skill is informed by social stratification based on class, gender, race and educational status" (p. 387), which is conceptualized by a neoliberalism. Applying the definition of neoliberalism and racial neoliberalism provided to the notion of skill, the onus of skill attainment is put on the

individual while the societal barriers and discrimination that limit one's ability to obtain such skills go unacknowledged.

Looking at the specific criteria necessary to be considered a primary applicant adds yet another level of contextualization for women's tendency to be disadvantaged in the economic migrant stream. As Boucher (2007) discusses, many criteria including language, education, and experience are all correlated and can be seen to magnify societal gender inequalities that are reflected in many point systems, such as Canada's. Starting with language and education, point systems in the west often allocate points to one's ability to speak English. Of course this is a useful skill to have, however, the increased weight given to this category and the higher standards required to gain points can be seen to privilege men over women. This is a result of women, depending on where they are coming from, what social class they hold and so forth, often having less opportunity to study and practice English because of the societal barriers that limit women's access to education and work in the formal economy where English is more likely to be spoken. With regards to experience, points are allocated according to how many years of continuous work experience an applicant has. The focus on continuous experience is criticized by scholars, including Boucher (2007) and Githens (2013), for assuming that a career has a linear trajectory. Such an approach neglects the fact that for many women, their life course trajectory will not be linear and indirectly implies that time out of the formal economy is not time where experience and "skill" can be gained. This perspective on career trajectories is also prevalent in the labour economy, which too values continuity. This common stance in the formal economy further marginalizes women as they are seen as less employable and are less likely to be invested in by their employers

with the assumption that they will have a higher rate of attrition. Coming back to the point system, this all contributes to lower scores in experience.

To make matters of experience more complicated and further cement the marginalized position women often find themselves in is the fact that age and offer of employment are also considerations. According to Boucher (2007), women tend to reach career goals later in life as result of the gender inequalities that exist in the workforce and the fact that non-linear career trajectories are considered a barrier. With regards to employment, again, as Boucher (2007) indicates, the combined factors of language, education, and experience contribute to the decreased likelihood of a female applicant having a job offer when applying for immigration in comparison to their male counterpart.

The implications of applying as a dependent rather than a primary applicant are also something to consider. The legal status of a dependent in many western countries does not afford applicants the same rights and opportunities as those who qualify as economic migrants. For example, with an economic immigrant status one can work and have access to skills training courses. Depending on the country dependents may have to wait a specific number of years before being able to work or may never be granted the right to work in their new country (Githens, 2013). In addition dependents are often required to remain in a relationship with the primary applicant for specific period of time or risk being deported (Boucher, 2007). As Elrick & Lightman (2014) demonstrate, these implications have detrimental effects on the ability of a dependent to fully integrate and regain their independence and are often associated with the "de-skilling, feminization and redomestication" of secondary applicants (p. 356).

A solution offered by Boucher (2007; 2016) to addressing the implications of such criteria is to take a gendered approach to developing immigration policy. This requires policymakers to conduct a gender-based analysis of immigration streams and identify how immigration experiences vary according to gender in order to create a policy that provides both men and women equal opportunity to succeed in the process to become primary applicants and fully integrated.

Although a number of scholars have been successful in demonstrating how immigration policy is indeed not gender neutral and have been able to identify how various aspects of the policy, as a result of its development, interpretation, and implementation, often disadvantage women more so then men, there are other scholars who are concerned with the use of the term gender in relation to immigration and the "gendered immigration policy" solution that has been advanced. For instance, Repo (2015) sees gender as not "simply a discourse of the dominated against the dominant," but rather as a social construction that needs further deconstruction under the context of neoliberalism. In other words "women do not exist prior to the discourse that summons them into being" (p. 158), and so it is imperative that researchers dissect this discourse in order to understand how women are conceptualized. It would thus be naïve not to be critical of the neoliberal discourse surrounding the notion of gender equality, and how women are defined in this discourse, as this ideology informs the "gendered" reforms to immigration policies being advocated for.

In practice, as Repo's (2015) interrogation demonstrates, the concept of gender equality, taken up in recent policy, serves not to advocate for equal opportunities for all women but rather works as a "biopolitical apparatus" (Repo, 2015, p. 134): an economic

tool used to differentiate women in ways that will increase fertility rates and economic labour. This understanding of gender equality is further developed by Phillips (2009), who brings attention to how the notion of gender equality, in Australia and the EU specifically, is often established in conjunction with discussions around the "reproduction of the nation" and "management of immigration" (p. 597). As a result of developing this correlation between how the state's physical makeup is envisioned and how it attempts to manage immigration, yet another dichotomy has been formed, this time between women who are imagined as not belonging to the nation due their perceived incapability to "reproduce" the nation as a result of the personal identifiers that are seen to be in contrast with the image they hoping to achieve and "white, citizen women" (Phillips, 2009, p. 597), who represent the image of what it means to be Australian or European.

This differentiation hinges upon determining which women have the right to gender equality in these terms, according to the intersection of their identifiers, and which do not. As Repo (2015) illustrates, gender equality policies serve specific women, women who are understood to be able to reproduce the nation, by denying the rights of those women who are seen to be unable to reproduce the nation. In this way these policies work to ensure "gender equal working women" (Repo 2015, p. 152), in other words, women capable of reproducing the nation, are able and encouraged to both have children and work in the formal economy in response to low fertility rates and labour needs. In order to encourage this, immigration policy further divides women according to who has the right to access to childcare and opportunities to contribute to the formal economy 'as they choose' and those women whose role is to support rights-bearing women through providing childcare and serving in the informal economy.

Of course this categorization has many implications. On the one hand those women who do not reflect the image of the nation do not 'benefit' from this policy and on the other hand what was meant by gender equality has been distilled down to a definition that subjects women to their reproductive capabilities and physical presence as labourers. From another perspective, by acknowledging the need to ensure women of the nation have the ability to have children and work, the establishment of feminized temporary worker migration streams specifically for child and elderly care is justified (Repo, 2015). The development of these streams assumes and thus reinforces the stereotypical gender role that it is the women's job to take care of children. Furthermore, by allocating these roles between "immigrant" and "citizen" accordingly, such polices indicate that immigrant women's "procreative capabilities [are] undesirable" but their childcare abilities are useful as they "enable the application of gender equality policies for its reproductively desirable population" (Repo, 2015, p. 152). Lastly, by establishing gender equality policies in this way governments are not only providing equal opportunity to their citizens by denying migrant women the right to gender equality, in how neoliberal policy defines it, they are also stripping migrant women of a gendered identity by categorizing them as an "ungendered domestic workers" (Repo, 2015, p. 152). From this perspective women on both sides of the border have been reduced to "bare-life" (Phillips, 2009, p. 598), a life "routinely excluded either legally or discursively from political-status" (Butler & Spivak, 2007, p. 15).

This understanding of the neoliberal conceptualization of gender equality problematizes the mainstream solution discussed above of taking a gendered approach to developing immigration policy as a way to address gender bias. It exposes the fact that such a

solution is merely attempting "to achieve gender equality within a capitalist economy," which according to Repo (2015) does not work. It also demonstrates that further investigation is needed into how "identities are inflected through the circulation of markets and the ways which diversity is managed in the reproduction of global capitalism" (Coole & Frost, 2010, p. 28). This understanding would help challenge the very system of capitalism rather than attempting to incorporate marginalized populations into it. Lastly, as Repo (2015) states, the goal should not be equality, as gender equality in neoliberal terms is seen as having the ability to be reproductive and contribute in the formal economy, but rather gender equity and that can only be achieved through critiquing the political economy of the larger system.

In addition to the criticisms surrounding the gendered approach to immigration, there are also those who acknowledge that gender is just one aspect of one's identity that contributes to their immigration experiences. To account for the implications that can result from the intersection of one's many identifiers, these scholars have encouraged the incorporation of intersectionality (e.g., Banerjee, 2012) and critical race theory (e.g., Romero, 2010) in immigration studies. From their perspective, taking up an intersectional and critical race stance will equip researchers to see the connection between personal identifiers, "social exclusion and social inequality" through immigration (Romero, 2010, p. 23), and to thus have the ability to challenge the normative approaches to the study of immigration.

Studying Immigration Policy

Much of literature surrounding immigration takes a realist perspective on immigration policy and focuses on the individual (Mayadas & Elliott, 2010). This perspective seeks to determine either how effective policy is in controlling migration flow – individuals' decisions to move – or how well individuals who have come through the system integrate into society. As Czaika & Haas (2013) note, scholars who attempt to analyze the effectiveness of an immigration policy approach the subject with the assumption that "migration is mainly driven by structural factors such as labour market imbalances, inequality in wealth and political conflicts in origin countries, factors on which migration polices have little or no influence" (p. 487). Such studies include Bhagwati (2003), Castles (2004) and Duvell (2005), all of which highlight the inability of governments to control migration due to the assumption that migration is the result of outside factors. Those who study integration, such as Yu, Ouellet and Warmington (2007), also seem to approach immigration policy with the assumption that the policy itself has no role to play in how immigrants integrate. From this view they see immigration policy as a given – a way to categorize applicants according to individual characteristics (Elrick & Lightman, 2014). For example, Yu et al.'s (2007) study of immigrant integration in Canada takes policy at face value, by organizing its analysis along category lines set out by policy and using the criteria of the point system to determine how well an individual will integrate.

Contradicting such studies, other scholars have contended that immigration policy is not value-free (Boucher, 2007; 2016; Githens, 2013). Policy is developed under certain assumptions and is informed by ideology that, intentionally or not, contributes to upholding and perpetuating immigration-based inequalities along intersectional lines,

both within their own society and those abroad (Boucher, 2007; 2016; Repo, 2015; Cisneros, 2015; Githens, 2013; Phillips, 2009). As illustrated above, immigration policy has implications on career and life choices of those far beyond the borders of a single nation-state and is linked to all other migration factors (Boucher, 2007; Githens, 2013).

Overall, how immigration criteria are determined, what fundamental assumptions serve as the policy foundation and how they are implemented have significant implications for how the image of the nation is realized and thus for how identities of the Other are conceptualized (Bauder, 2008). As stressed above, criteria establish a "boundary between legitimate and illegitimate members of the community" based on a "truth regime," which determines "which bodies matter and why" (Zylinska, 2004, p. 526). The dichotomies illustrated above are then actualized through immigration policy, which formally defines who belongs and who does not. But it is important to note, as Bauder (2011) points out, that the definition of what it means to belong is continuously being contested, constantly being renegotiated and will eventually be re-established through policy change before being challenged again.

Those scholars who acknowledge these implications advocate for a more critical approach to the study of immigration policy in order to further uncover the impact of policies, which are often considered non-discriminatory and neutral attempts at controlling migration. In this vein, I consider how immigration policies are not value-neutral, in that they reflect and reinforce certain dominant ideologies about the role of immigration and immigrants in specific national contexts. The contexts examined in this study are Canada and Australia as they are both (mainly) English-speaking countries with comparable relationships to the notion of immigration due to the fact that they are both

referred to as settler societies. Additionally they have both adopted skills-based point systems as part of their immigration policy as a way to evaluate economic applicants.

Canada's Immigration History

Canada's relationship to immigration can be traced back to the time of Confederation (Abu-Laban, 1998; Bauder, 2011; Segal et al., 2010). When Canada was originally founded there was a need for colonial settlement and immigration in order to create a country. From this perspective, since there was no acknowledgement of the presence of Indigenous peoples, nor any attempt to include Indigenous peoples as part of the imagined community, Canada was technically considered a land of immigrants. The vision of Canada as a 'settler society' has continued, to this day, to influence Canadian policy and perceptions with regards to immigration.

Without having any true connection to the land or common lineage, Canada needed some way to define its imagined community and what it meant to be Canadian. The concept of what it means to be Canadian, as Mackey (1999) and Bauder (2011), demonstrate, has often derived from developing an understanding of what it is not and this can been see to occur at many levels. Within Canada itself, the tension between Quebec and the rest of Canada is something that has contributed to how the nation has been defined. Tracing depictions of this tension over time, Mackey (1999) illustrates how Quebec is often depicted as being less Canadian than its English counterpart, but at other times, when in the interest of the English, it is portrayed as a crucial part of Canada's image. For example, the French are differentiated from the English, through the use of "gendered and heterosexual depictions" of Quebec as the wife and the rest of Canada as

the husband, developing a sense of authority and masculine power associated with English over the needy and submissive French (Mackey, 1999, p. 10). In other times, such as during the 1995 Quebec referendum, the separatist loss was strongly associated with the lack of "money and ethnic votes" (Mackey, 1999, p. 14). This helped to create an understanding that English Canada, being more monetarily well off, was also the multicultural and inclusive Canada while the French Canada was culturally homogeneous.

However on the other side, this relationship has also been used to differentiate Canada from its neighbour, the United States of America, and other non-White minorities. With regards to creating a vision of Canada that is not the United States, Canada was able to use the 'peaceful' coexistence between the French and the English as way of being more civilized than the United States. Moreover, it was also able to create further differentiation from the United States along these lines through the way it framed Canada's relationship with Indigenous peoples. This is what Mackey (1999) refers to as the "Benevolent Mountie Myth" (p. 1). Here the RCMP are depicted as peaceful and diplomatic figures of Canada in comparison to the vigilante-style "cowboys" of the United States. This dichotomy is tied to the myth of the "representatives of British North American justice" who "have managed the inevitable and glorious expansion of the nation (and the subjugation of Native peoples) with much less bloodshed and more benevolence than the violent US expansion to the south" (Mackey, 1999, p. 1).

Looking more specifically now at how Canada developed a vision of its nation in contrast to non-White minorities, the illustration of solidarity between French and English helped to create an image of a White nation that stands in stark contrast to the

'Other,' the Indigenous peoples and people of color (Mackey, 1999, p. 16). This differentiation and further development of Whiteness as being separate from the multiculturalism Canada associates itself with, from Bauder's (2011) perspective, can also be traced through how the Canadian government and its citizens have developed and continue to develop their identity with regards to the concept of immigration.

Canada's immigration policy history demonstrates that the evolution of who is considered Canadian has been largely determined according to the intersection of personal identifiers. This way of determining what it meant to be Canadian allowed the government to overtly determine and manage the physical makeup of its population through policy implementation (Vukov, 2003). Up until the 1960s, policies such as the 1910 Immigration Act and the 1946 Canada Citizenship Act indicated a strong preference for heterosexual Europeans, more specifically British-origin Protestants (Abu-Laban, 1998; Bauder, 2011; Segal et al., 2010). This slowly started to change after WWII, with a decrease in the number of Europeans immigrating to Canada and the implementation of the 1966 White Paper on Immigration (Segal et al., 2010). The 1966 White Paper officially put more emphasis on skill as the new organizing principle for immigration rather than race (Abu-Laban, 1998), through the development of the occupational point system (which was eventually replaced with a skills-based point system) and class-based immigration streams as a way to categorize applicants according to skill. In hindsight however, this "difference-blind approach" proved to be just a more discrete way of determining the makeup of the nation along intersectional lines (Abu-Laban, 1998, p. 6; Zylinska, 2004).

In keeping with such a "post-racial" momentum, this shift was followed by the 1971 Multicultural Policy implemented by Pierre Trudeau. The uptake of the concept of multiculturalism in this policy was seen as a "more inclusionary discourse" that stepped away from racial bias and stepped toward seeing immigration as an economic necessity to legitimize the presence of immigrants (Abu-Laban, 1998, p. 4; Bauder, 2011). However, in the 1990s this more inclusionary tone came into conflict with the neoliberal agenda, as often people of color from outside of the west were seen to have fewer acknowledged skills than their White western counterparts, and as a result such applicants were framed as being at odds with what it meant to be Canadian. As Abu-Lanan (1998) demonstrates, the role of neoliberal policy in Canada's history has been to "problematize immigrant families" and other dependent or non-economic applicants in order to steer immigration policy towards focusing on economic migration and integration (p. 4). The shift from multiculturalism to integration has allowed Canada to encourage "inclusion by understanding and recognizing difference within certain parameters" in order to re-establish the perception that Canada's identity and values are "monolithic" and that others wishing to immigrate must adapt (Abu-Laban, 1998, p. 11). From another viewpoint this also helped to re-establish Canada's identity as a "core English-Canadian culture" with "other cultures becoming multicultural in relation" (Mackey, 1999, p. 2). Over time this dichotomy between who belongs in Canada and who does not has been intensified and further influenced through neoliberal policy and, as demonstrated above, this has had many implications within Canada and abroad.

Australia's Immigration History

Similar to Canada, Australia's immigration history is largely connected to its nation-building objective. Its immigration policy changes have also reflected a tension between the desire to maintain a European heritage and the need for labour (Segal et al., 2010). As Segal et al. (2010) demonstrate, this tension can be traced back to Australia's relationship with the local Indigenous population and the "Asian invasion" of 1850. As a result of these interactions and fears of losing control, the "period of white Australian policy" from 1901 to 1973 followed. During this period priority was given to admit those who helped to contribute to maintaining their Anglo-Celtic background (Segal et al., 2010). Like Canada, this overtly racist policy was later replaced with a neoliberal take on immigration and a strong focus on the economy (Abu-Laban, 1998; Bauder, 2011; Segal et. al., 2010).

From the 1970s to the 1990s, an attempt to implement a multicultural policy, "imported from Canada" was also pursued (Poynting & Mason, 2008). However, as Poynting and Mason (2008) and Kundnani (2007) indicate, this was not solely an attempt by the government to address racism and discrimination towards minority immigrants, instead it was proposed in response to the demands of non-European minority immigrants to be recognized and equally valued. The hesitation to initiate an anti-racist reform could be an indication as to why this attempt to acknowledge the plurality of Australia's population and at the same time maintain the united image of the nation was unfortunately short-lived. Following this period, coinciding with the deregulation of Australia's national economy, a neoliberal assimilationist or "new integrationism" approach took hold (Poynting & Mason, 2008, p. 231). The tension between

multiculturalism and the White European identity of Australia was temporarily resolved by deciding to maintain the national image of Australia. This was partially achieved and continues to be maintained through an increased focus on control, which is often traced back to the 2001 federal election, and the rise of the "us first" mentality (Boulus, Dowding & Pietsch, 2013).

Since 9/11, Australia has taken a consistently louder approach than Canada to dealing with issues of national security and immigration screening processes, which have consumed many western countries. This has included detainment camps for those attempting to seek asylum, increased waiting times for new immigrants to obtain social services, as well as increased attempt to control the religious rights of the Muslim population specifically (Poynting & Mason, 2008). This being said, it is important to remember that though Canada may be more discrete, this sentiment also underlies Canada's current policy as well (Bauder, 2011; Segal et al., 2010).

Media

According to the literature reviewed, immigration policy, news media framing of immigration issues, and public perceptions of the phenomenon all contribute to how immigration is understood. However, how they work together to inform a position on the matter and what role each aspect plays in the creation of an imagined community and the identity of immigrants has yet to be fully explored.

For scholars such as Bauder (2006, 2008), Esses and colleagues (2006), Lawlor (2015) and Vukov (2003), media framing, the way that the news media decides to direct the attention of the audience to specific explanations and meanings of an issue and

courses of action available, plays a pivotal role in the creation of national identity and immigration policy. According to Bauder (2008), news media "affects attitudes toward migrants, create anxieties and fears, rallies support for and against immigration, and legitimates immigration policies and law" (p. 290). In other words, media discourse mediates what some have identified as a cyclical process through which information is conveyed between the government and the public. By determining what is newsworthy and how to frame it within the current social and political context, news media helps to formulate a dialectical relationship between national identity and the identity of immigrants. In this way, news media texts, according Vukov (2003), "serve as key sites though which public imagining of the future nation are shaped and struggled over" (p. 337).

According to some scholars, news media plays a critical and mobilizing role in articulating the popular frames that shape the formation of immigration identity and policy through establishing mediated moral panics (Beck & Levy, 2013; McKay et al., 2011; Vukov, 2003). A moral panic, as demonstrated by Goode and Ben-Yehuda (1994) consists of five necessary criteria, which include concern, hostility, consensus, disproportionality, and volatility. These criteria are applied in news media coverage of migration issues often through identifying potential risks of immigration, such as national security, in an exaggerated way, in order to establish concern and feed on an underlying panic to create a sense of consensus as well as hostility towards those immigrating. This ultimately contributes to establishing a relationship between immigration and national security through a sense of volatility in society (Beck & Levy, 2013; McKay et al., 2011; Vukov, 2003).

From one perspective, without the news media's identification of risk in this manner, there would be no perceived risk in society (Beck & Levy, 2013). In another view, this notion of moral panic can also be traced through news media as a cyclical process informing immigration policy reforms. For example, with the increase in terrorism the perceived threat associated with immigration has been amplified on all levels of this process. In response to national security needs, which are conveyed in news media and often rationalized through identifying potential threats, the government may implement stricter immigration polices. This representation is then seen to influence public opinion on the topic of immigration, which can result in a push from the public and media to further 'secure' the borders (McKay, Thomas & Blood, 2011).

Of course from an economic standpoint, bringing attention to a potential risk is monetarily beneficial for news media as risk is sensational and increases readership and viewership (Winseck & Jin, 2011). Additionally, who owns these media outlets, their self-interest, and the financial capital surrounding the industry may also influence media framing of immigration. As Winseck and Jin (2011) points out, there are only around ten media conglomerates that own the majority of the media economy in Canada. Such concentration of news media ownership can tighten this cycle of moral panic and enhance perceived consensus around the issue of immigration for at least two reasons: one, there are fewer voices contributing to the discussion around immigration; and two, having fewer voices and higher concentration of ownership in the hands of a few contributes to a decrease in the variety of views that can be produced on the topic.

Though there has been much focus on perceptions of immigration in the media (Beck & Levy, 2013; Esses et al., 2006; Lawlor, 2015; McKay et al., 2011), and to a

lesser extent, some focus on immigration policy from a critical perspective (Boucher

2016; Githens, 2013; Phillips, 1996; Repo, 2015), very few have attempted to bridge the

gap between policy and news media (Bauder 2008; Vukov, 2003). In addition, though

there has been some work done to provide a gendered perspective on immigration policy

(Githens, 2013; Phillips, 1996), on one hand, none of the literature reviewed explores the

role of gender in immigration news media framing, and on the other no scholars reviewed

have provided an intersectional understanding of the implications of immigration policy

and news media framing for perpetuating immigration-based inequality.

Chapter 3: The Exercise of Power - An Intersectional and Foucauldian Lens

Seeking to understand how immigration policy and news media discourse, together, work to uphold and reinstate current immigration-based inequalities that exist at the intersections of gender, race, and ethnicity, this thesis will take up both a Foucauldian and intersectional theoretical approach. Foucault's conceptualization of power provides this study with a way to identify the social and historical trajectory of dominant discourses, in this case neoliberalism and nationalism, and the ability to articulate their relationship to policy and news media institutions. Furthermore, through applying Foucault's work on biopolitics and governmentality, the framework helps to analyze how these discourses manifest power relations that work to construct identity and naturalize the identity formation process in order to maintain the status quo. An intersectional lens provides this study with the ability to situate power in specific relations and societal structures. Intersectionality also encourages an increased emphasis on how personal identifiers are constructed and used in these relations. By foregrounding the role of systemic immigration-based inequality in the naturalization of certain identities through policy and news discourse, intersectionality further provides space for this study to examine reform and the role of human agency in initiating change in both immigration policy and news media framing.

Through the course of this chapter these theoretical approaches will be developed to show how, in their own ways, they work to expose and deconstruct relations of power that contribute to immigration-based inequality. In addition, there will also be an effort to demonstrate how, though they differ in the way they situate and address power, they can

be complementary and form a comprehensive framework, which can be particularly useful for this study.

Intersectionality

The concept of intersectionality, originally coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw, is "a way of thinking about sameness and difference and its relation to power" (Cho, Crenshaw & McCall, 2013, p. 795). A common analogy Crenshaw provides to illustrate intersectionality and its approach to deciphering social inequality is the idea that "discrimination, like traffic through an intersection, may flow in one direction, and it may flow in another. If an accident happens in an intersection, it can be caused by cars traveling from any number of directions and sometimes, from all of them" (Crenshaw, 1989, p. 149). In other words, according to this theory, discrimination can occur concurrently at many levels and can be intrinsically linked to more than one aspect of one's identity.

Originally developed in the legal field, intersectionality served as way to deconstruct a multifaceted relationship between gender, race, and the United States judicial system, considered a structure of power and ideology, to expose the discrimination that the system embodies (Collins, 2015; Crenshaw, 1989). Since the 1980s this work has offered an intersectional disposition and method that has allowed researchers to understand how positions of privilege or penalization are developed, maintained or changed through a complex and dynamic power relationship between societal structures, ideology, and identity (Dhamoon, 2011).

Over the years many scholars have developed their own definitions of intersectionality, however, most would agree that it is both an ontological and epistemological approach used to critically analyze and deconstruct structures and relations of power that exist at a personal, cultural or societal level, in order to bring the perpetuation of social inequality to the forefront (Collins, 2015; Crenshaw, 1989; McCall, 2005). Such definitions are broad and thus allow scholars to apply an intersectional perspective to virtually any relationship of power (Carbado et al., 2013, p. 303). Some scholars have looked at various aspects of identity and their relation to social issues such as domestic violence (Sokoloff, & Dupont, 2005), others have focused on processes of differentiating or categorizing individuals and the normalization of these categories (Viruell-Fuentes et al., 2012), and some are more concerned with deconstructing the relationship between processes of differentiation and the societal structures or institutions that facilitate them (Spade, 2013).

Patricia Hill Collins' approach to intersectionality is of particular interest for this study. From her perspective there are two processes at play, intersectional "micro-level processes regarding how each individual and group occupies a social position" (Dhamoon, 2011, p. 231), and macro-level intersecting "systems of oppressions" that secure one another and facilitate the micro-level processes of differentiation, which work to establish social positioning (Collins, 1998, p. 27). In this view the relationship between the micro-level processes and macro-level interlocking systems of oppression offers an inroad into considering how institutional structures and everyday social experiences are intertwined. Immigration policy and news media can be seen as interlocking systems of

domination that secure one another and facilitate processes of differentiation that contribute to identity formation and impact people's lived experience.

Though many disciplines have picked up intersectionality as a valuable tool, as Boucher (2016) illustrates, immigration policy research has largely been unable to apply such an approach thus far. As discussed in the literature review, many recent studies of immigration have taken a gendered approach to understanding how policy, developed under certain assumptions and ideologies, perpetuates societal inequalities along the lines of gender. As some intersectional scholars indicate (Cho et al.,, 2013; Collins, 2015), a single axis approach such as this does not consider the multiple factors that contribute to the experience one has going through the immigration system. Razack's (1995) study of Canada's immigration policy and the legitimization of domestic violence claims offers a pointed example of how intersectionality can be used to identify these multiple factors. In this study Razack (1995), looked at the acknowledgement of domestic violence as a legitimate reason for women to apply for asylum under Canada's immigration policy. Through applying an intersectional lens, she exposed the fact that, although domestic violence was being recognized, a woman's race and nationality and the assumptions and stereotypes that are associated with these aspects of her identity also played a significant role in whether or not a particular case of domestic abuse was accepted or not. Razack's study makes it clear that attempting to initiate change in policy or news media framing through encouraging the use of a gendered perspective is largely ineffective, as it does not push policymakers to recognize and address the fact that policies discriminate on many levels simultaneously.

As a theoretical framework oriented toward social change, intersectionality has been taken up by many academic activists (Collins, 2015; Crenshaw, 1989; McCall, 2005). The contribution of intersectionality is directed at exposing and addressing discrimination along many lines, including along the lines of class, religion, sexual orientation, ability, age, race and gender, which are entrenched and maintained in societal structures that are said to serve the best interests of society.

From this perspective then intersectionality is a useful framework to apply to this research, where the main intersection of inquiry is between gender, race, and ethnicity. As illustrated in the literature review, these identifiers are seen to contribute to the identity of what it means to belong to a community and what it means be an "Other". Focusing then on the dialectical relationship between national identity and the "Other" present in immigration policy and news media discourse, I feel it is important to situate the concept of the "Other" prior to advancing.

The concept of "othering" has been well developed in the theory of Orientalism (Said, 1978). According to Said (1978), Orientalism is a far reaching and deeply penetrating discourse, "by which European culture was [and still is] able to manage – and even produce – the orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively" (p. 3). The orient in this sense is the image or identity of what a European, the occident, is not. The orient identity, as hooks (1992) puts it, is the product of a "white supremacist capitalist patriarchy," which is used to maintain a position of superiority (p. 22). In the case of immigration policy, the negative of what it means to be Canadian or Australian is developed through actively creating the identity of the Other or the orient in a way that maintains White dominance. As Razack (1995)

demonstrates, western countries, through avenues such as policy and media framing, channel the discourse of Orientalism to produce their identity "discursively as a civilized, rational, scientific, culturally and morally superior entity in relation to the East" (p. 49).

Governmentality and Biopolitics

As a discursive theorist, Foucault's work "provide[s] a paradigmatic set of terms, images and concepts which organize thinking and experience about the past, present and future society, doing so in a way which enigmatically surpasses the specific claims [he] put[s] forth" (Rabinow, 1984, p. 25). This approach is ever relevant and timeless as it allows one to deconstruct the world in which one lives by situating it historically in order to understand how it has been socially constructed and what power relations are at play to maintain it. For the purpose of this chapter, the main concepts of Foucault's work, including genealogy, knowledge, and power will be discussed. This will be followed by an exploration of two of his theories, governmentality and biopolitics, in order to demonstrate how these concepts come together to inform an analysis of immigration policy and news discourse.

The goal of Foucault's work was to provide a "Critical History of Thought" (Foucault, 1984). He was interested in understanding: 1) how, through analyzing history, certain knowledges became sources of truth; and 2), what role these truths played in society. In other words he was interested in uncovering the power relations that reside between universal truths and human beings and how humans, through these relations, are subjugated or made subject to this knowledge. Through reading his work it soon becomes clear that Foucault's approach and objective for theory was largely at odds with dominant

methods and goals of inquiry (Foucault, 1976; 1977; 1982; 1984; see also Seidman, 1994). While many philosophers have taken up a scientific or totalizing approach to theorization in hopes of achieving an objective truth that can be vastly applied, Foucault's work attempted to debunk the myth of an objective truth, problematize the goal of developing a grand narrative, and highlight the limitations of scientific theories that strove to achieve totality. From a Foucauldian perspective those theories that attempted to provide an objective truth or essentialist view did so by refusing to question the historical and social context that informs the basis of the so-called truth.

This perspective, building on Nietzsche's prior work on the subject, eventually developed into an alternative approach to human studies, which Foucault referred to as genealogy. Genealogy is an approach that rejects the Enlightenment project of searching for an objective truth, the basis of human science, in order to interrogate and expose the socially constructed nature of universal truths and the interests they serve (Seidman, 1994). It is the process of historicizing thought and the practices it embodies in an attempt to reveal the dominant discourses, constructed in time and place, that shape one's understanding of what is normal or natural and resurrect knowledges that have been subjugated or "disguised in a functionalist coherence or formal systemisation" (Foucault, 1976, p. 81).

Subjugated knowledges, according to Foucault, are both those that have been hidden or erased from history as well as those that are more local or personal and have thus been deemed subjective and unreliable. Through "the union of erudite knowledge and local memories," one can "establish a historical knowledge of struggles" and "make use of this knowledge" (Foucault, 1976, p. 84), in order to expose the effects of current

truth regimes. This position alludes to the idea that these marginalized discourses are in a position to critique the dominant discourse and challenge the "centralizing powers which are linked to the institution and functioning of an organized scientific discourse within society" (Foucault, 1976, p. 84), but unfortunately falls short of addressing whether these subjugated knowledges can initiate change in power relations.

In a Foucauldian sense, power is everywhere. It is not something that is possessed but rather something that comes through action. Power in this case is not imposed on an individual per se but on their actions, and it is thus exercised within a relationship between actions. As such, it is not a question of who has the power, or where it is created, it is the "how" of power that is of concern (Foucault 1982, p. 786).

When power is exercised within these relations it is exercised through the use of discourse. Discourse is what permits one to act on the action of others, what defines the objectives that are being pursued through the exercise of power and what rationalizes its use (Foucault, 1977). Knowledge or discourse, as the producer of truth and the definer of what is natural or normal, exercises power on two levels. On one level, through its ability to inform societal or state institutions and deem them necessary and natural structures of society (Seidman, 1994), discourse exercises power by subjecting humans to the control of societal institutions. At another level, through forcing individuals to use this knowledge to define themselves (Foucault, 1982), dominant discourses are able to "shape identities and regulate bodies, desires, selves and whole populations" (Seidman, 1994, p. 215). In this way individuals themselves become "vehicles of power" and subject themselves to the truth regime (Foucault, 1976, p. 97).

Foucault's theory of governmentality, through historicizing the concept of a western government, shows how it has been constructed in time and space and what discourses have given it legitimacy and rationalized its use of power. Foucault traces the concept of the modern state back to pastoral power and the discourse of Christianity. Drawing links between the role of the church in ancient times and the development of the state in the sixteenth century one can see many commonalities. Both the church and state are focused on the individual and the success of the individual. The idea of success may have changed from achieving religious salvation in the next world to the attaining material success in the present life but the focus on the individual is still clear. Another connection worth making is how both institutions subject their followers or citizens. The church and state both rely on subjection through the establishment of a hierarchy based on the rights that certain subject positions afford as well as rights to one's own identity by conscience and self-knowledge (Foucault, 1982). The church was able to subject their followers to their own identity through the use of dominant discourses about being conscious of one's actions and the need to confess, while the state employs methods of self-surveillance built on the discourse of Christianity that has developed and normalized the modern state.

In addition to reproducing power through the production of truth, the right to sovereignty as a state can also be seen as a function of power in the establishment of the state and the role of the government. The right to sovereignty, as Foucault points out, is a source of power because it conceals the need for domination and mechanisms of discipline used in order to achieve sovereignty within the normative idea of freedom (Foucault, 1982). The need to maintain freedom allowed the government to control all

aspects of life in order to maintain sovereignty, which is seen to have resulted in demographic expansion, an increase in agricultural production, and the overall growth of the eighteenth century as result of the state being more involved in the lives of its citizens (Lemke, 2002). From this perspective the government's role has become to lay out the "conduct of conduct" (Lemke, 2002, p. 50). It guides how citizens govern themselves as well as how to govern others. This is a strategic position, according to Foucault, as it allows the government to exercise both techniques of discipline and subjugation over the people (Lemke, 2002). Such techniques are also referred to as "technologies of government," and they act to establish differentiation (Lemke, 2002). But is the only objective of technologies of government to maintain physical sovereignty via the regulation of conduct?

After the eighteenth century, neoliberalism grew as a dominant discourse that wedded the state to the market economy, influencing society's understanding of what it meant to be sovereign and further the government's control of conduct to protect both physical sovereignty as well as the market. From a neoliberal perspective the notion of sovereignty is largely tied to the government's control over the population and their relation to society, or as Rabinow (1984) states, sovereignty is tied to "the art of government and the empirical knowledge of the state's resources and condition" (p. 16). So in order to maintain sovereignty from a neoliberal point of view, the government must be able to regulate how the population interacts with state resources and the resulting condition of the state.

By tracing the development of the state and concept of the government alongside the influence of these discourses, Foucault was able to demonstrate how the government

exercises power. In one way the power of the government is individualizing, as it has been informed by Christianity and neoliberal thought to focus on the wellbeing of the individual. In another way, it is also totalizing, as it is able to subject its citizens to control in every aspect of life in order to ensure economic prosperity or worldly salvation.

The influence of neoliberalism on the function of the government is then further defined in Foucault's theory of biopolitics (1979), where he demonstrates how the relationship between the government and the economy has shifted. This is a shift from understanding the economy and government, and the structures associated with them, as two separate spheres toward applying the economic model to non-economic structures and processes traditionally seen as outside of the field of economics (Brown, 2015). As a result of this shift a new role for the government has been created and, over time, normalized. This new role is to arrange society in a way that the economy can prosper by appearing not to infringe on the economic process. The government does so through "taking the social fabric and arranging it so it can be broken down, subdivided and reduced, not according to the grain of individuals, but according to the grain of enterprises" (Foucault, 1979, p. 241).

Through social policy and the control of social processes, the government reduces its citizens down to a network of enterprises in order to be able to incorporate all aspects of life into the economic model. These technologies of discipline, which include government laws, regulation of action, and control over population distribution, work to both subject individuals to formal means of control and to themselves by means of self-surveillance. In this way power is "capillary" (Foucault, 2003, p. 94) in that without

physical force, power informs all human actions in accordance with what is best for the state. Through these mechanisms, the government is able to exert power over individual bodies, how they function as a group, and the knowledge they use to understand their relation to society and to themselves.

The implications of generalizing this model, according to Foucault, is that firstly it allows non-economic actions, such as individual behaviour, to be analyzed through measuring supply, demand, cost, and benefit for every action. Through the rationalization of this analysis, as being efficient and effective, any relationship or action can be subject to a cost-benefit analysis, which is then used to determine if that relation or action is appropriate or not. Secondly, it normalizes the practice of determining the effectiveness of the government and its decisions according to the economic implications of its actions rather than how it contributes to the quality of life of its citizens from a non-economic point of view.

A state's self-conceptualization or image of community, through a neoliberal lens, can thus be boiled down to purely economic terms. To an extent this may be true, however, the relationship between nationalism and neoliberalism as distinct discourses or truth regimes is often more complex, and even inconsistent. At times, the notion of the nation and its limitations or inability to perceive others as part of its community, as theorized by Anderson (1983), can be associated with the economic burden that is perceived as a result of the other's lack of employable skills. But from a different perspective, the denial of entry of individuals, or the limiting of their ability to work in formal economy depending on which stream they come through, does not align with the neoliberal rationale. In fact, such an approach is not in the best interest of the market, as

from a neoliberal perspective all bodies and the skills they hold should be harnessed and

used to obtain and maintain economic prosperity. Sovereignty, or the right to associate,

and its discriminatory tendencies in this case are at odds with neoliberalism from a

governmentality and biopolitical perspective and can be seen as a separate rationale

working under the guise of the dominant neoliberal ideology. The purpose of this study is

not to attempt to resolve this tension, but rather bring it to light and understand how these

two truth regimes endeavour to coexist.

Intersectionality, Governmentality, Biopolitics

This study holds together ideas about how the discourses of national identity and

neoliberalism, as the foundations for immigration policy and news media framing of

immigration, work to normalize the subjugation and objectification of applicants to both

state control and identity formation. In this sense immigration policy and news media are

both positioned as technologies of government, which are informed by the discourses of

national identity and neoliberalism. They are seen to exercise power in two ways. First,

these technologies objectify subjects through what Foucault (1982) refers to as "dividing

practices" (1982, p. 777). This is the process through which all aspects of an individual's

social and personal identity are broken down and categorized in order to identify their

optimal position in society from a neoliberal perspective. The second way they exercise

power is through subjectification or through subjecting immigrants to the identity of the

"Other," which further implicates an eventual internalization by individuals who

objectify themselves through a "process of self-understanding but one which is mediated

by an external authority figure" (Rabinow, 1984, p. 11). The external authority figure

aligns with the dominant discourse in order to develop and maintain a sense of national identity by policing the nation's borders.

The purpose of this study is to explore how these two institutions or technologies work together by approaching the relationship between immigration policy and news media as a site of interlocking systems of domination. By acknowledging this relationship as a site of domination rather than taking an apolitical stance on the power relations at play, as Foucault tends to do (Deveaux, 1994), the study can focus on how they work to secure one another and facilitate, specifically, processes of differentiation, which contribute to identity formation. As such, the focus is to uncover the power relations between immigration policy and news media and their underlying discourses on the one hand and on the other expose how these institutions and discourses support each other and work to differentiate individuals or groups, along the lines of gender, race, and ethnicity specifically, in ways that perpetuate immigration-based inequality.

Chapter 4: Problematizing the Problematization of Immigration

In order to analyze how the phenomenon of immigration has been problematized in Canada and Australia, I conducted a critical discourse analysis of immigration policy and a framing analysis of national news media coverage. Immigration policy, as a governing technology or process of differentiation, is understood as a discourse, informed by neoliberal and nationalist rationales, which articulates both the 'problem' of immigration as well its solution. As such, immigration policy is seen as a technology of government, which is used to conduct the conduct of both applicants and citizens (Lemke, 2002, p. 50). My focus is on how immigration policy constructs and subjects applicants to the identity of the Other, and at the same time objectifies applicants by breaking down their identity into human capital and skills based on predetermined categories. Taking it one step further by applying an intersectional lens to the analysis, this study also critically addresses the identity formation of the Other and the association of various skills with certain applicants to expose how race, ethnicity, and gender are incorporated into the identities established through the policies.

News media framing of immigration issues, also seen as a governing practice, is analyzed to further contextualize the policy in a few ways. First, I deconstruct news media discourse in order to understand how it helps to create and differentiate the national identity from the identity of the "Other." Second, I attend to how the identifiers of gender, race, and ethnicity come into being through discourse and identity formation. Finally, I examine how the subjugation and objectification of applicants through news media framing is used as a way to coerce applicants into self-surveillance by informing

them as to how they should govern themselves and how they be should governed by the state.

Overall, by conducting a discourse analysis of immigration policy and news media framing this study offers an exploration of the relationship between policy and media. In addition, it also provides insight into how, through processes of differentiation and objectification, these technologies are able to uphold and reinstate current immigration-based inequities that exist at the intersection of personal identifiers.

Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is both a method and theory. More precisely, it is a theoretical approach to researching discourse, which can be conducted in many ways. One cannot conduct such an analysis "detached from its theoretical and methodological foundations" (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 4), as it is this understanding or perspective that informs the way a researcher approaches the study of discourse. However, it should also be noted that not all theories are compatible with CDA.

CDA, having a social constructivist and post-structural foundation, is focused broadly on how meaning and or fundamental truths are created. This broad orientation contains several specific approaches to theorizing discourse. As such, the objective or goal of CDA can vary, and these variations often come down to how a scholar defines the notions of discourse, power, and domination and additionally, how they conceptualize the relations between these concepts. For example, discourse can be understood as being strictly associated with the reproduction of meaning through language specifically, or through another non-textual form (Fairclough, 2001; 2013; Van Dijk, 2015), or it can be

viewed as has having a more active and all-encompassing role as an "articulatory practice" (Howarth, 2010, p. 311), an act of developing and bringing together "ideas, concepts and categories through which meaning is given to social and physical phenomena" (Hajer, 2006, p. 67). In other words, discourse can be seen as a representation of a particular social reality or it can be understood as what constitutes a reality. Furthermore what can constitute a discourse is also up for debate.

Power and domination on the other hand can be viewed as more or less one and the same, where power is exerted by a structure through the maintenance of domination or control (Fairclough, 2001), or they can be understood to be intrinsically linked but yet separate. In the latter case, power is seen to be exercised through practices of differentiation, which constitute social relations that arise as a result of lack of domination (Foucault, 1987; Haworth, 2009). Domination from this view is a state of stable control.

Despite these differences, all approaches to CDA seek to problematize a taken-for-granted knowledge or problematize a naturalized phenomenon through deconstructing the discourse surrounding it (Bacchi, 2012; Teghtsoonian, 2016). In addition to exposing the underlying assumptions of a so-called truth, CDA also attempts to shed light on the implications of the meaning associated with a specific phenomenon through discourse. The meanings developed through discourse are generally understood to be created through a dialectical relationship with the Other. In this way a meaning or identity of something developed through discourse is done in response to or by defining what it is not. CDA also strives to demonstrate how an understanding becomes truth and is furthermore maintained as such by developing a relation between discourse, power, and

domination. These similarities speak to the disclaimer made earlier that not all theories are applicable when conducting CDA and highlight the need for a critical post-structural foundation in order to successfully achieve the goal of CDA.

As a method then CDA is an approach, informed by a specific theoretical underpinning, to analyzing text or in some cases non-textual pieces, as a discourse. The task then is to choose which texts to analyze, again often influenced by one's theoretical foundation, and to then "work with what has actually been said or written, exploring patterns in and across the statements and identifying the social consequences of different discursive representations of reality" (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002, p.20). Additionally, by identifying what has been written or discussed one can also recognize what has not been acknowledged. Identification of these silences is an effective way to deconstruct a taken-for-granted knowledge or truth that informs the discourse. Research questions tend to be developed as a framework for analysis and are applied to the text to help the researcher identify patterns with regards to what concepts or understandings have been naturalized and which have not, and interrogate the implications of this (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002; Teghtsoonian, 2016). Of course, as Teghtsoonian (2016) states, all "methods are constitutive practices that have material effects: they strengthen some realities while undermining others" (p. 331). This method, by prompting the search for underlying truths, limits the researcher's ability to identify other aspects of the text.

For this study, I chose to focus specifically on language used in immigration policy and the news media articles reviewed. Texts in this case are considered as "sites in which social meanings are formed and reproduced, social identities are shaped and social facts are established" (Seale, 2012, p. 406), or in other words, as a micro level of social order

that is bridged to macro levels of social order through the use of CDA (Van Dijk, 2015).

Furthermore, informed by a Foucauldian lens, I approach language used in policy and

news media as a source of discourse and use Howarth's (2010) definition of a discourse

as an "articulatory practice" of differentiation that constitutes social reality (p. 311). It is

through the dialectical act of articulating what it means to be a Canadian or Australian

through defining what these identities are not, or through the act of defining lines

between inclusion and exclusion, which is facilitated through discourse, that power is

exercised (Howarth, 2010). Rather than seeing the use of language as a way to represent

reality, I approached the texts as active practices that seek to define and differentiate

human beings, resulting in real-life consequences (Hajer, 2006). Domination in this

approach then is the ability of language to maintain the status quo. Language in itself

does not exert power; instead power is exercised through interaction between concepts

such as 'Canadian' and other or economic immigrant and temporary worker.

Overall, this framework, as Goodwin (1996) and Codd (1988) demonstrate in their

uses of CDA to study policy, "frames policy not as a response to existing conditions and

problems, but more as a discourse in which both problems and solutions are created"

(Goodwin, 1996, p. 67). In comparison to traditional policy studies, which take the

"functionalist approach" (Goodwin, 1996, p. 67), this method addresses policy texts to

expose how "they are ideological texts that have been constructed within a particular

historical and political context (Codd, 1988, p. 244).

Framing Analysis

Like discourse, the concept of framing does not have one meaning (Scheufele, 1999).

Employed in various disciplines, framing has been referred to as "an approach, a theory,

a class of media effects, a perspective, an analytical technique, a paradigm and a

multiparadigmatic research program" (D'angelo & Kuypers, 2009, p. 2). In an attempt to

bring all these definitions together, Entman (1993) provides a broad and encapsulating

definition of framing as "a way to describe the power of communicating text" (p. 51).

This power, at a high level, involves deciding what to highlight, what not to highlight,

and how to bring attention to certain elements over others. This is frequently referred to

as the "packaging" of a phenomenon (Berinsky & Kinder, 2006; Gitlin, 1980; Kim et al.,

2011, p. 293). Through the process of packaging or framing, certain aspects of

information are selected and emphasized, making them more "salient" than others, to

create a specific version of reality (Entman, 1993, p. 52). According Entman (1993), this

constructed reality has four functions that inform how one should analyze a frame: to

define the problem; to determine the cause of the problem; to provide a "moral

evaluation" of the issue identified; and to provide a solution (p. 53). The way a problem

is defined, judged, and solved is influenced by ideology, political leanings, and societal

norms, which again reflect one version of reality (Entman, 1993). As Friedland & Zhong

(1996) state, framing "is at once a term of history, of culture, of politics, all linked

together," and in this way serves as "the bridge between these larger social and cultural

realms and everyday understanding of social interaction" (p.13).

In a more pointed sense, the way that news media decides to direct the attention of the

audience to specific explanations and meanings of an issue and courses of action

available is what is referred to as media framing. The analysis of news media framing can occur in two places according to Scheufele (1999). From a media effects perspective, one could look at how news media alters public perceptions of a phenomenon. This approach to media framing "illuminates the precise way in which influence over a human consciousness is exerted by the transfer (or communication) of information from one location – such as a speech, utterance, news report, or novel – to that consciousness" (Entman, 1993, pp. 51-52). The other approach, from a more critical tradition, views frames as a "dependent variable" (Scheufele, 1999, p. 107), and focuses on how they have been influenced by ideology and other discourses.

With an understanding of what a frame a can be, how can one attempt to analyze the media framing of a phenomenon? According to Entman (1993), in order to conduct an analysis of framing it is important to have a theory to inform the method. This theory, similarly to how one conducts CDA, informs the researcher's approach to the text. One then applies the theory to the artefact in question by firstly identifying what information has been selected and thus provided in the text and perhaps more importantly by uncovering the silences in the text – what information about the phenomenon was not selected (Cabaniss & Cameron, 2017). In addition, the analysis should also seek to recognize those aspects of the text that have been emphasized or have become more salient and which have not (Kim et al., 2011). A second level of analysis can then be taken up by applying the four functions that Entman (1993) identified: how the phenomenon has been posed as a problem, what has this problem been associated with, what values or information is used to make this judgement and what solution is being provided. The data collected can then be thematically categorized with the goal of

identifying and deconstructing the frame(s) that inform the reality it attempts to create (Friedland & Zhong, 1996).

Looking at news media framing of immigration specifically, some scholars, like Lawlor (2015), have approached framing as an "independent variable" (Scheufele, 1999, p. 107). From this perspective Lawlor (2015) argues that media framing influences "public perceptions of policy, particularly in an area like immigration where people often lack personal experience" (p. 330). Though this offers an interesting avenue to explore further, for the purpose of this study, and by approaching news media as the public discourse surrounding immigration, I am more interested not in how the public perceives immigration, but rather in the relationship between news media framing and immigration policy. As such I approach news media framing, according to Scheufele (1999), as a "dependent variable" (p. 107). As a dependent variable I seek to expose how the framing of immigration in news media is informed by the policy. Furthermore I am also interested in how the ideologies of neoliberalism and nationalism that have been identified as underlying the policy appear in the articles analyzed.

Informed by a Foucauldian and intersectional theoretical underpinning as well as Entman's (1993) conceptualization of framing as "the power of a communicating text" and its identified functions (p. 51), this study defines framing as an active practice of problematizing, interpreting, and providing a solution to the phenomenon at hand to establish an apparent reality through selection and salience. The segments of text that were identified as being more salient, by approaching news media framing as a technology of government and a micro-level process of differentiation, were those that

demonstrated interaction with the policy and its the underlying ideologies or that attempted to differentiate subjects.

Moreover, for this study the news articles themselves are viewed as active sites of interaction in the public domain where concepts from the policy such as the 'Other' are being created, contested, and re-evaluated. As Entman (1993) indicates, "many news texts exhibit homogeneous framing at one level of analysis, yet competing frames at another" (p. 55). In this way, these articles "operate at the intersection of national identity formation and the material world of news and national politics" (Bauder, 2011, p. 67), and they are spaces where policy framing and public framing of immigration interact and contradictions or tensions are exposed.

Research Design

Sample

The policies analyzed in this study, Canada's Immigration and Refugee Protection Act and Australia's Migration Act of 1985, were chosen due to the fact that both countries, broadly speaking, are (mainly) English-language settler nations within the British Commonwealth. In terms of their global positioning, Canada's and Australia's relationship to the concept of immigration is somewhat comparable. Additionally both countries employ points-based immigration systems as a way to determine the eligibility of an economic applicant. Originally this study was developed to analyzed the polices of Canada, Australia, and the United Kingdom, however, after some investigation it became clear that the United Kingdom, though it is an English-speaking country and also employs a point system, does not have a similar relationship to the concept of

immigration. Being a colonial power rather than a settler nation, or satellite of a hegemonic state, the concept of immigration as part of national identity or economic wellbeing is quite different. From a historical stance the country's economic wellbeing and position of power relied on its ability to settle and exploit other lands rather than attempt to attract people to settle in the United Kingdom.

The aspects of the policy that were analyzed included the use of the points-based system, which is often viewed as a neutral or unbiased way to differentiate applicants (Abu-laban, 1998). This taken-for-granted assumption and the unchallenged definition of skill that informs these systems thus served as a starting point for a critical analysis. Other sections of the policy that were analyzed included the objectives or application section as well as the definitions provided for applicant categories. In the Canadian system the categories of economic migration, family reunification, temporary worker, and refugee were reviewed. While in Australia's policy, the comparable categories that were analyzed included lawful and unlawful non-citizen, unauthorized maritime arrival, refugee, temporary worker and family. Due to the nature of CDA and its focus on in-depth qualitative data rather than the quantity of texts analyzed, as well as in response to the limitations of this study, the focus was put specifically on selected parts of the policy. It should also be noted that this analysis was conducted on the latest version of both policies that were downloaded from the respective government websites, and reflect any amendments made to the Canadian Act before October 18, 2017 and to the Australian Act before September 20, 2017.

In addition to analyzing the policy documents, this study also reviewed four articles from four national news media outlets from each country of interest. These

articles were chosen due to the fact that they were published within the year leading up to each country's last federal election, which in this case was from July 2, 2015 to July 2, 2016 for Australia and October 19, 2014 to October 19, 2015 for Canada, and because they explicitly discussed immigration as an issue that was required to be addressed by politicians that were running for federal office. Furthermore these articles were selected from four different news outlets in each country that are known to have different political leanings in order to include different viewpoints. With regards to Canada's news media, an article each from the *CBC*, *Toronto Star*, *The Globe & Mail* and *National Post* were chosen. To represent Australian news media coverage articles from *The Daily Telegraph*, *ABC*, *The Sydney Morning Herald* and *The Australian* were selected. Again, the sample size was chosen in response to the method, the overall objective of the study, as well as the limitations of the research project.

That being said, these articles were approached with the perspective that they function as an extension of the public domain where aspects of immigration reflected in the policies are deliberated (Hajer, 2003). In other words news media framing acts as an extension of the practice of policymaking, which serves as a "site for the articulation of conflict and difference, as a place of social and cultural contestation" (Hajer, 2003, p. 90). This is essentially a site where identities continue to be developed and contextualized through interaction with the notion of immigration and how it has been developed in policy.

My CDA Framework

With this foundation and overall approach to discourse, each policy was assessed, informed by Foucault's theory of governmentality and biopolitics and Teghtsoonian's (2016) application of governmentality to policy frameworks, by asking a series of questions. First, how is the notion of immigration being problematized? With the assertion that, at one level, immigration is being problematized simply due to the fact that there is a policy in place to regulate it, this question was applied to the policies by identifying ways in which they articulated the role of the document. Second, how do the rationales of nationalism and neoliberalism inform how immigration has been problematized? The decision to focus on neoliberalism here comes from governmentality and biopolitics and the understanding that this rationale is all encompassing. The concept of nationalism and its relationship to neoliberalism was identified during the literature review process (Anderson, 1983; Bauder, 2011; Vukov, 2003). This question was largely answered through identifying economic terms in the policy and how they were used, in addition to how the identities of Canadian and Australian were constructed through differentiating them from the identities of those subject to the policy. Third, what governing technologies have been proposed, as a result of how immigration has been problematized, to influence the conduct of conduct of applicants and ensure economic prosperity for the state? Again, this question comes from the idea that the ability of the economic to be simultaneously individualizing and totalizing is facilitated through influencing one's understanding of how they should conduct themselves (Foucault, 1982). So in this instance, justification for regulation or solutions to immigration, such as the points system, provided in the text were identified as technologies that inform the

conduct of applicants. The last question posed was, how do these technologies of government work to identify applicants as a source of human capital? This inquiry was explored through looking largely at the skills-based point system used to define what it means to be economic migrant and was also informed by other studies, such as Boucher (2007), which focused on deconstructing the neoliberal definition of skill that informs the system.

Reviewing the answers to these questions from an intersectional perspective, the following questions were then posed. Through problematizing the concept of immigration, whose existence is being problematized? By posing this question I was essentially looking to see who is immigrating to Canada or Australia. This was determined by identifying implicit cues in the text, such as "unauthorized maritime arrival" (Office of Parliamentary Counsel, 2017, p. 4) and referring to existing literature reviewed to determine who they are (Boucher, 2007; Githens, 2013; Phillips, 1996). Identifying these individuals and analyzing the categories that they fall into, as well as how these categories have been defined, led me to the next question, what assumptions about these individuals have been made as a result of the nationalist and neoliberal undertone? This question was mostly answered by looking at how the identity of the applicant and the identity of a Canadian or Australian are differentiated as well as how the definitions of each category differ. With the evidence provided in the answers garnered with regards to differentiation and association, this study was then able to ask what role does race, gender, and ethnicity play in how identity is conceptualized? Through characterizing the personal identifiers of applicants and the definitions of the categories they are categorized into, I was able to see how the personal identifiers were

associated to specific traits. This allows the study to move past the assumption that the economic approach to immigration does not discriminate along the lines of gender, race, and ethnicity to expose its role in perpetuating sexist and racist ideology. The last question then is what are the implications of how immigration is problematized and how is the identity of applicants formed through discourse in ways that perpetuate immigration-based inequality? From an intersectional perspective it is understood that one's experience varies and is influenced by personal identifiers, which can contribute to compounding barriers in one's experience (Cho, Crenshaw & McCall, 2013). From seeing how rights are afforded depending on which category one is associated with in the policies, and how the categories and identities associated to them are constructed, it became evident that there are significant implications to the way immigration has been problematized and how aspects of identity have been incorporated into policy.

After analysing each policy section through applying these questions, a comparison of the answers collected from each policy analysis was conducted. Each corresponding category was compared to reveal how immigration has been problematized through each policy in Canada and Australia. As Bacchi (2012) argues, it is important not to compare states, but rather compare problematizations in order to avoid "reinforcing entities, such as 'states' or 'institutions', as stable and legitimate" (Bacchi, 2012, p. 6). In this light a conscious effort was made to focus specifically on the policies as sites of tension rather than as concrete and objective reflections of the respective governments. This allowed me deconstruct and investigate the texts to expose the ways immigration has been problematization and what the implications of this have been.

My News Media Framing Analysis Framework

The framing analysis framework used in this study was developed from the definition of framing provided above, informed by the theories of governmentality, biopolitics and intersectionality. Additionally, the studies of Bauder (2011), Kim, Carvalho, Davis & Mullins (2011), Cabaniss & Cameron (2017), and McKay, Thomas, & Blood (2011) also helped inform this framework, specifically in how the analysis was conducted. These studies focused on what information about immigration was selected and emphasized in media framings versus what information was omitted or downplayed. The findings of these studies suggest how the phenomenon of immigration is packaged or framed and the implications of such framing.

For my framework, I analyzed the texts at two levels. At the first level I identified key terms from the policies that appeared in the news articles and examined how they were used, as well as what terms were not used, in order to solidify the relationship between policy and news media framing. The need to understand the relationship between policy and news media was informed by Collins' (1998) matrix of domination, which served as part of my theoretical framework, where she identifies larger social institutions, such as media and policy, as interlocking systems of oppression. So the question of how they interlock was of concern. I then looked at how the ideologies of nationalism and neoliberalism informed the way immigration was conceptualized. This was done by analyzing places were the notion of Canadian, Australian and what it means not be Canadian or Australian were being developed as well as instances when immigration was discussed in economic terms. The all encompassing nature of neoliberalism alluded to in Foucault's work and its dehumanizing implications informed

this specific inquiry, as did the need to identify how news media framing works as a process of differentiation to maintain the larger system of oppression in Collins' (1998) matrix. Lastly, I identified what adjectives or features were used to describe those immigrating and which were not in comparison to what terms were used to describe a Canadian or Australian. This allowed me to understand how the identities formed in the policies were further contextualized in the articles, what identities are attributed to different applicant categories (in other words, how the framing works to differentiate people), and how discrimination at the intersection of race, gender, and ethnicity are perpetuated through the association of personal identifiers to social hierarchies. The findings from this analysis were then thematically categorized according to the larger research questions about how immigration is problematized. These questions were asked in order to further establish a relationship between the immigration policies' conceptualization of immigration and how the public discourse or news media framed it.

Conclusion

Overall, the decisions made in my methodological framework for both CDA and the framing analysis allowed me to deconstruct the concept of immigration in Canada and Australia in order to understand how it has been problematized, what the role of nationalism and neoliberalism are in the problematization of the phenomenon, and how identities are formed through immigration policy and news media framing. That being said, my method, defining discourse in this case as specifically language or text, did not allow for the analysis of images that were present in the news articles reviewed. Additionally, being highly influenced by a Foucauldian approach, I was unable to

deconstruct the policies, news media framing of immigration, and their relationship in a way to understand how individuals actually experience the immigration process and how they are affected by the way they are framed in news media. As Brockling, Krasmann, and Lemke (2011) state, this approach looks at "the interrelations between regimes of self-government and technologies of controlling and shaping the conduct of individuals and collectives, not on what human beings governed by these regimes and technologies actually say and do" (p. 13). Furthermore, this analysis is strictly focused on the "texts, discursive strategies and governing practices within and through which efforts to 'conduct the conduct' of individuals are visible" (Teghtsoonian, 2016, p. 335). However, the use of intersectionality pushed this study further to attempt to understand how these processes of differentiation impact people differently according to personal identifiers. However, again, what one's experience in the system is like as a result of how they identify from their perspective is not explored. This was one of the larger limitations of my study, but also serves a point where this research could be expanded in further studies.

Lastly, this methodological approach did not allow me to make any suggestions for reform or change. As Teghtsoonian (2016) contends, "those deploying an analytic of governmentality are interested in criticism as an analytic practice of unsettling the taken-for-grantedness of how things are, but shy away from prescribing course of action or adopting a normative stance on the topic of research" (p. 341). This oversight is partly due to the fact that, in the case of immigration, to prescribe a redefinition of categories for example, would again just work to differentiate applicants and ultimately contribute to maintaining the status quo.

On a personal note, my position as a female, person of color, and first-generation immigrant in Canada, offers yet another lens through which to contextualize this study. My orientation of course has an impact on my approach to applying the methodology. In one way it could have informed the questions posed and the way in which I identified what was selected and salient in the framing analysis. And in another way, having been born and raised in the west I still may "share many of the taken-for-granted, common-sense understandings expressed in the material" (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 20), which limits my ability to conduct the CDA and framing analysis from an alternative perspective.

Limitations

This study could have been addressed in many different ways even through using the same methods. Depending on the way a researcher chooses to conceptualize the relationship between power, dominance, and discourse and which theoretical framework they use the result of this study could be very different. Additionally, one's approach to the concept of framing and how they conceptualize the relationship between policy, new media and the public could have significant implications on the findings. Of course any method is always partial (Bacchi, 2012).

Using a different methodological approach, such as incorporating interviews of immigrants or current applicants from diverse backgrounds, would be another way to approach the study of immigration policy and news media framing and the ways in which they contribute to immigration-based inequalities based on the intersection of personal identifiers. This would be a way to explore the concept of self-surveillance and whether

66

or not or to what extent immigrants and applicants internalize and portray the identities

they are subjected to in policy and news media framing. Additionally, it would also

provide space to explore the role of agency and "counter-conducts" (Teightsoonian,

2016, p. 343), or the unique ways in which those subject to system traverse and challenge

it.

Chapter 5: Whose Existence is Being Problematized?

The Cases of Canada and Australia

Canada's Immigration and Refugee Protection Act and Australia's Migration Act offer a sense of how immigration has been problematized and the implications of this problematization. By looking at the objectives sections of each Act, I show how the purpose of and justification for these policies are articulated in the service of regulating and, at a more fundamental level, limiting an individual's right to mobility. An examination of applicant differentiation provides an understanding of the role immigration policy plays in identity formation and social positioning of applicants. Through a deconstruction of the point systems used by Canada and Australia, I demonstrate how policy discourse further delineates which aspects of an applicant's identity are valued and which are not. These findings are contextualized within a critical discourse analysis of a series of national news media articles framing the phenomenon of immigration in light of the most recent federal elections in Canada and Australia, which exposes inherent tensions within immigration discourse.

The findings discussed in this chapter help to answer the central question of this research study: how do immigration policy and public discourse, together, work to uphold and reinstate current societal inequalities that exist along the lines of gender, race, and ethnicity? Through exposing the underlying assumptions of these discourses on many different levels, the findings elucidate the relationship between government policy and news media. They also demonstrate the various ways in which immigration has been problematized in policy and media framing, what solutions have been put forth to address

these problems, and more importantly how these solutions enact a form of biopolitics.

Lastly, the results of this critical discourse analysis expose the ways in which the

problematization and regulation of immigration work to perpetuate immigration-based

inequalities that exist along the lines of gender, race, and ethnicity.

Objectives

The "objectives" or "application" section of an immigration policy typically states the

purpose of the policy or what it aims to achieve. In addition, it also outlines how the

policy should be applied and why it should be applied in such a manner. For the purpose

of this study, the objectives section provides an interesting starting point for analysis

because, through defining the need for the policy, the objectives section problematizes

the phenomena it aims to regulate and sets the tone for the rest of the act. In other words,

in order to justify the need for immigration policy and more specifically the solutions it

puts forth, it must frame immigration as a problem that needs attention (Bacchi, 2012).

Canada – Objectives and Application

Immigration Objectives

(a) to permit Canada to pursue the maximum social, cultural and economic benefits of immigration;	(f) to support, by means of consistent standards and prompt processing, the attainment of immigration goals established by the Government
(b) to enrich and strengthen the social and cultural fabric of Canadian society, while respecting the federal, bilingual and multicultural character of Canada;	(g) to facilitate the entry of visitors, students and temporary workers for purposes such as trade, commerce, tourism, international understanding and cultural, educational and scientific activities;
(b.1) to support and assist the development of minority official languages communities in Canada;	(h) to protect public health and safety and to maintain the security of Canadian society;
(c) to support the development of a strong	(i) to promote international justice and

and prosperous Canadian economy, in which the benefits of immigration are shared across all regions of Canada;	security by fostering respect for human rights and by denying access to Canadian territory to persons who are criminals or security risks; and
(d) to see that families are reunited in Canada;	(j) to work in cooperation with the provinces to secure better recognition of the foreign credentials of permanent residents and their more rapid integration into society.
(e) to promote the successful integration of permanent residents into Canada, while recognizing that integration involves mutual obligations for new immigrants and Canadian society;	

Refugees Objectives

(a) to recognize that the refugee program is in the first instance about saving lives and offering protection to the displaced and persecuted;	(e) to establish fair and efficient procedures that will maintain the integrity of the Canadian refugee protection system, while upholding Canada's respect for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all human beings;
(b) to fulfill Canada's international legal obligations with respect to refugees and affirm Canada's commitment to international efforts to provide assistance to those in need of resettlement;	(f) to support the self-sufficiency and the social and economic well-being of refugees by facilitating reunification with their family members in Canada;
(c) to grant, as a fundamental expression of Canada's humanitarian ideals, fair consideration to those who come to Canada claiming persecution;	(g) to protect the health and safety of Canadians and to maintain the security of Canadian society; and
(d) to offer safe haven to persons with a well-founded fear of persecution based on race, religion, nationality, political opinion or membership in a particular social group, as well as those at risk of torture or cruel and unusual treatment or punishment;	(h) to promote international justice and security by denying access to Canadian territory to persons, including refugee claimants, who are security risks or serious criminals

Application

(a) furthers the domestic and international interests of Canada;	(d) ensures that decisions taken under this Act are consistent with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, including its principles of equality and freedom from discrimination and of the equality of English and French as the

	official languages of Canada;
(b) promotes accountability and transparency by enhancing public awareness of immigration and refugee programs;	(e) supports the commitment of the Government of Canada to enhance the vitality of the English and French linguistic minority communities in Canada; and
(c) facilitates cooperation between the Government of Canada, provincial governments, foreign states, international organizations and non-governmental organizations;	(f) complies with international human rights instruments to which Canada is signatory.

Canada's Immigration Act problematizes immigration in several ways. First, by highlighting the need to ensure Canada's "social, cultural and economic benefits" are maximized, the Act implies that an uncontrolled movement of people to Canada would hinder the maximization of social, cultural, and economic benefits for the country. This is reiterated and further developed through the dichotomy established between the social and cultural background of immigrants in confrontation with the "federal, bilingual and multicultural character of Canada." Again, this implies that there is a need to control or regulate what different social and cultural values or ways of life are acceptable in order to maintain Canadianess. This is a perfect illustration of Abu-Laban's (1998) view of Canada's approach to immigration as being neither assimilation nor segregation but instead, "inclusion and understanding within parameters" (p. 12). The hesitation to fully embrace difference as part of Canada's version of multiculturalism and the need to establish boundaries in order to limit this seemingly universal notion of inclusion is a reoccurring theme throughout the objectives section and seems to be one of the larger problems associated with the concept of immigration.

The shortcoming of the term "multiculturalism" can further be located in the news articles analyzed, in two distinct ways: one use of the concept is associated with the

variation of culture brought on by immigration, while the other is used as an inherently Canadian concept, as alluded to in the policy. For example, the *National Post* article used the term to describe a town that had seen a significant increase in their South Asian population, thus associating it with immigration (Blackwell, 2015), while in the *Toronto Star* article, it was used in the assertion that "partly to reflect our values in Canada's multicultural society and partly to reflect Canada's basic economic self-interest we should welcome newcomers" (Black, 2015). Interestingly the *CBC* article used the term "diverse" instead of multicultural to describe Brampton as one of "the most diverse cities in Canada, with a population that has more than doubled in the last two decades – growth fuelled primarily by an influx of immigrants from India, Pakistan and other South Asian Countries" ("Justin Trudeau", 2015). Here it is interesting that the author avoided the use of the term multiculturalism to describe a city known to have many cultures and could indicate that such diversity goes beyond the limits of Canada's notion of multiculturalism. The article continues by attributing Brampton's status as a "liberal stronghold" to immigrants, while also noting that the city's conservative population includes "new Canadians", who align with the "more conservative social and economic policies" of the Tories. This choice of terms differentiates immigrants – a potentially threatening group who favor more open immigration policy and stronger social services – from 'new Canadians' – those who align with more fiscally conservative policy. From this perspective, the differentiation between who is considered an immigrant and who is considered a new Canadian is not determined according to how long these residents have been living in Canada or some official threshold as to when an individual can be considered a Canadian, but is rather determined according to their perceived values.

The varied use of the term multiculturalism in news media coverage and the differentiation between "immigrant" and "new Canadian" specifically in the *CBC* article highlight a tension between being inclusive and accepting of the "Other" and Canada's values and "economic self-interest" (Black, 2015), which is also present in the policy objectives. The articulation of Canada's multiculturalism, as Mackey (1999) discusses, "implicitly constructs the idea of a core English-Canadian culture, and the other cultures become 'multicultural' in relation to that, unmarked, yet dominant, anglo-Canadian core culture" (p. 2). Like the 'ethnic' aisle found in many western grocery stores, all other cultures are lumped together, contained and situated in contrast to the dominant culture of the "white Anglophone majority" through the use of the term multiculturalism (Mackey, 1999, p. 3).

The identity of the Other, established in the above dichotomy, continues to be developed as a potential problem through how the objectives define which social, cultural, and economic aspects of one's identity are tolerable or accepted and which are not, as well as through the assumptions that are made about the values they hold as the "Other". Through how the objectives and application segments highlighted define acceptable attributes, it is clear that it poses immigrants' presence as a potential problem due to their different social and cultural backgrounds. These different backgrounds are framed as potentially limiting immigrants' perceived understanding of human rights or their value on human life, while also demonstrating skepticism around their ability to integrate into Canadian society.

Additionally, the need to protect public health cited in statement (g) of the refugee objectives is another way immigrants are problematized. This statement indicates that

those coming from outside of Canada could pose a risk to the health of Canadians. This connection between immigration and health is further contextualized in the *Toronto Star* article, which claims that "cuts in in-term health care for refugees" will bolster "the country's economic picture" (Black, 2015). The *CBC* article similarly highlights how "the conservatives capped the number [of applicants] at 5,000 in 2013, saying that the number of older immigrants allowed into Canada must be limited because of the burden they place on the health-care system" ("Justin Trudeau", 2015). From a neoliberal perspective, these quotes illustrate how immigration and those who come through the system can be considered a potential economic burden on the healthcare system.

Similar to the construction of health risks as an implicit threat posed by immigrants, another reason for the development of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act according to the objectives is to "maintain the security of Canadian society" (h). This fear developed around migration and its potential ability to jeopardize the country's security is heightened in statement (i), which indicates that these individuals come from places where human rights are not valued. This puts the values of immigrants in question and at odds with Canadian ideals. Though all the news articles I examined help to naturalize and reaffirm Canada's ideals through statements such as, "we're a country that takes in people from other cultures" (Blackwell, 2015), or claims about "Canadian generosity" ("Justin Trudeau", 2015), the *CBC* article expressly developed a relationship between terrorism and immigrants through its comments on Bill C-24. Bill C-24, an amendment to the Citizenship Act which allowed members of government the right to revoke Canadian citizenship from a dual citizen who is considered to have committed an offense, is cautiously framed in this article as both

controversial and a violation of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, as well as a response to a reality that needs to be to addressed ("Justin Trudeau", 2015). Here again, the news discourse demonstrates a recurring tension between Canadian values and the country's ability to embrace difference.

With regards to integration, the objectives section of Canada's immigration act repeatedly highlights its role in contributing to the "successful integration" of immigrants. In immigration objective (e), the illustration of the government's active responsibility in the process of integration demonstrates a need to help, which indirectly problematizes the ability of newcomers to integrate into Canada. In statement (j) the concept of integration is more explicitly addressed and is directly associated with recognized credentials. This indicates that one's ability to integrate into Canadian society is largely indicative of with whether or not they have skills that can be used in the formal economy. Their ability to utilize their skills and thus be fully integrated into society is further understood to be associated with having family support, as addressed in statement (d) of the immigration objectives and (f) of the refugee objectives. The family reunification category and the relationship being developed here between economic migrants and family support will be discussed in the categorization section below.

The last way that immigration has been conceptualized and framed as a problem in Canada's Immigration Act is through the development of a tension between upholding the rights and freedoms of the Other while also maintaining the status of the English and French majority. In statement (e) of the refugee objectives and (d) of the application, it is supposed that if the principles of equality and freedom are to be upheld to the fullest extent for those seeking to immigrate or obtain refuge, the status of the English and

French majority as well as the "integrity" (e) of the governing system could be jeopardized. This paradox reinstates a hierarchy along the intersectional lines of many identifiers, implicating an inherently discriminatory framework that Canada firmly states does not guide its immigration decisions (Abu-Laban, 1998). In addition, it shows how terms such equality or multiculturalism are limited in this context. Contrasting statements in the news discourse, such as, "we're a country that takes people from other cultures and its important of us to help other people when they're on hard times" (Blackwell, 2015), alongside "you can't take everybody" (Blackwell, 2015), highlight this contradiction and acknowledge the tension that results from the hesitation to be fully inclusive.

Looking at the language of the objectives section, many seemingly universal concepts, such as multiculturalism, equality, and human rights, have been only vaguely developed in order to avoid addressing the obvious contradictions that exist between Canada's humanitarian ideals and the best interest of its English and French majority. When immigration is framed as something that can have negative implications for the status quo of the majority, discrimination along lines of gender, race, and ethnicity continues to be justified. This differentiation along the lines of race is taken up in many of the news articles and is seen as an appropriate way to determine who is considered an immigrant versus who can be referred to as a Canadian. For example, the *National Post* and the *Toronto Star* articles referred to the "varied racial hue" of immigrant voters as an indicator of how immigrants would vote in upcoming election in comparison to "people born in Canada" (Black, 2015).

The lack of clarity surrounding concepts developed in policy creates a space

where adjustments to which aspects of one's identity are acceptable and which are not

can be changed or shifted in order to continue to maintain the current power dynamic.

Questions about who can be included in the vision of a multicultural Canada, what can be

considered a "well-founded fear", and what it means to successfully integrate invoke

broad concepts that have been articulated in such a way that their interpretation can vary

and change over time. An example provided by Razack (1995) is how what is considered

a "well-founded fear of persecution" (Refugee Objective) was only more recently

specified in order to acknowledge domestic abuse as a justifiable reason to seek refuge.

Though it was eventually included in Canada's policy, what is considered domestic abuse

is still open to interpretation in order to maintain space to question whose allegations of

domestic abuse are acceptable. The skepticism surrounding claims of persecution and

other avenues of immigration developed in the policy is fomented through the discourse

of news articles admonishing, for example, that policymakers' "efforts to crack down on

illegal immigration, smuggling, fake asylum claims, crooked immigration consultants,

fraudulent immigration marriages… are properly enforced" (Black, 2015). This kind of

language constructs real problems associated with the concept of immigration, and as

such justifies having space to determine whether one's claim to refugee status in

particular can be considered admissible.

Australia – Objectives

Object of Act

1) The object of this Act is to regulate, in the national interest, the coming into, and presence in, Australia of non-citizens.	4) To advance its object, this Act provides for the removal or deportation from Australia of non-citizens whose presence in

	Australia is not permitted by this Act
2) To advance its object, this Act provides for visas permitting non-citizens to enter or remain in Australia and the Parliament intends that this Act be the only source of the right of non-citizens to enter or remain.	5) To advance its object, this Act provides for the taking of unauthorized maritime arrivals from Australia to a regional processing country.
3) To advance its object, this Act provides for non-citizens and citizens to be required to provide personal identifiers for the purposes of this Act or the regulations.	

Australia's objectives also frame immigration as a phenomenon that can threaten Australian national interests. However, they do not specify what those specific interests are. Instead, the objectives identify four aspects of the immigration process that must be regulated with the intent that is in that country's best interest: entry into Australia; remaining in or maintaining a presence in Australia; deportation from Australia; and detention on a surrounding island. Through distinguishing these four aspects of the process as such, the policy ultimately creates a need to regulate entry and the ability to remain as well as provides justification for deportation or detainment. These sites of interaction are further defined and developed in policy and through news media framing that problematizes immigration in Australia in several ways.

The first way that the policy problematizes immigration is through highlighting modes of transportation that are used to arrive in Australia, specifically unauthorized maritime arrivals, and posing them as a threat to the immigration policy objective. Those who arrive by boat unauthorized are framed in the policy as threats to the interest of the nation, thus justifying their deportation or detainment, the solutions provided in statements (4) and (5). This potential threat has been taken on by news media coverage and seems to be one of the most contentious issues developed in all four articles. The

unauthorized or "illegal" arrival of immigrants by boat has been deemed a "test" to

Australia's borders, considered "unseaworthy" by *the Daily Telegraph* article (Benson,

2016), described as a heavy "cost" for the country by *the Sydney Morning Herald* article

(Bourke, 2016), seen as a sign of the potential "swamp [of] welfare queues" according to

The Australian article (Baxendale & Lewis, 2016), and lastly, deemed as an indication of

a lack of border "control" by *ABC* article (Donoughue, Ford & Blumer, 2016). These

perspectives on unauthorized maritime arrivals largely align with the policy's stance on

the issue and work to contextualize the apparent threat.

The justification for detention or deportation of maritime arrivals continues to be

developed in statement (2), which explicitly states that one's rights must be afforded by

the policy. If one is not granted rights by the policy one can be seen to have no rights,

which defends Australia's ability to detain or imprison "unauthorized maritime arrivals"

without any recognition of the universal human rights that this action infringes upon

(Bessant, 2002). The understanding established in statements (2) and (5) has been applied

by news media in discussions surrounding immigration, specifically in *the Daily

Telegraph* article, which stated that the asylum seekers that had been intercepted at sea

were "considered not to be owed protection", and are, as such, eligible for deportation

(Benson, 2016). Such a statement upholds the notion that without receiving rights to enter

Australia through the immigration policy, such persons effectively have no rights to

protect them.

The need to discursively justify these acts of deportation and detention implies

that immigrants' very existence in Australian society is a problem that is significant

enough to rationalize such harsh treatment. Yet, the reason why their presence is a

problem is left undeveloped. The vagueness of who can be deemed deportable provides a lot of room for interpretation as to who can be considered a "non-citizen" with rights to enter and stay and who is considered a "non-citizen" without rights to enter and maintain a presence. The term "non-citizen" is used in the policy objectives to refer to anyone who is not born in Australia. It is an interesting term to dissect as it puts emphasis on the negative, "non", and creates an obvious dialectical tension between Australian identity and the Other. By being a non-citizen, one's rights and opportunities can be easily put in question, and by not being associated with any other law or charter of rights, in comparison to Canada's reference to non-Canadians as "foreign nationals," indicating their association to another nation, one can be easily subjected to inhumane treatment. Again this reiterates statement (2), the notion that this policy is the only source of rights that are to be upheld. Additionally, it works to break down the identities of immigrants to simply a life that is located outside of the law when it comes their rights, and at the same time, subject to Australian law as a result of being excluded (Agamben, 1998).

The use of the word "presence" in statements (1) and (4) is also noteworthy and important to add here as it puts emphasis on the fact that immigrants are occupying space, but it does not necessarily give them the benefit of the doubt that their presence is appreciated or beneficial. It suggests a sentiment that, yes they are here, but they are not seen to be part of our imagined community or societal fabric. Their role in Australia's society once they have arrived is also poorly developed in the news articles reviewed. Their role was often vaguely depicted as either being a parasite or burden on society (Benson, 2016, Bourke, 2016 & Donoughue, Ford & Blumer, 2016), with only one story

depicting the larger positive impact immigrants can have, from, perhaps unsurprisingly, a job generation and skill contribution perspective (Baxendale & Lewis, 2016).

Overall the role of news media in this regard seems to be to provide further context as to why the presence of immigrants should be a concern for the public in a way that makes it applicable to the current political climate. For example during the last federal election, immigration and the presence of the Other were associated with "taking the jobs of locals" (Baxendale & Lewis, 2016), lacking skill (Bourke, 2016), and being a financial burden (Baxendale & Lewis, 2016; Bourke, 2016). The potential implications of immigration highlighted, informed by a neoliberal perspective, strongly associate the phenomenon of immigration with the market, which again works to objectify applicants and unauthorized arrivals.

The last way problems surrounding immigration are further developed and contextualized is through focusing on the personal identifiers of immigrants, as indicated in statement (3). Personal identifiers are explicitly stated to be of concern and are considered a determining factor for whether one receives the right to maintain a presence in Australia. Through deconstructing statement (5), more specific identifiers, such as race, gender, and ethnicity, can be seen to play an explicit role, as the statement specifically targets those arriving unauthorized by sea. Due to the fact that many of those who are arriving by boat unauthorized are often from places of conflict, who hold a lower socio-economic standing or have no other means of entry, and are from locales accessible to Australia by boat, such as Africa, the Middle East and Asia (Bessant, 2002), this statement can be seen from the outset to target individuals according to their race and ethnicity. These individuals, often because of their personal identifiers, are being forced

to flee from persecution to then be subject to further discrimination and the threat of detention as a result of how they have been defined while trying to seek refuge.

Through conducting an analysis of news media framing of asylum seekers, it is also evident that these individuals are also the most likely to be targeted and framed as a potential problem in the media. Personal identifiers of such immigrants were foregrounded in the articles, for example, *the Daily Telegraph* article specifically notes points of origin in Southeast Asia (Benson, 2016), and similar articles that comment on their education and formal skill levels (Baxendale & Lewis, 2016; Bourke, 2016). One of the most reported quotes in reference to refugees specifically, discussed in two of the four articles analyzed, was the then-Immigration Minister saying, "they won't be numerate or literate in their own language, let alone English. These people would take Australian jobs, there's no question about that" (Bourke, 2016). The discussion surrounding this quote in the articles reviewed was seen as both "a statement of the bleeding obvious" (Baxendale & Lewis, 2016) and not representative of the country's "proud tradition of multiculturalism" (Bourke, 2016). The tension developed in news media around how Australia perceives immigration, as extra-textual to the policy objectives, is an indication that there is a complex relationship between the discourses of policy and news media framing. However, the inclusion of these statements does help to develop a connection between fear and the negative consequences of immigration and the personal identifiers of these arrivals to justify the detention and eventual deportation of unauthorized boat arrivals as discussed in statement (4) of policy.

Australia's immigration policy application section together with Australian news media framing of immigration demonstrates that the polarization between the policy

stance and some of the positions taken in the articles analyzed is reflective of Australia's relationship to the concept of immigration, which has tended to swing from being quite open to more closed. The use of the words or statements "presence" (statements 1, 4) "unseaworthy" (Benson, 2016), "do not owe protection" (Benson, 2016), "non-citizen" (statements 1, 2, 3, 4), and "the only source of the right of non-citizens" (statement 2) in the policy and news media coverage together creates a strong position of superiority for Australia, where they are in a position to determine who is worthy of traveling by sea and who should receive fundamental rights, and a largely inferior position for of those seeking to immigrate, especially those arriving by boat from the non-western world. This brings the orientalist discourse into play, which is seen here to largely justify the state's approach to regulating the sites of interaction highlighted above.

Comparison Between Canada's and Australia's Immigration Objectives

Through analyzing the above sections a few comparisons can be made. First, both countries, by having an immigration policy, problematize the movement of people; however, their reasons or objectives for regulating immigration vary. Historically, immigration in Canada has been connected to the country's national interest as a settler nation. For Australia a similar link is made, but there is a hesitation to clearly outline how immigration is associated with national interest other than by making it explicit that the presence of those who are not welcome is not in the nation's interest. This tension is not new and has been a defining feature of how Australia's policy has swung from embracing the concept of immigration as part of their identity to approaching it as an invasion, as discussed in the literature review.

From this perspective, both the neoliberal and nationalist discourses seem to inform how the problem of immigration and the solutions put forth by policy have been developed and normalized. The underlying neoliberal discourse is more apparent in how it informs Canada's relationship to immigration and their policy objectives through the way that the objectives highlight and categorize all aspects of one's identity within social, cultural, and economic categories, and define them in terms of how they can contribute to the maximization of economic benefit for the nation. On the other hand, the nationalist discourse came out significantly in both policy objectives through how the documents determine who is subject to these policies and who is not. The use of the terms foreign nationals and non-citizens to refer to people who are not Canadian or Australian creates a generalized level of differentiation. This differentiation is further defined through how the objectives and application develop what it means to belong to that particular country. For example, to be Canadian means you fit into Canada's version of English and French majority multiculturalism, you hold humanitarian ideals and actively contribute to the economy. For Australia it means you have the right to enter or remain which non-citizens do not have until granted that right.

The articulation of the Other continues to be developed through the use of the terms integration and presence, which illustrate how immigrants come to be in their new society. The term integration, as discussed above, indicates that these individuals will participate in Canadian society by economically contributing. In Australia there is less focus on how immigrants will become part of society; rather, the policy discourse attempts to limit their ability to be part of society to the simple act of being physically

present. By determining a way for these individuals to live in their society there is a sense that their place or role is different than those considered Canadian or Australian.

Lastly, the identity of the Other is also constructed in the objectives and application section through the rights they are deemed to have. As indicated in Canada's policy, immigrants have rights as human beings, but not all of these rights can be upheld in practice, as they may be in conflict with the rights of Canadian citizens. For Australia, non-citizens do not have any rights unless granted rights by the government. So in both scenarios the rights of immigrants is differentiated from those who belong in the state, which works to further cement their position as the 'Other' and justify discrimination they may encounter.

By creating these associations, between applicant categories, societal positions, and rights afforded, within a neoliberal and nationalist discourse, these objectives have significant implications from a Foucauldian and intersectional perspective. One, they naturalize these connections and subject applicants to the identities and social positions constructed in the policy documents. In other words, these objectives act as micro-level processes that work to develop social positions for groups to occupy, which contribute to the perpetuation of immigration-based inequality. Two, through developing a threat to national identity by juxtaposing national identity with the identity of the Other, these objectives justify the need for immigration policy and the specific 'solutions' they present in a way that seems natural and unquestionable. These solutions include naturalizing the socially constructed hierarchy determined by one's ability to contribute economically, another micro-level process of differentiation, and the normalization of the restriction of rights of the 'Other' in the name of national identity and economic wellbeing. This

ultimately works to control individuals who apply, how they identify as a group and what knowledge they can use to define themselves and others.

The news media discourse surrounding immigration in Canada and Australia both use the policy objectives as a foundation for their approach to the topic. These discourses take up policy terms, such as multiculturalism or unauthorized maritime arrivals, as well concepts highlighted in the policy. For example, the focus on the presence of immigrants in Australia's policy objectives was largely the focus of the articles analyzed as well. However, as was demonstrated above, media framing has proven to not merely echo the policy but rather to contextualize and, on rare occasions, to challenge the policy. It does this by bringing attention to contradictions or inherent tensions that underlie the policy objectives through its use of policy terms and application of concepts, intentionally or not. This use of terms contributes to the way news media constructs problems in reference to potential risks that the objectives highlight, often justifying or rationalizing the solutions for regulation being implemented by the government.

Both Canadian and Australian news media coverage tend to explicitly apply the neoliberal and nationalist discourses that underlie the policy in their framing of immigration. The influence of these ideologies on the application of policy to current politics contributes to further articulating the vision of the imagined community and the role that immigration plays. Furthermore, it contributes to defining what it means to be Canadian or Australian and what it means to be an 'Other' in both neoliberal terms as well as along the lines of personal identifiers. Through this construction of identity and differentiation, the news discourse effectively serves as a micro-level process, like the objectives, to establish and naturalize the social hierarchy and discrimination that the

policies perpetuate. In a way the news media framing in this analysis serves to effectively demonstrate the implications of the policy objectives.

Categories

This section compares the discourse surrounding immigration applicant categories, specifically the categories of economic migrants, refugees / asylum seekers, family reunification applicants and temporary workers, in the two policy documents and the national media coverage. This analysis provides insight into how applicants are categorized and the implications of such categorization. By developing and presenting these categories in policy and media coverage, the requirement to categorize applicants is presented as unquestionable. The specific ways applicants are categorized become naturalized and linked to justifiable reasons to limit applicants' right to mobility through the implementation of such policies and categorizations. Furthermore, the policies pose a means to control the immigration of those who fall into one of the highlighted categories, according to the process of problematization through discursively constructing both a problem and its solution.

One way that I analyze these categories is by interrogating how applicants are being problematized and how their categorization has been justified. Categories are also studied in order to see how applicants are subjected to the identities associated with specific categories, which are developed through the discourse used to define them, and the implications of that subjectivization. Lastly, this section also looks at the extent to which applicants, through being broken down according to identifiers such as formal skills, are being objectified and ultimately reduced to what some scholars such as Phillips

(2009) refer to as "bare life," or a life "routinely excluded either legally or discursively from political-status" (Butler & Spivak, 2007, p. 15). These ideas build on Agamben's (1998) work on the "politicization of bare life" (p. 4), and his perspective that a life is "included in the juridical order solely in the form of its exclusion" (p. 8). This alludes to the circumstance apparent in this section where applicants often find themselves outside of the protection of the law but at the same time subject to the law and its regulations. According to Agamben (1998), it is this inclusion of exclusion where human life converges with politics and thus where the power of sovereignty lies, and through which, from my perspective, immigrant applicants are reduced to human capital.

As a result of how these categories are defined, how they are valued, and what rights are afforded to each group, a hierarchy among the categories is formed. Those who are more highly valued have a stronger political existence and thus are more humanized and positioned ahead of those who are less valued and thus less recognized as members of the imagined community.

Canada – Categorization of Applicants

Within the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, the following definitions for Economic Immigration, Family Reunification and Refugee are provided under the Selection of Permanent Residents section (Minister of Justice, 2017, p. 15). Additional detail for refugee status is provided under Refugee Protection Division 1 (Minister of Justice, 2017, p. 83). The only mention of temporary workers occurs in the Act's Objectives and is as such is being used to gain an insight into how temporary workers are defined.

Economic Immigration

(2) A foreign national maybe selected as a member of the economic class on the basis of their ability to become economically established in Canada.
14.1 (1) for the purpose of supporting the attainment of economic goals established by the government of Canada, the Minister may give instructions establishing a class of permanent residents as part of the economic class

As indicated in the objectives section, the term immigrant is often used synonymously for economic migrant. Breaking down the use of the term immigrant to mean economic migrant in both policy and news media framing indirectly indicates that an immigrant is one that has the "ability to become economically established in Canada". Through the synonymous use of these two terms it can also be argued that the idea of an economic immigrant becomes naturalized to represent the "normal" immigrant, associated strongly with the concept of integration as a result of their formal skills as discussed above. Through the association made between immigration and economic contributions, the policy not only defines who can be considered an ideal immigrant, it also effectively problematizes those who are not seen to be able to contribute economically and allows the policy to question their applications.

The focus on economic establishment in the definition provided and in the objectives discussed strengthens the claim made in the prior section about the equation of successful integration with one's ability to be economically successful in Canada. The skills that are seen to directly and obviously contribute to the "economic goals" of the country are privileged by the neoliberal approach taken here, and are rewarded with permanent residency status as indicated in statement (1). Any informal skills or the ways in which one's social and cultural background can have positive implications for Canada are not mentioned. Again, the unwillingness to acknowledge other aspects of one's

identity contributes to the tension that has been developed between Canada's 'universal' values and its self-interest.

The development of one's identity through the establishment of this category both objectifies applicants by associating their identity with their potential economic contributions, as well as influences the way these applicants start to understand themselves and their worth. In addition, by developing the subsequent categories in contrast to this category, the definition of economic migration also influences the way applicants of the other categories define themselves and what rights they deserve. The use and naturalization of this idea also establishes an undisputed hierarchy according to immigrant categorization, which privileges the economic migrant over applicants in other streams.

Family Reunification

(1) A foreign national may be selected as a member of the family class on the basis of their relationship as a spouse, common-law partner, child, parent or other prescribed family member of a Canadian citizen or permanent resident.

To start this definition overtly defines those who come through the family reunification stream according to their relationship to the primary applicant or the individual who has been granted permanent residency status. Adding further insight as to what it means to be defined in relation to someone else, I will also refer to statement (d) of the immigration objectives and (f) of the refugee objectives, which more explicitly develop this category of immigration as a support system for the economic migrant, as discussed above. The differentiation in categorization between the "primary applicant" and the "dependent," one being associated with their formal skills and thus highly valued and the Other being depicted as nothing more than a support system for the primary

applicant, creates a clear hierarchy that identifies those who come through the family reunification stream as a second class of immigrants.

Taking into consideration the fact that, as much of the literature reviewed has demonstrated, it is largely women and children or "dependents" that come through the family reunification stream there are a few significant implications that arise from this categorization and associated definitions. First, how this category has been differentiated can be seen to reinforce the stereotypical assumption that it is the women's role to support and ensure the success of the breadwinners, most often the men of the family (Boucher, 2016). In addition, the categorization provided also differentiates the emotional labor and "informal" skills used to support a family from formal skills associated with the primary applicant. This not only creates a hierarchy along the lines of gender it also seemingly devalues skills required to effectively support a family in an effort to demonstrate the value associated with skills used to overtly further the economic goals of Canada.

Within the news media articles analyzed, identity formation through the family reunification categorization and the differentiation of this category from the economic migrant stream was taken up and normalized in three of the four articles. The *CBC* article in particular not only differentiates the two categories; it unequivocally associates family reunification with providing "economic benefits" for primary applicants by providing source of "daycare" ("Justin Trudeau", 2015). A similar distinction also made by *The Globe and Mail* article, which distinguishes between "economic migrants and their dependents" (Friesen, 2014). The use of the word dependent can be seen to have some negative connotations as it puts emphasis on the fact that their identity and opportunity to

reside in Canada is reliant on their relation to a primary applicant. Furthermore this term also fails to give any acknowledgement to the roles they play in society and the positive impact their presence can have.

In sum, the policy description and media framing of immigration categorization distinguishes between the economic migrant stream and family reunification to problematize those coming through the family reunification streams, largely women, as less desirable and less able to contribute to the social, cultural, and economic interests of Canada. It does so by failing to acknowledge various aspects of one's identity in the definition provided and in how it is discussed in the media.

Temporary worker (defined in Immigration Objectives)

g) to facilitate the entry of visitors, students and temporary workers for purposes such as trade, commerce, tourism, international understanding and cultural, educational and scientific activities;

Temporary workers are not provided a separate definition in the policy unlike the other categories discussed above, however, the stream is distinguished from the 'normal' economic migrant flow in the objectives section as illustrated in statement (g) as well as in the news media articles analyzed. As stated in statement (g) temporary workers are defined again, in a neoliberal light, as those who can contribute to the economic prosperity of the country or to another aspect of society with the caveat being they are only needed temporarily. The use of the term "temporary" differentiates these individuals from economic migrants by degrading their skills as skills that are not worth keeping permanently, thus indicating their easy disposal. Here the identity of temporary worker is developed in regards to certain skills, skills that are viewed as less valuable than those held by economic migrants. As discussed in the literature, temporary applicants, having

to view themselves through this definition, eventually accept and normalize this identity, ultimately reinforcing the status quo (Cisneros, 2015).

From an intersectional perspective, more interrogation as to which skills are more likely to be accepted within the temporary worker stream rather than the skilled or economic migrant channel is of interest. Though the policy does not outline in detail which skills define these categories, the literature and news articles reviewed provide a more in-depth understanding, specifically with regards to caregiving. As Githens (2013) and Repo (2015) explain, caregivers have been distinguished from economic migrants as temporary workers in Canada. The stream of caregiving has become a feminized temporary worker channel, which works to main the status quo by discouraging foreign women who are looking to come to Canada from pursuing other careers as a result of the way the economic migrant and temporary worker streams have been defined. In addition, it perpetuates the devaluation and discrimination that occurs along the lines of skill, gender and often ethnicity since a significant portion of caregivers come from Asia (Githens, 2013; Repo 2015). The discrimination that occurs with regards to how skills are valued and the issues that arise from being defined as such, including being denied the opportunity to apply for permanent residency when arriving in Canada and the ability to obtain the rights that come with that status, is discussed in *The Globe and Mail* article. The article raises the point that "having [permanent residency] allows the caregiver to assert her rights", as well as shines a light on the fact that without those rights, "there's a power imbalance between the caregiver and the employer", which is detrimental to the worker's ability build a stable and secure life in Canada (Friesen, 2014). However, it also assumes and thus perpetuates the idea that caregivers are only women. In addition, the

article also continuously contrasts "a higher caliber of economic immigrant" against temporary workers to further diminish their importance (Friesen, 2014).

Refugee

> (3) A foreign national, inside or outside Canada, may be selected as a person who under this Act is a Convention refugee or as a person in similar circumstances, taking into account Canada's humanitarian tradition with respect to the displaced and the persecuted.

Convention Refugee

> 96 A Convention refugee is a person who, by reason of a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group or political opinion,
> (a) is outside each of their countries of nationality and is unable or, by reason of that fear, unwilling to avail themself of the protection of each of those countries; or
> (b) not having a country of nationality, is outside the country of their former habitual residence and is unable or, by reason of that fear, unwilling to return to that country.

A person in need of protection

> 97 (1) A person in need of protection is a person in Canada whose removal to their country or countries of nationality or, if they do not have a country of nationality, their country of former habitual residence, would subject them personally
> (a) to a danger, believed on substantial grounds to exist, of torture within the meaning of Article 1 of the Convention Against Torture; or
> (b) to a risk to their life or to a risk of cruel and unusual treatment or punishment if
> (i) the person is unable or, because of that risk, unwilling to avail themself of the protection of that country,
> (ii) the risk would be faced by the person in every part of that country and is not faced generally by other individuals in or from that country,
> (iii) the risk is not inherent or incidental to lawful sanctions, unless imposed in disregard of accepted international standards, and
> (iv) the risk is not caused by the inability of that country to provide adequate health or medical care.

Again, here the category of refugee is differentiated from "immigrant" by having a separate definition as well as by having a completely separate set of objectives as demonstrated above. The identities of those who fall into this category are strongly defined by their trauma and/or fear of persecution. This separates these individuals from other aspects of their identity as well as from any human agency or ability, which from a

Foucauldian perspective, has significant implications on how they are viewed by others as well as how they learn to view themselves. Being associated with "Canada's humanitarian tradition", individuals in this category are positioned largely on one side of the tension between Canada's ideals and self-interest. This puts refugees in direct contrast with Canada's economic goals and is thus always a subject of contention. As demonstrated in the *Toronto Star* and *National Post* articles, Syrian refugees were discussed as people who were in need of help, their identity associated with their current situation and suffering, but other aspects of their identity, such as their strong cultural background, skills and perseverance, were left out (Black, 2015; Blackwell, 2015).

In addition to being viewed indirectly as an economic burden in both policy and media, refugees' existence and intentions are also highly scrutinized in other ways. As demonstrated in the refugee objectives highlighted, those who apply as refugees are directly associated with public health risks and security threats, in addition to being perceived to be in need of support in order to be "self-sufficient". In the news media coverage reviewed, talks of refugees are often followed by remarks about "fake asylum claims" (Black, 2015), "exploiting the generosity of Canadian taxpayers" ("Justin Trudeau", 2015) and questions about "interim health care for refugees" (Black, 2015).

In the hierarchy that has been developed through how these categories have been defined, refugees are illustrated in both policy and media coverage to have no ability to contribute to the economic goals of Canada and are thus decidedly devalued in comparison to the other categories discussed, especially in contrast to the economic migrant. That being said, who exactly is considered to be eligible to apply for refugee status and hold this lower ranking? Whose fears of persecution or experiences of trauma

are not legitimized and thus hold an even lower or almost non-existent position according to the policy? Looking at statement (96) and the fact that fear of persecution or discrimination on the basis of gender is not explicitly listed recalls that claims of gender-based violence are not always viewed to be a justifiable reason seek refugee from persecution (Razack, 1995, MacIntosh, 2009). In addition, the fact that whether there are laws in place in an applicant's home country against gender-based violence is a consideration also has negative implications on the results of a such a claim. This is largely due to the fact that the root causes of gender-based violence stem from patriarchal culture, which serves as the foundation for many societies including Canada's (Burman, 2016). This culture and the values it promotes undermine the formal laws that may be in place to combat gender-based violence (Burman, 2016), and further limits the ability of refugee adjudicators to understand the trauma associated with experiencing such violence or harassment (MacIntosh, 2009).

Australia – Categorization of Applicants

The definitions of the immigration categories to follow were provided in Australia's Migration Act of 1985. Descriptions of Lawful and Unlawful Non-Citizens was retrieved from the document prepared by Office of Parliamentary Counsel, Canberra (2017) in Part 2 – Arrival, presence and departure of persons (p. 60), while Unauthorized maritime arrival was provided in Part 1 – Preliminary (p. 38) as was the definition for Refugee (p. 49) and family (p. 49). Provisions for visas, including the temporary worker visa, were outlined in Division 3 – Visas for non-citizens (Office of Parliamentary Counsel,

Canberra, 2017, p. 82), while the temporary sponsored visa was located in Division 3A –

Sponsorship (Office of Parliamentary Counsel, Canberra, 2017, p. 195).

Lawful Non-Citizens

(1) A non-citizen in the migration zone who holds a visa that is in effect is a lawful non-citizen.
(2) An allowed inhabitant of the Protected Zone who is in a protected area in connection with the performance of traditional activities is a lawful non-citizen.

Unlawful Non-Citizens

(1) A non-citizen in the migration zone who is not a lawful non-citizen is an unlawful non-citizen.
(2) To avoid doubt, a non-citizen in the migration zone who, immediately before 1 September 1994, was an illegal entrant within the meaning of the Migration Act as in force then became, on that date, an unlawful non-citizen.

In line with the objectives section, Australia's immigration policy distinguishes

applicants as, generally, lawful non-citizens and unlawful non-citizens. Lawful non-

citizens are those who currently reside in areas under Australian jurisdiction who have an

active visa and those who are considered "traditional inhabitants" (Office of

Parliamentary Counsel, Canberra, 2017, p. 27), or citizens of Papua New Guinea who

partake in traditional activities within the Protected Zone. Unlawful non-citizens are

those without a visa or inhabitant status. This understanding of what constitutes lawful

and unlawful non-citizenry is strongly connected to the concept of presence, discussed in

the objectives section, as these definitions are largely related to the existence of non-

citizens in a specific physical space. Again, the term non-citizen, defined in the policy as

"a person who is not an Australian citizen" (Office of Parliamentary Counsel, Canberra,

2017, p. 20), differentiates these individuals from those considered "Australian," as

Other, even though they could be lawfully allowed to reside in Australia. These

categories are then further broken down as follows:

Unauthorized Maritime Arrival

(1) For the purposes of this Act, a person is an *unauthorised maritime arrival* if:

(a) the person entered Australia by sea:
  (i) at an excised offshore place at any time after the excision time for that place; or
  (ii) at any other place at any time on or after the commencement of this section; and

(b) the person became an unlawful non-citizen because of that entry; and
(c) the person is not an excluded maritime arrival.

 (1A) For the purposes of this Act, a person is also an *unauthorised maritime arrival* if:

(a) the person is born in the migration zone; and
(b) a parent of the person is, at the time of the person's birth, an unauthorised maritime arrival because of subsection (1) (no matter where that parent is at the time of the birth); and
(c) the person is not an Australian citizen at the time of birth.
Note 1: For who is a *parent* of a person, see the definition in subsection 5(1) and section 5CA. Note 2: A parent of the person may be an *unauthorised maritime arrival* even if the parent holds, or has held, a visa. Note 3: A person to whom this subsection applies is an *unauthorised maritime arrival* even if the person is taken to have been granted a visa because of section 78 (which deals with the birth in Australia of non-citizens). Note 4: For when a person is an Australian citizen at the time of his or her birth, see section 12 of the *Australian Citizenship Act 2007*. Note 5: This subsection applies even if the person was born before the commencement of the subsection. See the *Migration and Maritime Powers Legislation Amendment (Resolving the Asylum Legacy Caseload) Act 2014*.

(1AA) For the purposes of this Act, a person is also an *unauthorised maritime arrival* if:

(a) the person is born in a regional processing country; and
(b) a parent of the person is, at the time of the person's birth, an unauthorised maritime arrival because of subsection (1) (no matter where that parent is at the time of the birth); and
(c) the person is not an Australian citizen at the time of his or her birth.
Note 1: A parent of the person may be an *unauthorised maritime arrival* even if the parent holds, or has held, a visa. Note 2: This Act may apply as mentioned in subsection (1AA) even if either or both parents of the person holds a visa, or is an Australian citizen or a citizen of the regional processing country, at the time of the person's birth. Note 3: This subsection applies even if the person was born before the commencement of the subsection.

For those who arrive in Australia by boat at either unauthorized times or places,

there is a strong focus on the method of transportation and the time and/or place of

docking, which supersedes any visa or citizenship unless explicitly exempt. This categorization plays up the problematization of maritime arrivals developed in the policy objectives by not only identifying individuals who arrive by sea unauthorized as unlawful non-citizens but also identifying their unborn children as such. As highlighted above, the term unlawful non-citizens implies that those who fall under this category do not have the rights that are afforded by the state to lawful non-citizens. Additionally, it also implies that by not being associated with any other state they have no other rights. As such, children born into a family labeled as unauthorized maritime arrivals are, through this categorization, seen to have no rights under Australian law. This differentiates these individuals from both those who are considered Australian and other "non-citizens," which helps to justify and naturalize depriving these individuals of the opportunity to belong and the rights that come with being a citizen of a country. This justification is further developed through the exclusion of terms in the category description that are often used to describe individuals who arrive by boat unauthorized, namely asylum seeker or refugee. Most individuals who come by boat unauthorized come from places of conflict and are seeking refuge, as indicated by Crock (2013). The omission of these words in the development of this identity distances these individuals from their unimaginable circumstances and the humanitarian treatment often provided to those seeking refuge, which ultimately justifies the categorization detailed in policy. The implications of subjecting the very existence of those who are born to families who arrive by boat unauthorized, since their time of birth, to an unlawful identity, unworthy of refugee status, and potentially defining them as stateless human beings has implications for what position in society they can hold. From a Foucauldian view, this enacts a biopolitics that,

over time, informs how these individuals start to see themselves and their worth as a process of self-surveillance (Cisneros, 2015; Foucault, 1978).

Interestingly, the distinction between refugees and unlawful maritime arrivals is muddled in the media framing of the issue. Though the emphasis on the mode of transportation is consistent in news media coverage, acknowledging these individuals as asylum seekers or refugees does occur occasionally. Oftentimes, however, these individuals are referred to simply as "boats" (Donoughue, Ford & Blumer, 2016), "asylum seeker boats" (Benson, 2016), or "unseaworthy" boats (Benson, 2016). The effect of this is to, first, establish an orientalist perspective from which Australia determines who is worthy of traveling by sea. Second, the use of such terms objectifies these individuals by associating them with an inanimate object and again further distances them from being seen as human beings in need of support or humanitarian treatment. On the other hand, there are also attempts to bring to light the strategic differentiation that the policy has created in quotes used in the news stories, such as, "I think the party rhetoric around illegal immigrants has created that perception that people arriving by boat are not necessarily genuine refugees" (Donoughue, Ford & Blumer, 2016). Such quotes can serve to push the boundaries around who can be considered a refugee or asylum seeker in Australia, regardless of how they arrived.

From an intersectional perspective, there are many intersecting oppressions that are occurring here that work to systematically disadvantage individuals and families deemed as unauthorized maritime arrivals over generations. By denying parents as well as their children access to medical care, education, and the ability to work, this policy is effectively limiting the quality of life these individuals can attain and the potential

opportunities their children will have (Crock, 2013). They will likely find themselves in a less advantaged position than their Australian and other non-citizen counterparts, who often come from western countries and/or have recognized skills, which will ultimately limit their ability to escape the cycle of poverty and inequality they find themselves in and which is being perpetuated by the policy (Crock, 2013). As has been discussed, these individuals tend to arrive from places of conflict, including the horn of Africa, the Middle East and other parts of Asia, as recorded by Australia's Department of Immigration and Citizenship, and often come with nothing other than a few belongings. As such it could be said that this policy indirectly targets and discriminates against non-westerners who do not have the skills required to apply for skilled migration nor the leisure of waiting in their origin country to see if their refugee application will be accepted. This creates yet another level of differentiation along the lines of race, nationality, and socio-economic status.

This discrimination is echoed in news media representation, which implies that those arriving by boat are "multi-ethnic" and different than "immigrants and people born in Australia", since "the vast majority of people who are born overseas are not from a refugee background, they are from a skilled migrant background" (Donoughue, Ford & Blumer, 2016). This discourse first equates those arriving by boats with the refugee categorization, which is contrary to the policy, but it also differentiates them from skilled migrants and Australians who are attributed with the same background in contrast to the refugee background. This could imply that that skilled migrants and Australians have skills which refugees do not or that they come from a similar ethnic background whereas refugees do not. This implication can be justified with the statement that follows, stating

that "someone who arrives in Australia from Britain or Europe… may not have much in common with someone fleeing a current conflict… of course it depends on where those foreign-born respondents come from" (Donoughue, Ford & Blumer, 2016). Here, the issue of nationality comes in to play and is explicitly used to define who is considered an asylum seeker who arrived by boat, who is considered an immigrant or skilled migrant and who is considered an Australian.

Refugee

(1) For the purposes of the application of this Act and the regulations to a particular person in Australia, the person is a *refugee* if the person:

| (a) in a case where the person has a nationality—is outside the country of his or her nationality and, owing to a well-founded fear of persecution, is unable or unwilling to avail himself or herself of the protection of that country; or |
| (b) in a case where the person does not have a nationality—is outside the country of his or her former habitual residence and owing to a well-founded fear of persecution, is unable or unwilling to return to it. |

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply if the Minister has serious reasons for considering that:

| (a) the person has committed a crime against peace, a war crime or a crime against humanity, as defined by international instruments prescribed by the regulations; or |
| (b) the person committed a serious non-political crime before entering Australia; or |
| (c) the person has been guilty of acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations. |

5J Meaning of *well-founded fear of persecution*
(1) For the purposes of the application of this Act and the regulations to a particular person, the person has a *well-founded fear of persecution* if the person:

| (a) the person fears being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion; and |
| (b) there is a real chance that, if the person returned to the receiving country, the person would be persecuted for one or more of the reasons mentioned in paragraph (a); and |
| (c) the real chance of persecution relates to all areas of a receiving country. |

(2) A person does not have a *well-founded fear of persecution* if

| effective protection measures are available to the person in a receiving country. |
| the person could take reasonable steps to modify his or her behaviour so as to avoid a real chance of persecution in a receiving country, other than a modification that would: |

| (a) conflict with a characteristic that is fundamental to the person's identity or conscience; or |

(b) conceal an innate or immutable characteristic of the person; or
(c) without limiting paragraph (a) or (b), require the person to do any of the following:

i) alter his or her religious beliefs, including by renouncing a religious conversion, or conceal his or her true religious beliefs, or cease to be involved in the practice of his or her faith;
(ii) conceal his or her true race, ethnicity, nationality or country of origin;
(iii) alter his or her political beliefs or conceal his or her true political beliefs;
(iv) conceal a physical, psychological or intellectual disability;
(v) enter into or remain in a marriage to which that person is opposed, or accept the forced marriage of a child;
(vi) alter his or her sexual orientation or gender identity or conceal his or her true sexual orientation, gender identity or intersex status.

(4) If a person fears persecution for one or more of the reasons mentioned in paragraph (1)(a):

(a) that reason must be the essential and significant reason, or those reasons must be the essential and significant reasons, for the persecution; and
(b) the persecution must involve serious harm to the person; and
(c) the persecution must involve systematic and discriminatory conduct.

(5) Without limiting what is serious harm for the purposes of paragraph (4)(b), the following are instances of serious harm for the purposes of that paragraph:

(a) a threat to the person's life or liberty;
(b) significant physical harassment of the person;
(c) significant physical ill-treatment of the person;
(d) significant economic hardship that threatens the person's capacity to subsist;
(e) denial of access to basic services, where the denial threatens the person's capacity to subsist;
(f) denial of capacity to earn a livelihood of any kind, where the denial threatens the person's capacity to subsist.

The definition provided for the refugee category works to justify limiting one's ability to seek refuge by alluding to the idea that these individuals could have criminal backgrounds and thus pose a threat to national security, or that they could be exaggerating or lying about their fear of persecution or the "real chance" of experiencing profound and systematic harassment. This is further supported by news framing of refugee claimants in *the Sydney Morning Herald* article, which describes these applicants

as "illiterate and innumerate" and who "would take Australian jobs or languish on the dole and use free health services" (Bourke, 2016). Claims of being seen as a economic burden or a disturbance to the labour force have a strong neoliberal undertone and offer a pointed example of how neoliberalism, as a guiding rationale, is able to penetrate a society's approach to deciding whether or not to provide an individual, in fear of persecution, refuge – something that one would assume would be influenced instead by morals and ethics.

What is considered a "real chance of persecution", "serious harm" or "systematic and discriminatory conduct" in the policy is unclear and left open to interpretation. In addition, what can be understood as "effective protection measures", what it means to have them "available", and what would be considered "reasonable steps to modify his or her behaviour" in order to avoid persecution is also quite vague. The space the imprecision provides, again, in a Foucauldian light, can be seen as a way for the state to change its policy in order to ensure it is always in the interest of economic progress, which will be further demonstrated below.

Interestingly, gender-based persecution is not listed as a well-founded fear, nor are acts such as domestic violence, sexual assault or rape, which are often associated with gender-based persecution (MacIntosh, 2009). Furthermore, the policy categorization's emphasis on physical harm and economic hardship signals a failure to acknowledge the emotional and mental harm that can occur from gender-based persecution, which according to MacIntosh (2009) is something usually not considered, as "adjudicators often fail to recognize the social, cultural, economic, and psychological dynamics of domestic abuse as legally relevant for their assessment of state protection" (p. 147). This

understanding of what is relevant puts cases and claims of emotional and mental abuse at odds with how this definition has been established. That being said, as was the case in Canada, the room that has been left for interpretation, with regards to what is considered a significant and established fear of persecution, could, over time, shift to include cases of domestic abuse (Razack, 1995), but how domestic violence is understood and when it is deemed an appropriate claim can vary in order to ensure that the interest of the state is upheld. As the literature review has demonstrated, "solutions" to migration as a result of gender-based persecution would likely be conceptualized in a way that would address the problem of an aging population and the potential decrease of economic labour that comes with it (Repo, 2015). According to Phillips (1996), this solution includes subjecting women to the singular identity of child-bearer and thus hinges on their ability to "reproduce the nation" (p. 597). From this approach those women who are determined to be unable or unwilling to "reproduce the nation" are less likely to have their claims heard (Razack, 1995). Here, as Repo (2015), Coole & Frost (2010), and Phillips (1996) discuss, factors such as race and nationality often come into play when considering who is able to reproduce "Australian" values and are as a result eligible for permanent visas.

Another way that this definition performs exclusion is with regards to sexuality. The reason for persecution initially stated in statement 1(a) does not include persecution along the lines sexuality. When it is brought up in statement 2(c)(vi), it is done so in contradiction with its use of binary language to describe individuals who may fear persecution due to identifying outside of the gender-binary norm. This binary language is consistent throughout the refugee section and creates a tension between the expectation of

being inclusive of anyone in fear of persecution and the hesitation to recognize diversity or acknowledge other forms of persecution.

With all this in mind, it becomes obvious how the intersection of identifiers are implicitly connected to the definition of who can be considered a genuine refugee claimant. For some, the intersection of their personal identifiers can be seen to negatively impact, in a compounding manner, their ability to seek protection. These identifiers become increasingly linked to the constructed definition of the ideal immigrant through media framing, which tends to justify limiting the number refugees accepted due to their perceived low socio-economic status and assumed lack of skills, employability, and ability to speak English (Baxendale & Lewis, 2016; Bourke, 2016). Moreover, even those who argue that some refugees have something to offer still do so by discriminating against others. For example, the *Sydney Morning Herald* article states that "refugees and humanitarian entrants are often keen to make up for lost time and take up the many diverse opportunities provided by Australia's education and training system. Refugee young people in particular can be highly motivated" (Bourke, 2016). This statement assumes that time outside of Australia was "lost time," thus failing to acknowledge that the life and experience one had prior to having to seek refuge may have been fulfilling and enriching on many levels. Such ignorance demonstrates a sense of superiority felt over those coming in as refugees. The position of superiority is further developed through how the education and training programs Australia provides are described. Additionally, the indication of age as a determining factor of one's ability to contribute to society is also discriminatory, as it questions the ability of those who are considered older. Lastly,

the focus on careers and education again brings in a neoliberal understanding of what it

means to have a beneficial presence as a refugee in Australia.

Temporary Worker
(2) Without limiting subsection (1), the regulations may provide that a visa, or visas of a
specified class, are subject to:

(a) a condition that, despite anything else in this Act, the holder of the visa will not, after entering Australia, be entitled to be granted a substantive visa (other than a protection visa, or a temporary visa of a specified kind) while he or she remains in Australia; or

(b) a condition imposing restrictions about the work that may be done in Australia by the holder, which, without limiting the generality of this paragraph, may be restrictions on doing:
     (i) any work; or
     (ii) work other than specified work; or
     (iii) work of a specified kind.

Temporary Sponsored Work Visa

(a) to provide a framework for a temporary sponsored work visa program in order to address genuine skills shortages;

(b) to address genuine skills shortages in the Australian labour market:
     (i) without displacing employment and training opportunities for Australian citizens and Australian permanent residents (within the meaning of the regulations); and
     (ii) without the temporary sponsored work visa program serving as a mainstay of the skilled migration program;

(c) to balance the objective of ensuring employment and training opportunities for Australian citizens and Australian permanent residents with that of upholding the rights of non-citizens sponsored to work in Australia under the program;

Australia has several temporary work visas, however the immigration policy

document only provides general rules for those who come with a visa and those who are

sponsored to work. Despite this, a critical discourse analysis of the above text reveals

some significant insights into how temporary work is defined and what discourses inform

how it is interpreted and valued. First, there is a significant tension between the presence

of temporary workers and employment for Australians as illustrated in statement (b(i)). In

this way, those who are categorized as temporary workers are problematized through

being seen as a threat to job security for Australians and permanent residents. This

problem is resolved by limiting the work opportunities and rights available for those who come through a temporary work program and is, as such, justifiable in order to ensure the interests of Australians are met first.

This interest is defined in solely economic terms, highlighting the neoliberal ideology informing how temporary workers are perceived. In this definition, they are subjected to being reduced purely to a skill that can be used to temporarily fill gaps in Australia's workforce. Using Brown's (2015) definition of neoliberalism to unpack how this immigration category has been established, it becomes clear that it not only defines temporary workers as human capital, it has also been explicitly developed to initiate economic growth, as stated in statement (a), and thus maintain global competitiveness. Through how the text juxtaposes temporary workers with "Australian citizens and Australian permanent residents" (c), this also develops an internal sense of competition, which is positioned as helpful for encouraging citizens to seek further training and ultimately stimulate the economy.

The juxtaposition is also seen to "Other" temporary workers through differentiating them from "Australian citizens and Australian permanent residents" (c). By defining what it means to be Australian through identifying who they are not, this statement helps to reinforce a sense of national identity as exclusionary. Furthermore, it also contributes to establishing a hierarchy between these various categories, where those who are considered citizens and permanent residents have more value in Australian society than temporary workers. Again, noting that temporary workers are accepted due to skills they hold – skills that are differentiated from those of skilled migrant workers, who receive permanent residency, and/or citizens – creates another level of

discrimination along the lines of which skills are more highly valued and which are

devalued or not considered skills.

Family
De facto partners

(1) For the purposes of this Act, a person is the **de facto partner** of another person (whether of the same sex or a different sex) if, under subsection (2), the person is in a de facto relationship with the other person

De facto relationship

(2) For the purposes of subsection (1), a person is in a **de facto relationship** with another person if they are not in a married relationship (for the purposes of section 5F) with each other but:
    (a) they have a mutual commitment to a shared life to the exclusion of all others; and
    (b) the relationship between them is genuine and continuing; and
    (c) they:
        (i) live together; or
        (ii) do not live separately and apart on a permanent basis; and
    (d) they are not related by family (see subsection (4)).

Certain persons taken to be included in spouse, de facto partner or parent's visa
Where:

(a) a person's name is included in the passport or other document of identity of the person's spouse or de facto partner; and
(b) the person accompanies his or her spouse or de facto partner to Australia (whether before or after the commencement of this section); the person shall be taken to be included in any visa granted to the spouse or de facto partner evidence of which is endorsed on the passport or other document of identity if, and only if, the person's name is included in the endorsement.
(a) the name of a child is included in the passport or other document of identity of a parent of the child; and
(b) the child accompanies that parent to Australia (whether before or after the commencement of this section); the child shall be taken to be included in any visa granted to the parent evidence of which is endorsed on the passport or other document of identity if, and only if, the child's name is included in the endorsement.

Family member's visa means a business visa held by a person:

(a) who is or was a member of the family unit of another person who held a business visa; and
(b) who would not have held the business visa if he or she had never been a member of the family unit of the other person.

The use of the term "person" to refer to the applicant in comparison to the use of the term of spouse, partner or dependent sets the tone for how family members are differentiated. The need to have documentation with the applicant's name on it, the need to arrive with that individual, and the fact that if the applicant loses their status so does their dependents all work to actualize the dependency aspect of the identity associated with those who come with an applicant. Being framed as a dependent problematizes these individuals as people who are reliant on their significant other or parent, where the dependent has unrecognized skills or attributes unworthy of being recognized as their own person.

Comparison Between Canada's and Australia's Application Categories

In terms of how applicants are problematized, and thus the categorization and regulation of applicants justified, both countries assume that an immigrant is an economic migrant unless otherwise stated. The naturalization of this assumption puts further emphasis on "other" categories and the need for their regulation. Beyond this assumption, however, the way economic migrants are envisioned as part of their imagined communities does differ. From Canada's perspective these individuals are those who will effectively integrate into Canada due to their formal skills and capacity to contribute economically. Additionally, these are the individuals who will help to form Canada's version of a "multicultural" society. For Australia, their integration is not of concern, nor are their economic contributions heavily emphasized in the policy, instead it is indicated that an economic migrant in the eyes of Australia is one who is considered to be a lawful non-citizen whose presence is tolerable. The strong neoliberal approach is overall more

overtly present in Canada's policy in comparison to Australia's, however, the media coverage in Australia does bring in a neoliberal lens to assess immigration.

The other immigration categories have been developed in contrast to the economic migrant, and thus they are often problematized through being depicted as economic burdens and less relatable to the notion of what it means to be Canadian or Australian. Canada and Australia both differentiate categories along the same lines, however, their policies and media coverage tend put more emphasis on different categories and establish different relationships with these categories. For example more discussion and distinction is made for family unification and caregiver streams in Canada, with a relationship between these categories and the country strongly relying on the economic benefits that can arise from the presence of family and caregiving support. In Australia, these categories were broadly discussed in policy and left largely undeveloped in the news media articles reviewed.

Another noteworthy differentiation to discuss here are the relationships that have been developed between refugee categorization and the nations' identities. For Canada, offering support to those facing persecution is a part of Canada's identity and humanitarian tradition. Yet this image of Canada is at odds with its neoliberal values, which frames non-economic categories as a potential threat to the nation. Australia, on the other hand, has established a strong and maybe less contradictory stance in relation to asylum seekers, specifically those who arrive unauthorized, seeing refugees as non-citizens who pose as a security threat to the nation.

Despite these differences, both countries, through how they differentiate the categories highlighted above, indirectly establish a hierarchy of categorization that

privileges economic migrants and devalues refugees, or maritime arrivals in Australia's case. The severity of association developed between applicants and the categories they have been placed into as well as the significance of the implications that result from such association seems to depend on one's position in this hierarchy. The differentiation between categories and thus the implications of such categorization is less distinguishable in Australia's policy and media coverage, with the strongest distinction made in both policy and media framing being between unauthorized maritime arrivals and all other immigrants. Canada on the other hand more explicitly differentiates categories specifically with regards to how they see these categories contributing to the national economy, allocating rights such as permanent residency status, citizenship, and ability to work accordingly.

From an intersectional perspective, the implications of this hierarchy in both Canada and Australia run deep. When taking into consideration who tends to fall into the categories discussed and the rights that are afforded or restricted according to one's categorization, it becomes evident that the hierarchy developed effectively contributes to the perpetuation of immigration-based inequality impacting those most marginalized in society. In both countries, gender, race, and ethnicity are contributing factors as to which category one is more likely to be placed in. Often times, as has been demonstrated, women and those from non-western countries are more likely to be admitted into the country through immigration streams that provide fewer opportunities and rights for applicants than the economic migrant stream. Again, for those who identify with more than one of these identifiers, these implications are compounding.

Points Allocation

Point systems are used by both Canada and Australia as a method to determine what it means to be an economic migrant. Points are allocated for specific skills and attributes, which are seen to positively contribute to the economic prosperity of the country. Applicants are required to receive a certain number of points, which tends to fluctuate according to the needs of the country, in order to qualify to move forward in the application process to becoming an economic migrant.

It is important to interrogate these systems as they provide useful insight into, first and most broadly, how immigration policy, as a technology of government, is able to incorporate non-economic aspects of one's identity into the realm of the economic. Second, an analysis of point systems provides more context as to how this technology is both individualizing and totalizing at the same time, and as such, how it reduces applicants to human capital. Third, and more specifically, by analyzing what attributes points are allocated to, one can get a sense of not only what is unequivocally valued by the country in it is applicants, but also which aspects of one's identity do not receive any recognition or in fact may hinder a person's ability to accumulate more points. It is at this intersection where identifiers of race, gender, and ethnicity are most explicitly pronounced.

Comparison Between Canada's and Australia's Point Systems for Skilled Migration

Canada's Immigration and Refugee Protection Act does not address the points system nor does it go into any detail as to how one is determined to have the "ability to become economically established" (Minister of Justice, 2017, p.15). The absence of the point

system in the policy may be a result of the fact that the point system and the economic

migrants it evaluates have been naturalized and less problematized than other

immigration categories in Canada. As a result there is less need to regulate this aspect of

immigration through policy. Within Australia's Migration Act, the point system is

alluded to in Subdivision B of Division 3, Part 2. However, details of the point system

and what skills or attributes are assessed are not provided. This may also be an indication

of how, though economic migrants are more highly valued and thus less problematized

through policy and media framing, they are still considered non-citizens and distinct from

the identity of Australians. The fact that details around points allocation are not described

in either policy document also brings attention to how economic migration criteria are

left malleable in order to ensure the needs of the market are always achieved. In light of

the lack of detail in Australia's policy, and due to the fact that Canada's point system was

not discussed at any length in their policy, this section will rely on the most updated point

system provided on Canada's and Australia's Immigration websites in addition to

analyzing Subdivision B of Australia's Migration Act. The following table summarizes

these point systems. Please see appendix (A) and (B) for a detailed version of Canada's

and Australia's point systems and appendix (C) for the full text of Subdivision B of

Division 3, Part 2 of Australia's Migration Act.

Canada's Point System	Australia's Point System
The Comprehensive Ranking System (CRS) is the points-based system we use to assess and score your profile and rank you in the Express Entry pool. The CRS gives you a score from your profile answers, including your:	93 Determination of applicant's score (1) The Minister shall make an assessment by giving the applicant the prescribed number of points for each prescribed qualification that is satisfied in relation to the applicant. (2) In this section: *prescribed means prescribed by* *regulations in force at the time the*

	assessment is made.
A. Core / human capital factors • Age • Level of Education • Official Language Proficiency	A. Age
	B. English
B. Spouse or common-law partner factors (if applicable) • Age • Level of Education • Official Language Proficiency	C. Education / Qualifications • A Doctorate degree or Bachelor degree from an Australian educational institution or from another educational institution that is of a recognized standard. • A diploma or trade qualification completed in Australia • An award or qualification recognized by the relevant assessing authority for your nominated skilled occupation. • Australian study requirement
C. Skill transferability factors • Education • Foreign work experience – With good official language proficiency • Foreign work experience – With Canadian work experience	D. Skilled Employment • Skilled employment in the last 10 years – outside Australia • Skilled employment in the last 10 years – in Australia
D. Additional points / Adaptability • Your spouse or partner's language level • Your past study in Canada • Your spouse or partner's past study in Canada • Your past work in Canada • Your spouse or common-law partner's past work in Canada • Arranged Employment in Canada • Relatives in Canada • Provincial or territorial nomination	E. Other • Accredited in a community language • Study in regional Australia or a low population growth metropolitan area that meets the Australian study requirement • Partner skill qualifications Professional year in Australia

The point systems outlined here are suggestive in a few ways. First, one can start with the term "skilled worker" or someone who would be eligible to apply for the Skilled Independent Visa. An ideal or highly-ranked skilled worker, according to both systems, is one who has a strong ability to speak the national language(s), English and/or French,

holds a PhD from a university in the country or from a foreign institution that is equivalent with several years of full-time paid experience and a standing job offer in a high-ranking position according to the latest occupation list. In addition, they are within the age range of 18 to 35, and if applying to immigrate to Canada have family that live and hold permanent residency in Canada. Lastly, if they have a spouse or partner, they too have full-time work experience and education from a recognized institution and if applying to migrate to Canada also have family residing there. As was expected, due to the lack of focus on family migration channels in Australia, less emphasis is put on family relations and the associated skills of the partner of a primary applicant in Australia in comparison to Canada when defining a suiting candidate.

This description of the ideal candidate offers a clear demonstration of how the term skill has been defined in both point systems. As explicitly stated in the language skills section of Canada's point system and also implicitly indicated through point allocation in both systems, skills are considered to be only those capacities that are seen to positively contribute to the formal economy. Both countries differentiate between employment and education received outside of Canada and Australia and the experience and knowledge gained within these countries. This differentiation is further cemented through the way that points are allocated. As demonstrated in Australia's "Skilled Employment" section, the policy equates one to two years of employment in Australia to three to four years of employment outside of Australia. Similarly, section C of Canada's policy also differentiates experience gained outside of Canada from experience received in Canada. At a superficial level this experience equation seems quite neoliberal and calculated. However, the act of effectively diminishing the weight that experience and

knowledge gained outside of Australia or Canada carry and privileging that which is received from within is not necessarily in line with neoliberal logic. With no tangible explanation or way to demonstrate why two years of employment in Australia is equivalent to four years outside, this stipulation comes across as largely a way to build up the image of the nation and privilege domestic experience over foreign experience.

The strong focus on formal employment and education from accredited institutions stems from an underlying neoliberal ideology, which is seen here to determine the value of an individual in economic terms according to their perceived ability to contribute to the market. Through this approach the point system becomes both individualizing, by deconstructing an applicant into a series of points, which essentially serves as an indication of their worth as human capital, and totalizing, as it attempts to incorporate non-economic aspects of one's identity like age and family into the economic equation. The neoliberal imperatives of this project are quite distinct and unambiguous in Canada's point system in comparison to Australia's points table and category descriptions, which come across as more subtle. The use of the terms "human capital", "positive labour market impact assessment", and "skilled" in addition to the strong focus on education, work experience and language to help "you in the Canadian job market" all serve to reinforce a neoliberal ideology at the expense of other ways of understanding immigration. In Australia's points table the points allocated to factors such as studying "in regional Australia or a low population growth metropolitan area" also clearly reinforce the association of applicants to human capital and the use of immigration as a way to stimulate the economy where growth is stagnant. In addition, their use of the term independent to describe a skilled worker is also noteworthy for supporting the

preconceived notion of dependency often associated with other avenues of migration. The identity of those who not have work experience and education from Australia or an equivalent alternative are constructed as in need of support and less able to positively contribute to national interests. Again, when looking at who is more likely to come through other migration channels due to how this skilled migration stream filters applicants, this implied notion of dependency contributes to the perpetuation of gender stereotypes and the superiority of western over non-western applicants.

Continuing with this neoliberal thread and its implications, one last aspect that should be highlighted is how the definition of skill puts the onus of skill attainment on the individual applicant. Consequently, when calculating the value of an applicant, these systems fail to acknowledge the societal barriers that might limit one's ability to obtain such skills. In this way the exclusive definition developed here ultimately privileges very few applicants while disadvantaging most others.

The point systems' narrow focus not only attributes value to certain skills with no regard to one's circumstances and opportunities, or lack thereof, to obtain such skills, it also indirectly devalues other important talents such as those traditionally associated with the private sphere (Boucher, 2007). From this view, these systems play a significant role in the larger process of differentiation or social sorting being facilitated by immigration policy. The implications of this process of differentiation differ for each applicant often as a result of their intersectional positioning, and it is through further deconstruction of these implications that the systematic racial and gender-based discrimination, which implicitly informs the identity of the citizen and the Other, is exposed.

As Phillips and Taylor (1986) state, "our understanding of skill is informed by social stratification based on class, gender, race and educational status" (p. 54). Looking at the point systems' definition of skill, the attributes valued are strongly associated with high socioeconomic status from a western country. As a result of the systemic discrimination that has and continues to devalue and suppress women and people of color, those most devalued by this system are often women from non-western countries. They are less likely to have strong English or French speaking skills due to holding positions in the private sphere or informal sectors where English is less often used (Boucher, 2007; 2016). Additionally, access to formal education is not always available for female students due to societal barriers. And, for those who do speak fluent English and/or French and have formal education, the likelihood of having a non-linear career trajectory due to having a child or being required to take care of an elder, traditionally seen to be a job for women, has negative implications on their work experience score. Lastly, due to the dominant patriarchal and neoliberal ideology informing how society views the contributions of women in the formal economy, as demonstrated through the current gender pay gap, where according to the International Labour Organization "globally, women only make 77 cents for every dollar men earn" (2016, p. 28), and the disproportionate percentage of men holding executive or leadership positions in comparison to women (International Labour Organization, 2016, p. 41), the opportunity to occupy a higher socioeconomic status is restricted.

However, it is not enough to identify how Canada's and Australia's point systems discriminate along intersectional lines as result of societal barriers restricting opportunities to obtain these skills. It is imperative that to develop a new understanding

of what skill can be and what it means to be a contributing member of society that acknowledges and embraces the different attributes with which applicants identify. As such this study also strives to show how, through subverting the categorization of skills and point allocation, one can expose the skills or attributes that are left unrecognized and the implications of their devaluation. For example, from this analysis it became clear that the skills used in the informal or private sectors, the emotional labour required to support another individual, the experience gained outside of the formal economy and the knowledge and expertise that comes with age are stated here to not be of value in the Canadian and Australian market. Additionally, it is seen to be appropriate and natural for economic migrants, especially in Canada, to require support from their partners and family members and still be viewed as independent, but it is unimaginable for applicants in other streams to be viewed as strong contributing individuals, making it unacceptable for these individuals to require assistance when given fewer rights and privileges than their economic migrant counterparts. The consequence of refusing to recognize these skills and the resilience and potential of these individuals is that a hierarchy of skill and dependency is developed and further maintained through how rights and privileges are assigned. From this perspective it becomes clear that the intersecting aspects of one's identity within this point system can be compounded, as a result of being unable to obtain recognized skills, by being associated with less valued skills, and by being placed in a subordinate position of dependency and inferiority, to significantly disadvantage particular groups of applicants. This inequality is maintained through placing those who it privileges in a position to obtain permanent residency and the opportunities associated with having such a status, a right not necessarily afforded to other applicants. Without

acknowledging the value of all skills and potential of all applicants and by not providing these rights and opportunities to all applicants the cycle of inequality continues, discrimination along the lines of race, ethnicity and gender is further institutionalized and the institutions of domination are maintained.

Through conducting a critical discourse analysis of the news media framing surrounding economic migration in Canada and Australia, it became clear that this perspective is also reiterated and solidified in the articles reviewed. In Canada specifically, for example, *The Globe and Mail* article associates an increase of economic migration through the skilled worker stream with the notion that it "is crucial to Canada's economic prosperity" (Friesen, 2014). This statement is developed in contrast to the live-in caregiver program, which was associated with mothers who are seeking more rights. This differentiation demonstrates the distinction made between skilled workers and other streams and indirectly reinstates the definition of skill developed in the point system. At another level this contrast also plays on gender stereotypes and the devaluation of women by associating a feminized channel with the need of support and also separating it from the skilled category. This alludes to the idea that the skills used as a live-in caregiver are not skills that can be recognized in the skilled migration process. Again, in the *Toronto Star* article, this point system is considered "the mainstay of the new economic immigration to Canada", which is discussed as a natural conclusion in contrast to the problems of "fake asylum claims" and "fraudulent immigration marriages" indirectly identified with the refugee and family reunification streams (Black, 2015). Lastly, the *CBC* article also, through describing skilled immigrants as "young" and "highly skilled," naturalizes their privileged position and the rights they receive, such as "fast-tracking

permanent residency" due their ability to "fill the country's labour needs" ("Justin Trudeau", 2015).

In the Australian news articles reviewed, the concept of skilled migration is largely left unquestioned. The factors highlighted in the table above are also used, perhaps more overtly than in Canada's news coverage, to judge and either discount or recognize refugees and immigrants from other streams. For example, the *Sydney Morning Herald* article both problematizes asylum seekers by highlighting the then-Immigration Minister's quotes on how "They won't be numerate or literate in their own language, let alone English" and that they "would be unemployed", while also acknowledging the contributions of asylum seekers, "refugee young people" specifically, and their ability to be "ambitious in their educational and career goals", in contrast to the Minister's comments (Bourke, 2016). The *Australian* article takes a similar stance through highlighting the problems associated with refugees using the point system criteria on the one hand and on the other using the criteria to develop a counterargument by demonstrating how refugees can learn English and create jobs (Baxendale & Lewis, 2016).

To summarize this comparison then a few things can be said. As demonstrated, both Canada and Australia are strongly influenced by neoliberal ideology. However, the extent to which their point systems are totalizing from a Foucauldian lens seems to be dependent on how immigrants are developed as part of the imagined community. For Canada, immigrants, especially skilled migrants, are seen to have a stronger and more integrated presence in Canada's imagined community. On the other hand, for Australia there is a distinct line drawn between non-citizens and citizens, regardless of how skilled

an applicant is. The inability to envision immigrants as part of the imagined community limits the ability of the neoliberal ideal to infiltrate in the same way it does in Canada. From this perspective, the neoliberal influence is in a way more naturalized in Canada's immigration policy. This can be concretely demonstrated in the way both countries incorporate families and/or partners into their point systems. Canada allocates several points related to the skills or attributes of the primary applicant's partner and the presence of their families, which, as has been demonstrated, is understood to have positive economic implications. By contrast, Australia does not incorporate family in the conditions for the Skilled Independent Visa and only has one area where points for an applicant's partner applied.

Additionally, the fact that the point system was not discussed in Canada's legislation but was superficially developed in Australia's is also noteworthy. This difference also seems to play off the way in which both countries conceptualize immigrants in their visions of the nation. Skilled migrants, as discussed, have been more easily understood to have positive implications for the nation and thus need less regulation. However, the stronger hesitation surrounding immigration in Australia hinders the naturalization of skilled migration and translates into a need for regulation.

From an intersectional perspective, both point systems privilege some applicants over others. This privilege can be deconstructed to expose the way in which gender, race and ethnicity underlie these categories and contribute to how points are allocated. Those who are privileged are demonstrated to have formal education and work experience from the west as well strong language skills and are within a certain age. Those who receive the highest points in both systems are more likely going be White men form a western

country who have had the opportunity to receive higher education from a recognized institution and maintain continuous work experience, which ultimately allows them to obtain a higher position within a company or institution at a younger age. These opportunities can largely tied to the way in which they identify and the privilege they receive as result of societal views on gender and race.

In the news media framing analyzed for Canada and Australia, the point system is not directly addressed in either discourse. This may indicate the naturalization of the point system and the sense that there is nothing to question or challenge in the way both countries accept skilled migrants. Furthermore, the use of the term skilled in the news articles analyzed for both Canada and Australia holds a strong neoliberal undertone, which works to reinforce the neoliberal definition of what it means to be skilled. Other factors, which are identified in the point system, such as age, employment and language, are used to define skilled migrants as well as to undermine immigrants from other streams. This works to perpetuate the differentiation of categories and uphold current ideas around which attributes associated with an applicant are valuable and which are not.

Conclusion

From this analysis, it can be said that both government and news media institutions serve as systems of domination and oppression, which work to reinforce each other to maintain the privileged position of the English and/or French majority and perpetuate immigration-based inequality that exists along the lines of gender, race, and ethnicity. They do so through facilitating processes of differentiation, in this case immigration policy and news media framing of immigration, that effectively work to objectify or reduce applicants to

strictly human capital on the one hand, and on the other, subject these individuals to the identity of the Other, someone who can not be envisioned as part of the imagined community. Through the construction of the identity of the Other, the applicants' race, gender and/or socioeconomic status are positioned as less desirable due to their perceived inability to positively contribute to the market, thus justifying limits to their right to mobility. For some applicants this categorization process has a compounding negative effect, especially for women of color from non-western countries as was demonstrated. Lastly, these processes of differentiation establish a cyclical pattern where applicants are forced to use the categories and skills established by these systems to describe themselves, which in the end legitimizes the current system and perpetuates the current understanding of what it means to be valuable. This process of self-surveillance ultimately works in the favour of maintaining White patriarchal supremacy.

The relationship between policy and news framing is complex as there are instances when news media coverage functions to bring inherent contradictions or tensions between national identity and the role of immigration from a neoliberal perspective to the forefront. These moments are important as they serve as points where naturalized understandings of immigration and its synonymous relation to economic migration can be challenged and the destructive implications of these processes can be exposed. When these processes of differentiation do work in conjunction however, they essentially serve to uphold the systems of oppression by reinstating the socially constructed hierarchy.

Chapter 6: Privileging Association Through Post-Racial and Post-Feminist Policies

It seems to me that it is time to rethink the unquestioned freedom to associate. From the findings of this study, not only is the right to associate being privileged over the right to mobility, but in fact by taking away one's right to mobility immigration discourses are paradoxically also oppressing their right to associate with particular groups as they choose. So the question is not only whose mobility is being limited but also, through this process, how is their right to associate being denied? Privilege in this sense is having the opportunity to decide who to associate with and who to disassociate from without limiting one's own right to mobility, both physically and socially.

Reflecting on this study, the conceptualization and problematization of immigration in the policies and news articles reviewed ultimately work to secure these rights for some by denying the rights of others. In the case of Canada, this is justified through viewing immigration as a threat to Canada's version of multiculturalism and by developing an explicit tension between the universal rights of immigrants and the rights of the English and French majority. With regards to Australia, framing asylum seekers arriving by boat as an attack on national borders and developing the rights of immigrants in contradiction to the rights afforded or refused by policy also helps to justify limiting the universal notions of association and mobility. The differentiation between what it means to be Canadian or Australian and what it means to be an 'Other' is both an exercise of association/disassociation and a justification for affording some people with the right to mobility. In both a physical sense and a social sense, the right to mobility determines how certain subjects are conferred the opportunity to move within the social hierarchy, and by corollary, to decide who they wish to disassociate from.

Looking at the neoliberal and nationalist discourses that are understood to inform and rationalize the allocation of rights, an interesting tension arises. At first glance the policies and news media coverage of immigration seem to frame the concept in largely neoliberal terms. From a Foucauldian perspective, focusing on quantifying skill as a way to determine the eligibility of an applicant, as both individualizing and totalizing, is able to reduce applicants to an enterprise or series of measurable skills. Furthermore, it is also able to redefine the image of the nation into a vision of the economic. However, the tendency to differentiate between domestic and foreign skills and experience and the arbitrary nature in which they are measured does not align with neoliberal logic. This indicates that the image of the nation cannot be so easily determined in an economic sense and that the nationalist discourse cannot be simply viewed as synonymous for neoliberalism. This is important to identify, as there may be a tendency to write off issues of racism, sexism, and other forms of discrimination as purely an economic issue detached from the personal identifiers of those in lower social positioning (Goldberg, 2009).

As the title of this chapter alludes to and as has been developed through this thesis, the immigration policies of Canada and Australia have attempted to create a façade of being purely informed by the interest of achieving economic prosperity through regulating immigration. The uptake of this position is associated with the movement towards multiculturalism in both countries. However, as Melamed (2006) demonstrates, the relationship between economic prosperity and multiculturalism has resulted in "new categories of privilege and stigma determined by ideological, economic, and cultural criteria [which] overlay older, conventional racial categories, so that traditionally

recognized racial identities—black, Asian, white, or Arab/Muslim—can now occupy both sides of the privilege/stigma opposition" (pp. 2-3). In this way, policies are able to move past personal identifiers and avoid addressing the barriers faced as a result of intersecting attributes and the stigma associated with them. Melamed (2006) suggests that due to the fact that antiracism discourses have become so intertwined with neoliberalism, thus limiting the ability to address the prevalence of racism in immigration policies, the "fight against racism and the fight against neoliberalism [are inseparable]" (p. 21). In this vein, a focus on formal skill in immigration policies results in an inability to address the discrimination that occurs at the intersection of many personal identifiers, which can also be attributed to the postfeminist, neoliberal position these policies take.

By employing an intersectional lens, this thesis was able to move past the guise of neoliberalism to expose the inherent tension between these discourses and the discriminatory tendencies of the policies and news articles analyzed. From this perspective the neoliberal ideology largely served as a way for immigration systems to claim their position as unbiased and neutral, where applicants are rationally filtered according to their skills. However, as this study has shown, the skills and attributes valued as well as those devalued or unacknowledged, sometimes in contradiction to what is best for the market, privilege certain applicants, often elite White men from western countries, or those who strive to attain attributes associated with elite White men, over other applicants, especially women of color from non-western countries. This differentiation contributes to establishing and maintaining a social hierarchy largely based on race, gender, and ethnicity. Thus the unquestioned truth of neoliberalism serves to allow these systems to deny their discriminatory underpinnings and move past identity

identifiers to distance themselves from being seen as institutional structures that perpetuate immigration-based inequality.

Looking at the literature surrounding immigration policy and news media framing of immigration, this study has been able to contribute to the understanding of the relationship between immigration policy, news media, and identity in a few ways. First, it identifies a relationship between the larger systems of policy and media rather than focusing only on one, in order to show how, as systems of oppression, they intersect and work to maintain their positions through facilitating technologies of government or processes of differentiation. Second, this thesis offers a critique of the normative approach to studying immigration policy often taken up by scholars (Bhagwati, 2003; Castles, 2004; Duvell, 2005; Yu, Ouellet & Warmington, 2007). In this vein, I focus on problematizing the policy and its problematization of immigration rather than on policy effectiveness. Furthermore, the findings elucidate the ways in which neoliberalism and nationalism inform the conceptualization of immigration as a problem as well as the solutions put forth. Lastly, and for me most importantly, by applying an intersectional perspective, this study identifies the problems of taking only a gendered approach to the study of immigration policy, and as a result demonstrates how immigration policy has varying implications, which can be negatively compounding, depending on how one identifies intersectionally. In this way, this study deconstructs the problematization of immigration in policy and media, without rebuilding the system of White patriarchal supremacy and furthering the governing practice by advocating for more inclusive categories or the acknowledgment of traditionally informal skills (Phillips, 1996; Repo, 2015; Teghtsoonian, 2016).

This being said, it is important that the study not stop there, for as my personal experience developed in the introduction leads to me to believe, and as some scholars such as Waseema (2005) have shown, people who migrate and immigrate to a new country are not docile bodies. Though these systems and their conceptualization of immigration, skill, and what it means to be successful limit one's potential to achieve a neoliberal version of self-actualization according to gendered and raced barriers, individual migrants are actively engaging in the conceptualization of what it means to belong and what it means to be an Other. As Foucault says, "in relations of power, there is necessarily the possibility of resistance, for if there were no possibility of resistance – for violent resistance, of escape, of ruse, of strategies that reverse the situation, there would be no relations of power" (Foucault, 1987, p. 12). From this perspective, the overarching purpose of this thesis then, is to explore the dichotomy between what it means to belong and what it means to be an 'Other' and to expose how the differentiation of peoples informed by racial neoliberalism and its implications have been justified and thus naturalized. From here, an avenue to move this research forward would be to look at the active ways in which immigrants engage in challenging the systems of domination that maintain these taken-for-granted assumptions.

Being highly influenced by a governmentality and biopolitical approach, my study was limited in that I was unable to approach the question of belonging in a way that allowed me to uncover how individuals actually interact with the immigration process and news media framing. In addition, I was not in a position to determine if indeed they did internalize the identity constructed and further established for them by policy and news media or if they engage in some sort of resistance. Furthermore my method was

focused on deconstructing text as a source of discourse to essentially understand how policy and news media, as technologies of government, work to conduct the conduct of applicants. This approach to the method limited what could be considered discourse and the role that policy and news media were seen to play. Lastly, due to the limitations of this study, I was also unable to examine how other personal identifiers such as sexual orientation, religion, and ability were conceptualized.

In the future I hope to develop this research further in a couple of ways. I would like to take a more in-depth look at how personal identifiers identified in the study, as well as those I was unable to focus on, contribute to how one is categorized in the policy and the implications of this by collecting original data on who comes through each migration stream in order to provide an updated perspective. As well, building on my comment above, I hope to explore "counter-conducts" (Teghtsoonian, 2016, p. 343), or the unique ways in which those subject to the system traverse and challenge it. This could be done through interviews or other methods that attempt to involve the voices and perspectives of those it seeks to study.

To conclude on a personal note then, I would also like to reflect on my experience writing this thesis. As alluded to in the introduction, this was most definitely an emotional process and I cannot deny that I was personally invested. Acknowledging my personal stake in this project exposed my vulnerability and brought on a significant amount of pressure and doubt in my mind about whether I took this work far enough, and if it makes even the slightest impact on how society comes to understand the notion of immigration and those who they refer to as immigrants. In this way, conducting this study exposed the weight that comes with being imagined as an 'Other' and the tension one

inevitably engages in, actively or not, as they attempt to conceptualize their own identity. Moreover, it demonstrates how the implications of problematizing immigration and the solutions justified continue to be felt for generations. From this experience, as a first-generation immigrant and woman of color, I can say that it most definitely would be a privilege to have the ability and opportunity to be removed from what one researches (Cooper, 2018). But I can also say that having the space to explore the tension between what it means to be Canadian and what it means to be an 'Other', a tension I now realize I am constantly engaging with, and a space to channel my thoughts, emotions, and "eloquent rage" through the confines of the formal standards of the academic institution (Cooper, 2018), has been a fulfilling process.

References

Abu-Laban, Y. (1998). Welcome/stay out: The contradiction of Canadian integration and immigration policies at the millennium. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 30*(3), 190. Retrieved from http://link.galegroup.com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/apps/doc/A82883442/WHIC?u=ucalgary&xid=0f81735

Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso Books.

Bacchi, C. (2012). Why study problematizations? Making politics visible. *Open Journal of Political Science, 2*(1), 1-8. doi:10.4236/ojps.2012.21001

Banerjee, P. (2012). *Constructing dependence: Visa regimes and gendered migration in families of Indian professional workers* (Order No. 3558462). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1343688467). Retrieved from http://ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/docview/1343688467?accountid=9838

Bauder, H. (2011). *Immigration dialectic: Imagining community, economy, and nation*. University of Toronto Press.

Bauder, H. (2008). Immigration debate in Canada: How newspapers reported, 1996 – 2004. *Int. Migration & Integration, 9*(3). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/docview/213848267?pq-origsite=summon&accountid=9838

Baxendale, R., & Lewis, R. (2016, 5, 18). Federal election 2016: Dutton on refugees;

    Shorten in Sydney; Turnbull in Cairns. *The Australian*. Retrieved from

    https://www.theaustralian.com.au/federal-election-2016/federal-election-2016-

    dutton-on-refugees-shorten-in-sydney-turnbull-in-cairns/news-

    story/16e8096aa3081a62dc9cd306a25f9158

Beck, U., & Levy, D. (2013). Cosmopolitanized nations: Re-imagining collectivity in

    world risk society. *Theory, Culture & Society, 30*(2), 3-31. doi:

    10.1177/0263276412457223

Benson, S. (2016, 06, 21). Election 2016: Navy intercepts asylum seeker boat in first test

    of borders during campaign. *The Daily Telegraph*. Retrieved from:

    https://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/news/election-2016-navy-intercepts-asylum-

    seeker-boat-in-first-test-of-borders-during-campaign/news-

    story/d41e8445475bf3658048b3a1a4418d59

Berinsky, A. J., & Kinder, D. R. (2006). Making sense of issues through media frames:

    Understanding the kosovo crisis. *The Journal of Politics, 68*(3), 640-656.

    doi:10.1111/j.1468-2508.2006.00451.x

Bessant, J. (2002). The camps, a site of exceptionality: Australia's detention of asylum

    seekers. *Australian Journal of Social Issues, the, 37*(1), 1-29. doi:10.1002/j.1839-

    4655.2002.tb01108.x

Bhagwati, J. (2003). Borders beyond control. *Foreign Affairs, 82*(1), 98-104. Retrieved

    from http://ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-

    com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/docview/214307660?accountid=9838

Black, D. (2015, 9,18). Immigration and refugee policies centre stage in federal election

    campaign. *Toronto Star*. Retrieved from

    https://www.thestar.com/news/immigration/2015/09/18/immigration-and-refugee-

    policies-centre-stage-in-federal-election-campaign.html

Blackwell, T. (2015, 9, 3). Syrian refugee story adds new twist to tight race in

    Immigration Minister Chris Alexander's riding. *National Post*. Retrieved from

    http://nationalpost.com/news/politics/syrian-refugee-story-adds-new-twist-to-

    tight-race-in-immigration-minister-chris-alexanders-riding

Boucher, A. (2016). Gender awareness of skilled immigration policies across the OECD:

    Presenting the GenderImmi data set. In *Gender, migration and the global race for

    talent* (2). doi:10.7228/manchester/9780719099458.003.0002

Boucher, A. (2007). Skill, migration and gender in Australia and Canada: The case of

    gender-based analysis. *Australian Journal of Political Science, 42*(3), 383-401.

    doi:10.1080/10361140701513547

Boulus, P., Dowding, K., & Pietsch, J. (2013). Policy agendas and immigration in

    Australia 1996-2012. *Australian Journal of Social Issues, 48*(3), 299-318.

    10.1002/j.1839-4655.2013.tb00284.x

Bourke, L. (2016, 5, 18). Petter Dutton says 'illiterate and innumerate' refugees would

    take Australian jobs. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. Retrieved from

    https://www.smh.com.au/politics/federal/peter-dutton-says-illiterate-and-

    innumerate-refugees-would-take-australian-jobs-20160517-goxhj1.html

Bröckling, U., S. Krasmann, & T. Lemke. (2011). From Foucault's Lectures at the

    Collège de France to Studies of Governmentality: An Introduction. In

    Governmentality: Current Issues and Future Challenges. New York: Routledge.

Brown, W.(2015). *Undoing the demos: Neoliberalism's stealth revolution* (First ed.).

    New York: Zone Books.

Brucker, H., Hauptmann, A., Jahn, E., & Upward, R. (2014). Migration and imperfect

    labor markets: Theory and cross-country evidence from Denmark, Germany and

    the UK. *European Economic Review, 66*, 205-225.

    doi:10.1016/j.euroecorev.2013.11.007

Burman, J. (2016). Multicultural feeling, feminist rage, indigenous refusal. *Cultural*

    Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies, 16(4), 361-372. 10.1177/1532708616638693

Butler, J., & Spivak, G. C. (2007). *Who sings the nation-state? Language, politics,*

    belonging. London: Seagull Books.

Cabaniss, E., & Cameron, A. (2017). "unassimilable and undesirable': News elites'

    discursive construction of the American immigrant during the Ellis island

    years. *Discourse & Society, 28*(6), 614-634. doi:10.1177/0957926517710990

Carbado, D., Crenshaw, K., Mays, V., & Tomlinson, B. (2013). Intersectionality mapping

    the movements of a theory introduction. *Du Bois Review-Social Science Research*

    on Race, 10(2), 303-312. doi:10.1017/S1742058X1300034

Castles, S. (2004). The factors that make and unmake migration policies. *The*

    International Migration Review, 38(3), 852-884. 10.1111/j.1747-

    7379.2004.tb00222.x

CBC. (2015, 9, 25). Justin Trudeau promises to make family reunification easier for immigrants. *CBCNEWS*. Retrieved from http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/canada-election-2015-trudeau-immigration-reform-1.3243302

Cho, S., Crenshaw, K. W., & McCall, L. (2013). Toward a field of intersectionality studies: Theory, applications, and praxis. *Signs, 38*(4), 785-810. doi:10.1086/669608

Cisneros, J. D. (2015). A nation of immigrants and a nation of laws: Race, multiculturalism, and neoliberal exception in Barack Obama's immigration discourse: A nation of immigrants. *Communication, Culture & Critique, 8*(3), 356-375. doi: 10.1111/cccr.12088

Codd, J. (1988). The construction and deconstruction of educational policy documents. *Journal of Education Policy, 3*(3), pp. 235-247. doi:10.1080/0268093880030303

Collins, P. H. (2015). Intersectionality's definitional dilemmas. *Annual Review of Sociology, 41*(1), 1-20. 10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112142

Collins, P. H. (1998). Intersections of race, class, gender, and nation: Some implications for Black family studies. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies 29*(1), 27–36.

Constant, A., & Massey, D. S. (2002). Return migration by German guestworkers: Neoclassical versus new economic theories. *International Migration, 40*(4), 5-38. doi:10.1111/1468-2435.00204

Coole, D., & Frost, S. (2010). Introducing the new materialisms. In Coole, D. & Frost, S. (Ed.), *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics* (pp.1-46) Durham: Duke University Press.

Cooper, B. (2018, 2, 28). *In Defence of Rage: Black Feminist Political Resources for 21st Century Struggle.* University of Calgary.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1*(8), 139-167.

Crock, M. E. (2013). Of relative rights and putative children: Rethinking the critical framework for the protection of refugee children and youth. *Australian International Law Journal, 20*(20), 33-53.

Czaika, M., & Haas, H. D. (2013). The effectiveness of immigration policies. *Population and Development Review, 39*(3), 487-508. doi:10.1111/j.1728-4457.2013.00613.x

D'angelo, P., & Kuypers, J. A. (2009). Doing news framing analysis (1). *Doing news framing analysis: Empirical and theoretical perspectives*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group.

Deveaux, M. (1994). Feminism and Empowerment: A Critical Reading of Foucault. *Feminist Studies, 20*(2), 223-247. doi:10.2307/3178151

Dhamoon, R. K. (2011). Considerations on mainstreaming intersectionality. *Political Research Quarterly, 64*(1), 230-243. 10.1177/1065912910379227

Donoughue, P., Ford, M, & Blumer, C. (2016, 6, 8). Election 2016: 10 things vote compass reveals about voters' views on immigration. *ABC News*. Retrieved from http://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-06-09/election-2016-vote-compass-asylum-seekers-immmigration/7493064

Düvell, F., Molodikova, I., & Collyer, M. (2014). *Transit migration in Europe*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press.

Elrick, J., & Lightman, N. (2016). Sorting or shaping? the gendered economic outcomes of immigration policy in Canada. *International Migration Review, 50*(2), 352-384. doi:10.1111/imre.12110

Entman, R. (1993). Framing - toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication, 43*(4), 51-58. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x

Esses, V. M., Wagner, U., Wolf, C., Preiser, M., & Wilbur, C. J. (2006). Perceptions of national identity and attitudes toward immigrants and immigration in Canada and Germany. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 30*(6), 653-669. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2006.07.002

Fairclough, F. (2013). Critical discourse analysis and critical policy studies. *Critical Policy Studies*, 7(2), 177-197.

Fairclough, N. (2001). The dialectics of discourse. *Textus, 14*(2), 231-242.

Foucault, M. (2008). Ten: American neo-liberalism. In *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France 1978-1979* (pp. 239-266). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault, M. (2003). *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège De France, 1975-76*. New York, NY: Picador.

Foucault, M. (1987). The ethic of care for the self as a practice of freedom. In Bernauer. J. & Rasmussen, D. (Ed.), *The final Foucault* (pp. 281-301). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Foucault, M. (1984). Foucault. *Dictionnaire des philosophes*, 942-944. Retrieved from https://foucault.info/doc/foucault/biography-html

Foucault, M. (1982). The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry, 8*(4), 777-795.

Foucault, M. (1972). Two Lectures. In *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*. New York: Panthon Books.

Friedland, L. A., & Zhong, M. (1996). *International television coverage of beijing spring 1989: A comparative approach*. Columbia, SC: Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.

Friesen, J. (2014, 10, 31). Canada to open the door wider to 'higher calibre' immigrants. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/canada-to-open-the-door-wider-to-higher-calibre-immigrants/article21417126/

Githens, M. (2013). *Contested voices: Women immigrants in today's world* (First ed.). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making & unmaking of the new left*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Glenn, E. N. (2011). Constructing citizenship: Exclusion, subordination, and resistance. *American Sociological Review, 76*(1), 1-24. doi:10.1177/0003122411398443

Goldberg, D. T. (2009). *The threat of race: Reflections on racial neoliberalism*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell

Goode, E., & Ben-Yehuda, N. (1994). Moral panics: Culture, politics, and social construction. *Annual Review of Sociology, 20*(1), 149-171. doi:10.1146/annurev.so.20.080194.001053

Goodwin, N. (1996). Governmentality in the Queensland department of education: Policies and the management of schools. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 17*(1), 65-74. doi:10.1080/0159630960170105

Hajer, M.A. (2006). Doing discourse analysis: coalitions, practices, meanings (4). *In Words Matter in Policy and Planning, Discourse theory and method in the social sciences*. Utrecht, The Netherlands: Koninklijk Nederlands Aardrijkskundig Genootschap.

Hajer, M.A. (2003). A frame in the fields: policymaking and the reinvention of politics (3). In *Deliberative Policy Analysis : Understanding Governance in the Network Society*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

hooks, b. (1992). Eating the other: Desire and resistance. In *Black Looks: Race and Representation*. Boston: South End Press.

Howarth, D. (2010). Power, discourse, and policy: articulating a hegemony approach to critical policy studies. *Critical Policy Studies*, 3(4), 309-335. doi:10.1080/19460171003619725

Inda, J. X. (2006). *Targeting immigrants: Government, technology, and ethics*. Oxford; Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

International Labour Organization. (2016). *Women at work trends 2016*. Geneva, Switzerland: International Labor Office. Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_457317.pdf

Jones, B., & Mukherjee, R. (2010). From California to Michigan: Race, rationality, and neoliberal governmentality. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies, 7*(4), 401-422. 10.1080/14791420.2010.523431

Jorgensen, M., & Phillips, L. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method* (1st ed.). London: SAGE Publications.

Kim, S., Carvalho, J. P., Davis, A. G., & Mullins, A. M. (2011). The view of the border: News framing of the definition, causes, and solutions to illegal immigration. *Mass Communication and Society, 14*(3), 292-314. 10.1080/15205431003743679

Kretsedemas, P. (2008). Immigration enforcement and the complication of national sovereignty: Understanding local enforcement as an exercise in neoliberal governance. *American Quarterly, 60*(3), 553-573. doi: 10.1353/aq.0.0031

Kundnani, A. (2007). Seeds of segregation. In *Echoes of empire: racism, migration and the war on terror* (3). London: Pluto Press.

Lawlor, A. (2015). Framing immigration in the Canadian and British news media. *Canadian Journal of Political Science-Revue Canadienne De Science Politique, 48*(2), 329-355. doi: 10.1017/S0008423915000499

Lemke, T. (2002). Foucault, governmentality, and critique. *Rethinking Marxism: A journal of Economics, Culture & Society, 14*(3), 49-64.

MacIntosh, C. (2009). Domestic violence and gender-based persecution: How refugee adjudicators judge women seeking refuge from spousal violence-and why reform is needed. *Refuge, 26*(2), 147-164.

Mackey, E. (1999). *The house of difference: Cultural politics and national identity in Canada*. London; New York: Routledge.

Massey, D. S., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A. Pellegrino, A., Taylor, J. E. (1993). Theories of international migration: A review and appraisal. *Population and Development Review, 19*(3), 431-466. doi:10.2307/2938462

McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs, 30*(3), 1771-1800. doi:10.1086/426800

McKay, F. H., Thomas, S. L., & Warwick Blood, R. (2011). 'Any one of these boat people could be a terrorist for all we know!': Media representations and public perceptions of 'boat people' arrivals in Australia. *Journalism, 12*(5), 607-626. doi:10.1177/1464884911408219

Melamed, J. (2006). The spirit of neoliberalism: From racial liberalism to neoliberalism multiculturalism. *Social Text, 24*(489), 1-24. doi: https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/10.1215/01642472-2006-009

Menjívar, C., & Abrego, L. (2012). Legal Violence: Immigration Law and the Lives of Central American Immigrants. *American Journal of Sociology, 117*(5), 1380-1421. doi:10.1086/663575

Minster of Justice. (2017). *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act* (S.C. 2001, c. 27). Retrieved from http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/I-2.5/FullText.html

Office of Parliamentary Counsel Canberra. (2017). *Migration Act 1958* (62, 1985). Retrieved from https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/C2017C00309/Download

Ong, A. (2003). Introduction Government and Citizenship. In *Buddha is hiding: refugees, citizenship, the new America* (Introduction). Retrieved from https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca

Pateman, C. (1989). *The disorder of women: Democracy, feminism and political theory*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Phillips, K. (2009). Provocative women in the border zone: Articulations of national crisis and the limits of women's political status. *Continuum, 23*(5), 597-612. doi:10.1080/10304310903154719

Phillips, A., & Taylor. B. (1986). Sex and Skill. In *Waged Work, ed Feminist Review*. London: Virago Press.

Polson, E., & Kahle, S. (2010). Limits of national discourse on a transnational phenomenon: A case study of immigration framing in the BBC online. *The International Communication Gazette, 72*(2), 251-268.

Poynting, S., & Mason, V. (2008). The new integrationism, the state and Islamophobia: Retreat from multiculturalism in Australia. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice, 36*(4), 230-246. 10.1016/j.ijlcj.2008.08.001

Rabinow, P. (1984). "Introduction" In Rabinow, P. (Ed.), *The Foucault Reader* (pp. 3-28)*. New York: Pantheon Books

Razack, S. (1995). Domestic violence as gender persecution: Policing the borders of nation, race and gender. *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law, 8*(1), 45-88

Repo, J. (2015). Gender equality as neoliberal governmentality. In *The biopolitics of gender* (pp. 133-157). New York: Oxford University Press

Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon.

Scheufele, D. A. (1999). Framing as a theory of media effects. *Journal of Communication, 49*(1), 103-122. doi:10.1093/joc/49.1.103

Segal, U. A., Elliott, D., & Mayadas, N. S. (2010). *Immigration worldwide: Policies, practices, and trends*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Seidman, S. (1994). The French Poststructuralists. In *Contested knowledge: Social theory in the postmodern era.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell

Sen, S., Aguilar, J. P., & Bacchus, D. N. A. (2010). Migration, poverty, and risk of HIV infection: An application of social capital theory. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 20*(7), 897-908. doi:10.1080/10911359.2010.494961

Sokoloff, N. J., & Dupont, I. (2005). Domestic violence at the intersections of race, class, and gender: Challenges and contributions to understanding violence against marginalized women in diverse communities. *Violence Against Women, 11*(1), 38-64. 10.1177/1077801204271476

Spade, D. (2013). Intersectional resistance and law reform. *Signs, 38*(4), 1031-1055. 10.1086/669574

Teghtsoonian, K. (2016). Methods, discourse, activism: Comparing institutional ethnography and governmentality. *Critical Policy Studies, 10*(3), 330-347.

van Dijk, T. A. (2005). Critical Discourse Analysis, in *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Malden, Massachusetts, USA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Viruell-Fuentes, E. A., Miranda, P. Y., & Abdulrahim, S. (2012). More than culture: Structural racism, intersectionality theory, and immigrant health. *Social Science and Medicine, 75*(12), 2099-2106. 10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.12.037

Vukov, T. (2003). Imagining communities through immigration policies: Governmental regulation, media spectacles and the affective politics of national borders. *International Journal of Cultural Studies, 6*(3), 335-353. doi:10.1177/13678779030063006

Winseck, D., & Jin, D.Y. (Eds.). (2011). *The Political Economies of Media: The Transformation of the Global Media Industries*. London: Bloomsbury Academic. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781849664264

Yu, S., Ouellet, E., & Warmington, A. (2007). Refugee integration in Canada: A survey

    of empirical evidence and existing services. *Refuge, 24*(2), 17.

Yuksekdag, Y. (2012). Moral cosmopolitanism and the right to immigration. *Public*

    Reason 4(2), 262-272.

Zylinska, J. (2004). The universal acts: Judith Butler and the biopolitics of immigration.

    Cultural Studies, 18(4), 523-537. 10.1080/0950238042000181647

Appendix

Canada

Federal Skilled Workers (Express Entry) Selection Factors

https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/services/immigrate-canada/express-entry/become-candidate/eligibility/federal-skilled-workers/six-selection-factors-federal-skilled-workers.html

Express Entry candidates are scored using the Comprehensive Ranking System. If your skills and experience qualify you as a federal skilled worker, we will also assess you on six selection factors. **If you score 67 points or higher (out of 100)**, you may qualify to immigrate to Canada as a federal skilled worker. **If you score lower than the pass mark of 67 points,** you won't qualify to immigrate to Canada as a federal skilled worker. **Point grids for each factor:**
Language skills **(Maximum 28 points)** Being able to communicate and work in one or both of Canada's official languages is very important. Knowing English, French or both helps you in the Canadian job market. You can get up to 28 points for your skills in English and French. We'll give you points based on your ability to: - write   - read   - listen   - speak
Education **(Maximum 25 points)** To get points for your education: If you went to school in Canada, you must have a certificate, diploma or degree from a Canadian: - secondary (high school) or   - post-secondary school   If you have foreign education, you must have: - an Educational Credential Assessment (ECA) report from an approved agency showing that your foreign education is equal to a completed certificate, diploma or degree from a Canadian: - secondary (high school) or   - post-secondary school

Education	Maximum 25 points
University degree at the Doctoral (PhD) level or equal	25 points
University degree at the Master's level or equal OR University level entry-to-practice professional degree (or equal). Occupation	23 points

related to the degree must be:
- NOC 2016 Skill Level A, and
- licensed by a provincial regulatory body

Two or more Canadian post-secondary degrees or diplomas or equal (at least one must be for a program of at least three years)	22 points
Canadian post-secondary degree or diploma for a program of three years or longer, or equal	21 points
Canadian post-secondary degree or diploma for a two-year program, or equal	19 points
Canadian post-secondary degree or diploma for a one-year program, or equal	15 points
Canadian high school diploma, or equal	5 points

Experience
(Maximum 15 points)
You can get points for the number of years you've spent in full-time paid work (at least 30 hours per week, or an equal amount of part-time).

National Occupational Classification (NOC)
The NOC is a system used to classify jobs in the Canadian economy. It describes duties, skills, talents and work settings for different jobs. We use the 2016 edition of the NOC to assess skilled worker applications.

Experience	Maximum 15 points
1 year	9
2-3 years	11
4-5 years	13
6 or more years	15

Age
(Maximum 12 points)
You'll get points based on your age on the day when we get your application.

Age	Points
Under 18	0
18-35	12
36	11
37	10
38	9
39	8
40	7
41	6
42	5
43	4
44	3
45	2
46	1

47 and older	0	

Arranged employment in Canada
(Maximum 10 points)

You can get points if you have a, full-time job offer of at least one year from a Canadian employer. You must get the job offer before you apply to come to Canada as a federal skilled worker.

A valid job offer has to be:
- for continuous, paid, full-time work that is:
  - not seasonal
  - for at least one year
- in an occupation listed as Skill Type 0 or Skill Level A or B of the NOC.

You can get 10 points for a valid job offer. To be valid, one of these cases must apply:
1. You currently work in Canada on a temporary work permit and
   - your work permit is valid both when you apply and when the visa is issued (or you're authorized to work in Canada without a work permit when your visa is issued)
   - we issued your work permit based on a positive Labour Market Impact Assessment (LMIA) from Employment and Social Development Canada (ESDC). Your employer would've applied for the LMIA, which you then had to attach to your application to us
   - you're working for an employer named on your work permit who has made a permanent job offer based on you being accepted as a skilled worker
2. You currently work in Canada in a job that is exempt from the LMIA requirement under:
   - an international agreement (such as, the North America Free Trade Agreement) or
   - a federal-provincial agreement and
     - your work permit is valid both when you apply and when the visa is issued (or you're authorized to work in Canada without a permit when your visa is issued)
     - your current employer has made a permanent job offer based on you being accepted as a skilled worker
3. You currently don't:
   - have a work permit, or
   - plan to work in Canada before you get a permanent resident visa

OR

you're currently working in Canada and a **different** employer has offered to give you a permanent full-time job

OR

you're currently working in Canada in a job that is exempt from a Labour Market Impact Assessment, but **not** under an international or federal-provincial agreement

AND

an employer has:
- made you a permanent job offer based on you being accepted as a skilled worker and

▪ a positive LMIA from ESDC	

Adaptability
(Maximum 10 points)
If you have a spouse or common-law partner who will immigrate with you to Canada, they can earn points for adaptability too. You can only get points for each item once.

The maximum number of points in this section is 10.

Adaptability	Maximum 10 points
Your spouse or partner's language level Your spouse or common-law partner has a language level in either English or French at CLB 4 level or higher in all four language abilities (speaking, listening, reading and writing).	5
Your past study in Canada You finished at least two academic years of full-time study (in a program at least two years long) at a secondary or post-secondary school in Canada. Full-time study means at least 15 hours of classes per week, and you must have stayed in good academic standing (as set out by the school) during that time.	5
Your spouse or partner's past study in Canada Your spouse or common-law partner finished at least two academic years of full-time study (in a program at least two years long) at a secondary or post-secondary school in Canada. Full-time study means at least 15 hours of classes per week, and your spouse or partner must have stayed in good academic standing (as set out by the school) during that time.	5
Your past work in Canada You did at least one year of full-time work in Canada: 1. in a job listed in Skill Type 0 or Skill Levels A or B of the National Occupational Classification (NOC), and 2. with a valid work permit or while authorized to work in Canada	10
Your spouse or common-law partner's past work in Canada Your spouse / partner did at least one year of full-time work in Canada on a valid work permit or while authorized to work in Canada.	5
Arranged Employment in Canada You earned points under Factor 5: Arranged Employment.	5
Relatives in Canada You, or if it applies, your spouse or common-law partner, have a relative: • living in Canada • 18 years or older and • a Canadian citizen or permanent resident	5

This relative must be a:
  • parent
  • grandparent
  • child
  • grandchild
  • child of a parent (sibling)
  • child of a grandparent (aunt or uncle)
  • grandchild of a parent (niece or nephew)

The Comprehensive Ranking System (CRS) is the points-based system we use to assess and score your profile and rank you in the Express Entry pool.
The CRS gives you a score from your profile answers, including your:
  • skills
  • education
  • language ability
  • work experience
  • other factors
The CRS also gives you points for:
  • Canadian degrees, diplomas or certificates
  • a valid job offer
  • a nomination from a province or territory
  • other factors
We regularly send invitations to apply to the highest-ranking candidates in the pool. If you are invited, you can apply to immigrate as a permanent resident.

A. Core / human capital factors
  • Age
  • Level of Education
  • Official Language Proficiency

B. Spouse or common-law partner factors (if applicable)
  • Age
  • Level of Education
  • Official Language Proficiency

C. Skill transferability factors
  • Education
  • Foreign work experience – With good official language proficiency
  • Foreign work experience – With Canadian work experience

D. Additional points
  • Brother or sister living in Canada who is a citizen or permanent resident of Canada
  • Scored NCLC 7 or higher on all four French language skills and scored CLB 4 or lower in English (or didn't take an English test)
  • Scored NCLC 7 or higher on all four French language skills and scored CLB 5 or higher on all four English skills
  • Post-secondary education in Canada - credential of one or two years
  • Post-secondary education in Canada - credential three years or longer
  • Arranged Employment
  • Provincial or territorial nomination

Comprehensive Ranking System

https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/services/immigrate-canada/express-entry/become-candidate/criteria-comprehensive-ranking-system/grid.html#pointsA

The Comprehensive Ranking System (CRS) is the points-based system we use to assess and score your profile and rank you in the Express Entry pool.
The CRS gives you a score from your profile answers, including your:
- skills
- education
- language ability
- work experience
- other factors

The CRS also gives you points for:
- Canadian degrees, diplomas or certificates
- a valid job offer
- a nomination from a province or territory
- other factors

We regularly send invitations to apply to the highest-ranking candidates in the pool. If you are invited, you can apply to immigrate as a permanent resident.

A. Core / human capital factors
- Age
- Level of Education
- Official Language Proficiency

B. Spouse or common-law partner factors (if applicable)
- Age
- Level of Education
- Official Language Proficiency

C. Skill transferability factors
- Education
- Foreign work experience – With good official language proficiency
- Foreign work experience – With Canadian work experience

D. Additional points
- Brother or sister living in Canada who is a citizen or permanent resident of Canada
- Scored NCLC 7 or higher on all four French language skills and scored CLB 4 or lower in English (or didn't take an English test)
- Scored NCLC 7 or higher on all four French language skills and scored CLB 5 or higher on all four English skills
- Post-secondary education in Canada - credential of one or two years
- Post-secondary education in Canada - credential three years or longer
- Arranged Employment
- Provincial or territorial nomination

Australia

Skilled Independent Visa – The Points Table

https://www.homeaffairs.gov.au/trav/visa-1/189-
?modal=/visas/supporting/Pages/skilled/the-points-table.aspx

Age	
18 – 24 years	25
25 – 32 years	30
33 – 39 years	25
40 – 44 years	15
English	
Competent English	0
Proficient English	10
Superior English	20
Skilled employment in the last 10 years – outside Australia	
Less than 3 years	0
3 – 4 years	5
5 – 7 years	10
8 – 10 years	15
Skilled employment in the last 10 years – in Australia	
Less than 1 year	0
1 – 2 years	5
3 - 4 years	10
5 – 7 years	15
8 – 10 years	20
Qualifications	
A Doctorate degree from an Australian educational institution or a Doctorate from another educational institution that is of a recognised standard.	20
A Bachelor degree from an Australian educational institution or a Bachelor qualification, from another educational institution that is of a recognised standard.	15
A diploma or trade qualification completed in Australia	10
An award or qualification recognised by the relevant assessing authority for your	10

nominated skilled occupation.	
Australian study requirement	
At least one degree, diploma or trade qualification from an Australian educational institution that meets the Australian study requirement	5
Specialist education qualification	
A Masters degree by research or a Doctorate degree from an Australian educational institution that included at least two academic years in a relevant eld.	5
Other	
Accredited in a community language	5
Study in regional Australia or a low population growth metropolitan area that meets the Australian study requirement	5
Partner skill qualifications	5
Professional year in Australia	5

Subdivision B—The "Points" System

92 Operation of Subdivision

This Subdivision has effect where one of the prescribed criteria in relation to a visa of a particular class is the criterion that the applicant receives the qualifying score when assessed as provided by this Subdivision.

93 Determination of applicant's score

(1) The Minister shall make an assessment by giving the applicant the prescribed number of points for each prescribed qualification that is satisfied in relation to the applicant.

(2) In this section:

prescribed means prescribed by regulations in force at the time the assessment is made.

94 Initial application of "points" system

(1) An applicant whose assessed score is more than or equal to the applicable pass mark at the time when the score is assessed is taken to have received the qualifying score.

(2) An applicant whose assessed score is less than the applicable pool mark at the time when the score is assessed is taken not to have received the qualifying score.

(3) If an applicant's assessed score is more than or equal to the applicable pool mark, but less than the applicable pass mark, at the time when the score is assessed:

(a) the Minister must, unless the application is withdrawn, put the application aside and deal with it in accordance with section 95; and

(b) if the Minister puts the application aside—the Minister is taken to have put the application into a pool.

(4) Where, in accordance with this section, the Minister puts an application aside, he or she shall be taken for all purposes not to have failed to make a decision to grant or refuse to grant a visa.

95 Applications in pool

When section applies

(1) This section applies if the Minister puts an application into a pool.

How applications to be dealt with

(2) If, within 12 months after the assessment of the applicant's assessed score, the Minister gives a notice under section 96 varying the applicable pass mark or the applicable pool mark:

(a) the Minister must, without re-assessing that score, compare that score with the applicable pass mark and the applicable pool mark; and

(b) if that score is more than or equal to the applicable pass mark—the applicant is taken to have received the qualifying score; and

(c) if that score is less than the applicable pool mark—the applicant is taken not to have received the qualifying score; and

(d) if that score is more than or equal to the applicable pool mark but less than the applicable pass mark—the application remains in the pool until it is removed from the pool (see subsection (3)).

Removal of applications from pool

(3) An application in the pool is taken to have been removed from the pool at whichever is the earliest of the following times:

(a) the end of 12 months after the assessment of the applicant's assessed score;

(b) the earliest time (if any) when the applicant is taken to have received the qualifying score as the result of the operation of subsection (2);

(c) the earliest time (if any) when the applicant is taken not to have received the qualifying score as the result of the operation of subsection (2).

Removal from pool under paragraph (3)(a) treated as failure to receive qualifying score

(4) If an application is removed from the pool because of paragraph (3)(a), the applicant is taken not to have received the qualifying score.

Section to be subject to section 95A

(5) This section has effect subject to section 95A.

95A Extension of period in pool

(1) This section applies to an application that:

(a) is in the pool at the commencement of this section; or

(b) is put in the pool after that commencement.

(2) Section 95 has effect in relation to the application as if references in subsections 95(2) and (3) to 12 months were references to 2 years.

96 Minister may set pool mark and pass mark

(1) The Minister may, from time to time, by notice in the *Gazette*, specify, in relation to a class of visas, the pool mark for the purposes of this Act and the regulations.

(2) The Minister may, from time to time, by notice in the *Gazette*, specify, in relation to

applications for visas of a particular class, the pass mark for the purposes of this Act and the regulations.

(3) A notice under subsection (1) or (2) operates to revoke the previous notice under that subsection in relation to the same class of visas and also operates as a variation of the mark specified in the previous notice.

(4) The Minister shall cause copies of each notice under subsection (1) or (2) to be laid before each House of the Parliament within 15 sitting days of that House after the publication of the notice in the *Gazette*.

(5) This Act does not prevent a pool mark and a pass mark from being equal.

(6) This Act does not prevent a pool mark and a pass mark from being varied independently of each other.