

Permanent Worker, Temporary Resident:
Media Representations of Canada's Live-In Caregiver Program

by

Julia Sarah Jane Gilliland
BA, University of Victoria, 2008

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Anthropology

© Julia Sarah Jane Gilliland, 2012
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without the permission of the author.

Supervisory Committee

Permanent Worker, Temporary Resident:

Media Representations of Canada's Live-In Caregiver Program

by

Julia Sarah Jane Gilliland
BA, University of Victoria, 2008

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Margo Matwychuk (Department of Anthropology)

Supervisor

Dr. Hülya Demirdirek (Department of Anthropology)

Departmental Member

Abstract

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Margo Matwychuk (Department of Anthropology, University of Victoria)

Supervisor

Dr. Hülya Demirdirek (Department of Anthropology, University of Victoria)

Departmental Member

The Live-in Caregiver Program is a temporary foreign worker program that allows workers to come to Canada in order to labour as private caregivers for children, the elderly, and disabled individuals. This program allows caregivers to apply for permanent residency after the successful completion of 24 months of full time work. There are a number of scholars, advocacy groups, former caregivers, and other parties that have raised concerns about certain regulations of this program. For example, caregivers under this program have an employer-specific work permit, must live in the homes of the employers, and have no external monitoring of their work environments. Subsequently, the Live-in Caregiver Program has been seen as problematic because of the high number of abusive labour situations. This thesis is dedicated to an analysis of how the Canadian news print media represents the Live-in Caregiver Program. Although there has been much research done on migrant care work within Canada, and around the world, there are few studies on how the news media construct arguments that describe these transnational labour flows. The main topics that guided the research questions for this thesis were: temporary foreign worker programs; citizenship status; globalized, gendered, and racial stereotypes; the live-in regulation; employer specific work permits, and power relations in the labour relationship. This research was not geared to proving or disproving the main findings of key migrant domestic worker literature, rather it was focused on how these conclusions are interpreted, transferred and argued within a publically accessible format, Canadian news print media. This analysis revealed how journalists within Canadian news media construct important cultural narratives to persuade audiences to either reject the LCP as exploitative and problematic, or embrace it as economically beneficial.

Table of Contents

Supervisory Committee.....	ii
Abstract	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Acknowledgements	vii
Introduction	1
Research Topic and Questions: The Live-in Caregiver Program	1
Research Objective and Significance: Perceptions, Stereotypes and Strategies in the Media.....	5
Thesis Overview.....	8
Chapter One: Literature Review	12
1.1 Introduction	12
1.2 Terminology	12
1.3 A Brief History of Canadian Immigration/Migration Policy: The Changing Face of Migrant Care work in Canada.....	13
1.4 The LCP (current regulations, facts and figures).....	20
1.5 Theme One: Migration under the LCP.....	22
1.5.1 Who belongs? Citizenship and Entitlements.....	24
1.5.2 Gender, Race, Global Inequalities: Entangled Systems of Difference under the LCP	28
1.6 Theme Two: Labour Relations under the LCP	33
1.6.1 Private Sphere Labour and the Live-in Requirement: Living Where You Labour.....	34
1.6.2 Common Issues within the Employment Relationship: Long Hours, Low Wages, and a Lack of Regulation	37
1.6.3 Government Regulations and Migrant Rights: How the State “Regulates” Caregivers	38
1.7 Chapter Summary.....	41
2.1 Introduction	42
2.2 Materials: Print Media as Representation of the LCP.....	42
2.3 Critical Discourse Analysis as Fieldwork	43
2.4 Critical Discourse Analysis: Influential Research	45
2.5 News Discourse and Prejudice: Media in Canada	51
2.6 The Critical Analysis of News Documents.....	54
2.7 Chapter Summary.....	55

Chapter Three: Migration under the LCP	57
3.1 Introduction	57
3.2 Table of News Article Findings	58
3.3 The Link Between the Use of the LCP (as a TFW Program) and Canadian Economic Prosperity ..	58
3.3.1 Argumentation Strategies that Question and Condemn the use of Temporary Foreign Workers	59
3.3.2 Arguments that Applaud the Use of Temporary Foreign Workers	65
3.4 The promise of eventual permanent residency under the LCP as compensation	72
3.4.1 Inadmissibility under the LCP: Not Everyone Deserves Permanent Residency	77
3.5 Images of Canada and LCP Supply Countries	80
3.5.1 Global Stereotypes: Canada is the Land of Opportunity and the Philippines is not	81
3.5.2 Racial Essentialisms	87
3.6 Conclusion	90
Chapter Four: Labour Relations under the LCP	94
4.1 Introduction	94
4.2 The Difficulties of an Employer-Specific Work Permit	95
4.2.1 Work Permit: Narrative One	95
4.2.2 Employer-specific Permit: Narrative Two	97
4.2.3 Fraudulence and Illegal Labour under the LCP: Narrative Three	104
4.2.3.1 Undocumented Caregivers	106
4.2.3.2 Fraudulence within the Recruitment Agencies	110
4.3 Living Where They Labour	115
4.3.1 The Live-in Regulation	116
4.4 Labour Relations	119
4.4.1 Abusive Employment Situations	120
4.4.2 The Ruby Dhalla Case	125
4.4.3 One of the Family	131
4.5 Conclusion	133
Chapter Five: Conclusion and Future Research Opportunities	138
5.1 Introduction	138
5.2 Summary of Research	139
5.3 The Prevailing Narrative	142
5.4 What is Missing from the Prevailing Narrative	144

5.5 Permanent Residency as a Justificatory Strategy.....	146
5.6 Race and Gender- “Immigrants and Women”.....	149
5.7 Potential Future Research.....	155
5.8 Some Concluding Thoughts	156
Bibliography.....	160
Newspaper Articles	170

Acknowledgements

This research benefited from the support of many individuals. Thank you to everyone who enriched my life along the way, in particular I would like to acknowledge:

My supervisory committee: Thank you to Dr. Margo Matwychuk for your help with every step of this program and thesis, your comments always encouraged me to see the bigger picture. To Dr. Hülya Demirdirek, who supported me through this process, I will forever appreciate our conversations.

My friends: Thank you to Jen, Matt, Katie, Sarah, Adam, Susannah, Claudine, and Jess. You have all made my time in this program more enjoyable, thank you. Karin, you are a true friend. Alexa, Maggie and Maggie, I appreciate all the good times over the many years.

My family: Mom, Dad, April and Bill, thank you for the support, love, and laughs. I would never have come this far without you!

My partner: Kevin, you have stayed a loving friend through all these years. I am so lucky to have you by my side.

Thank you to the University of Victoria and the Department of Anthropology, for the financial support and teaching assistantships.

Introduction

Research Topic and Questions: The Live-in Caregiver Program

The current immigration policy could use a tweak or two. But until that happy day when the entire social structure does a backflip, and child care workers and women are paid what they're worth, the policy works. Any righteous fiddling by the federal government merely denies the reality in which working families live and limits opportunities for people in less prosperous countries. Yup, we exploit others in order to survive ourselves. But so far, I don't see a line-up for a revolution. (Faulder 1999, Edmonton Journal)

Over the past few decades, Canada has become increasingly reliant on the use of temporary foreign workers to fulfill specific needs within the national labour market. With an increase in the number of temporary workers entering Canada each year, it is important to raise certain questions around the use of temporary foreign workers to fill specific labour shortages within the country. According to census data, “the number of non-permanent residents that entered Canada in 2008 (399,523) exceeded the number of permanent immigrants of all types landed that year (247,243)” (Thomas 2010:36). As of December 1, 2011, there were 300,111 temporary foreign workers residing in Canada (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012). Although Canada has been following a points system for immigration (where individuals receive points based on variables such as age, education and occupation) since the late 1960s, it has also maintained special immigration classes and temporary foreign worker programs, such as the Live-in Caregiver program (LCP), that are used to target specific labour market goals. Specifically, the LCP and its predecessor programs were created to bring in migrant workers, often from less prosperous countries, to perform live-in caregiver labour within private homes.

The LCP is an interesting program within Canada because it bridges the temporary

foreign worker program initiative as well as the immigration program. As such, caregivers under this program enter Canada as temporary foreign workers (or migrants/visitors). However, if the caregiver complies with the necessary regulations and completes two years of full time work within a private home, then they are able to apply for permanent residency and work in an occupation outside of care work. Thus, because the LCP is a temporary labour program that potentially turns into an immigration program, it is important to research the migration, citizenship and labour aspects of the program.

A few of the regulations that apply to this program include a single employer work permit, a stipulation of living in a private home with your employers, and the inability to work for any other employers. Scholars who study this program have also highlighted some key theoretical concepts that are of importance, which include citizenship, employer-specific work arrangements, private sphere labour, gendered burden of care, inequalities between countries, the impacts of racialization on labour opportunities, the construction of skill, and power relations between employers and employees. Existing research on the LCP (see for example, Pratt 1997, 2005; Grandea & Kerr 1998; Stiell & England 1997a, 1997b; Bakan & Stasiulis 1994, 1997, 2003) has flagged certain regulations and practices of the LCP as inherently problematic. These include:

1. The caregiver has precarious rights connected with a temporary worker status, which leaves them vulnerable to exploitation from employers;
2. There is an employer-specific work permit rather than an occupation-specific work permit, which means that the caregiver is allowed to work only for the employer listed on their permit. This can give the employer considerable power over the employee. The process of changing employers takes a long time, which may lead caregivers to stay in an abusive

situation;

3. The mandatory live-in regulation leads to certain vulnerabilities, such as the employee being on-call 24 hours a day, inappropriate accommodation being offered, and the increased potential for abusive situations;
4. The two year full-time work experience component necessary to apply for permanent residency can be difficult to complete if a caregiver has to change employers or has other unforeseen circumstances;
5. Employers are rarely charged or reprimanded for exploitation of caregivers and instead, caregivers may be deported when problems arise;
6. There is no external monitoring of work environments, which increases the vulnerability of caregivers to abusive employment situations.

The Live-in Caregiver Program (LCP) was implemented for the sole purpose of allowing people to enter the country as migrants to work within a private Canadian home, performing elder, child, or other types of care. Notably, “the occupation ‘nannies and parents helpers’ has accounted for the largest single share of non-permanent resident workers since 1991” (Thomas 2010:41). Many factors have led to the increasing need for private caregivers in Canadian homes. Some of these factors include an “increase in women’s labour force participation, falling fertility rates, increasing life expectancy, changes in family structure, shortage of public care, and the increasing marketization of care in the North” (Fudge 2011:239).

The use of temporary foreign worker programs to satisfy private demands in domestic care work has a long history in Canada and has gone through various transformations. Currently, “while most nations have been reprimanded for their restrictive policies toward migrant domestic workers, Canada’s LCP has been commended by the UN Special Rapporteur on the rights of

migrants, and other nations have considered replicating the policy within their own borders” (Khan 2009:24). The LCP is often seen as innovative simply because it allows the chance for workers to apply for permanent residency status after a certain amount of time, an opportunity not afforded to migrant caregivers in other countries.

Through this research, I have performed a critical discourse analysis of Canadian news media articles that discuss the LCP, its participants, and larger issues that surround the use of the program. Since there are constant criticisms against the LCP from academics and advocacy groups, the purpose of this research is to understand how this program is discussed within newspapers, which is a format that is geared towards informing and engaging the general public. Thus, there are a few goals for this research: (1) I wished to locate the common arguments and assumptions that journalists utilize in order to discuss this program for consumption by Canadian audiences; (2) to understand how citizenship/permanent residency, temporary foreign workers, private sphere labour, LCP regulations, gendered burden of care, inequalities between countries, and power relations between employers and employees are understood and translated within the context of Canadian news media.

I explore how the LCP was discussed in print media published between 1992 and 2011. In order to understand how the LCP was described, it was important to address questions that explored a wide range of topics that were both migratory-related and labour-related. There were six research questions that guided the analysis:

1. How do journalists discuss, justify, or condemn the use of temporary foreign worker programs?
2. How do individuals discuss citizenship within these media discourses, and how is the potential for permanent residency status under the LCP interpreted within these articles?

3. Do journalists create, reinforce, or transform global, racialized, or gendered stereotypes?
4. How are the issues related to working in the private sphere discussed and understood by the journalists? Does the fact that the employee lives in their employer's home influence what the media say about the issue?
5. Do journalists discuss and acknowledge the regulations surrounding work permits and how this can greatly influence the labour experiences of women under this program?
6. Do journalists in the news articles recognize power imbalances within these situations?
Through the news discourses they create, can we understand what relationships, negotiations, and compromises emerge out of these labour situations?

Research Objective and Significance: Perceptions, Stereotypes and Strategies in the Media

The news articles I explored for this study revealed common perceptions, stereotypes, and strategies that were used by journalists to justify, question, or condemn the migratory and labour processes created by the LCP. Mainstream news articles are important because they are windows into what might be viewed as acceptable and how certain issues may be perceived within the larger Canadian populace. Beyond this, news reports often offer the audience a glimpse of a situation or issue, which they may never have known about otherwise. Such reports may have considerable influence on the readers' understanding of such issues, particularly considering if the report is the only source of information about the topic relied on by readers. Thus, the journalist's perspective may be extremely influential in forming public opinion. Indeed, Van Dijk (1993b:243) suggests that "media power is especially prominent in ethnic affairs because of the fact that large segments of the white public have little or no alternative information sources on ethnic affairs."

Discourse analyses have previously been conducted on the Canadian news media in relation to race and immigration (see for example, Bauder 2005, 2008a, 2008b; Mahtani & Mountz 2002; Hier & Greenburg 2002; Henry & Tator 2002). According to Henry and Tator (2002:31), there are three main ways to study racism in the media: “structural studies, which concentrate on media organizations and systems; behavioural studies, which focus on the reactions, perceptions, and effects of the media on audiences; and cultural studies, which involve analyzing meanings and language.” This research is best fit under ‘cultural studies’ because it focuses on the meanings and language used within the articles to construct certain images and arguments surrounding the LCP and temporary foreign workers.

It is difficult to state exactly how the media influences perceptions, or whether it has any major effects at all. In their literature review of media studies, Henry and Tator (2002) contend that there is little consensus among academics about what power media makers have, and what the relationship is between the production, circulation and consumption of information. As Chiapello and Fairclough (2002:186) note, “discourse may be more or less important and salient in one practice or set of practices than in another, and may change in importance over time.” Most critical discourse analysts believe that discourses “constitute objects of knowledge, situations and social roles as well as identities and interpersonal relations between different social groups and those who interact with them” however, how this process works is often hard to pin down (Wodak 2009:8).

One reason that media makers may be powerful for shaping events is that “the media have become, so to speak, the managers of public opinion by allocating space to and emphasizing the voices of those elites... and sometimes... those sections of the population at large- that they believe should be heard” (Van Dijk 1993b:281). Discourses can be integral to the

constitution of identity through the use of certain linguistic strategies such as comparisons, the creation of ‘concrete’ definitions, and the use of ‘us and them’ narratives. Henry & Tator (2002:4) underscore this idea by stating that “radio, television, the print media... are the elements out of which we form our identities... shape our sense of self, our understanding of what it means to be male/ female, and our sense of ethnicity, class, race, and national identity.” The term discourse is defined in this thesis as the “use of language in social contexts” or the study of what uses that language can be put to (Widdowson 1995:158).

Constable (1997:xiii) stresses the importance of understanding common perceptions of domestic workers, stating that “local forms of xenophobia, occupational and gender stereotypes, attitudes about ethnic, racial, and cultural differences, as well as local laws and government policies, all contribute to the difficulties faced by foreign domestics in their day-to-day lives.” This is a salient point because Constable is emphasizing how there can be a wide range of factors that can impact how temporary foreign workers are framed within the larger population. Perceived differences with regard to gender, race, class, skill level, education, and culture interweave to create specific stereotypes. Therefore, it is important to assess both the experiences created by migration, and how those experiences are perceived and given meaning by others.

Annelies Moors (2003:394) calls for an exploration of the “impacts that the mass-media and new means of communication have both on political debates about migrant domestic labour and on the daily lived experiences of domestic workers.” In recognizing the importance of how the mass media impacts such debates, this research also looked at how journalists, and those quoted in the articles, shape topics related to immigration, the value of care work, and the use of foreign sources to fill labour demands in Canadian markets. Sharma (2001:419) notes that even though there are many researchers who have looked at the labour conditions created by migration

for care work, “more attention needs to be paid to how the very categorization of people as migrant workers assists in the restructuring of the labour market in Canada.”

Sharma (2001) believes that the increasing reliance on temporary workers is possible only because the state is able to justify why certain people are not entitled to Canadian citizenship, and this is accomplished through the creation of an imagined Canadian community where certain people are constructed as being ‘Canadian.’ This means that we need to interrogate how we construct and give meaning to the word ‘migrant’ or ‘temporary foreign worker’ or ‘Canadian’ because this is integral to how the state can justify differential treatment of some categories of people over others. I believe the news media is a fruitful area to deconstruct notions of deserving and undeserving citizens, and what defines ‘Canadianness’ or ‘foreigner.’

Thesis Overview

This research is focused on news media discourses on the LCP and the individuals who are involved within the program. Specifically, I am interested in how the issues and processes identified as integral to an understanding of the program are discussed within news discourses. A critical discourse analysis of these texts allows for a better understanding of how the LCP and temporary foreign workers are framed and understood within a publically oriented format. In particular, this research is focused on both migration and labour issues that have been identified as problematic with the program. Chapter 1 will explore some key literature on migrant domestic workers, the Live-in Caregiver Program, and some theoretical concepts that are important to this research. The literature review will be divided into migration-related literature and labor-related literature. Under the migration theme, I am particularly focused on citizenship, transnationalism, the creation of different categories of workers, and the impacts of stereotypical assumptions involving gender, race, and class. For the labour theme, the analysis will concentrate on how the

news media constructs and understands the labour situations created under the LCP, particularly surrounding private-sphere issues, live-in requirements, government regulations, work permits, and power relations within the employment relationship.

Chapter 2 is a discussion of the methods and materials used for this study. There is a general description of the news articles used for this research, including how they were collected, the date range, and where the articles originated. I then review some theoretical frameworks that were most influential to my critical discourse analysis, as well as some influential methodological research topics and findings. There is also a brief summary of certain studies on Canadian print media and prejudice. The rest of the chapter is dedicated to describing the processes involved in my analysis of the news reports.

Chapter 3 concentrates on the analysis of news articles focused on transnational or migratory aspects of the LCP. The chapter is organized around the research questions laid out in Chapter 1. I begin by looking at the arguments used to discuss, justify or condemn the use of temporary foreign workers. In the next section, I focus on three different ways that citizenship is discussed within the articles for analysis. Firstly, citizenship is seen as compensation for the difficulties that workers experience under the program. Thus, the offer of residency status to workers is often framed as a justification for the existence of the LCP. Secondly, citizenship is framed within the context of familial separations, which is often used by authors as a way to show Canadian readers how much citizenship status means to these workers. Lastly, in the citizenship section, I focus on media discussions of instances of denial of permanent residency status and subsequent deportation.

The last section of Chapter 3 is dedicated to the third research question and concentrates on gender, racial and global stereotypes. In this section, I focus on the constant juxtaposition of

Canada with the Philippines to create globalized stereotypes of superiority, opportunity, and poverty. I also look at images of race or ethnicity that are created within the news articles.

Finally, I discuss issues of gender and how journalists discuss the female burden of care.

In Chapter 4 of this thesis, I look at how labour relations and regulations are discussed within the news articles on the LCP. In the first section, I concentrate on the live-in regulation and how it is discussed. The live-in regulation is mentioned in many of the articles in relation to abusive or exploitative work situations. Certain authors highlight the regulation as the main cause of abuse of caregivers by employers and the creation of certain unrealistic expectations, such as the notion that the worker is on call at all times. In the next part of Chapter 4, I focus on the employer-specific work permit and how it was discussed in some of the articles as potentially creating a more vulnerable work environment for LCP workers. As with the live-in regulation, the work permit rule is also a place where academic research is strongly reflected within the articles that discuss the LCP. Narratives created about the permit were also often discursively tied to unscrupulous recruitment agencies. In the last part of this chapter, I look at how journalists represent the labour relations between employer and employee. Although many of the authors discuss the vulnerability of caregivers under the LCP, there were some articles that emphasize positive labour situations where workers are treated well. Most of the journalists, however, focused on abusive working conditions, with some discussing actual cases and others acknowledging how certain factors can lead to caregivers becoming vulnerable to abuse.

In Chapter 5, I summarize my main findings of this thesis, while expanding on some key topics. I then look at some implications of the analysis, with a focus on citizenship, racialized perceptions, and the gendered burden of care. There is also a section on the prevalent narrative

that emerged through the analysis, as well as what I found to be missing from this narrative. In the last part of this chapter, I suggest opportunities for future research.

Chapter One: Literature Review

1.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will explore some of the key research around migrant care work and the LCP. First, I will briefly discuss the terminology used for this thesis. Second, in this chapter I will review some important historical context on Canada's use of foreign caregivers. I will then provide an overview of the current regulations that govern the program in order to understand the processes of sponsoring caregivers and gaining proper visas and permits. There will also be a brief description of what is required in the labour relationship under the program, including contract requirements. The aspects of migration relevant for this thesis will then be discussed, with a focus on citizenship, inequalities between countries, and perceived differences in gender, race, and skills. In the last section of this chapter, I look at the labour related aspects of the program, with a focus on regulations, and previous research on the labour environment created under the LCP.

1.2 Terminology

In this thesis, 'migrant' refers to an individual who is working in Canada with a temporary work visa, but is a citizen of another country. The term 'temporary foreign worker' refers to anyone who is on a temporary work visa in Canada. A 'permanent resident' is someone who has received permanent residency and has an open work permit, which means they can choose their occupation. For this thesis, 'migrant' and 'temporary foreign worker' are the most common terms used for a caregiver under the LCP, because until they successfully apply for residency, they maintain a migrant or temporary worker status.

This thesis will primarily utilize the term ‘live-in caregiver’ or ‘caregiver’ to refer to the individuals who work under the LCP. In media reports, a worker in this occupation is more commonly referred to as ‘domestic worker’ and ‘nanny.’ The term ‘domestic worker’ is also the most commonly used terminology for researchers of transnational caregivers; however, because the Canadian government uses the term ‘caregiver’ for workers under the LCP, I will also be favouring this term. This thesis will refer to caregivers from the Philippines as both “Filipino” and “Filipina” since these two terms are used interchangeably within academic and news media writing.

1.3 A Brief History of Canadian Immigration/Migration Policy: The Changing Face of Migrant Care work in Canada

The variations in, regulation of, and experiences of, different groups of domestic workers, thus suggests that there has been a continuum in status and socially constructed racial/ethnic desirability among foreign domestics, which corresponds to the racial/ethnic hierarchy constructed within Canadian immigration policy as a whole (Arat-Koc 1997:55).

In order to understand the current Live-in Caregiver Program, it is imperative to understand the use of migrant caregivers within Canada in a historical sense. This section explores some of the important transformations of migrant care work in Canada, revealing government-implemented migratory schemes that have targeted particular groups of women, based on simplified perceptions and stereotypical understandings of these different groups. According to Dill (1994:2-3), it is important to place domestic workers “within the changing context of the occupation, examining both its contradictions and limitations” in order to ascertain the impact of the occupation on the lived realities of these individuals. As it was stated in the introduction, there has been a long history of Canada using foreign labour to satisfy domestic demands, and it is important to understand past motivations and schemes in order to properly evaluate the current version of the LCP.

Live-in caregivers are often responsible for child or elder care, household chores, and other tasks the family may require. However, the symbolic capital of having access to domestic labourers should not go unnoticed, since the possession of a private caregiver is often viewed as a “status symbol” (Anderson 2000). The demand from private households in Canada for domestic labourers can historically be explained by a number of factors including the rise in standards of housekeeping during the nineteenth century (Arat-Koc 1997). A shortage of Canadian residents and citizens willing to labour in domestic service was partially created by industrialization and a proliferation of jobs for women in diverse areas such as “factories, hospitals, offices, retail outlets, and schools” starting in the nineteenth century (Arat-Koc 1997:59). There have been many attempts to secure individuals for cheap labour within domestic service; indeed, Fudge (1997:121) states that “domestic workers were the single largest category of paid female workers in Canada from 1871 to 1941.” The following paragraphs present a brief summary of Canadian immigration history in regards to caregiver programs.

Largely beginning during the nineteenth century, individuals of British origin started to migrate to Canada for labour in the domestic sphere. These women were not seen as permanent domestic workers; rather, they were perceived to be future wives who were able to run a “proper” Canadian household (Langevin & Belleau 2000; Arat-Koc 1997; Macklin 1992). Since these women were viewed as permanent settlers, there were no strict state regulations about how to control or organize their labour, although it is important to note that they did face class-based discrimination. Arat-Koc (1997) emphasizes that regardless of the fact that British women, and women from less desirable locations were performing the same type of labour they were treated differently based entirely on a racialized continuum of desirability constructed by Canadian understandings of race/ethnicity. Where domestics fell on this racial continuum influenced how

they were able to enter into Canada, what restrictions were placed on them, and what opportunities were open to them (Arat-Koc 1997).

By the beginning of the early twentieth century, demand from Canadian families for cheap labour became too great to be satisfied by immigration from Britain alone. Canada turned to Scandinavian countries, such as Finland, in the early twentieth century to actively recruit women for domestic service since continental Europe was seen as the next best area to supply racially acceptable caregivers (Arat-Koc 1997). Indeed, “an overwhelming majority of Finnish women who came to Canada in the early twentieth century were occupied in domestic service” (Arat-Koc 1997:67). The number of women coming in from these areas of Europe were still not enough to help populate the Western provinces, so the government turned to other “less desirable” sources, such as Eastern and Southern Europe (Hodge 2006).

For example, after the Second World War, Canada received over 165,000 displaced persons who had to labour in specific occupations for one year before gaining citizenship (Langevin & Belleau 2000). The state was still concerned with the racial composition of immigrants and “indicated ethnic and religious preferences” for these displaced persons (Arat-Koc 1997:70). These specific occupations included farming, mining, and forestry for men and domestic or care work in hospitals or private homes for women (Langevin & Belleau 2000; Arat-Koc 1997). The Canadian government preferred women from the Baltic States, because they were thought to be the closest to Scandinavian women, who were the favoured choice for domestic workers at the time (Arat-Koc 1997). The government also sought out Protestants, who “were a minority” among this group, unlike Jewish people, who were seen as “unsuitable” because of a lack of experience as domestics (Arat-Koc 1997:70). This program for displaced persons implied that the workers were tied to a certain employer on the contract; however, it was

not difficult to change employers (Arat-Koc 1997).

With the onslaught of the Cold War, migration from Eastern Europe became difficult, and Canada turned to Southern Europe, Barbados and Jamaica to satisfy the large demand for low cost caregivers (Langevin & Belleau 2000). There were several attempts to export individuals from Southern Europe, including in 1951, when Canada started a program to recruit women from Italy to work as domestic labourers (Arat-Koc 1997). However, after one year this program was terminated because these women were seen as too outspoken and ‘culturally backward’ to fulfill the requirements and expectations of Canadian households (Arat-Koc 1997). The failure of this program reflects the nature of domestic service and how it is often seen as desirable for these labourers to be docile and uncritical of their conditions. There were also limited and ultimately unsuccessful programs set up during the early post-war years to recruit women from Greece and Spain for domestic work. These individuals were expected to provide cheap labour, rather than being viewed as valuable additions to the Canadian population (Arat-Koc 1997).

Arat-Koc (1997:73) contends that, “women of colour in Canada have been a source of domestic workers during most of Canadian history, largely because they have been barred from exercising other labour-market options.” The Caribbean Domestic Scheme, as it was titled, began in 1955 and allowed Canadians to sponsor “single, childless women” from Jamaica and Barbados to labour in Canada as domestics from 1955-1967 (Oxman-Martinez *et al.* 2004:4). Since these women were not “desired” by Canadians, the government called this program a “favour” to the source countries (Arat-Koc 1997:75). The stipulation that women had to be young and without children could be seen as a way for the state to try and ensure that the caregivers would be docile, cheap, and easily exploitable. The single status was also to ensure that these women would be less likely to sponsor their own families for Canadian citizenship

(Arat-Koc 1997). This program allowed women to gain permanent residency after one year of labour within domestic service (Arat-Koc 1997). The Canadian government offered permanent residency status after the year of work because they assumed that these women would be unable to move on to a new occupation after gaining permanent residency (Arat-Koc 1997).

After 1967, Canada adopted the points system for immigration applicants, which ended the Caribbean Domestic Scheme. The points system allows the Canadian government to have more control over the occupational composition of immigrants by assigning potential individuals a number of points based on variables such as age, education, finances, training, and occupational demand (Green & Green 1995). An individual must be granted a certain number of points to be eligible for immigration to Canada, unless they qualify under the refugee class. Points are also given based on kinship ties to individuals who reside in Canada (Green & Green 1995). Therefore, non-refugee immigrants and those outside the temporary foreign worker category can enter in three different classes: (1) the family class (in this class, individuals do not go through the points system, but are granted citizenship based on being close family members with other Canadian permanent residents and citizens); (2) the independent class (in this class, individuals go through the points system and enter the country based on their “potential contributions” to the economy and society); and (3) the assisted relatives class (more distant kinship connections than immediate family who must still go through the point system, but are given “bonus points” for their kin connections) (Green & Green 1995:1009).

Arat-Koc (1997:77) contends that immigration officials in the 1970s, “deliberately and arbitrarily lowered the points awarded to domestic servants under the system to ensure that domestic workers did not qualify for entry as landed immigrants.” Thus, the points system is not a method of avoiding discriminatory regulation of immigration; rather, points are awarded based

on ideological assumptions about an individual's worth and potential value to Canadian society. The adoption of the points system also marked the beginning of importing domestic workers as temporary foreign workers. From 1973 to 1981, the government allowed women to come in as temporary foreign workers for up to three years as domestic labourers while living in a private home (Langevin & Belleau 2000). After receiving criticism for this temporary worker program, which did not offer the benefits of future citizenship status, Canada developed the Foreign Domestic Movement Program (FDM) in 1981 (Hodge 2006). This arrangement allowed individuals to apply for permanent residency in Canada after successfully completing two years of domestic labour in a private Canadian home. Therefore, under this program and the current LCP, workers enter Canada with a temporary worker status, which they maintain for the duration of the work experience component, and only after this time can they apply for permanent residency, and potentially gain a more secure status within Canada.

The Foreign Domestic Movement was replaced in 1992 by the Live-in Caregiver Program (LCP), which remains intact as of today. The LCP continued the FDM stipulation that the caregivers have to live-in their employers' home with a work permit, but required the caregiver to have higher levels of education and work experience. Therefore, to qualify for the LCP, an individual must have completed the Canadian equivalent of a grade 12 education, as well as have documents proving relevant labour or secondary education experience (Hodge 2006). Bakan and Stasiulis (1997a:34) view the immigration regulations put in place in the 1970s, prior to the FDM and LCP, as the beginning of the government's exploitation of an "indentured" workforce, where certain people are given a migrant or temporary worker status rather than permanent residency for their contributions to society.

Through the various avenues that Canada has explored to fill the gap in care options, it

becomes clear that perceived race/ethnicity, along with other constructions, are important factors for determining which caregivers are allowed to enter, and how those caregivers are treated by the state. Indeed, “in the period following Confederation, the state began not only to regulate immigration through legislation, but also to use immigration policy as the major means of actively controlling the racial composition of Canada” (Arat-Koc 1997:60). As the various programs developed historically to import caregivers shows, the state has relied on simplistic stereotypes to allow the “right kind” of women into the country. As Canada had to move away from Britain to find domestic workers, restrictions against these workers became more severe and the mobility of these women more controlled by the state. With the introduction of a point system, the government deliberately lowered the skill points for this occupation to ensure a temporary work force that would be easy to control, and also easy to dispose of depending on economic necessity.

Over the past twenty years, Canada has taken in close to 1% of the existing population in immigrants each year (Bissett 2009:4). These individuals tend to settle in larger numbers in Vancouver, Toronto, and Montreal (Bissett 2009). The number of temporary foreign workers living in the country is also increasing, from 199,165 residing in Canada in 2007, to 300,111 temporary workers resident in Canada for 2011 (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012). There have been a significant number of migrants entering Canada under the LCP, with 19,072 caregivers arriving in “Canada from 2003-2005” (Valiani 2009:11). As of 2010, there were 35,006 LCP caregivers residing within Canada (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2010b). Currently, the primary source country for the LCP is the Philippines, with these individuals making up about 95% of the Live-in Caregivers entering Canada in 2005 (Fudge 2011:247, Khan 2009:29). “Only 5%” of those admitted under the program in 2005 were male, making this

immigration stream highly feminized (Fudge 2011:247). The average profile of a domestic worker currently migrating under the LCP is an unmarried Filipina woman in her thirties (Langevin & Belleau 2000).

1.4 The LCP (current regulations, facts and figures)

“The Live-in Caregiver Program is a federally legislated work visa program” that allows individuals to work for a private household in Canada while holding a temporary foreign worker status (Canadian Coalition for in-Home Care 2010). Currently, work permits can be issued “for a maximum of three years and three months” (Canadian Coalition for in-Home Care 2010). Individuals wishing to migrate for care work in Canada under the Live-in Caregiver Program must complete a number of steps before beginning work. First, the potential Canadian employer will submit a request to hire a live-in caregiver at Human Resources and Skills Development Canada/ Service Canada (HRSDC) within Canada. In order to gain a labour market opinion (LMO) from HRSDC, the employer mails a packet with proof that they advertised for the caregiver position on the national job bank for at least fourteen days, and must also include signed copies of the potential labour contract, a description of the caregiver’s living space, and proof that they have obtained a Canadian revenue agency business account (Human Resources and Skills Development Canada 2012a). The HRSDC will make sure that “no Canadians, permanent residents or other temporary workers already in Canada are qualified” and able to take the position before issuing the LMO (Arat-Koc 2001:4).

After the application is approved by the HRSDC, the employee must apply for a work visa; if the visa office approves the application, the individual must then complete medical tests. If the medical test results are adequate, the individual is issued a work authorization permit, and receives a work visa from Citizenship and Immigration (CIC) upon entering Canada (Arat-Koc

2001). It is important to note that individuals wishing to labour in the LCP must participate in a seven month training course (in Canada or in their own country), or at least one year of full time work experience as a caregiver (or in a related field), before applying to Canada's LCP (Valiani 2009). This training course has five parts: "childcare, elderly care, personality development, first aid, nutrition, and housekeeping" (Valiani 2009:5). The caregiver is also tied to one employer, and is legally allowed to only work for that employer. If a caregiver is fired or resigns, she must find a new employer with an "offer of employment validated by HRSDC and CIC, and then obtain a new federal work permit, which could take up to a month, during which time she is not permitted to work" (Fudge 2011:246). This inability to change employers with relative ease can lead to a situation where caregivers may stay with an abusive employer because of the complexity of gaining a new legal labour situation.

The individuals employed under the LCP are ideally protected by a contract that lays out the regulations and rights of the worker as well as the responsibilities of the occupation. The employer is legally required to pay for the transportation costs to Canada, provide private medical insurance for the three months prior to provincial coverage, pay all recruitment fees, and ensure that the labourer is covered by workplace safety insurance (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2010a). The employment contract is required to outline job duties, hours of work, wages, termination and resignation terms, accommodation arrangements, and holiday and sick leave entitlements (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2010a). The employee must live with the employer and must be provided with safe accommodation with a lock on the door, which usually means a private bedroom. As of 2012, the maximum charge to an employee for room and board is \$325.00 per month (Employment Standards Branch 2011). The caregiver must be paid an overtime wage if they have worked over eight hours (Employment Standards Branch 2011).

Employers must also keep a record of the hours worked and the payments made.

While performing the work experience component of the LCP, caregivers hold a temporary worker status; however, if this part of the program is completed, then the caregiver can apply for permanent residency if they choose. If this application is successful, the individual loses the temporary visitor status and becomes a permanent resident with an open work permit. Individuals employed under the LCP have 4 years from their date of arrival to complete the employment requirements and apply for permanent residency. To be eligible for permanent residency, an individual must complete “24 months or a total of 3,900 hours of authorized full time employment” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2010a).

1.5 Theme One: Migration under the LCP

While the specific legal rules pertaining to migrant domestic caregivers vary significantly among and within major destination countries... this line of work is everywhere perceived as low-status physical labour and has proven to be intimately linked with social exclusion, abysmal working conditions, sub-standard living accommodations, sexual and racial discrimination, and exploitation on the part of employers, labour brokers, and employment agencies (Khan 2009:23).

The following sections discuss the most common themes that have emerged from my review of the literature on the LCP and similar programs, including: notions of citizenship and entitlements, the creation of different categories of workers under government regulatory schemes, issues surrounding transnationalism and migration patterns, and the influence of gender, race, and class on migratory routes and the opportunities afforded to individuals once they are in Canada. These themes will then be carried on to my analysis.

The migration of individuals for domestic and caring labour has been studied extensively by social scientists in many parts of the world over the past few decades. For example, Filipina domestic workers have been studied in Los Angeles and Rome (Parrenas 2000, 2001a), in Hong

Kong (Constable 1997, 2003), in Malaysia (Chin 1997), in Singapore (Yeoh & Huang 1998) and in Taiwan (Cheng 1996, 2004); Caribbean nannies have been studied in New York (Colen 1995); Indonesian domestics have been researched in Saudi Arabia (Silvey 2004); South African domestic labour has been researched (Cock 1980); and Mexican and Latina domestics have been studied in the United States (Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994, 1997, 2001; Romero 1992).

James Tyner (1999, 2004) looks at the migration of domestic workers out of the Philippines, and how these women are discursively constructed by recruitment agencies to appeal to employers. Hülya Demirdirek (2007) looks at “illegal” Gagauz domestic workers in Istanbul to explore how transnational labour exchanges can open up new types of social relationships and new forms of power relations, which are impacted by varied intersections of gender, race, and class. Keough (2004, 2006) researches ‘illegal’ domestic workers who travel from Moldova to work in private homes in Istanbul in order to discuss gendered ideals, the impact of neoliberalism on thoughts and actions, and women’s own struggles with agency and power.

In Vancouver, feminist geographer Geraldine Pratt, in collaboration with the Philippine Women’s Centre, has studied Filipina caregivers since 1997. Pratt first focused on the conditions experienced by women under the program and is now focused on women’s experiences after the program, including gaining citizenship, family reunification, and navigating the Canadian labour market. Nona Grandea and Joanna Kerr (1998) carried out a participatory action research study with caregivers from the Philippines working under the LCP in Toronto and Montreal, to determine how caregivers felt about the program and what aspects of the program they wanted to see changed. Kim England and Bernadette Stiell (1997a, 1997b) studied foreign caregivers in Toronto, focusing on the construction of difference based on race. Daiva Stasiulis and Abigail

Bakan (1994, 1995, 1997, 2003) also look at foreign caregivers in Toronto, with a focus on citizenship and migration policy.

Patricia Daenzer (1997) looked at citizenship, transnational ties between countries that sustain the exchange of workers, and the changes that occurred from the Foreign Domestic Movement to the current Live-in Caregiver Program. Judy Fudge (1997, 2011) wrote on the exclusion of domestic workers in Ontario from collective bargaining rights. Her most recent article focuses on the governance of care workers in Canada and the problems of jurisdiction between the provinces and the federal government, which is often used as an excuse for Canada's poor record when it comes to caregiver exploitation. Daniel Parrott (2011) presented a case study of the role of private recruitment agencies within the LCP, to compare BC's employment agency legislation to other Western provinces.

1.5.1 Who belongs? Citizenship and Entitlements

Citizenship has been extensively studied within the context of migrant domestic labour (Macklin 1992, Khan 2009, Tamang 2010, Goldring 2001, Baines & Sharma 2002, Stasiulis & Bakan 1997). This section will explore some important aspects of citizenship research with regard to migrant domestic labour in order to gain a clearer understanding of why this concept might be important when analyzing news discourses of the LCP and temporary foreign workers in Canada. Permanent residency status is not offered to caregivers upon arrival into Canada, instead these workers must perform labour with a temporary worker or visitor status. However, once two years of work is successfully completed, workers can apply for permanent residency if they choose. Thus, there are two main issues that will be discussed in regard to citizenship: (1) the lack of permanent residency status afforded to caregivers under the LCP; and (2) the promise of eventual citizenship status that is constantly applauded by government discourses.

The concept of citizenship is important for this research, since many past researchers have claimed that a lack of citizenship status within the receiving country is associated with increased vulnerability of migrant care workers. Citizenship is often seen as a system of entitlements that allows certain individuals access to social services and other benefits and rights. These researchers conceptualize the temporary status of certain foreign workers as a strategy by the state to ensure that this group is not afforded the same rights and freedoms as other workers. This makes temporary workers easy to expend if the economy fluctuates, and easy to exploit because labour laws are not held to this category of worker in the same way as residents and those considered to be “skilled” workers. This point is reflected in the work of Macklin (1992:686) who contends that Canada “suppresses awareness of its dependence on foreign domestic workers by rendering domestic workers socially invisible within the household and legally invisible within immigration and employment protection legislation.” Indeed Baines and Sharma (2002:87) echo this point, asserting that the LCP is one of the “most poignant examples of people living and working in Canada whose basis for invisibility and exploitation within the country is the legal category and concept of citizenship.”

The lack of permanent residency status within Canada impacts the ability of these workers to assert their own rights and desires. It has been noted that “there is a basic asymmetry in the relationship between a migrant domestic worker and her employer, in terms of the status and rights associated with citizenship” (Momsen 1999:6). This asymmetry emerges through differences in access to resources and services; however, it also comes from the temporary and employer-specific permits that caregivers need in order to continue their employment in Canada legally. This can lead to an uncomfortable dimension of the employment relationship where employers are positioned above caregivers simply based on citizenship status. Bakan and

Stasiulis (1997b:113) emphasize this point by stating that under the LCP there are “non-citizens originating from Third World conditions, now working for employers who are First World citizens and predominantly white women.” Through my analysis of articles that deal with the labour relationship, I found that this issue of unequal power dynamics is embedded in subtle ways in employers’ and employees’ own thoughts on the LCP and permanent residency.

Since caregivers under the LCP hold a temporary worker status, they are vulnerable to potential deportation, which creates more anxiety for workers who attempt to access rights and assert their opinions. I discovered that there were certain articles in my analysis that describe cases of deportation under the LCP. Pratt (2005:1064-1065) notes that because of their temporary status, “their residency in Canada is carefully monitored, and periodically there is a high profile deportation that makes visible through example the discretion and force of state power.” Pratt believes that the media’s coverage of caregiver deportations may act as a strategy to ensure that other temporary foreign workers appreciate their precarious status and the power of the state to decide who can stay in Canada and for what reasons.

Beyond the vulnerability of the caregivers based on their temporary status under the LCP, it is important for this research to look at the promise of eventual citizenship status that is built into the majority of state discourses about the LCP. There have been countless articles written by academics and advocacy groups (see for example, Bakan & Stasiulis 1997, 2003; Macklin 1992; Sharma 2002) that outright condemn the LCP as a system of “indentured servitude” (Pratt 2005:1065). However, the program still goes on without much public protest or negativity, and is overwhelmingly portrayed as a good program outside of academia and advocacy (Pratt 2005). This lack of protest has been strongly connected to the promise of permanent residency status at the end of the two years of work. As Pratt (2005:1065) underscores, the LCP is often perceived

as “a time-limited period of legal abandonment for which citizenship is judged as compensation.” Chapter 3 will contain an analysis of citizenship as a concept within the news articles to explore how it is used as a justification for the problems that are consistently identified by researchers, caregivers, and advocates.

Beyond the idea that citizenship status may allow individuals access to certain rights, it is important to recognize how various actors culturally construct citizens. Aihwa Ong (1996) has conceptualized modern citizenship status, in regards to immigration, as less about loyalty to a specific country, and more about being able to participate in certain labour markets. Ong (1996:737) envisions citizenship as a contested process where people both engage in “self-making,” and are also made by various “power relations” and discourses that construct subjects to conform to cultural ideas of what constitutes a “good” citizen. These cultural ideals are heavily influenced by intersections of gender, race, and class. Ong (1996) suggests that new ideas of citizenship within the United States are heavily influenced by neoliberal values, which often translates citizenship into economic terms. Indeed, Ong (1996:739) contends that “in the postwar United States, neoliberalism, with its celebration of freedom, progress, and individualism, has become a pervasive ideology that influences many domains of social life.”

This connection of what constitutes a “good” citizen with economic worth is an important concept when looking at immigration within the news media. Ong (1996:739) discusses how, in the context of America, “the interweaving of ideologies of racial difference with liberal conceptions of citizenship is evident in popular notions about who deserves to belong in implicit terms of productivity and consumption.” Thus, immigrants are often discursively constructed as being valuable or expendable based on their perceived economic contributions, or potential participation within the labour market. Perceived gender, race, class, and skill influences whether

a potential citizen is seen as valuable to the economy. As Ong (1996:751) states, “the racialization of class, as well as the differential othering of immigrants, constitutes immigrants as the racialized embodiments of different kinds of social capital.” The news media for this thesis reflects Ong’s (1996) conclusions, since many of the narratives created by journalists had an economic stance in order to discuss whether the LCP, as a bridge to permanent residency, is a positive initiative for Canada to continue. Thus, the concept of citizenship is extremely complex. Having a secure citizenship status does not just ensure rights, it also influences how one can participate in the labour market, as well as contributing to important cultural narratives that constitute categories of “citizen/foreigner” as well as “skilled/unskilled” and “good/bad immigrant.”

1.5.2 Gender, Race, Global Inequalities: Entangled Systems of Difference under the LCP

By gender, I mean not simply social roles for women and men, but the articulation (metaphoric and institutional) in specific contexts of social understandings of sexual difference. If meaning is constructed in terms of difference... then sexual difference... is an important way of specifying or establishing meaning. My argument, then, is that if we attend to the ways in which language constructs meaning, we will also be in a position to find gender (Joan Scott 1987:3).

As with most studies that deal with care giving labour, the concept of gender is an important aspect to interrogate. Firstly, the fact that 95% of participants in the LCP are female is significant because it makes this stream of temporary foreign workers highly feminized (Fudge 2011). The high number of women who participate within the program is directly linked to the stereotypes and perceptions of care work in general. It is common for private sphere care giving to be considered “women’s work,” and, in reality, it is mostly women who participate in this occupation, and thus paid care giving is often explained through women’s circumstances. For

example, Fudge (2011:4) explains an increase in demand for feminized migration as related to “the increase in women’s labour force participation, falling fertility rates, increasing life expectancy, changes in family structure” while she views the supply of foreign workers as a product of economic instability in conjunction “with gender-related factors such as abuse, family conflict, and discrimination.” In the media reports I reviewed, characterizations of the LCP did have obvious connections to gendered norms and stereotypes, which will be discussed fully in chapter 3.

Fudge’s statement echoes the research of Khan (2009:24) who emphasizes that “because of its strong economic potential for women and families on all sides of all borders, the globalized care giving system has sustained itself over time, despite manifesting profound conflict with human and labour rights.” This is partially explained by the fact that domestic labour is often the easiest way for women to gain permission to work within countries such as Canada and the United States (Momsen 1999). Thus, gender, along with other variables, can have a direct impact on how women can migrate, and what occupations they can perform within the destination country.

In the media reports reviewed for this research, there is the clear sense that all paid foreign caregivers are women, and they replace citizen women who are performing public sphere work, which takes them away from their “natural” position as family caregivers. In the words of Brikner and Straehle (2010:318), without acknowledging the importance of gender in which “women joining the paid workforce simply replace their unpaid domestic labour with the paid labour of socially and politically invisible migrant women, Canadian policy makers will continue to overlook the vulnerabilities caregivers face because they are doing women’s work.” The fact that care giving is linked to a woman’s “natural” duty, it is also often perceived as unskilled. This

unskilled categorization impacts compensation for caregivers. The perception of skill also influences how the job is discursively constructed, and what value is placed on this type of work. In conjunction with the feminized perception of care workers, the unskilled categorization often leads to the work being seen as outside of “normal labour.” Consequently, care work is regularly excluded from normal levels of workplace monitoring and regulation.

Gender is an important component; however, there is no way to separate this variable from other aspects such as perceived race/ethnicity. Indeed, the majority of participants in the LCP are from the Philippines. In 2005, Filipina women “accounted for 95.6% of Canada’s live-in caregivers” (Khan 2009:26). Khan (2009:29) notes that “since the 1980s, Canadian employers and recruitment agencies have shown a strong preference for sourcing live-in caregivers from the Philippines over other countries.” This strong preference for Filipinas can be linked with certain stereotypes and simplistic understandings about what this group of women can offer in relation to care giving. Khan (2009:29) views the preference as stemming from “persisting stereotypes within Canada of Filipino women as obedient, nurturing, complacent, and, thus, as ideal domestic workers.” Khan’s perception of how Filipino women are viewed within Canada is aligned with Barber’s perspective (2000:400) that the high number of Filipino women that have participated in domestic labour has actually led to the identification of *Filipina/Filipino* “becoming negatively coloured by the demeaned class and status connotations accorded paid domestic labour.”

Beyond the impacts on hiring practices, the ability for perceived race or nationality to impact employment relations has also been documented. Pratt (1997) and Stiell and England (1997a) concluded that there was a substantial difference in how caregivers from the Philippines or Caribbean were treated and perceived compared to “white” European caregivers, which

translated to more labour and less money for the women of color. The stereotypes and images of Filipinos, along with other gendered and racialized groups, constructed in the news articles will be discussed in chapter 3.

Since the movement of individuals for labour in countries outside their birthplace, or “transnational migration,” is an integral aspect of globalization, it is important to deal with some of the images and perceptions that often surround the concept of globalization. The news articles about the LCP that have been chosen look at some aspects of transnational labour migration, since this is the basis of the LCP’s existence. Thus it is important to outline a few conceptions of transnational migration and other global linkages, since how the movement of labour from some countries into Canada is theorized and constructed by journalists will impact the narrative that is created to discuss the LCP.

Fiss and Hirsch (2005:32) look at constructions of globalization in the news, distinguishing “between globalization as a structural process and globalization as a symbolic discourse” since they feel that the concrete aspects of globalization, such as trade agreements and the transnational movement of workers, is intimately tied to the ideological constructions of these processes. They found a few dominant constructions, with certain journalists seeing globalization as inherently negative or destructive in relation to “workers’ rights,” the environment, “the authority of the nation state,” and the strength of “democratic processes” (Fiss & Hirsch 2005:32). Other journalists saw the greater linkages between countries’ economies as positive and beneficial for trade and industrial development/advancement (Fiss & Hirsch 2005). Thus while there are many opinions on what globalization entails and what the significance is, Fiss and Hirsch (2005) concluded that the news mostly looks at globalization in terms of economics. My research on how journalists discuss temporary foreign worker programs

corroborates Fiss and Hirsch's conclusions that the economic aspects of transnational exchanges are often the most discussed by journalists.

The connection between economics and temporary labour migrations is not surprising since much of the transnational labour migration process is influenced by countries that desire a cheap labour force that can easily be sent back home when they are no longer needed. As Anderson (2007:248) states "labour migration in general... is increasingly perceived in terms of employer demand, with migration policies effectively regulating a tap that can be turned on or off according to the requirements of national labour markets." I found that much of the news coverage on temporary foreign workers in my analysis acknowledged this connection between temporary work programs, government regulations, and the needs of business owners.

"There are approximately 6.5 million Filipino labour migrants globally, 60 percent of whom are women" (Parrenas 2001b:1133). Parrenas (2001b) has researched the migration of Filipinos for care work, emphasizing that these women have created an imagined global community with other Filipinos who are away from "home." She contends that these workers always perceive the Philippines as "home" while "at the same time, they create an international community... their sense of place and sense of community extends into a transnational terrain" (Parrenas 2001b:1131). In the analysis, I discovered that this sense of community with other women working under the LCP came through in quotations from caregivers within the news articles, especially around the live-in regulation and the renting of apartments with other LCP caregivers.

When analyzing narratives about the LCP, it is important to attend to the inequalities between sending and receiving countries and how this impacts the existence of the program. The LCP can be described as a transnational labour process because workers leave their countries in

order to migrate to Canada for labour opportunities. Canada as a wealthier country can profit from the economic inequalities of other countries by allowing women to migrate and work in an undervalued occupation. As Nijeholt *et al.* (1994) notes, the migration of domestic workers must be understood as a product of uneven development between countries. However, the LCP does not necessarily alleviate poverty, instead “while LCP workers are able to lessen their families’ poverty by sending remittances to family members left behind, they simultaneously experience a new poverty in Canada, trapped in a low-wage occupation... socially regarded as subordinate work” (Khan 2009:44). I will discuss in Chapter 3 the ways in which Canada is constructed in comparison to other countries in the articles analyzed.

1.6 Theme Two: Labour Relations under the LCP

The second theme for this study focuses on how journalists discursively construct the labour conditions that are created under the LCP. Past research has revealed the importance of looking at how labour relationships are impacted by being located in the private sphere (social isolation), how regulations may be ignored or enforced by employers and employees (unpaid hours, no time-off, working for friends and family, excessive work load), how the job may be impacted by government regulations of the program (work permits, live-in requirement), and how power operates within the employer-employee relationship under the LCP (see for example, Pratt 1997, 1999, Stiell & England 1997b, Oxman-Martinez *et al.* 2004, Sharma 2002, Macklin 1992, Momsen 1999, Constable 1997, Lan 2003, Fudge 2011). These are all important aspects of labour relations within the LCP that have been studied at great length over the last few decades. The next few sections discuss the importance of these ideas within the realm of live-in care giving labour in order to gain a better idea of what issues appeared within the news articles on the LCP.

1.6.1 Private Sphere Labour and the Live-in Requirement: Living Where You Labour

Care work is often performed within a private home. Thus it is important to discuss how labour located within the private sphere can be changed or impacted by the fact that it is not located within the “public sphere.” The nature of care giving labour, when it occurs within a private home, can leave the employee potentially vulnerable to a number of abuses: emotionally, financially, and physically. Indeed, private sphere work often has limited labour safety nets or work place regulations and there is also often less room for flexible working hours. If the employee needs to take time off work, the employer may be put in a difficult position because of a lack of other care options (Pratt 1997). Beyond this, it is important to separate private sphere labour from live-in private sphere labour, since in one case the worker is free to leave the house when their employment time is over, and in the other, the employee lives within the place where they labour.

The stipulation under the LCP that employees must live with employers is a factor that makes the LCP a unique temporary foreign worker program within Canada. Khan (2009:27) notes that “this type of residence restriction is exclusive to the live-in caregiver category and, therefore, sets out a clear distinction between their work environment and housing rights and those of other economic migrants.” The fact that caregivers under the LCP are forced to live with their employers can make for strained relationships where both employer and employee navigate complex situations on a daily basis. These complex relationships came through in the news articles in a variety of ways, where both caregivers and employers related stories of how they personally dealt with the labour and living situation created by the LCP.

It is also important to note that when a care worker has lived and laboured with a certain family, there may be strong emotional bonds that form. These relationships can lead to another dimension of vulnerability, since the caregiver may feel obligated to work because she cares for that family (Stiell & England 1997a). Employers may also assert this moral or emotional connection to obtain greater control over the caregiver. As Lan (2003a:189) notes, a common idea is that “care workers receive low wages because of their receipt of emotional compensation as an intrinsic reward of their jobs.” Therefore, the focus on pseudo-familial connections with the labourer can be viewed as a strategy for employers to justify both the regulations of the occupation and the lack of adequate compensation for the caregiver. The caregiver being constructed as “one of the family” came through in certain employer discourses quoted within the news articles, especially those that address the low financial compensation given under the LCP.

One LCP worker contends that “living in means you are on call 24 hours a day” (Stiell and England 1997a:347). This short quote reinforces the conclusions of many researchers (such as, Stiell & England 1997a; Oxman-Martinez *et al.* 2004; Sharma 2002; Macklin 1992) that the live-in stipulation is inherently problematic and creates a potentially exploitative environment where the employer has the ability to stretch the work day since the caregiver is present after her allotted hours have been completed. This issue of employers having a large amount of control over the duration and type of labour performed under the LCP emerged within the news articles when both employees and advocacy groups were being quoted.

The issues experienced by caregivers under the LCP, including inequalities in “employment mobility, residence rights, and social benefits” are experienced by other temporary workers in different programs; however, the addition of working in a private home makes these

workers “qualify as one of the most vulnerable” categories (Khan 2009:29). This vulnerability is linked to the fact that caregivers under the LCP are forced to work “in an isolated environment and are solely responsible for enforcing the terms of the private contracts under which they are employed” (Khan 2009:29). Indeed, Khan compares the LCP with the Seasonal Agricultural Workers Program, which is another TFW program aimed at bringing in farm labourers to Canada primarily from Mexico, South America, and the Caribbean. The farm workers employed under this program, unlike LCP caregivers, benefit from “bilateral negotiations between participating governments” (Khan 2009:29). Khan (2009:29) also points to the fact that this TFW has “multi-stakeholder administration” of the program and “workplace inspections.” The TFWs that work in agricultural areas also often live in camps together, unlike caregivers under the LCP who live alone in their employer’s home. However, it is important to note that these agricultural workers are consistently subjected to discrimination and exploitative demands, as well as not being offered the potential for permanent residency (Khan 2009; Leibel 2007).

Caregiver isolation can make the formation of support networks with other caregivers and advocacy groups extremely difficult. Basok (2003:5) notes that “in the case of migrants, failure to exercise the legal rights extended to them by the receiving states may be related to the social exclusion from the national community of the host society.” With live-in caregivers from other countries, the fact that the caregiver may not speak the employer’s primary language well and may not know other individuals in the community can lead to another state of physical and emotional isolation. This isolation creates a situation where the employer has a great amount of power over the worker, who may not even be aware of the proper labour regulations that should be enforced. Thus, the realities of working and living within the same private location can have far-reaching effects on the employee, including increased isolation, higher vulnerability to

abusive employment situations, and the creation of intimate social relations that may complicate employment contexts. The live-in condition was a common focus for many articles that were analyzed since it is such an important aspect of the program. The creation of informal support networks with other caregivers also emerged through caregivers' own thoughts on how to survive the live-in component and the difficulties that it entails.

1.6.2 Common Issues within the Employment Relationship: Long Hours, Low Wages, and a Lack of Regulation

The employment relations that exist under the LCP are as diverse as the individuals who participate within the program. There are, however, certain factors that have been revealed as common by many different researchers of migrant care work. Workers under the LCP commonly report “being exploited by employers who force them to work long hours without overtime pay, perform tasks not included in their contracts, refuse requests for time off, or fail to live up to the stipulations of the standards required under the program” (Hodge 2006:63). Researchers (see for example, Oxman-Martinez *et al.* 2004; Tung 2000; Stiell & England 1997; Pratt 1997) have consistently identified these abusive aspects of the LCP, and these factors were also consistently reflected within the news coverage of the LCP.

In a focus group conducted by PINAY, a Filipino Women's Association in Quebec, it was revealed that many participants often had to labour more hours than what was agreed upon in the contract (Oxman-Martinez *et al.* 2004). Beyond this, many of the participants confirmed that they were not compensated for this extra time in wages, but instead often received small gifts from their employers (Oxman-Martinez *et al.* 2004). This point highlights that labour in the private sphere often requires personal negotiations between employer and employee. The focus groups also revealed that many of the labourers were fearful of complaining about unfair labour

standards because it may have jeopardized their jobs and work permits. Many of the women reported that employers had “threatened” to call the immigration office when they complained about their labour situation (Oxman-Martinez *et al.* 2004:14). Oxman-Martinez *et al.* (2004:14) also emphasized that 24% of their survey participants were not being paid the minimum wage at the time of the study.

Charlene Tung, in her study of elder care situations and Filipino caregivers in California, emphasized that even though the caregiver appears to have a lot of power over the client (with dispensation of medication, etc), she warns that “power within a caring work relationship plays itself out in a variety of ways” (2000:74). She also underscores that Filipino caregivers may have less power to assert their own needs because the client often has “advantages of class, race, ethnicity, immigration status, and some-times gender” (Tung 2000:74). Tung (2000) found that all of her participants were not paid the minimum wage at the time of her study, which again shows that these women may not have felt able to raise such an issue with their employers. She gave an example of one of her Filipino caregiver participants, who was regularly paid \$2.10 an hour; however, when she needed a day off and a replacement nurse was hired from a professional agency, that nurse was paid \$31.50 an hour (2000:75). Through my analysis, I found a few articles that discuss the “differences” between caregivers brought in by employers for the LCP and those hired out by “professional care agencies” which manifested in discourses addressing the skill and quality of care given by LCP caregivers. This is discussed more fully in Chapter 4.

1.6.3 Government Regulations and Migrant Rights: How the State “Regulates” Caregivers

When focusing on both the migration of women for labour and the employment and immigration regulations governing these women, it is imperative to recognize the multitude of

agencies, governmental bodies, and legal jurisdictions (often within a number of countries) that are involved in the creation and maintenance of the LCP. For example, immigration may be at the federal level, whereas employment standards and their enforcement are at a provincial or territorial level (Fudge 2011). There are “three federal government departments” that are involved in the admittance of new care workers: Citizenship and Immigration Canada distributes work permits and temporary resident visas; Human Resources and Skills Development Canada/Service Canada are in charge of labour market opinions; and Canada Border Services Agency has the final say as to who can enter the country (Fudge 2011:245).

A main problem with the program for many researchers is the employer-specific temporary work permit and how this can lead to more vulnerability on the part of the caregiver. Bakan and Stasiulis (1994:14) argue that the Canadian government grants temporary work permits in order to ensure “an indentured or captive labour force... who were unlikely to quit regardless of how exploited or intolerable their work and living situations.” Pratt also finds fault with government policies that create more vulnerability for domestic workers. She states that the temporary worker status sanctioned by the government for live-in caregivers helps to maintain “wage levels and working conditions unacceptable to Canadian citizens” (Pratt 1997:166).

Since their work permit is tied to a specific employer rather than a specific occupation, if a caregiver wants to change employers under the LCP, they must go through the government administrative process to gain a new work permit. This is contingent on a new validated offer of employment. During the time that it takes to get that new permit, it is not legal to work and therefore, it is likely that the caregiver will have few options for accommodation. These potential financial and residential stresses, along with the increased time it will take to gain 24 months of work experience to qualify for permanent residency, often ensure that many caregivers will stay

in a bad situation to avoid the “bureaucratic limbo” that awaits them if they do decide to change employers (Oxman-Martinez *et al.* 2004). This fear of being unable to complete 2 years of work experience within the four year time limit because of the long process necessary to change employers came through in quotations from caregivers and advocates within the news articles for this research. The difficulty of changing employers and finishing the work experience component is discussed further in Chapter 4.

Beyond the temporary worker status and employer-specific work permit, many researchers have criticized the difficult processes of lodging formal complaints about employment problems. Constable’s study of migrant domestic workers in Hong Kong concluded that “domestic workers, unlike employers, have neither the financial resources, the time, nor the confidence to pursue their claims through the maze of Labour and Immigration Department officials, hearings, tribunals, courts, and offices” (1997:125). She goes on to stress that Hong Kong’s policies “deter workers from pursuing their rights, ensure the continued availability of an affordable pool of foreign workers, and aim at maintaining domestic workers as temporary and docile migrants” (1997:126). Thus, the confusing process of lodging formal complaints with government bureaucracies ensures that few migrant workers have the ability to access appropriate forms of social justice. Stasiulis and Bakan (1997:132) argue that, in Canada, “migrant domestic workers are generally exempted from societal-level employment standards and other forms of protective labour, social security and human rights legislation.” However, since 1997, domestic workers are covered by provincial labour regulations that ensure standard minimum wage levels, room and board deductions, maximum working hours, and vacation time (Human Resources and Skills Development Canada 2012b).

The above summary of influential research underscores the vulnerability inherent in

labouring as a private caregiver, where a lack of enforcement of regulations can lead to forms of labour exploitation. Research on labour relations between live-in caregivers and their employers has raised these issues as creating problems for women employed under the LCP. In Chapter 4, I explore how labour relations and the regulations of the program are characterized in the news articles and what arguments are utilized to justify or condemn the conditions created under the LCP.

For this study, the focus was not on proving the validity of the research discussed above, rather it focused on the language used within the news media to understand, address, or give meaning to these sorts of issues. The language used by journalists gives important clues to how meaning is assigned to certain occurrences, how these individuals perceive or understand an issue, and how they then go about assigning importance or significance to these phenomena or events. This is informed by the idea that it is critical to attend to the words people use since this will then provide a way to determine “which reality mattered most within a particular context” (Scott 1987:5).

1.7 Chapter Summary

In this chapter I explored some important literature on migrant domestic workers and the Live-in Caregiver Program. Under the migration theme, I am particularly interested in permanent residency or citizenship, transnationalism, the creation of different categories of workers, and the impacts of gender, race, and class stereotypes. For the labour theme, the critical discourse analysis will concentrate on how the news media constructs and understands the labour situations created under the LCP, particularly surrounding private-sphere issues, live-in requirements, government regulations, work permits, and power relations within the employment relationship. The next chapter will explore the methods and data used for this research.

Chapter Two: Methodology

2.1 Introduction

This research is committed to a critical analysis of discourses from Canadian news media sources. I will focus on content that is related to either migration or labour themes within the discourse on the LCP and its participants. In this chapter I will go through the materials used, the theory behind critical discourse analysis (CDA), and some research that has been carried out within the critical discourse movement. Particularly, I am most interested in discussing the research of Wodak and her colleagues, as well as the critical analysis by Van Dijk of racism in the news. The last section of this chapter will focus on the processes of analysis that were utilized for this study.

2.2 Materials: Print Media as Representation of the LCP

My research was based on a total of 70 news articles chosen from a variety of different newspaper sources found on the Internet. All of the articles address issues or stories about caregivers who come to Canada under the LCP. There were diverse types of articles: some were editorials, a few were letters to the editor, some were opinion pieces, and some were stories on particular events, issues or people. Articles were chosen through web searches of newspaper websites and an Internet search engine, *Proquest*. To find the articles, key terms were used within the search engines. The terms used were: “nanny,” “live-in caregiver,” “live-in caregiver program” and “domestic worker.” Through these terms I would then find articles that were focused on some aspect of live-in care giving, particular narratives of individual caregivers, and certain negative or positive opinion pieces on the use of migrant caregivers, the increasing reliance on temporary foreign worker programs, and other potential migration/immigration

issues that surround this program.

I chose a variety of articles to try and cover many of the attitudes, concerns, and perceptions of the program that exist today. The articles range in date from 1992 to 2011 and are taken from 24 different news sources, with over 50 different authors. This variation was important because it allowed me to gain a broad picture of the discourses circulating within Canada during that time period. It is difficult to say whether this sample is representative of the time period, as when searching electronically for articles it is never easy to know whether the terms you plug into the search engine allow for all of the articles on a topic to be found.

I performed a very thorough search, browsing through hundreds of articles that came up with the key word searches to find articles that were actually focused on the LCP. I found 91 articles on the LCP, eventually choosing to analyze seventy. I did not use all of the articles I found because a few were too short (less than a paragraph) and some only mentioned the program with a sentence or two. Other articles were determined to be too similar to the articles that had already been chosen with the exact same information, quotes, and arguments as multiple others that were already being analyzed. While I identified 91 articles, there is no way for me to definitively say that those were the only articles written on the LCP during that time period.

2.3 Critical Discourse Analysis as Fieldwork

As I have tried to show, we achieve meaning by indexical realisation, that is to say by using language to engage our extra-linguistic reality. Unless it is activated by this contextual connection, the text is inert. It is this activation, this acting of context on code, this indexical conversion of the symbol that I refer to as discourse. Discourse in this view is the pragmatic process of meaning negotiation. Text is its product (Widdowson 1995:164).

In its simplest form, the term ‘discourse’ refers to “passages of connected writing or speech” (Hall 1997:44). However, according to Hall (1997:44), Foucault connected this term

with a new meaning, which focused on the “production of knowledge through language” where discourse “constructs the topic...defines and produces the objects of our knowledge.” Scholars who use critical discourse analysis view discourse as “authentic everyday communication in institutional, media, political, or other locations,” which is also how the term is used within this study (Wodak et al. 2009: 8). Indeed as the above quote from Widdowson (1995) suggests, the context of language use is critical for determining meaning. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a theoretical framework, not a singular method. CDA often focuses on the importance of discourse for creating and maintaining power relations, as well as masking the workings of certain other forms of power.

Researchers of discourse contend that “discursive practices... serve to establish or conceal relations of power and dominance between interactants, between social groups and classes, between men and women, and between national, ethnic, religious, sexual, political, cultural, and sub cultural majorities and minorities” (Wodak *et al.* 2009:8). Thus, CDA is a theoretical orientation that is focused on the critical analysis of many forms of discourse, which is essential since “through discourses, social actors constitute objects of knowledge, situations, and social roles” (Wodak *et al.* 2009:8).

In a simple way, it can be stated that CDA is a theoretical approach, which views discourse as connected to power and domination in a mutually constitutive way. CDA scholars stress the importance of critique when studying discourse, in order to reveal what is often meant to be hidden or obscured. Beyond this, it emphasizes the importance of taking into account the “social, political, historical, and intertextual contexts” of a specific discourse, which goes beyond a mere focus on language (Baker *et al.* 2008:273). However, historical context was beyond the realms of my research. Content was my main focus, rather than placing the articles within a

larger context beyond the policies and practices of the LCP.

The basis of CDA's theory is often viewed as neo-Marxist, since there is a focus on the importance of both culture and economics in the maintenance of systemic and ideological inequalities (Titscher *et al.* 2000). This is because the material aspects of daily life can have profound consequences for how groups and individuals form specific ideological frameworks, and vice versa. The focus on how material conditions and ideologies mutually interact with each other is also linked to the fact that CDA is largely concerned with social issues relating to dominance and inequality, which is legitimated, produced, reproduced, and transformed through discourse (Titscher *et al.* 2000).

2.4 Critical Discourse Analysis: Influential Research

Within the CDA framework, I found the theories and methods of Van Dijk and Wodak to be the most helpful for my analysis of the news media documents. Wodak developed the discourse-historical approach (DHA) with her other colleagues at the University of Vienna. She used DHA to reveal common attitudes and ideologies that were contained in the news media with regard to the construction of immigrants and refugees within a European context. In one study, Wodak and her team examined how refugees, asylum seekers, immigrants, and migrants (RASIM) were represented within the British Press from 1996 to 2005 (Baker *et al.* 2008). The main research questions were: "in what ways are RASIM linguistically defined and constructed? What are the frequent topics of, or issues discussed in, articles relating to RASIM? What attitudes towards RASIM emerge from the body of UK newspapers seen as a whole? Are conventional distinctions between broadsheets and tabloids reflected in their stance towards (issues relating to) RASIM" (Baker *et al.* 2008:276)?

To analyze the large number of newspaper articles, they utilized two methods of analysis. The first method is called “corpus linguistics” (CL), which is a computer-based, “quantitative” method that uses software to perform a “key word analysis” of the data (Baker *et al.* 2008:278). I chose not to utilize this method, and so I focused on the second qualitative method, the discourse-historical approach. The DHA approach developed by Wodak focuses on three different dimensions of discursive realizations: “the content of the data, the discursive strategies employed (including argumentation strategies), and the linguistic realization of these contents and strategies” (van Leeuwen & Wodak 1999:91).

The content of the data basically refers to what is being said and which group(s), individual(s), action(s), or event(s) is the main focus of the discursive piece. Discursive argumentation strategies “refer to plans of actions with varying degrees of elaborateness, the realization of which can range from automatic to conscious, and which are located at different levels of our mental organization” (De Cillia *et al.* 1999:160). These strategies either support, complicate, or refute a certain position, argument, narrative or idea. For example, in order to justify a specific discourse, journalists may try to discredit an opinion through the use of exaggeration, trivialization, vagueness, comparison, or the use of black and white terms (Wodak and Matouschek 1993).

The final important analytical part of the DHA method is referred to as the linguistic realizations of these contents and strategies. The linguistic realization of a certain idea, belief, or value can be expressed in various ways. These forms of linguistic realization can include: unreal scenarios, comparisons, analogies, evocations, equation/generalization, quotations, rhetorical questions, allusions, assertions, metaphors, predications, vagueness, euphemisms, and metaphorical lexemes (Titscher *et al.* 2000:159). For my research I was mainly interested in

presenting the arguments that were being forwarded within the articles to discuss the LCP. However, in certain parts of the analysis, I also look at some of the linguistic strategies used by journalists to promote a specific argument. For this thesis, I focused the most on the use of trivialization, comparison, generalization, vagueness, stereotypes and exaggeration employed by journalists to forward specific arguments about the LCP.

In their study of the British Press, Baker et al. concluded that RASIM were often discussed in the articles negatively in relation to a number of topics, which are: “(a) Provenance/transit/destination, (b) Number, (c) Entry, (d) Economic problems, (e) Residence, (f) Return/repatriation, (g) Legality and (h) Plight” (2008:286). They concluded that these groups were discussed in a limited number of ways that were mostly negative or unsupportive (Baker *et al.* 2008). Interestingly, they also found that “a large number of topoi/topics/categories is shared by *refugees*, *asylum seekers* and *immigrants*, but less so by *migrants*” (Baker *et al.* 2008:288). The study also concluded that “the newspaper gives more space and direct citation to an in-group member, whereas citation to out-group members is provided when they are (or can be represented as being) inarticulate, extremist, illogical, aggressive or threatening” (Baker *et al.* 2008:295).

Wodak with Matouschek (1993) also carried out a discourse analysis to determine how Austrians felt about asylum seekers from Eastern Europe. For this study, which took place from 1988 to 1991, they utilized public, informal discourse, such as oral stories to determine why there was an increase in racist attitudes towards foreigners in Austria. They found that neo-racist discourses about new foreigners were actually created out of previously existing discourses of anti-Semitism (Wodak and Matouschek 1993). Wodak and Matouschek (1993) identify some of the argumentation strategies utilized frequently in prejudiced discourse. One strategy they point

to is of “group definition and construction,” which creates a “we discourse” and allows for individuals in the group to feel solidarity because opinions cannot be wrong when they are shared by many people (Wodak & Matouschek 1993:239). In conjunction with this, they identified strategies of justification, which involve the discussion of things in “black and white terms,” where “the world is divided into good and bad, rigid, normative dichotomies are constructed, and the contrast we-they is emphasized” (Wodak & Matouschek 1993:239).

Part of Wodak and Matouschek’s research included a review of other discourse studies performed on the subject of racism in regards to minority coverage in European newspapers. They found that with many of the studies, there were similar conclusions made with regard to how minorities are discussed by journalists, which resulted in many journalists focusing on three general points (Wodak and Matouschek 1993:234):

They (the foreigners) damage our socio-economic interests—emphasis is on various types of economic competition. They are different in terms of culture and ideology—a threat to cultural order. They are involved in activities that are viewed as negative (ex. loudness) or criminal—threat of deviance from the social order.

In the analysis, I look at whether there were similar arguments made in the news reports with regard to live-in caregivers as temporary foreign workers.

Van Dijk (1991, 1993a, 1993b, 2008) uses CDA in a similar manner in that he employs a form of discourse analysis to deconstruct news that is focused on minority groups in Europe. In one study, Van Dijk looks at the rationalizations of discriminatory behavior towards minority groups in elite discourse. For this study he used “a vast corpus of various types of text and talk: thousands of pages of interview transcripts, news reports, textbooks, parliamentary records, scholarly publications, letters and informal everyday communication, originating from several countries in North America and Europe” (Van Dijk 1993b:12). The study examined how “white”

elites speak and write about ethnic minorities and how this may help to create consensus among “white” groups. To do this he examined the text in three different ways.

First, the “discourses are systematically studied in their own right, at various levels or dimensions of structure, although this study does so largely in rather informal terms” (Van Dijk 1993b:48). Keeping the discourse analysis informal and avoiding technical aspects makes the research more “accessible to a broad public” (Van Dijk 1991:10). This was a valuable note for my own research, since I wanted to make this analysis accessible to non-linguists or people who do not know all the technical terminology related to linguistic analysis (which also describes myself). The second part of Van Dijk’s research involved relating discourse structures to “the social cognitions, including ethnic attitudes of the authors, namely the elites themselves, as well as those of the recipients” (Van Dijk 1993b:48). Lastly, the discourses were linked to “a broader social, cultural, and political framework, in which the role of the elites and the institutions, and relations between different social or ethnic groups, are studied as elements in the reproduction of racism” (Van Dijk 1993b:48). The first and last steps in his methodology were the most useful for my own research since I was unable to go into the psychology behind the writers’ and recipients’ engagement with the discourses. Thus, the articles for my research were studied multiple times in order to make connections between articles and to start to pull out patterns and links to broader issues that have already been pointed out by academics.

After a systematic discourse analysis of more than 5,000 news articles in both the Dutch and British Press, Van Dijk’s study, along with many other studies, concluded that there are a limited number of topics used in the news to discuss ethnic minorities. One of these stereotypical topics is immigration with “a special emphasis on problems, illegality, large numbers, fraud, and demographic or cultural threats” (Van Dijk 1993b:248). He goes on to state that “the very topics

of news on ethnic affairs convey an overall impression that associates minorities or immigrants with problems, conflicts, deviance, or even threats” (Van Dijk 1993b:278).

For the analysis of the media texts, my research also relied on certain methods that are focused on the analysis of journalistic devices. Entman (1993) points to the importance of two themes when discussing the power of media to form opinion: salience and framing. He defines salience as the ability to make a topic more “noticeable, meaningful, or memorable” (Entman 1993:53). Salience is often achieved by saturating news media with articles on a certain issue. The concept of salience relies on the idea that the more something is seen or talked about, the more likely it will receive attention from institutions and the public (Entman 1993). Framing, on the other hand, according to Entman (1993), relates to how a topic or issue is characterized, or whether the journalist gives certain hints within the text that signal how one should feel or think about a certain issue.

“Frames, then, define problems... diagnose causes—identify the forces creating the problem; make moral judgments—evaluate causal agents and their effects; and suggest remedies” (Entman 1993:52). Therefore, when studying products of news media it is important to attend to both the topic(s) that are addressed, and the subtle ways that journalists can provide ideological frameworks for these topics, which can create different opinions, attitudes, ideas and values. For my analysis, I paid attention to whether a topic received a lot of media attention, and if so, how journalists characterized issues through language use, quotation strategies, and arguments.

Thus, this study made use of a few different types of methods and ideas developed in similar critical discourse studies. This mixture of methods is actually seen as preferable when studying discourse, as Wood and Kroger state in their book *Doing Discourse Analysis* (2000).

They emphasize that they “do not propose a simple combination of approaches, but a strategy of drawing upon resources— notions, techniques, devices, and strategies—from different perspectives as appropriate to the specific project at hand” (Wood & Kroger 2000:25). Following this I took the topics for the study from a multitude of past research, the methods were taken from a variety of discursive studies, and the analysis was aided by other academic research on various subjects within multiple disciplines such as anthropology, sociology, geography, law, gender studies, and history.

2.5 News Discourse and Prejudice: Media in Canada

I have not found any specific news media analyses of the LCP (although Sharma 2001 utilizes some news articles); however, in a similar area, according to Bauder (2008b:292) “media representations of seasonal foreign farm workers have played an important role in maintaining and legitimating Canada’s Commonwealth Caribbean and Mexican Seasonal Agricultural Workers Program.” Bauder (2008a:101) examined the newsprint media in Ontario to determine how the media’s coverage of temporary foreign farm workers “legitimizes labour exploitation.” He found that the workers were portrayed in the news as “valuable economic resources, and as skilled agricultural labour; but also as a social problem and potential criminals; employing them is depicted as a means of providing assistance to poor families in the global south” (Bauder 2008a:101).

Bauder’s (2008a) conclusions are interesting for this research because he found that the news articles he reviewed from 1997 to 2002 created a narrative that imagined the farm workers as integral to the existence of Canadian agriculture. The narrative, however, goes on to justify the temporary status by showing that these foreign workers also partake in deviant behavior that could jeopardize the communities around which they work (Bauder 2008a). Another part of the

narrative identified by Bauder (2008a) is that Canada is helping these workers provide for their families as a form of international humanitarian aid. This idea of providing work for TFWs as a form of charity or gift giving will be discussed in Chapter 3 because I also found this to be a prominent narrative created to justify the existence of the LCP.

Michele Ducharme (1986) performed a small-scale study of 70 news articles from the *Globe and Mail* (1980-85) on immigration to reveal how journalists discuss this topic. Ducharme (1986) found that there was some reliance on stereotypes and clichés around immigrants, and there was a focus on ‘sensational’ aspects of immigration. Henry and Tator (2002:44), in their study of racism in the Canadian press, note that there are often dualities created by journalists between the West and the Rest by “the constant production of images that distinguish between the attributes, capacities, and strengths of the West (largely positive) and those of the countries of the East or the Third World (largely negative).” They found that the “Third World is linked with racialized premises; it is defined as traditional, underdeveloped, overpopulated, irrational, disordered, and uncivilized” (2002:44). In the articles I analyzed, I also found these dichotomies were created between Canada and the main supply country for the LCP, the Philippines.

Charles Ungerleider (1991:159) looked at the representation of minorities within Canadian newspapers and found “not only do governments figure prominently in the news, they are also the major manufacturers and distributors of information that gets codified as news.” The fact that government officials are often instrumental in the production of news is attributed to the notion that the “government provides a steady flow of safe information, at least safe in the sense that it can be attributed to sources which people typically find credible” (Ungerleider 1991:159). I found that most of the news articles related to immigration policy, citizenship issues, and

temporary foreign worker programs, relied heavily on quotations from government officials or excerpts from government reports.

In addition, Ungerleider (1991:160) looked at the structure of minority stories in Canadian news and concluded that the “information that counts as news is typically constructed into a narrative or story structure. The narrative structure of the news casts people as heroes, villains, and victims.” However, he found that with minorities in the news, they are most often put into the villain or victim category, and rarely are they given the hero position (Ungerleider 1991:160). He highlighted this with an example that focused on how the media interpreted the housing price increase in Vancouver:

The rise in housing prices in Vancouver is one of a number of issues that were combined in stories involving minorities that cast a minority group—immigrants from Hong Kong—in the role of villain. By linking emigration from Hong Kong and the rising housing prices in Vancouver in a narrative structure, the media provided a single, easily understood interpretation to the increase in housing prices. Rather than address the issue of the many factors affecting competition for scarce housing, the media chose to cast the story in a narrative framework that pit wealthy, Hong Kong immigrants against resident Canadians (Ungerleider 1991:160).

This dichotomous casting of minorities into the villain or victim role is also frequently found in studies that assess how the media reports on refugee applicants in a Canadian context.

One event that received a significant amount of media exposure was the arrival of boats carrying Chinese refugees off the coast of BC in 1999. The news stories that were produced during this period have been analyzed by Greenberg (2000; 2002), who found through an analysis of opinion pieces in five major Canadian newspapers, that the refugees came to be a symbol for the public’s frustration with the government’s weak immigration and border laws. Greenburg (2000:530) found that these refugees were seen as a threat to the health and well being of “real Canadians” since they were associated with disease and crime, which again placed

these individuals into the narrative structure in the category of villains. Greenburg (2000:531), concluded that “the migrants were objectified as greedy, selfish, and economically-driven individuals whose disdain for the proper channels of entry to Canada was simplified by the media’s use of such terms as *illegal migrant* or *economic migrant*.” I also found these dichotomous narrative structures in the news articles on the LCP, with some caregivers cast into the victim position, while others may be seen as the villain.

2.6 The Critical Analysis of News Documents

There were a number of steps that I used to analyze these discourses. These steps were mostly taken from the works of Wodak and her colleagues, Van Dijk, and Entman. There were several different readings of each individual news article. In the first reading, each article was read to gain a general idea of the topics, events, and individuals involved within the text. In the second reading, I began to make notes of certain arguments, word choices, quotation styles, topic choices, and characterizations of certain issues, mostly using a highlighter. In the third reading stage, I pulled out the main subject or topic of the article and made note if it was more focused on the labour theme or the migration theme.

In the fourth reading, I made note of whether there was any recognizable aim of the story. In the fifth reading, I then focused on the caregivers mentioned in the articles, to determine what terminology and characteristics were used to describe them. In the fifth reading, I also looked at the quotation strategies of the journalists to see if the articles contained quotes from caregivers, or whether there was a reliance on ‘experts’ such as government officials, academics, or advocacy groups. In the sixth reading, I looked at how employers were characterized within the articles, and whether they were quoted. In the sixth reading, I also looked at how the labour relations between employer and employee were discussed.

After completing these reading stages, I began to focus on the arguments created within the article to justify a certain stance on the LCP. In the seventh reading, I highlighted whether the journalist appeared to be advocating a specific narrative about the LCP, and the use of TFWs. If the journalist was forwarding a clear argument on the LCP, I would then determine what their argument was, and pull out the important or interesting aspects of their arguments for further analysis. In this seventh reading, I also began to pull out any linguistic realizations that existed within the arguments, such as the use of unreal scenarios, generalizations/stereotypes, metaphors or allusions.

After the discourses were studied using the steps above, the arguments and narratives that had been highlighted or pulled out of the articles, were taken and divided into various subtopics. These subtopics included, for example, a popular topic, an argument, a common assumption, or a particular incident. This was not an easy task, and the quotes were moved around frequently based on what I believed to be the most important part of the quote. After this had been completed, patterns, arguments, and prevalent narratives emerged, which formed the basis for my analysis and discussion.

2.7 Chapter Summary

For this study, the news articles were taken from a variety of sources and provinces, and are focused on some aspect of the LCP or migrant care work within Canada. The framework for the analysis is influenced by a variety of Critical Discourse Analysis scholars. Within the CDA framework, the research of Wodak and Van Dijk are the most influential for this study. CDA is important for unearthing hidden assumptions and strategies that are often obscured within news discourses. The movement also focuses on the importance of discourse for the creation and maintenance of power relations between and within different groups.

For the analysis of the articles, this research utilized many different strategies from a collection of studies based on the critical analysis of news discourse. Specifically, the analysis was focused on understanding the arguments, quotation patterns, terminology, types of linguistic realization, and how certain topics that are common under the LCP are acknowledged, discussed, and emphasized. The next chapter lays out the data that has been collected through the analytical process to answer the first three research questions.

Chapter Three: Migration under the LCP

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will explore the first three research questions that guided this thesis. These research questions are, 1) How do journalists discuss, justify, or condemn the use of temporary foreign worker programs? 2) How do individuals discuss citizenship within these media discourses, and how is the potential for permanent residency status under the LCP interpreted within these articles? 3) Do journalists create, reinforce, or transform global, racialized, or gendered stereotypes?

In the first section of the chapter, I provide a table that highlights some of the main topics that came up in the articles, and the number of articles in which they appeared. In the next section, I look at the narratives that are created and perpetuated by journalists to explain, justify, or disprove of the use of temporary foreign worker programs, such as the LCP, within Canada. These narratives address economic expectations that various stakeholders have about the use of temporary workers, and how these individuals perceive the program as either a negative strategy, or an asset to the economy. In the second section, I address the question of permanent residency, and how journalists examine this aspect of the LCP. In this section, I also explore how certain individuals who do not qualify for permanent residency through the program are constructed within news articles. In the last section of this chapter, I focus on the global and racialized images that are created and perpetuated within the articles that were analyzed, and how these images hint at larger issues around inequalities between countries, transnational exchanges, and gendered as well as racialized essentialisms and expectations.

3.2 Table of News Article Findings

TOPIC	NUMBER OF ARTICLES IN WHICH IT WAS FOUND (OUT OF 70)
CITIZENSHIP/PERMANENT RESIDENCY STATUS	42
ABUSIVE EMPLOYERS (POSSIBILITY OF OR REALITY)	36
WORK EXPERIENCE OF 24 MONTHS	29
LCP HELPS CAREGIVER WITH POVERTY	28
ARTICLES THAT INCLUDE QUOTES FROM CAREGIVERS	26
ILLEGAL OR FRAUDULENT CAREGIVERS	25
WORK PERMIT	23
LIVE-IN REGULATION	22
RECRUITMENT AGENCY FEES	21
CAREGIVER FAMILIAL SEPARATIONS UNDER THE LCP	21
VULNERABLE CAREGIVER	21
DEPORTATION (ACTUAL CASE OR THREAT OF)	20
CHANGES TO LCP POLICIES	18
LCP AS PART OF TFWs IN CANADA	18
PHILIPPINES AND POVERTY	17
RECRUITMENT AGENCY FRAUD	15
RUBY DHALLA	13
CANADIAN WOMEN BENEFIT FROM THE LCP	12
VULNERABLE CANADIAN FAMILIES	11

3.3 The Link Between the Use of the LCP (as a TFW Program) and Canadian Economic Prosperity

Out of the 70 articles that were analyzed for this research, 18 discussed some aspect of the LCP while explicitly linking this program to the larger set of Canadian temporary foreign worker programs. Within the news articles that I analyzed, the dominant way that journalists and government officials discuss the LCP was through an economic lens. This is especially true with articles that discuss the LCP in terms of it being one of the temporary foreign worker programs that Canada utilizes. There are two conflicting narratives here. On one side, the use of temporary

labour is seen as strengthening our economy because it allows for employers to access affordable workers. The LCP is portrayed within this narrative as a way to provide working families with cheap child or elder care options, which in turn strengthens the economy by allowing both parents to work. The LCP is also constructed as aiding women more than men, because it allows women to have childcare so they can then choose other occupations beyond care giving.

On the negative side, these programs are seen as a potential cause for wage stagnation in lower-skilled occupations within Canada. Indeed, a few journalists question why the wages for certain “low status” occupations are not raised in order to attract Canadian citizens. There are also some journalists who question whether it is better to focus on training Canadian citizens rather than importing pre-trained labour. The use of temporary workers was also linked to increased vulnerability, where foreign workers are seen as helpless in the event of abusive labour relations. The fact that, according to Citizenship and Immigration Canada, caregivers are unskilled workers, also led some journalists to link caregivers under the LCP to the notion that there has been a deprofessionalization of care work. The first section below reveals the argumentation strategies that question and condemn Canada’s use of TFWs, while the second section deals with arguments that focus on the positive aspects of temporary foreign workers programs and the LCP.

3.3.1 Argumentation Strategies that Question and Condemn the use of Temporary Foreign Workers

The committee, which has recommended that the temporary-worker category be eventually scaled back, points to the obvious problems of this system. First, it discourages employers and governments from training Canadians to do necessary jobs. Why spend money training unemployed citizens to build houses when skilled carpenters can be imported from abroad? Second, it keeps a brake on wages. If employers can tap into the global reserve army of labour, they have no incentive to increase the

productivity, and thus the wages, of their existing workers. Most important, perhaps, it creates two classes of immigrants (Walkom 2009, Toronto Star)

Journalists, who explicitly discuss the LCP as part of the temporary foreign worker programs currently available in Canada, often focus on the inherent vulnerability that is created within these labour situations. The image of the ‘vulnerable worker’ is invoked in many of the articles that discuss the LCP, with 21 explicitly using that term to describe the program’s participants. This vulnerability is linked to a few different things; however, many articles focus on the personal characteristics of the workers. Whittington (2009), in an article for the *Toronto Star*, quotes a report prepared by the Auditor General on the use of TFWs, which connects worker vulnerability to “their economic conditions, linguistic isolation and limited understanding of their rights.” Another *Toronto Star* article by Nicholas Keung (2008) also connects vulnerability to personal properties, stating that temporary foreign workers “are vulnerable to exploitation thanks to language barriers, poor education and unfamiliarity with Canada’s labour laws.” Walkom (2009) in an article for the *Toronto Star* also constructs an image of these workers as “fearful, exploitable, marginalized and insecure.”

Another worry with Canada’s use of foreign workers was the impact that this practice may have on wages for Canadian citizens. Karl Flecker, a national director of the Canadian Labour Congress, is quoted in an article stating that “by expanding the temporary foreign worker program, Canada is creating a pool of disposable workers to do jobs at a wage that Canadians won’t accept” (Keung 2007). An article by Keung (2007) for the *Toronto Star*, titled “Guest Labour Programme Raises Troubling Questions,” asks whether there is a labour shortage to justify temporary workers in low-skilled sectors. He states:

Few would dispute there is a labour shortage in certain sectors. The debate is whether Canada is really short on low-skilled labour. Rising wages are

usually the best indicator of a labour shortage, yet Statistics Canada and labour experts say wages for low-skilled work have been stagnant for years. (Keung 2007, Toronto Star)

The concrete connection made by Keung between the use of temporary foreign workers and the stagnation in wages for Canadian workers is a powerful argument to make the audience reflect on how the reliance on temporary labour may be negatively impacting certain citizens' ability to receive a living wage. The argument also draws a clear distinction between desirable and undesirable immigrants based on perceptions of skill and who is a valuable asset to the Canadian economy.

As seen in the above quote, a related concern is about whether Canada should allow anyone in who may not have appropriate skills to contribute to the Canadian economy. Walkom (2009) in an article on the LCP states,

As a Commons committee reported this month, the nanny program is just one small part of a "temporary" foreign-worker system that has careered out of control. Some of these temporary workers have special skills that employers say they can't find in Canada. But many don't. (Walkom 2009, Toronto Star)

The term "careered out of control" suggests to the audience that temporary foreign worker programs are no longer functioning as they should. The juxtaposition of those who are skilled and those who are not also implies that the temporary workers allowed to come to Canada are not making a positive contribution to the economy or society because they lack "special skills." This fear is shared by Whittington (2009) who relies on a government report to parliament to make the claim that a "lack of strategic planning by the government has also skewed the system so that the type of workers being admitted permanently to Canada is changing without significant thought being given to the overall impact on immigration patterns and the country's needs." This statement encourages dividing immigrants into categories of "good" and "bad" based on

what the author perceives as “skilled” and “unskilled.” Whittington’s statement also implies that there is no thought being given to ensure that the “best” migrants are admitted into Canada.

Unstated is the implication that programs such as the LCP, which can provide a route to permanent residency, are not bringing in the “best” or most suitable immigrants. The quote below is from an immigration “expert” who is nervous about the toll that low-skilled workers, in this case caregivers under the LCP, may take on the economy.

They’re using this system simply to try and get permanent residency status without meeting the normal requirements. And the result is that a lot of them live in poverty. Her husband hasn’t got employment in the Philippines, he’s probably even less likely to get it here. If you’ve got severe economic problems all the time, it can be disruptive and it can disadvantage the kids in terms of having the full opportunities of growing up in Canadian society. People in that situation – it’s described by one American think tank as basically importing poverty. You’re bringing in people because they’ll work for long hours at low pay, but you’re creating impoverished situations which may wash over into the next generation. (Mahoney 2010, Globe and Mail)

This quote from Mahoney’s article is interesting because it does state certain ideas quite bluntly, such as the fact that LCP workers are brought into Canada because they will work for long hours at low pay. However, she goes on to condemn people for being from countries that have high poverty and unemployment levels. The author implies that LCP workers are tricking their way into Canada when they do not deserve to be here. The “expert” also blames the caregiver’s husband for his unemployment and denies that he would have the skills to find any work in Canada. The quote is effectively condemning immigration from disadvantaged countries by saying that poor families are a threat to Canadian economic and social wellbeing.

The fact that caregivers leave their families behind in order to migrate to Canada for private care work under the LCP was addressed in certain articles. There were 21 articles that mentioned or discussed these familial separations as part of the reality of migrant workers who

come to Canada. Most of the articles, however, did not discuss anything about family separations, with the majority of journalists writing one line that explains that workers must leave their families behind while working the required 24 months. A few articles underscore that these lengthy separations, of usually “five to seven years,” are detrimental to families, especially the children (Chan 2008). Chan (2008), in the *Vancouver Courier*, states that “citizenship does not mean happily ever after as the newly reunited family still must deal with separation and integration.” This highlights that the reunification of families may be a difficult process, particularly when this process of reintegration takes place in a new country.

The topic of family reunification frequently leads authors to suggest that there are some not so positive aspects to the reliance on the LCP as a route to citizenship. It is also an area where some of the more material aspects of citizenship status become more sharply revealed. A couple articles, for example, mention that sponsoring family members may create financial difficulties for live-in caregivers. The quote below is from an article that highlights how difficult it is to afford sponsorship. When the LCP worker is making minimum wage, minus room and board, personal costs, and remittances sent home to the family, it can be extremely difficult to save money for residency application fees.

The women's meagre pay also makes family reunification daunting, since the average cost to sponsor a small family is about \$7,000, according to the Philippine Women Centre in Vancouver. “It's really difficult to save \$7,000 when you're only earning \$1,500 a month.” (Howard 2007, Globe and Mail)

Another common argument that questions the use of TFWs was whether there is adequate governmental monitoring of these programs and whether there is enough attention given to checking on employers, job offers, and the labour situation itself. The worry here is that if there is no thorough regulation of the program, this can lead to a number of problems, such as abusive

employers not being punished, exploited workers not given respite from illegal conditions, and a large increase in workers turning to undocumented, underground work situations.

With no official agreement obligating the federal government to tell the provinces who, when and how many people are arriving as temporary foreign workers or live-in caregivers, employment standards branches across the country, no matter how good their intentions, don't have the necessary information to check up on workers, Sikka says. (Cherry 2008, Toronto Sun)

The quote above from Cherry's article highlights the research of Judy Fudge (2011), who looks at the lack of regulation of LCP working environments, and the lack of monitoring of recruitment agencies. Fudge contends that since migrant caregivers cross so many different jurisdictional boundaries, there is often confusion as to who is responsible for enforcing what rules. Since there is a separation between the federal government that oversees immigration regulations and the provinces in charge of labour regulations and their enforcement, officials often blame this split in jurisdiction as a factor that makes it "difficult to govern these workers in a manner that enhances their capabilities and provides decent work" (Fudge 2011:237-238). Ferrie (2004) highlights this jurisdictional problem by interviewing an employee of HRSDC, who states "if certain things are not happening in a labour relationship between an employer and a worker, that's not what we do, that is not our responsibility." The article also contains a quote from a member of CIC Canada, who puts the responsibility on other departments by stating,

If an unhappy caregiver wants "to change employers, we just tell them how to do it," says Janis Fergusson of CIC, "but in terms of monitoring the work environment, it's beyond our area of responsibility." (Ferrie 2004, The Tyee)

Many of the authors who looked at a variety of LCP topics also took the opportunity to include commentaries that question the ability of current government members to properly administer immigration. These narratives often address the government's inability to govern the

program and to make sound regulatory changes to the program. Certain authors allow for both current government officials and opposition critics to be quoted about the LCP. Other authors, however, took the opportunity to promote only one political party's arguments while ignoring contradictory ideas. There were a total of 27 articles on LCP policies and regulations that dedicated space to the commentaries and criticisms of current officials and opposition critics. For example, an article by Cribb and Brazao (2009) on Canada's lack of prosecutions against fraudulent recruiters, features an interview with an immigration critic, who states "[Prime Minister Stephen] Harper's Conservatives are either soft on crime or asleep at the switch." An article on the Dhalla controversy for the *Ottawa Citizen* also addresses party politics when the author states, "if I had to pick one other politician, lickety-split, who might have servants at home, the first name that comes to mind is Michael Ignatieff, the Liberal leader and Dhalla's boss... He just has that Lord of the Manor air about him" (Egan 2009).

3.3.2 Arguments that Applaud the Use of Temporary Foreign Workers

"This is an employment program for Canadians, dedicated to meet specific needs Canadian families have," de Beaucamp says. "It also is designed to help the caregivers land on their feet after their employment is finished." (Hall 1992, Toronto Star)

In contrast to the narratives discussed above, certain journalists, such as Hall (1992), argue that the use of temporary foreign worker programs, specifically the LCP, is an overall positive policy for Canada to pursue. Here the arguments also largely follow an economic perspective, with a focus on how these programs help businesses, and how the LCP in general could improve the productivity of Canadian citizens. Delaney (2007) states, "the live-in caregivers program was started in 1992 to fulfill a shortage of nannies in Canada, which occurred mainly because Canadians are unwilling to do the job."

Keung (2007), echoes Delaney's statement, explaining that "some argue low-skilled foreign workers are needed to do unpleasant jobs that Canadians refuse to do at current pay scales like the caregiver and farm worker jobs that often pay \$7 to \$10 an hour." Keung (2007), in the *Toronto Star* interview with the director of the Alliance of Sector Councils, references the director who explains that the low status and pay of some jobs leads to labour shortages in those occupations. The director states "If people don't want to do it, it's a labour shortage" (Keung 2007). The director continues to discuss the topic, stating "yes, employers could pay higher wages, but it's going to drive up the cost of goods... Are people going to pay \$3 for a Tim Hortons coffee?" (Keung 2007). The director, like others, justifies the use of the "cheap" labour of foreign workers as a benefit to Canadians in general.

The quote from Keung's article suggests that the low wages offered by employers result in a shortage of workers, but warns that it would be disadvantageous for Canadian consumers to demand that employers pay higher wages. The obvious issue is that if wages are raised for farmer workers and caregivers, then the cost of these goods and services will be higher for the Canadian consumer. This may be an effective way to gain support from some consumers for the temporary foreign worker programs and for the low wages paid to workers in those programs. If there can be a strong connection made between higher wages for TFWs and higher living costs for the average consumer, then there may be less of an outcry against exploited minimum wage foreign workers. The director uses a cup of coffee as an example of goods that could increase in prices, which also serves to trivialize the issue.

In the media reports that I reviewed, one argument about the benefits to Canadians of using temporary workers highlighted the increased ability of businesses to survive and succeed

within a difficult labour market. In an article from Whittington (2009), Immigration Minister Jason Kenney was asked about some of the potential problems of TFWs. Kenney supported the use of temporary workers programs by stating “there are tens of thousands of employers who tell me that they would go out of business if they couldn’t find people to fill those jobs” (Whittington 2009). Kenney’s use of the term “tens of thousands” gives the impression that TFWs are an important component of the Canadian economy, and that ending them could significantly hurt certain sectors of the economy.

The goal of the LCP is to provide private care options to individuals and families. This is reflected within the articles where some journalists make the argument that these workers are needed because there are no Canadians who want this type of work. One article by Ferrie (2004) states,

An aging population and the trend away from institutional care for all age groups means the demand for private pay home workers is growing in Canada, according to an October 2003 report commissioned by Health Canada and HRDC. Canadians won’t fill the need, the report says, because the jobs are low status. (Ferrie 2004, The Tyee).

Similar to this argument, a few authors (for example, Ferrie 2004; Friscolanti 2004) make the claim that the LCP helps to take pressure off Canada’s health care system, and also ends up saving money for taxpayers. In an article for the *National Post*, Friscolanti (2004), laments the long wait times that plague the administration of the LCP program, which ends up making families who desire caregivers wait for a long period of time before a caregiver can be brought into the country. Friscolanti (2004) contends that “severe backlogs in the program leave many needy Canadians without homecare workers... In the cases of those needing home health care, people are forced to check into a hospital or long-term-care facility while they wait for a foreign

worker to arrive—an option that ultimately ends up costing taxpayers.” The connection made between the use of the LCP and the expenditure of an average Canadian taxpayer is a powerful argumentation strategy for demonstrating that the program is important, even for those who do not directly use it.

Another important debate that some journalists tap into is the question of care options for an aging population within Canada. Certain authors frame the LCP as a viable care option for the senior population. For example, Proudfoot (2011) quotes an agency owner who discusses her placement business and claims “it’s becoming busier all the time because it is a very viable alternative for seniors.” The agency owner goes on to say, “they can stay in their own home, they don’t have to go into a facility and it’s less expensive” (Proudfoot 2011). This quote sets up the LCP as a great option for seniors who want to maintain independence, and also a great option for keeping pressure off senior facilities and hospitals and, by extension, taxpayers.

The vast majority of articles do not recognize the diverse skills that caregivers under the LCP may have to benefit the economy. However, Proudfoot, along with a couple other reporters from the smaller newspapers (Delaney 2007; Ferrie 2004; Calugay 2000), emphasizes that many of the caregivers under the LCP are highly skilled. Proudfoot (2011) interviews an academic researching elder care, who states “we often refer to it as ‘unskilled work,’ and believe me, you need a heck of a lot of skill.” Ferrie (2004) interviews an advocate for caregivers who explains, “these are highly skilled workers facing little opportunity or pay at home.” Thus, the majority of journalists paint the image of caregivers under the LCP as having less skill than the average Canadian; however, there are a few who recognize that the work that caregivers perform is diverse and often requires various skills from multi-tasking to first aid.

In a similar vein to the elder care issue, some articles connect the use of the LCP with the fact that there are few government-sponsored universally affordable childcare options for Canadian families. One article written by White (2010), a director for the Association of Caregiver's and Nanny Agencies Canada, emphasizes that "currently, Canada has no universally affordable child care option, leaving some families with few alternatives other than hiring an overseas caregiver." Pearce and Sokoloff (2007) again make this point by claiming that "it has gone from an upper-class luxury to a mainstream child-care option for two-income families as women have increased their presence in the work force." This quote draws attention to a second main argument about the positive aspects of the LCP: the idea that the use of the LCP allows for the existence of dual income families.

Many of the articles reflect the idea that "the increased employment of women, especially of married women with children, is usually what comes to mind when people explain the proliferation of private nannies, housekeepers, and housecleaners" (Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001:4). Perceptions of the LCP as a method for allowing women to work outside the home is reflected within an editorial posted in the *Globe and Mail* that frames the program quite positively. The editorial makes the statement that, "the Live-In Caregiver Program, while not perfect, contributes to Canada's productivity, by allowing middle-class mothers who cannot afford the prohibitive cost of daycare to re-enter the labour market after childbirth" (*Globe & Mail* editorial 2010). An article by Gombu (2000) for the *Toronto Star* also emphasizes the importance of the LCP for "Canadians, working mothers particularly." Hersch (2010c), in an article for *The Province*, states that under the LCP, "typical employers are women who may have spent the past several months on maternity leave and so are already living on a reduced income, families with members who

have lifelong disabilities, or elderly relatives for whom having a live-in caregiver is necessary for them to remain in their own home.”

Underlying every article that I reviewed was the assumption that caregivers are women. Care work is often perceived as women’s work since many of the tasks that domestic workers perform “are associated with women’s ‘natural’ expressions of love for their families” (Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001:9). Indeed, most articles did not question or discuss the gendered nature of care work, and just stated that LCP workers are female. The authors almost invariably used she/her when abstractly discussing a caregiver or they directly state women/girls, for example:

The LCP also serves a purpose because Canada has a lack of caregivers. Canadian girls don’t grow up wanting to be nannies, Kim says. “They want to be lawyers, architects and they have the educational opportunity to go further.” (48 Chan 2005, The Vancouver Courier)

The quote taken from Chan’s article above blatantly exemplifies the highly gendered nature of and assumptions about care work. The author points to Canadian girls as the section of the population that should rightfully be filling these home care jobs. However, since Canada has more resources and better educational opportunities, “girls” can become “high status” professionals, rather than low-skilled labourers. This quote says a lot about how the author assumes the job is perceived within Canada and who the authors expects to fill these private-sphere, poorly compensated jobs. Another article in the *Globe and Mail* also compares a highly feminized and stigmatized position to that of a caregiver, stating “in many ways, a great nanny is like having a mistress – it’s about love, power and need” (Pearce and Sokoloff 2007). The article is one of the few that explicitly mentions that power does play a significant role in the labour relationship.

The ability to hire a private child care worker is portrayed in the articles as improving family life for the average Canadian because it increases the quality time that parents can spend with their children, while the caregiver attends to chores, such as cooking and cleaning. These articles also discuss the fact that the LCP worker allows children to have a more stable life because the caregiver is always there to provide the child with one-on-one attention. One author in the *Edmonton Journal* frames the LCP as a necessity, not just a luxury, stating “a live-in nanny is often the only option for women whose work requires shifts or long hours” (Faulder 1999). One narrative found in the *Globe and Mail* from an employer describes her caregiver: “Susan was always there, in the background, careful not to disrupt our family life and yet supporting it through her contributions” (Sherman 2009). This quote highlights the uncomfortable reality that these women live with the family while remaining excluded from it. The reader gets the idea that the caregiver should really be an invisible entity, on call to satisfy the employer’s demands, but also ready to fade into the background in order to not “disrupt” the family. Another narrative from the *Nanaimo Daily News* also emphasizes this idea that the LCP improves family life,

Nan says her life is much less hectic as a result, as are her children’s. “We have a life as a family again,” she said. “Our lives used to consist of working all week, then spending two days getting things ready for the week. Now, we can go out and enjoy bike rides with the kids. What I find now is that we have a lot more quality time.” (Smith 2002, Nanaimo Daily News)

The above selection focuses on the caregiver’s ability to take on the mundane chores of everyday life such as cooking and cleaning, enabling Canadian parents to spend quality time with their children, enjoying activities such as bike rides. In the quote below, Loney discusses the increase in the number of Canadian families hiring two caregivers.

And despite an uncertain economy that has forced many families to adjust their household budgets, caregiver placement agencies across the country are reporting that not only has demand held steady, but requests for a second nanny have increased significantly in the past year. Most of the company's clients are working professionals who need extra help and don't want to pay overtime to an existing caregiver. Others are stay-at-home mothers with two young children who simply want more me-time. "They still want to make it to their yoga classes, or have date nights with their husbands," Ms. Bruce says. (Loney 2009, Globe and Mail)

Loney states that the families who hire two individuals are not just rich celebrities, but working families who either do not want to pay overtime to an existing worker, or who want more time away from their children. This article encourages the reader to see LCP workers as extremely affordable, since an increasing number of families are able to employ two individuals. The last sentence in the quote highlights the privilege that many Canadian employers have compared to the caregivers that they hire, since they are able to hire multiple caregivers just for more "me-time."

3.4 The promise of eventual permanent residency under the LCP as compensation

There are a few conflicting narratives within this section. Many journalists utilize the promise of eventual permanent residency status to show that this program is innovative and, unlike other countries, we do not just use workers for their cheap labour and then discard them. However, within this narrative, journalists also justify the period of temporary status by framing these women as low skilled, less educated, and lacking linguistic abilities, which in turn suggests that these women are not able to offer much in the way of financial or educational contributions to Canada. In order for the audience to not feel threatened by an influx of low-skilled and poor foreigners who will be eligible for residency, these women are also overwhelmingly portrayed as vulnerable, meek, and self-sacrificing hard workers, who only want to provide better lives for

their poor families. The framing of these workers as self-sacrificing and vulnerable women comes through strongly in the articles that discuss cases of unsuccessful residency applications and deportation orders.

Citizenship or permanent residency status is by far the most prolific topic found through the analysis stage, with 42 out of 70 journalists discussing this aspect of the program. A common perception in many of the articles (see for example, Faulder 1999; Chan 2005; Kleiss 2006) on the LCP was that live-in caregivers specifically participate in the program to gain landed immigrant status. These narratives suggest that gaining a chance to live in Canada is a major life goal of all those who enter the program and that getting to live in Canada will increase opportunities for these workers and their families. To access these “rewards,” these women will voluntarily work for wages that others would not accept. According to Faulder (1999):

finding a qualified, competent Canadian worker willing to work for a foreign domestic's wage -- about \$1,080 a month, less room and board -- is difficult. Foreign workers, on the other hand, may be nurses or teachers willing to exchange two years on minimum wage for a crack at a future in a country with opportunities, however hard-won. (Edmonton Journal)

Faulder juxtaposes “us and them” by stating that Canadians will not work for minimum wage because Canada is a place with opportunities. This disregards the fact that there is a significant section of the Canadian population that does work for minimum wage, or less than that. For example, a statistics Canada report on low-income individuals, states “approximately 20-24% of workers earn less than \$10.00 per hour” (Chaykowski 2005:2). In another report, Fortin and Fleury (2006:i) highlight that “in 2001, there were 653,300 working poor persons in Canada” (working poor is defined as a person who has worked a minimum of 910 hours in a year and has an income that falls below a low-income threshold, see report for calculations). On the other hand, Faulder believes that foreigners are so “desperate” to come to Canada that they will

work at jobs below their qualifications in return for residency status at the end of the difficult work term. This juxtaposition of skilled and unskilled immigrants continues below with Kleiss.

“I always had a dream of living in Canada,” Uematsu says, but she didn’t have the training or experience to qualify for traditional immigration. Then she learned of Canada’s unique Live-in Caregiver Program, run by Citizenship and Immigration Canada, which aims to bring foreigners to Canada to work as live-in caregivers. After two years of work, successful applicants can apply for landed-immigrant status. (Kleiss 2006, Edmonton Journal)

Kleiss’ description above of the LCP as “unique” creates the image that the program is an innovative, special, and positive initiative for both foreigners and Canadian citizens. Canada is often put in comparison with other countries that utilize foreign care workers. Certain articles highlight that the LCP allows eventual residency status, while other governments simply use similar care workers for labour and do not allow anything but temporary worker status. These comments focus on the fact that the Canadian government does give care workers something back in return for their labour, which makes the LCP appear far superior to other countries that rely on temporary migrant care workers. The majority of the reporters seem to support the idea that the offer of potential residency to caregivers helps to define Canada as a compassionate and caring nation that has a history of allowing people from “disadvantaged areas” to have a better life.

Many countries that host foreign domestic workers - including Hong Kong, Israel and other nations in Europe and the Middle East - do not permit them to become citizens. They are paid a pittance and stay for years as temporary guest workers; even their children born there have no right to citizenship. Under Canada’s innovative model, foreign caregivers (who must have a high school diploma, English fluency and work experience) are “fast-tracked” and can apply for permanent-resident status after completing 24 months of employment. (Globe & Mail editorial 2010)

The quote above is taken from a *Globe and Mail* editorial, which underscores the idea that the LCP is often applauded as a good model for other countries to adopt for their migrant caregivers.

The author scolds other countries that pay workers poorly and do not allow status, while portraying Canada's program as ethical and fair. This of course ignores the other temporary labour programs utilized by Canada that do not allow for permanent residency, such as farm workers under the Seasonal Agricultural Workers Program.

Indeed, Pratt (2005:1065) questions how this program of "indentured servitude persists in a liberal democratic society" and "not only does it persist without much censure or popular protest, but it is usually perceived in positive terms." Her answer to this question is that middle-class Canadians feel that even though the work is difficult and unregulated, "citizenship is judged as compensation" (Pratt 2005:1065). This idea of citizenship as the prize at the end of a difficult work term is evident in many of the articles analyzed for this research and is illustrated in many of the quotes discussed in this section. In an article for the *Vancouver Courier*, Chan (2005) states that the LCP "is the only program in the world to offer caregivers potential citizenship at the end of their work term." Following this theme, another journalist quotes an agency owner who also points out that Canada "is the only country in the world that allows permanent resident status" (Proudfoot 2011).

The eventual attainment of residency status is also linked to workers being able to provide "a better future for their families" (Proudfoot 2011). Smith (2002) in an article titled "The Nanny Alternative" also promotes this idea,

For many of the nannies from overseas, coming to Canada offers them the opportunity to make good lives for themselves. Those who enter the country as part of Immigration/Human Resource Development Canada's live-in caregiver program have the opportunity to apply for permanent residence after two years of employment. (Smith 2002, Nanaimo Daily News)

Indeed, employer narratives often justify the lower wages paid to workers by identifying the ability of the LCP to lead to permanent residency status, and then a better future. One employer

states, “I do justify it with discomfort, because I do support the whole notion that child care shouldn’t be underpaid.” In the article, the employer also states that what makes the situation work for her under the LCP is the potential for residency: “I think it’s a reasonable way for immigrant women to get entry into this country” (Faulder 1999).

Many articles that discuss the LCP stress that most of the participants would never qualify under the independent class of immigration because of issues such as poverty, education, or current occupation. Thus this program is often understood as enabling “under-privileged” individuals and their families to gain Canadian permanent residency in exchange for a few years of difficult and poorly compensated labour in a private home.

“If they were going through the regular independent immigration program, that assumes they could land another job here in Canada other than as a live-in caregiver, and we can’t assume that,” says Rene Mercier, a spokesman for the Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration. “Normally, many of the people who come here as nannies would not meet the high criteria that we have to be landed as economic migrants. So [the program] is one way for those people to come in, help someone in Canada and get something in return.” (Calugay 2000, Kingston Whig Standard)

The quote above, taken from Calugay’s article, portrays the LCP and the potential for permanent residency as a type of balanced exchange. The labour they perform under the program is characterized as “helping someone,” while a chance at residency is their reward. Another article by Walkom (2009) for the *Toronto Star* also highlights this narrative, stating “foreigners who otherwise don’t qualify to get into Canada win a chance at citizenship.” The term “win a chance” again highlights the notion that since they would never qualify outside of the LCP, Canadian residency is a prize that successful workers win.

3.4.1 Inadmissibility under the LCP: Not Everyone Deserves Permanent Residency

The threat of deportation can be a powerful incentive for many workers to stay in exploitative situations or to move to undocumented work situations. Some researchers (Pratt 2005; Oxman-Martinez et al. 2004) have suggested that a threat of deportation is a common intimidation tactic under the LCP. Even though employers do not have the ability to have a caregiver deported, the caregiver may not be aware of this, and may comply with unreasonable demands. The threats of deportation from employers will be addressed in chapter 4 in relation to the labour relationship. Beyond threats of deportation by employers, there are certain problems that can arise, which may lead to the caregiver or her family being inadmissible for residency.

If the caregiver completes her work experience component and applies for permanent residency, inadmissibility may be determined for a variety of reasons. Medical or past criminal problems of the caregiver or any family members (being sponsored or not) may lead to inadmissibility. Therefore, even if the caregiver is deemed healthy and not a security threat, any problems that arise with family members can still lead to her application being inadmissible (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2011b). If a caregiver is unable to prove that they have completed the two years of full time work, that the main duty was to perform care work, or that they only worked for one employer, then they may also be deemed inadmissible for permanent residency. Once inadmissibility is determined, the worker must leave voluntarily by a set date or a deportation order may be administered and the applicant may be forced to leave the country immediately.

There are 20 articles that discuss deportation either in terms of actual cases of deportation ordered against caregivers or caregivers feeling threatened with deportation in employment

situations. The majority of the authors side with the caregiver, showing sensitivity to their situations, and often questioning the decision of government officials who had determined that these caregivers cannot become permanent residents. The authors in these articles often focus on the sacrifices made by these caregivers, and how it is unfair for the country not to reward the worker with residency. The narratives created within these articles allow for the journalists to further images of the caregivers as self-sacrificing and hard working women who desperately want Canadian citizenship for their families. These narratives work well at quelling audience anxieties over the program because it creates the idea that even though these workers are low-skilled, the Canadian population should not despair because these women will do anything just to help their families out of poverty and despair. These stories of inadmissibility also allow for journalists to show how much the attainment of residency would really mean to the caregivers, which again may compel audiences to look at these women as favourable additions to the Canadian population.

After the LCP was implemented, certain stories began to emerge in the media of workers being denied residency because of the second medical exam that workers had to complete before applying for permanent residency. Medical problems with the caregiver or her family may arise during this second exam, which may negate the fact that the caregiver has already completed the necessary labour requirements under the LCP to apply for permanent residency. Many critics pointed out that this was the only immigration program where the second medical exam was a requirement, and that this medical exam was conducted, untypically, after the workers had already completed their work experience. Journalists discuss participants who were denied residency because of medical problems, which developed during or after their work experience, such as one Filipino caregiver who was “denied residency because she had breast cancer” (Lee-

Shanok 1993). Mamann (2008) in an article for *Metro News* recounts the story of Laila Suan Elumbra, a caregiver who fell into a coma two months before finishing the two years of service, and “was ordered to leave Canada in August 2006.”

Another problem identified in the media reports is where a caregiver and her family are denied residency because of the health problems of family members. One popular story involved a caregiver, Hesanna Santiago, who completed her work experience and applied for residency. When her family went for their medical examinations, her daughter was diagnosed with chronic kidney failure, which made her inadmissible for residency status. An article by Chai (2009), for the *Times Colonist*, highlights the image of these workers as vulnerable, stating “Santiago’s deportation would mean the family could not afford medical treatment for Angelika.” Santiago was working two jobs in Canada to pay for her daughter’s medical treatment and she expressed fear that being deported would jeopardize the family’s finances. Chai (2009) goes on to state “this is really a life-or-death issue... This little girl will die.” Another article about this case in the *Vancouver Sun* highlights the image of the devoted worker by stating, “Santiago’s hard work and sacrifice came under fire last September, when a required medical exam diagnosed her 12-year-old daughter with chronic kidney failure, disqualifying the family from permanent residency” (Tebrake 2009). The two quotes above frame citizenship status as more material, rather than symbolic, and highlights how this status can ensure that the families of these workers are able to access important resources, such as medical care.

In response to criticisms from advocates, the government began to look at scrapping this second test, and ultimately did so in 2010. One of the main reasons for scrapping the second test was the publicity that surrounded Juana Tejada. Tejada was a live-in caregiver who was denied residency after her second medical test revealed cancer in 2006. The government denied her

applications for humanitarian and compassionate considerations; however, the media attention she received ended up creating a situation where the unfairness of the second test was highlighted. She was eventually granted permanent residency status and successfully lobbied to end the second medical requirement before passing away in a Toronto hospital in 2009. The case of Tejada again framed her as a hard worker who spent two years “faithfully serving Canadian families” (Mamann 2008). One article by Keung (2008) quotes Tejada stating “I have paid my dues to earn my permanent residency. I have worked hard to try to give my family (her husband and six siblings) a better life.” Keung goes on to quote her lawyer,

“Juana has respected and followed all of our laws to the letter. If not for her cancer, she would have already been a permanent resident and realized her dream,” said her immigration lawyer, Rafael Fabregas. “Is it right to kick her out of Canada now because she is dying? While it may be legal, I don’t think it’s right. It would be manifestly inhumane.” (Keung 2008, Toronto Star)

Keung successfully portrays Tejada as a helpless victim at the mercy of unfair government regulations. He also frames her desire for permanent residency status as “realizing her dream” which promotes the image that these caregivers will do anything just for the chance to live in Canada.

3.5 Images of Canada and LCP Supply Countries

All but three of the articles did not explicitly acknowledge the racialized aspect of the LCP, when the majority of the participants are women of color from the Philippines. The most common terms used to describe these women were “immigrant caregiver,” “foreign caregiver” or “Filipina caregiver.” Within the majority of articles, there was no real mention of racialized labour, or how this may impact labour flows under the program and also employment experiences within Canada. There were certain prevalent narratives that constructed the

Philippines as poor, corrupt, and dependent on labour exports for economic survival. Canada, on the other hand, is portrayed as a place where opportunities are wide open and there are no structural barriers to advancement.

There is virtual silence within the news articles as to what caregivers may experience when they gain an open work permit after their 24 months of labour tied to a specific employer. Many academics have contended that since LCP caregivers are unable to take courses to improve or update their skills while under the program, that this may impact what type of work they may access after they leave the program. The inability to work in an occupation tied to their educational attainment, and the fact that wage levels in new jobs may be effected by what the wages were at previous positions, means that many workers do not find jobs and pay scales relevant to their skills at the end of the process. The majority of journalists ignore these concerns for caregivers raised by academics and advocates (see for example, Pratt 1999; Valiani 2009; Sharma 2002). A narrative that is created within many of the articles is the framing of the LCP as a form of financial aid to “Third World” countries. Journalists in 28 of the articles describe the LCP as the only way that these women can help their families get out of poverty. The LCP is also seen as helping to sustain the Philippine economy through remittances. The focus on the poor wages available to these caregivers at home is used as a way to justify the minimum wage open to workers under the program.

3.5.1 Global Stereotypes: Canada is the Land of Opportunity and the Philippines is not...

Within many of the articles certain ideas emerge which promote an image of Canada as a nation of opportunity. This is often juxtaposed with images of source countries for the LCP, namely the Philippines with a small number of other countries also mentioned occasionally, such

as Jamaica and Slovakia. A few articles made direct comparisons between Canada and other countries that construct Canadian society as equal and open and the others as poor and corrupt.

For Slovaks, whose country is undergoing the difficult transition from a centrally planned economy to a capitalist one, Canada is seen as the land of opportunity, and the Live-in Caregiver program a quick way to get your papers. "I grew up under communism and then we had the Velvet Revolution so I've seen both sides. Here, the opportunities are wide open," says Ms. Gajdosova, who cares for three children in a spacious North Toronto home. (Jimenez 2004, Globe and Mail)

Jimenez (2004) describes an increase in caregivers from Slovakia migrating to Canada under the LCP. The author emphasizes that the LCP is a "quick way" to obtain permanent residency in Canada. Jimenez does not acknowledge the fact that on average the process takes about 5-7 years and is extremely expensive. The comparisons made between Canada and Eastern Europe are also of note. Jimenez highlights through quotations that opportunities in Canada are "wide open." This statement puts all of the responsibility for success on the individual, and again denies existing social barriers in Canada that can hinder certain individuals from being successful in the labour market. The comparison of Canada to other countries is threaded through this quote from Calugay,

Like the desperate people from China who arrived in rusty boats off the coast of British Columbia, thousands of women are willing to make any sacrifice to come to Canada. "Since I was a child, I've been hearing that Canada is much better than the U.S.," she says. "I didn't really know why, but I heard it often." (Calugay 2000, Kingston Whig Standard)

Calugay makes a direct link between refugees and LCP workers, with specific reference to boats that were discovered off the coast of BC in 1999, carrying 600 migrants from China. This event was heavily reported by the media and at times, encouraged fears regarding threats to national security (Hier & Greenburg 2002). Calugay's quote resonates with the findings of Baker *et al.* (2008) who also found that refugees, asylum seekers, migrants, and immigrants were often

talked about in the same ways, with journalists using similar descriptions and adjectives to talk about the different groups. Baker *et al.* were surprised by the overlap between refugees and migrants within the British press, and concluded that “the four terms are used as near synonyms” within the press (2008:287). The quote below, taken from Egan’s article, describes Canada as a society with limited class distinctions and little to no history of a domestic labour market. Egan ignores Canada’s long history of securing migrant labour for domestic work in private homes, which was discussed in Chapter 1.

Having servants doesn't strike me as a particularly Canadian custom, or value. We never had much of a class system, nor a string of castles. We'll trap our own beavers, thank you, chop our own trees, try our own renos. Generally speaking, the generation of post-war parents did not have "servants," save the odd house cleaner, nor do their now-grown children. Does anyone on your street have a butler? (Egan 2009, The Ottawa Citizen)

A few articles discuss the Philippines as a major labour exporter. The authors stress that remittances that come from migrant workers help to sustain the Philippine’s economy. These articles also draw attention to the poverty in the Philippines and the low wages that many workers are avoiding through migration.

The Philippines is a massive labour exporting country. According to the Philippine Overseas Employment Agency, more than 5.4 million Filipino overseas contract workers are employed in 150 countries as varied as Saudi Arabia, Cyprus, Italy, Denmark, and South Korea. Instead of exporting garments and coconuts, the Philippine government exports its people. They are a lucrative source of foreign dollars for the government, sending back over \$8 billion US in remittances last year. Philippine president Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo recently implored overseas workers to increase their remittances by an additional \$20 a month to help their families and their country. (Chan 2005, Vancouver Courier)

In the quote taken from Chan’s article, she discusses the large number of workers who migrate out of the Philippines. Chan describes typical Asian exports and then compares these objects to people from the Philippines. This has an effect of dehumanizing workers that migrate

from the Philippines by equating them with a coconut or piece of clothing. The idea that a country is exporting a product also takes away from the agency of these workers and trivializes their own difficult decisions to migrate out of their home countries. This notion of the Philippines as “exporting workers” is also seen in Montgomery’s article below.

But the Philippines, for example, gladly exports its workers because the foreign currency they send back to their families is in part what saved it from the economic meltdown experienced in other Asian countries in the 1990s. (Montgomery 2003, The Gazette)

Montgomery makes the connection between the LCP and remittances to the Philippines. The quote focuses on how the LCP is a positive program for both Canada and the Philippines. The justification is that the program, through remittances and caregiver training centers, has allowed economic growth in the Philippines. Indeed, the narrative created by Montgomery seems to be suggesting that the LCP in some small way has helped the Philippines stave off financial disaster unlike other countries in the region which do not take advantage of the opportunity for their citizens to migrate for work. Within this humanitarian narrative, there is obviously no discussion of any negative effects of these mass migrations out of the country, such as long-term familial separations or “brain drain.”

Many articles highlight the fact that caregivers from the Philippines made the decision to migrate to Canada because of the low wages that are offered at home. Calugay (2000), in an article titled “Not One of the Family,” discusses the decision of one caregiver to migrate and states that she left her teaching job in the Philippines because it only paid \$150 dollars per month. She is quoted in the article stating, “You could get paid double that in Singapore as a nanny... triple that in Hong Kong - greener pastures. The whole reason why I went abroad was because of low salaries back home” (Calugay 2000). Another caregiver, quoted by Proudfoot

(2011), emphasizes that her decision to migrate under the LCP was economically motivated. She contends, “There was better pay abroad. Unemployment in the Philippines is the number 1 problem now” (Proudfoot 2011). Chan (2005) continues this theme,

The vast majority are women, most of them university educated. Agoncillo has a bachelor’s degree in psychology but when her daughter Mylene started school, she decided to become a domestic worker in Hong Kong. There, she can earn \$552 a month, a generous amount compared to a minimum monthly wage of \$140 in the Philippines. But soon, Canada beckoned. More than higher wages (approximately \$1,200 a month on paper), the LCP offers a golden carrot. (Vancouver Courier)

All of the quotes included above emphasize the higher pay available to Philippine women who leave their homes to work as care givers abroad. Chan (2005), in particular, suggests that the pay in Canada is much higher than elsewhere and that the women who leave the Philippines for Canada will earn around 1000 dollars more per month. This narrative emphasizes that these women are gaining in financial terms when they come to Canada under the LCP. Chan, Proudfoot, and Calugay above all identify low wages and no job opportunities in the Philippines as the primary reason for migration. These explanations are contrary to other authors who suggest that the acquirement of Canadian citizenship is the main reason why people come to Canada under the LCP. For Chan, Proudfoot, and Calugay, temporary foreign workers may be coming to Canada simply because they can earn much higher wages here rather than as a means to attain permanent residency or citizenship status.

Similarly, some authors choose to emphasize that these workers are supporting their relatives back home, who may otherwise starve without the remittances. Pratt (2005) suggests that a focus on poverty for caregivers in the Philippines is often a strategy to justify low wages and poor working conditions within Canada. In fact, most caregivers who migrate from the Philippines are middle class and decide to leave the Philippines to “maintain their middle class

standing in the face of massive privatization of state services in the Philippines, especially health and education services” (Pratt 2005:1068). Despite the reality that many LCP workers are from the middle class, “media fascination with poverty in the Philippines, for example with the sale of body organs, does nothing to convey this message of middle-class labour migration—of the basic similarity between middle class Canadians and the Filipinas whom they employ as servants” (Pratt 2005:1068).

The assumption that these women are supporting their relatives and communities through money earned under the LCP also supports a narrative that this program is an effective means of aiding those in poverty. This humanitarian narrative, with a focus on how remittances sent from Canada allows for families to improve their own lives in the Philippines, helps to justify the existence of the program, and provides a counter balance to a narrative that Canadians are exploiting these workers. Cryderman and Gignac (2009), in an article for the *Calgary Herald*, assert that LCP workers are “often supporting relatives back at home who would starve without them. There’s a lot of economic pressure on them.” Mamman (2008) also utilizes the poverty narrative by discussing the story of one caregiver who “worked hard looking after other people’s children so that she could support her relatives back home.” The quote below, from an article for the *Toronto Star*, mobilizes this poverty narrative and reflects how it can be taken up within the employment relationship in order for employers to justify exploitative wages.

Namukasa said she didn’t question her \$100 monthly pay when she began working for Ssekabira in March 2008 because she didn’t know the value of Canadian money. But when her mother in Uganda became ill and asked her to send more money for medication, she said she asked Ssekabira for a raise. “She told me I was already earning more money than I would ever make back home,” Namukasa said. “She told me to never tell anyone how much I was making.” (Monsebraaten 2011, Toronto Star)

Namukasa’s words included in Monsebraaten’s article reflect the findings of Cheng’s

(2004) research. Cheng found that employers often constructed domestic workers through perceived differences in race, class, and national identity in order to legitimate their unequal treatment at their workplaces and in the wider society. Cheng (2004:57) contended that in Taiwan, many employers focus on the poverty of the Philippines because it “reinforces the system of low wage, and it affirms the overseas work as an ‘international gift-giving.’” Thus, many employers interviewed by Cheng believed that migrant workers from the Philippines should not ask for more money because the minimum wage was higher than what they could make back home.

Where Taiwan and Canada meet is in the fact that in both countries, the use of migrant caregivers often “comes to be seen as a gesture of good will by individual employers and a form of global charity by an economically advanced nation” (Cheng 2004:57). Faulder (1999) reflects this idea in an article for the *Edmonton Journal* where she interviews an employer about wages paid under the LCP. Faulder (1999) writes, “Chotalia points out that, though the wage she pays her nanny is small by Canadian terms, it still affords the woman the opportunity to send money home to help support her own children, who are cared for by a nanny back in the Philippines.” This statement again reflects how employers, governments, and the general population can justify the poor wages, the exploitative situations, and the unfair regulations, since these migrant workers are making more money than they could in their home country.

3.5.2 Racial Essentialisms

A common theme within many academic research projects on transnational care work is the influence of race/ethnicity on how workers are perceived by employers and the public (Arat-Koc 1992; Bakan & Stasiulis 1995, 1995; Cheng 2004; Constable 1997; Pratt 1997; Stiell & England 1997). A few journalists pointed out that women from countries such as the Philippines

or Jamaica are treated as less qualified and are often given a wider range of labour intensive tasks than those considered to be “white”; however, the majority of authors avoided commenting on the racialized aspect of labour under the LCP. Chan (2005) is one of the authors that does acknowledge the racialized aspect, stating “compared to British, Australian or other European nannies who are typically treated more as au pairs, critics of the program say, Filipino nannies tend to be treated more as all-around servants expected to do heavy household chores in addition to taking care of children.” Her use of the terms “British,” “Australian,” and “European Nannies” to signify that these workers are “white,” reflects the common assumption that these countries or areas of the world signify a particular racial composition that is different from “Filipino Nannies.”

Hondagneu-Sotelo’s study of Latina domestic workers in Los Angeles found that race and immigration are interacting to create new racialized perceptions and terms. She contends that “their position as ‘foreigners’ and ‘immigrants’ allows employers and the society at large to perceive them as outsiders and thereby overlook the contemporary racialization of the occupation” (2001:14). She goes on to state that “immigration does not trump race but, combined with the dominant ideology of a ‘color-blind’ society manages to shroud it” (2001:14). As such, she is not suggesting that race appears to be less important than it was in the past in the construction of certain occupations, but rather that racialization is now intersected by categories of foreignness or immigrant. This is an important comment because the articles analyzed for this thesis also seem to follow this pattern with most using “immigrant” or “foreign worker” to discuss the individuals who migrate under the LCP. These terms also seem to imply that immigrants and foreign workers under the LCP are most likely visible minorities. One article by Ferrie (2004) does acknowledge that there can be differential treatment of caregivers from

different areas, however he does not mention specific racialized populations, instead preferring the more neutral term of “immigrant.” Ferrie (2004), underscores that “immigrant caregivers earn paid minimum wage while the average Canadian caregiver makes \$11.95 per hour.”

Carlson (2009) in an article for the *National Post* interviews an agency owner who again avoids addressing the issue of racialization, instead using the term “foreign nanny.” The agency owner discusses exploitation of caregivers under the LCP and contends that the issue stems from workers being mistreated and overworked in other countries before arriving in Canada. She states, “when they come over here, they overwork themselves, almost out of habit” (Carlson 2009). This implies that Canadian employers do not overwork, mistreat, or exploit their workers, which is certainly an overgeneralization. The owner goes on to state, “there is definitely a cultural divide among local and foreign nannies. Local caregivers have a different view of what’s reasonable” (Carlson 2009). The quotes discussed above reinforce Hondagneu-Sotelo’s conclusions that the use of the term “foreign” or “immigrant” within the news articles can be seen as a way to signify that LCP workers are outsiders, without having to discuss issues of racialization. The framing of local caregivers as “more reasonable” in Carlson’s article creates a racial dichotomy that differentiates one group from another. This focus on the caregivers overworking themselves also takes the employers out of the equation and does not acknowledge the countless cases of exploitation by Canadian employers and the power dynamics that can emerge between employer and employee.

The use of the term Filipina nanny in many of the articles reviewed is also interesting and lends some credence to Barber’s research claims. As mentioned in Chapter 1, Barber (2000) believes that the large number of Filipinas that have participated in domestic service have allowed for Canadian society to rework constructions about class, gender, and cultural identities.

Barber claims that this has led to Filipinas in Canada being negatively associated with “demeaned class and status” (2000:400). A key way to consistently associate a group with an occupation is to put the ethnic identity before the occupational description. This is a powerful way to connect a group with the perceptions and stereotypes associated with an occupation. For example, Jimenez (2004) states “Filipina nannies have long dominated the scene in Canada, along with caregivers from the Caribbean, who exist in parallel but separate universes.”

3.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have explored the dominant media narratives about the LCP as a form of intertwined processes and results, including those of immigration, migration, migrant labour, or temporary foreign labour. In general, these narratives highlight the movement of these women across borders and the reasons for and consequences of those movements for the women, for the sending countries, and for the receiving country of Canada. Within these discussions, we can discern two dominant organizing frameworks, which we are provided with to understand the LCP. In the first dominant frame, the LCP is promoted as a temporary foreign worker program that efficiently provides Canada with the types of workers they need today, at the right costs, without tying the country to the need to integrate these workers in the future when their services are no longer wanted.

As such, the LCP is seen as a positive element of the Canadian economy since it allows for affordable private care options while reducing the pressure on government to provide public care options and thereby lessening the burden on taxpayers. The LCP is also presented as allowing primary care givers to shift some responsibilities to paid caregivers, thereby enabling them to take on paid employment and/or to spend more “quality time” with family and friends.

For the women employed under the LCP as a migrant labour program, the benefits are seen to include the ability of the women to make much more money than they could at home or elsewhere, to support their impoverished families back home, and to assist their underdeveloped countries through their transfers of wealth.

However, certain journalists see the LCP as a negative addition to the economy because it allows low skilled workers to apply for residency, it can lead to vulnerabilities for the caregivers, and some see it as an integral aspect to the de-professionalization of the caregiver industry within Canada. In justifying the poor wages and restrictive living conditions of the temporary foreign workers, many journalists rely on the construction of these workers as unskilled, uneducated, and desperate, willing to do whatever is necessary to support themselves, their families and their countries. Yet, this narrative also celebrates the “fact” that the women can make more money here than they can make elsewhere. Through the analysis of the articles it became clear that the majority of the authors avoided the racialized aspects of the program, despite the fact that most of them focused on Filipina caregivers. However, racialized perceptions may have impacted other constructions of these women, such as the “unskilled” stereotype.

The other main framework discussed in this chapter for understanding the LCP is the LCP as a route to immigration to Canada. The LCP is applauded in this narrative as a means to permanent residency and/or citizenship for individuals who are otherwise not qualified to enter the country. This is then a program that provides an opening to individuals who are not considered worthy to stay in the country because of their wealth, family connections, or necessary skills. So unlike other temporary worker programs, the LCP is singled out as unique in offering a chance at landed immigrant status that the other TFW programs do not provide.

Journalists utilize the ability for caregivers to apply for permanent residency after 24 months of work to justify the controversial elements of the LCP, such as the live-in regulation and the employer-specific work permit. Yet a few commentators also spoke to the difficulties in attaining permanent residency status. Indeed, there were some that focused on the deportation of caregivers. Some discussed barriers to achieving permanent residency: because of the difficulties of gaining or documenting the required work experience in Canada, because of health problems for the applicant or family members, or criminal record issues.

In these articles that discuss instances of inadmissibility, caregivers are often seen as hard working and driven by a strong desire to aid their poor families and provide better lives for future generations. These images of self-sacrificing workers resonate well with neoliberal principles that perpetuate the value of individual initiative. Other commentators, however, questioned the sincerity and/or the appropriateness of the women and their families applying for landed immigrant status because they are constructed as less skilled than “regular” immigration groups. These narratives that see caregivers as low-skill are potentially driven by prejudiced understandings of what the “Rest” has to offer the “West.” It also links poverty with skill to forward the assumption that if an individual grows up in a disadvantaged region, then they are less likely to have something positive to offer a privileged country.

To answer the first question about how TFW programs are discussed by the media, it became clear that an economic framework was often utilized in order for journalists to discuss, justify or condemn the temporary aspect of the program. This is unsurprising given the fact that the drive for temporary labour often comes from employer needs within the national labour market. However, this lens also signifies that LCP caregivers, as TFWs, are characterized primarily as workers. This again harkens back to the idea that in order to justify differential

treatment of foreign workers, they are differentiated from Canadians, and framed as workers more often than as potential citizens. With regard to the second question on citizenship, this aspect was discussed with overwhelming positivity. Residency was seen as inherently positive for all LCP caregivers, because it is framed as leading to a life of opportunities. For the third question, it became clear through the analysis that many journalists reinforced existing stereotypes of the “West vs. the Rest.” There was also a clear reinforcement of the common idea that care work is a woman’s natural duty. The clear link between foreign caregivers and the unskilled stereotype was also a reinforcement of common racialized perceptions of certain regions of the world.

Chapter Four: Labour Relations under the LCP

4.1 Introduction

This chapter is concentrated on the last three research questions of this study. These research questions are: 1) Do journalists discuss and acknowledge the regulations surrounding work permits, and how this can greatly influence the labour experiences of women under this program? 2) How are the issues related to working in the private sphere discussed and understood by the journalists? Does the fact that the employee lives in their employer's home influence what the media say about these issues? 3) Do journalists in the news articles recognize power imbalances within these situations? Through the news discourses they create, can we understand what relationships, negotiations, and compromises emerge out of these labour situations?

In the first section, I explore how different media reports construct representations of the employer-specific work permit that all caregivers have under the LCP. I also identify how journalists constructed the plight of Leticia Cables, one caregiver who was deported after she was encouraged by her employer to work for other people. The work permit topic is also examined through narratives that highlight anxiety around the monitoring of the program and the ability for the government to ensure that caregivers are kept track of and that they have “proper” or legal status.

In the second part of this chapter, I focus on how journalists portrayed the live-in component of the program, which amounted to most authors seeing this regulation as problematic. In the final part of the analysis, I look at the representations of the labour relationships created under the program, and how employers and employees are portrayed within

the Canadian news reports. The majority of the articles that dealt with labour relations under the program promulgated representations of the “vulnerable caregiver” who is exploited by the employer. The power asymmetry within the labour relationship was exemplified perhaps most through the case of Member of Parliament Ruby Dhalla, which received a considerable amount of media attention after three caregivers complained about their treatment while working for her family. Some articles, however, countered the abusive employer narrative by emphasizing how many caregivers are treated like “one of the family.”

4.2 The Difficulties of an Employer-Specific Work Permit

The work permit was not a main focus for most of the reporters who discussed the regulations of the program. Instead, the articles focused primarily on the live-in regulation and the labour relationship. I discuss these topics in more detail later in this chapter. The work permit was mentioned 40 times in a total of 23 articles (see for example, Calugay 2000; Purdy and Ovenden 2000; Gombu 2000). There were three main narratives that surrounded the work permit aspect of the LCP. The first narrative involves journalists simply mentioning that a work permit is required for caregivers employed under the program. The second prevailing narrative focuses on some of the problems that may arise due to the employer-specific aspect of the permit. A third primary narrative about work permits focuses on how the government may be unable to properly regulate either the recruitment agencies that operate under the LCP, or the women themselves to insure that they are working in the jobs they were approved for.

4.2.1 Work Permit: Narrative One

Rather than an open work permit or an occupation-specific permit, the work permit under the LCP is tied to a single employer. Thus, if a job does not work out, for whatever reason, the

caregiver must first find a new employer, and then reapply for a labour market opinion and work permit, which can take at least one month. This fact led Bakan and Stasiulis (1994:14) to conclude that the Canadian government grants temporary work permits in order to ensure “an indentured or captive labour force... who were unlikely to quit regardless of how exploited or intolerable their work and living situations.”

Most authors of the news articles analyzed simply mention that the work permit is something that caregivers under the program have, without acknowledging why this may be significant. These authors do not mention that the work permit is employer-specific. This narrative also makes no mention of how the employer-specific permit may increase the probability that caregivers will stay in bad labour situations because it is a time consuming process to change employers.

For example, Keung (2008) wrote an article on the deportation of a caregiver, Juana Tejada, who was ill with cancer, and simply mentions that she will “be forced to leave when her work permit expires in two months.” He does not, however, mention anything else about the work permit required under the program. Sanders (2009), in an article for the *Winnipeg Free Press*, also does not mention that the work permit is employer-specific, or that it can lead to further difficulties under the program. She discusses the story of one caregiver under the LCP who “obtained a work permit in April 2005.” Another article by McGinnis (2004) about a caregiver who ran into troubles trying to sponsor her family for permanent residency, does not mention any work permit required under the program, and in fact only mentions that she applies for one after the completion of the LCP.

The first two years flew by with few hurtles. She worked for families in Ottawa and Moncton, completed the live-in caregiver program and was granted a work permit as she applied to become a Canadian citizen. (McGinnis 2004, Telegraph-Journal)

In an article for the *Toronto Star*, Gombu (2000) discusses one couple that wanted to sponsor a relative to be a caregiver. Gombu (2000) states, “Now they’re taking the immigration department to the Federal Court of Canada for refusing to grant a temporary work permit to Kiani’s Iranian sister so that she can help look after their 18- month-old son.” In an article by Howard (2007), he discusses the story of one caregiver, who “came to Canada in 1991 through a work-visa program for live-in caregivers that can pave the way to landed-immigrant status.” These authors all acknowledge that the program requires a work permit; however, that is the only aspect that is mentioned in regards to the permit within this narrative. My analysis of the articles reveals that this narrative was the most prevalent, while smaller newspapers were likely to discuss more details about the permit.

4.2.2 Employer-specific Permit: Narrative Two

The second prevailing narrative found through the analysis focuses on the employer-specific aspect of the permit. These journalists (see for example Simons 2000; Ferrie 2004; Delaney 2007) emphasize how the regulations that govern employment changes can have a negative impact on the caregiver, since the wait time to process new permits is often at least two months. The authors that describe in quite a bit of detail the process necessary to change a work permit tended to write for smaller newspapers, while the larger dailies were more likely to present the first narrative and just mention the work permit in passing.

While it's easy to suggest that live-in caregivers leave a bad boss to shop for a better one, that process can be a bureaucratic slog. Wasike says she lost

eight months of full time work looking for new employers and going through a drawn out certification process that involves HRDC and CIC. It can take two months to process any changes to the work permit. In addition, it takes time for the caregiver to find a new employer. The delays are risky. A caregiver must fulfill 24 months of full time employment within three years. If she is unable to do so, she must leave the country, reapply, and start from scratch. (Ferrie 2004, The Tyee)

The majority of the articles that explained how the process of changing employers could contribute to worker vulnerability came from smaller newspapers, such as *The Tyee*, *Epoch Times*, and the *Kingston Whig Standard*. In an informative article on the program, Delaney (2007) explains, “if the caregiver’s services are no longer needed or she wants to change employers, there’s a wait of at least three months while Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) issues a new work permit.” This is an important statement because it provides the reader with an understanding of how changing permits is a time consuming process.

A few authors (Delaney 2007; *Gazette* Editorial 2009; Calugay 2000) that describe the process of changing employers also mention the problem of limited financial support available to the caregivers while they are unemployed. According to Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2011a), caregivers under the LCP who lose their jobs at no fault of their own, may be eligible to receive employment insurance. However, whether caregivers qualify can be a confusing matter. The Citizenship and Immigration Canada website states, “how long you must work before you qualify for EI will depend on the unemployment rate in your region when you file a claim for benefits” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2011a). The narratives created by journalists about the program also reflect this uncertainty over whether caregivers who are fired will be able to receive EI.

In an article for the *Epoch Times*, Delaney (2007) states that during the wait time for a new permit, the caregiver “who is prohibited from receiving social assistance or taking any kind of training courses, is without an income if she doesn't qualify for employment insurance.” In an editorial posted in *The Gazette*, a former caregiver reflects on the negative impact of the employer-specific permit on the caregivers under the program. The former caregiver explains that while waiting for a new permit, “the caregiver has no compensation, no EI, no income” (*Gazette* Editorial 2009). Indeed, these quotes reflect that the process of receiving employment insurance is so long and complicated that few caregivers attempt to claim it while they are without a job (Bakan and Stasiulis 1997).

In an article for the *Kingston Whig Standard*, Calugay (2000) interviews Abigail Bakan, who is an influential Canadian academic researching the LCP. Calugay quotes Bakan who emphasizes how, regardless of the intentions of either the worker or employer, the nature of the work permit sways the balance of power strongly in the employer's favour. Bakan states, “In the Live-in Caregiver Program, you are assigned a particular employer in order to guarantee your rights to stay inside the country... and it is difficult to change employers” (Calugay 2000). Bakan's point is that the caregiver's status is intimately linked to the employer's wishes and needs. Thus, if the employer decides they do not need the caregiver anymore, even for a valid reason with appropriate notice, this can have an enormous impact on the caregiver's success in the program.

Bakan also points out that the work permit “is an unseen placement procedure” (Calugay 2000). By this she means that there is no public record kept when caregivers leave abusive employers, and thus, there is no way for new caregivers to know whether their potential employer has a history of exploitative relations with their workers. The inclusion of Bakan's

voice within this article demonstrates that advocates for LCP caregivers seek to provide the general public with balanced information on the labour related aspects of the program.

Both larger and smaller newspapers (see for example, Purdy and Ovenden 2000; Simons 2000) also raised the issue of the employer-specific work permit in relation to the case of Leticia Cables. Cables was an LCP caregiver who was deported after violating her employer-specific permit by working for more than one employer. She argued that her main employer pressured her into taking on the secondary work because he cut down her number of hours. These articles focus on the fact that the main employer was able to change the employment situation to suit his needs, which is a reflection of the precarious nature of the employment contracts under the LCP. The articles also highlight how Cables, rather than changing employers when her hours were cut back, decided to violate her work permit to take on other jobs, presumably to avoid the long process of changing work permits. The media reports on this event are mostly supportive of Cables and her case. Certain journalists use her story as an opportunity to discuss the lack of government prosecutions against exploitative employers, the vulnerability of caregivers in general to problematic work environments, the difficulty of employer-specific work permits, and how it seems ridiculous to punish a foreign worker just for working hard and being loyal to her original employer.

The time consuming process of changing employers and gaining new work permits may encourage caregivers, such as Cables, to comply with unreasonable employer demands because there is only four years to complete the two years of work experience. The quote below from Simons (2000) reflects the fact that if caregivers, for whatever reason, are unable to finish the 24 months of work within the four years, that they must return to their home country with no

validation of their work hours. Thus, if a caregiver reapplies for the LCP, she must start again from scratch to gain her work experience for the permanent residency application.

Leticia Cables' long fight to stay in Canada has come to an end. Edmonton's most famous nanny has given up her dream. She broke the rules. So we're kicking her out. When Cables' full-time employer cut her working hours, raised her room and board, and began charging her for household "expenses," she didn't walk out on them. She didn't quit. Instead, to make up for the shortfall in her salary, she took on extra housecleaning work for her employer's friends, neighbours and colleagues. But Cables' visa didn't allow her to work as a freelance maid – only as a live-in nanny. And her visa allowed her to work for only one "official" government-approved employer. Cleaning toilets for her boss's boss was a strict no-no. So Cables is heading back to the Philippines. Her years of hard work and separation from her family have, in the end, been pointless. So have all her legal and public relations battles. (Simons 2000, Calgary Herald)

Simons successfully constructs Cables as an innocent and helpless victim who suffers at the hands of her stingy employer. The use of the sentence “we’re kicking her out” is very effective in making the reader feel partially responsible for her plight. Furthermore, Simons is able to create an image of Cables as a responsible, hardworking individual who is clearly deserving of Canadian residency status. The quotation marks around the word “official” government-approved employer, is also noteworthy because it seems to mock the government’s requirement that a caregiver can only have one employer, regardless of whether the employer offers enough hours to make the job economically feasible. This further legitimates Cables’ struggle to stay in Canada. Simons’ mention of how the employer changed the labour situation also starkly reflects to the reader how the employment contract under the program is virtually useless for ensuring the protection of caregivers’ rights.

In an article written for the *Edmonton Journal*, Purdy and Ovenden (2000) discuss the plight of Cables, with a focus on the monetary cost of this deportation for caregivers under the LCP.

Cables claims her first employer, a lawyer, encouraged her to take on other work – something he should have known was illegal – and paid her less than he claimed on tax forms. He denies the allegations. The RCMP also investigated and forwarded the file to the Justice Department for review. A department spokesperson said he couldn't comment on the status of the file. Cables said her main concern now is money. Caplan has promised to refund her immigration landing fee, but it will cost Cables another \$1,900 to reapply. (Purdy and Ovenden 2000, Edmonton Journal)

Purdy and Ovenden's use of phrases such as "claims" and "denies allegations" work to challenge the validity of Cable's complaints. Rather than giving her the ability to plead her case in her own words, all of the authors summarize her experiences and rely on experts to frame and describe the situation. When the authors state that Cables' main concern is now money, it again persuasively calls attention to the perceived extreme poverty suffered by LCP caregivers. Indeed, many of the narratives around this case focus on how the LCP was Cables' only way to help her disadvantaged family.

The quote below from Calugay's article also connects the problems experienced by Cables with the employer-specific regulation of the program. Here, the author points out the fact that the LCP imposes the employer-specific permit on caregivers, whereas other labour programs do not have these requirements.

Domestic workers in the program are required to follow rules not normally imposed on other workers in Canada, and breaking these rules can have serious consequences. The case of an Edmonton nanny, Leticia Cables, is a recent example that received considerable media attention. Many of Cables' supporters and the program's critics have pointed out that while Canada did not suffer from Cables' hard work, the nanny was punished because of it. Advocates for domestic workers have argued that the government discriminates against them by treating them differently from

other foreign workers who are in demand in Canada, such as computer technicians. (Calugay 2000, Kingston Whig Standard)

Calugay again puts forward a representation of Cables as a hard worker who is being punished by the requirement that LCP caregivers can only work for one employer. When an employer only gives an LCP caregiver a minimal number of hours per week, this creates a major disadvantage for caregivers in terms of both earnings and the number of hours amassed and necessary for applying for permanent residency. As Pratt (2005) has noted, even full time employment of 40 hours per week, makes it difficult, if not impossible, for LCP caregivers to save enough money to apply for permanent residency for herself and her family members. This puts pressure on the caregiver to look for other employment opportunities to supplement her “official” income.

Certain authors in the news articles discuss how there is a lack of abusive employer prosecution under the LCP. Simons (2000), in the quote below, questions why Leticia Cables was deported, while her employers were not punished:

The immigration bureaucrats say Cables was responsible for reading and understanding the rules. Fair enough. But what about her employers -- educated Canadian professionals and corporate executives? Did any of them have a duty to read and understand the laws of their own country? Did any of them have a responsibility to exercise a little “reasonable diligence”? Until we start doing more than deporting penniless foreign domestics, how many people are going to get the message that the Immigration Act applies, not just to Filipina nannies, but to comfortable middle-class Canadians? The bottom line is simple. You can't work illegally -- unless someone is willing to pay you. Canadian citizenship shouldn't put people above the law. Instead, it should be Canadians who are held to the highest ethical standards, when it comes to their dealings with vulnerable newcomers to our shores. (Simons 2000, Calgary Herald)

The quote from Simons (2000) highlights the power differentials that are common between employer and employee under the LCP. Regulations for monitoring employers and agencies do exist in the Canadian legal system; however, these rules are seldom enforced. The

framing of Cable's employers as "educated" seems to imply that she herself is not educated, which again creates a dichotomy between employers and their caregivers. Simons' description of caregivers under the LCP as "vulnerable newcomers" reflects the overall image of these caregivers as weak, subordinate, and feeble individuals.

Similar to the Cables case, Chan (2005), in an article for the *Vancouver Courier*, interviews one LCP worker who contends that she was forced to violate her work permit by working for her employer's mother and at her employer's place of business. Chan (2005) states, "for \$300 a month, the 39-year-old worked 17-hour days taking care of three children, cooking, gardening, cleaning her employer's house, her employer's mother's house, and working at their video store." This quote again highlights how the lack of regulations under the LCP can lead to employers being able to violate both the labour contract and the employer-specific aspect of the work permit. This article may also leave the reader with the perception that the terms of the work permit are easily violated under the program.

4.2.3 Fraudulence and Illegal Labour under the LCP: Narrative Three

A third primary narrative about work permits focuses on how the government may be unable to properly regulate temporary foreign workers under the program. Here, journalists question the ability of the government to monitor the status of workers to ensure that all caregivers have proper documentation and that they remain with the employer that is named on the permit. Within this illegality narrative, there were two competing ways that journalists framed caregivers. On the one hand, caregivers were constructed as agents who purposefully duped the government and Canadian employers to gain entry into the country before moving on to other (undocumented) work situations. Or, the caregiver and/or her family already in Canada were framed as the agents who together misled the government when the caregiver was

sponsored by relatives who were seen to have no real need for a caregiver. On the other hand, some narratives that highlighted illegal practices framed the caregivers as victims of unscrupulous recruitment agencies. Here recruitment agencies were accused of initially offering caregivers work with fictitious employers and once the caregiver arrived in Canada, they were placed instead in unauthorized work situations.

Through the analysis, it became clear that there is a strong narrative of concern surrounding the lack of government monitoring of the program and its employees/employers. In 25 of the articles, issues of illegality were raised in relation to people who are seen either to be misusing the LCP to try to “sneak” into Canada or violating their visas and working in undocumented jobs. The common construction of people under the LCP as low-skilled labourers may increase the public’s anxieties about the monitoring of the program and the legality of workers. There were four main sources of illegality listed by journalists: (1) women who came to Canada legally through the LCP but, for various reasons, had become illegal or undocumented (2) family members who use the LCP to sponsor relatives when they have no real need for a caregiver; (3) women who try to intentionally use the LCP to sneak into the country in order to move on to other forms of work; and (4) agency recruiters who forge documents, fake employers and then force workers into undocumented labour situations.

It is important to note that there were also articles that discussed undocumented live-in caregivers, but did not specify whether they entered Canada through a different route other than the LCP, such as those who enter on study visas and then turn to care work. In the first three instances, caregivers and/or their families are framed as villains who will do anything to dupe the government and the larger Canadian public; while in the fourth case, caregivers are seen as victims who are at the mercy of unscrupulous recruitment agents. Regardless, all of the articles

that mention some form of illegality or fraud within the LCP, or with live-in caregivers in general, have the effect of raising public anxieties around the government's ability to effectively monitor the employer-specific work permit system.

4.2.3.1 Undocumented Caregivers

The fear of illegal workers was prominent from the earliest articles in the analysis, when the LCP was first implemented. One article written for the *Gazette* titled “A Domestic Nightmare; Thousands of Women Work Illegally as Nannies” focuses on employers who were unable to find legal caregivers. One mother of three discusses her difficulty looking for a nanny, where “of the 30 calls she received, 20 were from women working illegally – without federal government papers” (Cornacchia 1993). The article ends by stating that in Montreal “there are as many as 30,000 women working illegally” (Cornacchia 1993). This large number of illegal workers signals to the audience that the number of undocumented caregivers in just one city is very high, which could lead to real anxiety over the regulation of foreign workers.

Academic research conducted by Khan (2009) links the creation of undocumented workers with the government regulations that are part of the LCP. In particular, the employer-specific work permit is pointed to as a major cause for caregivers turning to illegal work situations. Khan (2009:38) states “laid-off caregivers may be forced to accept unprotected work in the informal sector as the only means to sustain themselves until they are issued a new LCP work permit.” This potentially important element to the creation of undocumented populations is virtually ignored in the articles that discuss caregivers who “intentionally abuse” the program.

Within both the second and third main narratives, emphasis is placed on the misuse of the LCP as way to enter the country fraudulently in cases where the primary intention is not to work

as a temporary foreign worker either for a set period of time before leaving the country or as a legal route to permanent residency. The authors that discuss fraudulent applicants frequently utilize different images to describe these individuals compared to the authors that focus on worker vulnerability to unscrupulous recruiters. When discussing applicants who are “misusing” the program, authors often create an image of workers as active agents, who are purposefully engaging in violence, corruption and crime. This is unlike the representation of “vulnerable” workers, who are overwhelmingly portrayed as passive victims. This is highlighted in the next two quotes that discuss the fraud that supposedly exists in relation to the LCP.

Similar to marriage fraud, a number of overseas caregivers are using Canadian families to gain entry into the country with no real intention of working for the family long term. Kenney has made it clear that he takes marriage fraud seriously, as Citizenship and Immigration Canada states: “There are some people who think marriage to a Canadian citizen will be their ticket to Canada. It is a crime for foreign nationals to marry Canadian citizens or permanent residents only to gain entry into Canada.” Yet there is no issue with caregivers using Canadian families to gain entry to Canada, with no intention of working for them. (Hersch 2010a, The Vancouver Sun)

Bogus “nannies” are among many fraudsters seeking entry into Canada through a \$25-million immigration office in India that was opened in 2004 for political reasons, according to newly released internal documents. (O’Neil 2007, Times Colonist)

Hersch’s comments frame caregivers under the LCP as cheats who use families for a name to put on a work permit so they can then enter Canada. Hersch and O’Neil use terms that connote the image of active agents, for example, “caregivers are using” or “seeking entry.” Within this narrative, the portrayal of caregivers as active agents links to the idea that there is some sort of sinister or criminal intentionality behind the actions of these caregivers. Indeed, these journalists create the image of caregivers who are actively plotting to seek entry for illicit reasons. This illegality narrative that frames caregivers as disingenuous applicants follows Van

Dijk's assertion that white group dominance is often legitimated through a "systematic association of ethnic minorities with problematic cultural differences at best, and more likely with illegal immigration and residence, illegal work, crime, welfare abuse" (1993:264).

Associating "ethnic minorities" with abuse of the system is also seen in reports that identify Canadian residents as misusing the LCP. Friscolanti (2004), in an article for the *National Post* about fraud under the LCP, suggests that although there are numerous forms of program "abuse," "the most common example is people applying to have family members become their live-in caregivers, even though in some instances they do not need the service." The article also states that "a federal immigration program that brings foreign nannies into Canada is often abused by people trying to cheat their way into the country with the help of family and friends who are already here, according to an internal government report" (Friscolanti 2004). This narrative directs attention to a particular subsection of Canadian residents. Indeed, there are already programs in existence that allow residents to sponsor family members to immigrate to Canada.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2010c) states, "in order to facilitate the reunification of families, Canadian citizens and permanent residents may sponsor close relatives to become permanent residents." As such, readers may interpret this illegality narrative to be referring primarily to so-called "new immigrants" who are trying to bring family members to Canada who either do not want to wait or who are not eligible to enter Canada under the existing Family Class category. This narrative then creates an image of people who are trying to "jump the queue" or who are unacceptable or undesirable. This might also be seen to pit "law abiding citizens" or "real Canadians" against "new immigrants," who may not yet be Canadian citizens,

or are not perceived to be “real Canadians.” Furthermore, this assumed “abuse” of the Live-in Caregiver Program impacts perceptions about caregivers in general.

Through the analysis it became clear that there is a perception that it is common for foreign caregivers to have an undocumented status, which is seen by journalists as effecting the occupation as a whole. In an article for the *Windsor Star*, Proudfoot (2011) quotes one agency owner who contends that “in the last 10 years, the status of a live-in caregiver or in-home care of any kind has plummeted because there's so much under-the-table and illegal work going on and people desperate for work.” Thus, the low status of the occupation is constructed as at least partially the result of a large number of desperate undocumented workers who will take any type of work because they do not have proper work permits. Within this narrative, comparisons are also made to the United States, with Jimenez (2004) quoting an agency owner who underscores that “it's not as bad as the U.S., where 90 per cent of the domestics are illegal. But there is a whole subculture of nannies without status, some of whom come from the West Indies.” This statement serves to link the undocumented “subculture” of caregivers with the West Indies, revealing the racialized stereotypes held by this owner and others.

Some journalists utilize the image of undocumented caregivers to question the quality of care being accessed by Canadian families. One article in the *Globe and Mail* links the “grey market” of undocumented nannies with the idea that “there has been a de-professionalization of care across the system” (Agrell 2007). Agrell (2007) states, “some families are employing women living in Canada illegally.” She goes on to interview an agency owner, who claims,

“People are hiring the cleaning lady who has always been with them, or somebody's nanny who is no longer working for another family and is available,” said Martha Russel, president of Toronto-based eldercare agency Integracare. “It evolves from good-meaning people but it can create

a problem.” Integracare employs only experienced, trained caregivers, and Ms. Russel said when families arrive at her agency they are often looking to replace an under-the table employee. (Agrell 2007, The Globe and Mail)

Agrell and the agency owners she interviews create the image of nannies that work under the table as unskilled, untrained, and unmonitored. Thus, the fact that certain caregivers do not have proper work permits is portrayed as leading to a situation where families may be receiving inadequate care, which successfully draws a clear link between skill and status.

4.2.3.2 Fraudulence within the Recruitment Agencies

As noted above, another major focus in news reports about fraud or illegality within the LCP, or around care work in general, related to the actions of recruitment agencies and their role in creating undocumented labourers. The process of connecting employers with foreign caregivers under the LCP is often controlled by recruitment agencies both overseas and within Canada. Parrott (2011:85) states “private employment agencies recruiting caregivers for employment with Canadian families have organized themselves into a group known as the Association of Caregiver & Nanny Agencies Canada (ACNAC).” Initially, agents located in the caregiver’s home country, or other countries the caregiver may be working in, recruit many of the caregivers into the program. However, agencies are also involved with helping caregivers find new employers after they have been working in Canada. Even though recruitment agents are not allowed to charge employees fees for recruitment, Parrott (2011:87) describes various ways that ACNAC tries to charge fees to caregivers under the program, which includes recruiting “foreign caregivers “offshore” in jurisdictions that do not prohibit recruiters from charging foreign workers recruitment fees.” Recruiters may also “blur the distinction between legal and illegal fees” or “judicially challenge current legislation” (Parrott 2011:87).

A main focus for articles that discuss recruitment agencies were cases where recruitment agents had been accused of promising workers legitimate jobs that did not exist. In some cases, agents were being accused of forging documents and/or supplying the names of fake employers. Some reporters (Cribb and Brazao 2009; Jimenez 1997; Wilton 1998; Clough 2004) point out that, given the long time it takes to process applications through Citizenship and Immigration Canada, recruitment agencies may use the names of unconfirmed or nonexistent employers to start the process of getting these foreign caregivers into Canada. When caregivers arrive in Canada, they may be told that the previously identified employer no longer needs them, but that other potential employers are available. The women may, as a result of debts incurred at this stage of the process and limited regulatory support, agree to be employed in various forms of undocumented working situations.

In an article for the *Toronto Star* that explores agency fraud, Cribb and Brazao (2009) state, “not only does this seriously jeopardize the integrity of the Live-in Caregiver Program, it puts these desperate caregivers at risk.” The representation of desperate caregivers as passive, vulnerable victims is further underscored by Cribb and Brazao’s (2009) statement that “some are forced to work illegally, others are deported and some end up suicidal.” This construction of caregivers as passive victims continues with the next two quotes, where Jimenez describes how the agency “brought nannies to Canada,” and Wilton states “nannies getting caught:”

Police believe Angel Nannies falsified documents and brought nannies to Canada for jobs that didn't exist. The RCMP began investigating in the summer of 1996, after receiving a complaint from Human Resources Development Canada that the agency was bringing nannies to Canada without obtaining legitimate jobs for them. (Jimenez 1997, The Vancouver Sun)

Bill O'Connor, acting manager for the Calgary office of Employment and Immigration Canada, said Jacobo Borja is among a growing number of

foreign nannies getting caught in recruiting scams that promise jobs and a way to emigrate to Canada. (Wilton 1998, Calgary Herald)

The recruitment fraud narrative follows the research findings of Mahanti and Mountz (2002) who highlighted that news reports often connect immigration with criminal activity and this may create a “sense of crisis” among readers (Bauder 2008:292). Wilton’s statement that there is a “growing number” of fraudulent cases under the LCP leads the reader to believe that this problem of recruitment scams is serious and may be getting out of hand. The focus on fraudulence in the recruitment scheme was also linked to the idea that employment contracts are not being properly scrutinized and verified by government officials. The quote below is from a former federal employee who emphasizes that the federal government is not being thorough in reviewing and substantiating applications, allowing agencies to forge multiple documents. This article relies on information from former government workers who say they are under pressure to fast-track applications under the LCP, which could allow illegal work situations to increase within Canada.

Hundreds of foreign workers whose applications should have been disqualified have entered B.C. under the poorly administered Live- In Caregiver Program. Federal government employees say they’re under pressure to fast-track applications and bogus employment contracts aren’t being weeded out. (Clough 2004, The Province)

The description of the program as “poorly administered” is a good strategy for creating fear among readers because it questions the Canadian government’s ability to adequately control the country’s borders. Suggesting that “hundreds of disqualified foreign workers” have entered the province allows the author to imply that this is a significant problem that may be widespread. Clough’s use of quotes from “former employees” of the government also adds credence to the allegations because these workers actually witnessed the recruiter fraud problem from the administrative side of the LCP. Indeed, this reflects the idea that within the news media the

“government provides a steady flow of safe information, at least safe in the sense that it can be attributed to sources which people typically find credible” (Ungerleider 1991:159). In the majority of the news articles, there was a reliance on experts and government officials to describe the LCP, caregivers, and labour issues. In fact, only 26 out of the 70 articles included any significant quotes from caregivers. This lends credence to Baker *et al.*'s research on minorities in the British press in which they concluded that “the newspaper gives more space and direct citation to an in-group member” (2008:295).

Cherry (2008) over-simplifies the issue of recruiter fraudulence in her article and suggests that the cause of illegal work situations and caregiver vulnerability is the failure of the relevant government agencies to inform temporary workers of their rights and proper procedures. Cherry (2008) states, “something as simple as informing workers about the procedure of changing employers would be helpful for foreign workers who are granted visas to work at one place, but upon arrival, are shuffled to different employers.” Cherry, unlike most of the other journalists in this analysis, emphasizes the government's failure to provide information on the procedures and processes required by labour and immigration laws, rather than simply focusing on unscrupulous recruiters. However, the idea that giving information to LCP caregivers would help the fraudulence problem ignores the fact that there is no proper monitoring of these labour situations and places the responsibility of ensuring status solely onto the caregivers.

Some of the articles in this narrative focus on the idea that once temporary foreign workers arrive in Canada they may be in debt to an agency and are potentially forced into underground work to pay back this debt. Certain authors mention that workers are imprisoned in agents' homes to ensure an indentured and powerless worker. Even though these workers are

suing their agent, this quote from Brazao below again highlights the framing of caregivers as passive victims, through the use of passive language within this narrative.

Three foreign caregivers brought to Canada for jobs that did not exist are suing a Thornhill nanny recruiter for breach of contract, false imprisonment and mental distress, claiming they were victims of human trafficking. In three separate lawsuits filed against Rachel Spivak and her Rakela Care Agency, the nannies allege their passports were confiscated, they were confined in the basement of Spivak's home and sent out to work illegally. (Brazao 2009, Toronto Star)

When Brazao uses the term “brought to Canada,” this again emphasizes how within this narrative, caregivers are seen as passive and not actively controlling their own actions. The term also highlights the implicit conceptualization of caregivers as a form of commodity. This representation of caregivers as passive victims differs from the first narrative of illegality, discussed in section 4.2.3.1 above, where caregivers are presented as purposeful agents who are “using families to gain entry” or “seeking to gain entry” into Canada.

Despite the tendency in these articles to represent the relationship between agencies and caregivers as unequal and disempowering, there is also recognition that it is simpler for the government to go after the caregivers than the recruitment agencies. Cribb and Brazao (2009) suggest that since it is cheaper to prosecute and deport the workers, agencies are left to continue their illegal activities. They argue that this essentially punishes caregivers who were not responsible for forging the documents, and shows how little we value the rights of foreign workers.

Jim Karygiannis, a Liberal MP on the citizenship and immigration committee, says Canada must get tough with fraudulent recruiters. “We are not going after the traffickers because it costs too much money to prosecute and they only end up getting a slap on the wrists. The most vulnerable are the caregivers and if we deport them or ask them to leave, (we) sweep the problem under the rug.” Instead of prosecuting rogue agencies, federal officials have, to date, focused on deporting nannies based on a 2007

Federal Court ruling that found caregivers with bogus contracts cannot stay in Canada even if they find a legitimate job. (Cribb & Brazao 2009, Toronto Star)

This passage from Cribb and Brazao may have the effect of raising anxiety for the reader because of their suggestion that fraudulent recruiters are able to continue engaging in illegal activities and to continue to recruit more undocumented workers. The focus on fraudulent recruiters may take attention away from abusive employers, but it generally constructs caregivers as victims, as opposed to the narratives that portray caregivers and/or their families and friends already in Canada as abusing the LCP by either jumping the queue or bringing in individuals who would be otherwise inadmissible. And while there was some concern that the government could do a better job of overseeing recruitment agencies, there was comparably less emphasis on weaknesses in government regulations than there was in the discussions of fraudulent caregivers.

4.3 Living Where They Labour

There was one main narrative that surrounded the live-in regulation of the LCP. This narrative included three main arguments: (1) the regulation leads to a greater potential for exploitation; (2) the regulation leads to more unreasonable work demands; and (3) the regulation leads to uncomfortable labour relationships where employers are also landlords. Within this narrative journalists presented the live-in requirement as a main reason for exploitation under the LCP. Here, more than other aspects of the program, caregivers were able to share their own stories on the regulation through quotes in the news articles. Some authors discussed caregivers co-renting apartments, which underscored the potential vulnerabilities inherent in working and living with employers. However, certain employers were also quoted within a couple articles discussing how they were uncomfortable with the idea of letting a stranger live in their home. This topic was well aligned with academic findings (see for example, Macklin 1992; Khan 2009;

Baines & Sharma 2002; Stasiulis & Bakan 1997) and shows the efforts of advocacy groups to inform the public about the negative aspects of this program have paid off in certain ways.

4.3.1 The Live-in Regulation

In addition to the articles that discussed in various ways issues related to the employer specific work permit, another dominant labour theme uncovered in the analysis was the live-in component of the program. Within the articles that mention the stipulation that caregivers must live with their employers, there is a strong connection between what is said by advocates for caregivers and what is written in the media for consumption by the general population. Here the concerns raised by both advocates and the media about living-in include: exploitation of live-in caregivers in terms of wages and hours worked, quality of accommodation, worker isolation and vulnerability, and challenges to the employee/employer relationship.

Certain journalists made the point that LCP caregivers earn significantly less and work more hours than non-LCP caregivers who live-out. For example, in an article titled, “The Two-Nanny State,” Loney contends that “wages for a live-in nanny start at about \$1,200 a month, while a full-time, live-out nanny will set you back anywhere from \$2,000 to \$5,000 a month” (Loney 2009). This may be because live-out caregivers charge more than minimum wage and have firmer fixed hours, which ensure that they are more likely to receive overtime pay. Regardless of the reason, journalists in this narrative reinforce the idea that live-in caregivers are a cheap care option.

Several authors (see for example, Bagnall 2003; Carlson 2009; Palmer 2010) highlight the fact that living-in has the potential to cause the worker to be on call at all times. Bagnall (2003) states that from the live-in regulation “flows an entire set of prejudicial assumptions: that

the worker is on call 24 hours a day; that she can be paid in room and board; and that she is part of a lesser category of worker.” An editorial in the *Gazette* (2009) from a former caregiver also points to this aspect of the regulation, stating, “If I did not leave on the weekend, they would expect me to work then, too, which is why I would leave.” This description of the labour situation in the editorial captures the idea that caregivers feel forced into working if they remain in their employer’s home when they have completed their “official” work hours. Carlson (2009) discusses how the regulation can lead to more abuse since “caregivers live where they work, there’s no firm start or finish to a day.” There is also acknowledgment that the live-in requirement can lead to certain instances such as the family leaving for vacation and expecting the worker to look after the house, often without pay, the entire time they are gone. The editorial in the *Gazette* (2009) states that, “although I got vacation pay, when the family went away for holiday, they did not pay me, but expected me to look after the house in their absence.”

A concern expressed by certain authors was the fact that LCP workers may not be given appropriate accommodation, which is required as a part of the labour contract. Within these narratives, caregivers are again portrayed as vulnerable and meek, and at the mercy of greedy employers. An article by Thompson (2009) in *Metro Vancouver* discusses the experiences of one caregiver under the program who “worked six days a week and slept in a windowless storage room with a light that couldn’t be turned off, so she covered it with a black garbage bag at night.” Another caregiver’s experiences with the live-in component is discussed by Calugay (2000), who writes, “she was given a room in her employers’ cold basement where she had to wear a jacket or double her blanket at night.”

In some of the news reports, the live-in requirement is also presented as a regulation that increases vulnerability because it may lead to isolation of the worker from the community and

informal social support networks. This, coupled with the lack of outside regulation of the workspace, can be seen to increase vulnerability even more. Palmer (2010) utilizes this image of the vulnerable and isolated live-in employee, as contrasted with an employee who lives-out, in an article written for *Herizons*. Palmer (2010) first highlights how LCP caregivers may feel powerless within the employer's home, but then she also shows how caregivers are strong and resilient, creating their own solutions to the isolation problem under the program:

LCP migrant Marjorie notes, "After six p.m., when you are live-in, you will stay only in your room, talking to the four corners of your room - stay there, and do nothing. And when you are live-out [on weekends], after work you can go out, you can talk to anyone, you are relaxed, you have peace of mind." Another domestic worker, Pamela, adds, "Here [at the weekender apartment] you can leave your bedroom and do whatever you want in the apartment. No one will bother you - you share jokes, memories and laugh. You are not censored in the apartment. You have free will. It is a democracy here." By living away from their workplaces on their days off, these women are getting a break from the archaic live-in requirement of the LCP. (Palmer 2010, Herizons)

Palmer highlights an escape strategy utilized by some LCP workers that involves renting an apartment with other workers, so that they can share these apartments on their days off and have some freedom from their place of work. This strategy has been discussed by Stiell and England (1997a:349) as an important way to relieve weekly stress and to "maintain a level of autonomy" from employers. The quote in Palmer's article allows caregivers to express their frustrations with the live-in requirement in their own words. The caregivers quoted in this article reflect Lan's (2003:528) conclusion that live-in migrant caregivers are "*diasporic homeless*, who endure the pain of family separation while feeling not at home in the employer's household." Palmer aptly calls the live-in requirement "archaic" and signals to the reader that Canada should be more advanced or forward in its practice than this.

Beyond the quotes from caregivers on the live-in component, employers' perspectives are also incorporated into a couple articles. One employer, quoted by Sherman (2009), discusses the struggle that she had with allowing a live-in caregiver into her home.

At first, we tried to get her to hang out with us, to be our nanny by day and our pal by night. But Susan understood boundaries. She did her work and played with the kids and retired to her room after dinner. Invitations to watch the big-screen TV or to come for a drive were politely turned down. She went to stay at an apartment with other nannies every Friday and didn't return until Monday morning. (Sherman 2009, Globe and Mail)

The employer highlights the uncomfortable situation that many employers and employees must deal with based on the fact that caregivers have to live where they labour. The employer describes the struggle some employers have trying to make the worker a “nanny by day... pal by night,” which can blur boundaries and complicate the distinction between employer and friend. The caregiver in Sherman's article avoids the friendship issue by deciding to isolate herself in her room after working hours. This quote again captures how many employees must individually navigate these difficult boundary issues within the employment relationship. In another article, Elaine Smith looks at how the live-in caregiver program has allowed for families to have more quality time. Smith quotes one agency owner stating,

“It's not for everyone, and I explain that to families,” said Knof, who has a nanny for her own children. “For one child, it's cheaper to go to a day care centre or someone's home.” Nor is everyone willing to welcome a stranger into their home. However, for those who do, it can be a real boon. (Smith 2002, Nanaimo Daily News)

4.4 Labour Relations

In addition to labour-themed narratives that focused on the employer specific work permit and those that centered on the live-in requirement, a final dominant theme was identified that raised concerns with what might be better characterized as general labour relations.

Sometimes these concerns were seen to result from specific aspects of the LCP, such as the single employer work permit or the live-in requirement. Other times these concerns were seen to arise from the lack of regulation of the workplace. A large number of these reports were in response to the Ruby Dhalla case. Reporting on this case became an opportunity for journalists and others to raise concerns about larger labour problems with the program. Most of these reports focused on caregivers and their vulnerability to abusive employment situations. In the majority of these narratives, caregivers were described as the victims, while employers, government authorities, or fraudulent recruiters were portrayed as villains.

The large number of journalists who mention abuse and vulnerability suggest that academics and advocates have made progress in informing media representations of the LCP. Yet, narratives about abusive employers may also reflect how the news media prefers to sensationalize or dramaticize aspects of immigration. Journalists that discussed abuse emphasized the breaking of labour contracts, unpaid overtime, inappropriate tasks, threats of deportation, and the underpayment of wages. Within this narrative, caregivers are generally portrayed as helpless, vulnerable, and passive workers. There was, however, a conflicting narrative discovered in some of the articles. At times, caregivers were portrayed, often within employers' narratives, as "part of the family" or as a "second mother." Here there was also a tendency to point out that while cases of abuse tend to get publicized, they probably represent the minority, and that the majority of caregivers work in good, non-abusive jobs

4.4.1 Abusive Employment Situations

In 36 articles, journalists discussed instances of abusive employers. The most common problems highlighted were employers breaking the labour contracts by either making the caregiver work more hours than was agreed upon and/or the employers not paying the agreed

wages for the hours of work. Calugay (2000), in an article for the *Kingston Whig Standard*, quotes one government representative who claims that, “of the 77 complaints filed by domestic workers...from all over Ontario, 94 per cent had to do with inadequate pay, including unpaid wages, vacation pay, termination pay and overtime pay.” Calugay (2000), however, also interviews a member of Intercede who paints a broader picture of the number and type of complaints that are filled each year:

Intercede, a Toronto-based service and advocacy organization for live-in domestic workers, receives, from the Toronto area alone, about 500 complaints a year that relate to employment standards. The complaints they receive overall, including immigration, human rights abuses and criminal violations, reach into the thousands annually. (Kingston Whig Standard)

The discrepancy in number of cases acknowledged by the government and by Intercede may be a reflection of caregivers not feeling comfortable lodging complaints with the government. It could also show that Intercede is more accessible to caregivers. Regardless, Calugay’s use of this interview constructs the idea that employer abuse is a significant problem since Intercede receives at least 500 complaints a year just from the Toronto area.

Calugay (2000) emphasizes unpaid overtime by reporting that one caregiver “worked 60 hours a week with no overtime pay in her first year.” This is also expressed in an editorial from *The Gazette* (2009), which states, “even though the contract specifies 40 hours a week, many caregivers must work longer hours for which they are not compensated.” This statement again gives the reader the impression that the LCP employment contract does not ensure that employee rights are protected. An article from Delaney (2007) discusses an LCP caregiver from Kenya who faced “exploitation by various employers who expected her to work a 14- hour day even though she was only paid for eight.” Ferrie (2004) also looks at abuse under the LCP and interviews Mancilla-Fuller who represents the West Coast Domestic Workers Association.

Many live-in caregivers are illegally overworked and underpaid, some getting much less than minimum wage. Caregivers tell her of being refused vacations or any days off, of being forced to sleep on the floor next to children, and of being sexually harassed. Mancilla-Fuller says that most mistreated caregivers are silent because they fear losing their jobs and being sent home. Others are not aware of their rights or do not know where to lodge a complaint. (Ferrie 2004, The Tyee)

Similarly, Monsebraaten (2011), in an article for the *Toronto Star*, discusses two caregivers who were overworked and underpaid by their employers. One caregiver, Vivian de Jesus, “lived with the family, working 132 hours a week - almost three times the statutory 48-hour work week... She did not receive overtime pay” (Monsebraaten 2011).

In many of these discussions, caregivers are constructed as passive victims who remain silent in bad labour situations. Many articles reproduce the image created by Bagnall (2003) when she describes one worker who “was trapped and exploited” in her care job. Sometimes, the reader might infer that cultural factors may be at the root of the problem. Stiell and England, in their interviews with domestic workers in Toronto, concluded that many ‘third world’ women felt a “lack of freedom to change jobs, negotiate with employers or even complain about their treatment” (1997a:349). In many of the cases, however, attention is paid to the external factors that may constrain resistance on the part of the women. For example, some authors point out that the fear of not completing the required two years of labour within the allotted time can also lead caregivers to stay in bad situations. Pearce and Sokoloff (2007) note:

For Ms. Robles, the need to serve out two years as a live-in caregiver pushed her to put up with unreasonable demands. At her second job, the mother followed her around while she was cleaning, Ms. Robles says, criticizing her. “I was working and crying because I didn’t know the reason she was always angry at me.” (Pearce and Sokoloff 2007, Globe and Mail)

Another caregiver interviewed by Wilton (1998) for the *Calgary Herald* states, “It was branded into our minds that we would be deported. I was so scared because I was told I would be

handcuffed and deported if I went to immigration.” This quote reflects the powerlessness that caregivers under the LCP may feel within the labour environment because they are in Canada as temporary foreign workers. An article by Montgomery (2003) also highlights this deportation threat through the story of one caregiver who became pregnant while labouring under the program. The caregiver in this situation recounted how her employers and her recruitment agency tried to force her into having an abortion. Montgomery (2003) writes, “Marisa, for example, says both the agency and her employers threatened to have her deported if she didn't have an abortion.”

This insecurity about deportation may even follow caregivers after the completion of the program. Calugay (2000) interviews one caregiver, who received her landed immigrant status, and would not complain openly about the abuse she had gone through from previous employers. She explains this insecurity about her permanent residency status by stating, “look what happened to Cables, they kicked her out.” The former LCP caregiver in this article is referring to the Leticia Cables case, discussed above in the work permit section. This statement raises an interesting point, in that media attention around the Live-in Caregiver program, may also impact the conduct and ideology of current caregivers under the program. This links back to Pratt's (2005) research where she contends that the media's portrayal of deportation orders acts as a strategy to ensure that other temporary foreign workers appreciate their precarious status. These quotes create an image of powerful constraints that seemingly limit the ability of temporary foreign workers to challenge abusive work environments.

A few journalists also suggested that the lack of monitoring systems make caregivers more vulnerable to abuse. Duchamp (2009) interviews a former LCP caregiver who states, “no one came to see where I was living, to see if I had a proper room or to see that I wasn't being

abused. All there was were these bad websites and confusing laws.” The quote from this caregiver highlights how women may feel abandoned under the LCP, because there are no external monitoring procedures in place.

Monitoring might help resolve accusations of abuse that result from disputes over the allocation of tasks. Various authors report on conflict that results when the employer and the caregivers disagree about which tasks the caregiver is responsible for. This may be the result of vagueness in the labour contract, misunderstandings, or guile. Carlson (2009), in an article for the *National Post*, states that it is a “trite distinction” to decide what falls into certain tasks, which trivializes the realities of many employment situations where employers do demand unreasonable workloads,

Though caregivers sign a contract outlining what is expected of them, these agreements are often vague and include blanket categories like “light housecleaning” and “laundry.” Whether mopping is considered light housecleaning or whether ironing is considered laundry may seem like a trite distinction, but it is precisely this sort of fine line that employers and their live-in nannies awkwardly tread each day. (Carlson 2009, National Post)

Carlson’s article may help the reader to understand the sorts of difficult negotiations that may be required under the LCP employment relationship on a daily basis. An important point made by a few authors is that the employers are never penalized for breaking labour or immigration regulations under the LCP. It is common for only the LCP worker to face the consequences of violating work permits or other rules, with Bagnall (2003) quoting a lawyer who states that he “has never seen the government go after an employer, no matter how badly the worker was abused or exploited.” The quote below from Calugay (2000) also questions not only why it is that employers are not prosecuted when they have knowingly violated the labour contracts but also why they are not blocked from hiring other workers.

“Let’s say there’s an employer who’s had several workers [under the program] and is known to be an abusive employer. At the time you apply to come to Canada as a live-in caregiver, you have no way of getting access to that information.” Like Guillermo, many live-in domestic workers find employers whom they are satisfied with, but Bakan says there are others who work under conditions “most Canadians would find appalling.” (Calugay 2000, Kingston Whig Standard)

Even though this article does highlight employer abuse, Calugay’s statement that there are many domestic workers that find good employers, suggests to the reader that these cases of employer abuse are uncommon, the exception to the rule and that the majority of LCP caregivers work in good jobs.

4.4.2 The Ruby Dhalla Case

The news focus is on whether three foreign workers were hired legally, how they were paid, the length and arduousness of the work day and why other politicians, once alerted, failed to act. All issues worthy of scrutiny, no doubt. But has no one pondered this: what does the hiring of a servant, let alone the treatment, say about the master’s character? Are the Dhallas just too good to shine their own shoes? (Egan 2009, The Ottawa Citizen)

The Ruby Dhalla incident was the most reported case of abuse in the selection of articles. Dhalla was a Liberal MP whose family was accused of mistreating three live-in Filipina caregivers in 2009. After increasing media pressure, she stepped down as the Liberal Youth and Multiculturalism Critic. One of the most interesting aspects of this topic is how the affair brought media attention to issues that had existed under the LCP for years. Here, advocacy groups were finally able to grasp onto a popular topic and use it as a jumping off point to discuss some major flaws with the regulation and administration of the LCP. However, other authors did question the validity or importance of this case by either using language to trivialize or make light of it, or overtly questioning if the caregivers were telling the truth. The quote above, taken from Egan’s article is a good representation of how this incident was interpreted by many of the journalists.

Egan's portrayal of the three caregivers as servants and the Dhalla family as "masters" highlights the unequal power relationship between employer and employee under the program. Beyond this, however, it is also a commentary by Egan on how the labour relationship under the LCP is akin to a sort of master-servant/slave relationship. The fact that Dhalla was a federal politician meant that much of the news coverage of this case may have been politically motivated and may have been used by opponents of the ruling Liberals to discredit Dhalla and her party. There were, it should be noted, various conflicting media reports on the facts of the case: were the caregivers working for Ruby or for her parents and was she or her brother responsible for contracting and supervising the caregivers? Beyond this, there is the question of whether a similar "scandal" with overtones of masters and servants/slaves would have been as effective or acceptable if the employers had not been Sikhs? These are issues that will not be discussed here, however they may greatly impact how journalists reported on the case within the news articles for this analysis. What I am interested in for this research is how the media used this case to discuss the potential for abuse in labour relations within the LCP.

Cryderman and Gignac (2009), in an article for the *Calgary Herald*, quote a Vancouver lawyer and advocate for caregivers who explains that "the Ruby Dhalla case has suddenly made people look at the live-in caregiver program... People have started paying attention to the problems that have been there for a long, long time." Another article by O'Neill (2009) follows this trend by contending that the Dhalla controversy "has drawn public attention to flaws in the live-in caregiver program, to the provincial role of labour law protection and to a battle fought by caregiver advocates to ease a situation where some caregivers feel trapped in households where they are overworked or mistreated." O'Neill's statement that some caregivers "feel trapped" again underscores to the reader that these women can be victimized by exploitative employers.

Another caregiver advocate emphasizes that this case “was an opportunity to shed light on the plight of caregivers” (O’Neill 2009).

The incident encouraged a former LCP caregiver to write in and share her own stories. The editorial describes how her personal experiences under the program were filled with abusive employers, and shows that the Dhalla incident is not uncommon. The author ends by recommending changes to the program that would aid caregivers to gain more power within the labour situation. The caregiver states “I hear some good stories from some of my friends, but the stories I hear from Dhalla’s family caregivers are typical of the majority of cases” (*The Gazette* editorial 2009).

A reoccurring theme in the media coverage of this case was the accusation that the Dhalla family treated the three women like “slaves,” a choice of terminology that again could be influenced by the fact that she is Sikh. Reporters describe the caregivers as having their passports confiscated and being forced into work that they considered inappropriate. It was also reported that none of the caregivers had proper work permits for their jobs and that Ruby Dhalla and/or other family members had promised to, but never did, straighten out their status and get them the proper work permits. Brazao (2009) creates the image of one of the workers being completely controlled in the labour situation, stating that, “she was not allowed to eat with the family, and could eat only after they finished. She could go to bed only after the last family member had retired for the night.” These narratives that support the caregiver’s claims all further the image of LCP caregivers as powerless and vulnerable compared to their abusive employers.

The Dhalla incident led one reporter to question the existence of the program all together. In this quote the author ponders why Canada allows a special temporary worker program just to bring in caregiver labourers.

Hidden behind the delightfully juicy contretemps over how Brampton MP Ruby Dhalla treated her Filipina nannies lies a larger, more important question. Why does Canada have a special, temporary immigrant program for nannies? If we truly lack qualified live-in caregivers, why not admit them through the normal immigration stream? And if we don't need foreigners to take care of children or the elderly, why admit anyone at all? (Walkom 2009, Toronto Star)

While Walkom may be seen to initially trivialize the case by using the term “delightfully juicy contretemps,” he goes on to ask some very probing questions about the program. And in asking these questions, Walkom suggests a link between temporary worker programs and the potential for abuse in labour relations. Egan, in a piece which is more of a critique of some of the media reports than of the case itself, takes issue with the conflating of the terms servants, nannies, and caregivers, suggesting perhaps that live-in caregivers are much more respectable and valued than nannies and servants. In doing so, Egan may also lead the reader to question why these terms are used interchangeably and why the connotations of these terms may be of significance. Egan writes:

There is a great ballyhoo about Brampton-area MP Ruby Dhalla and her family's alleged treatment of live-in “caregivers”-- though the label shifts to “nannies” or “servants,” sometimes in the same news story. The Toronto Star's front-page headline on Friday was one for the ages, like a lyric from an old Broadway musical: “I shined ‘Miss Ruby’s’ many shoes, servant says.” (Egan 2009, The Ottawa Citizen)

The case also raised concerns about abuse in relation to what chores were appropriate for a caregiver and what chores were acceptable under LCP regulations. According to some media reports, the caregivers alleged that the Dhalla family forced them to do tasks that were not

related to care giving and that required them to work outside of the home—neither of which was appropriate or acceptable. O’Neill (2009), in an article for the *Kamloops Daily News*, talks about the caregivers being required to work “long hours and [doing] what they perceived to be inappropriate chores such as cleaning other peoples’ homes and snow shoveling.” O’Neill’s use of the term “what they perceived to be” suggests that these chores may be both appropriate and acceptable, even though working in other people’s homes is a violation of the work permit. Brazao (2011) also raises the question of what is appropriate and acceptable, yet does not go on to provide an answer to the question when he states that “Tongson was hired as a caregiver for Tavinder Dhalla, but claims she ended up doing many non-nanny jobs such as washing cars and cleaning the family’s chiropractic clinics.” Both of the authors utilize terms such as “claims” and “perceived” that may draw the reader to question the sincerity or validity of the caregivers’ claims against Dhalla.

The Dhalla controversy also led the media to raise the question of what constitutes a reasonable workload for a live-in caregiver in other work situations. In doing so, they often represented caregiver workload issues as potentially confusing and inexact. This suggests that there is no firm line between what demands are reasonable and unreasonable:

Does light housekeeping include mopping? As Liberal MP Ruby Dhalla faces public allegations of mistreating three former caregivers, nannies and their employers across Canada are privately manoeuvring their own live-in situations, confronting the often blurry boundaries that separate reasonable job expectations from abusive work conditions. (Carlson 2009, National Post)

While Carlson and others may suggest that it was time for employers to begin to reevaluate their treatment of their own caregivers, there is also a troubling acceptance in such statements that the fixed workloads of other jobs are not possible for live-in caregivers. Carlson’s reasoning seems

to take the pressure off abusive employers by suggesting that the abuse was never intentional; it was simply the result of blurry boundaries.

While many of the reporters seemed to accept or at least not openly question the allegations of the three caregivers against the Dhalla family, some reports directly question the testimony of the three women. And some of these reports imply that caregivers at times charge their employers with abuse as a means to gain certain benefits. Certain reporters, for example, quote a former employer of one of the workers in a way that is meant to imply that the claim of abuse was simply a ploy by the caregiver to gain permanent residency faster. Brazao (2009) reports that Roswell, the former employer, “sponsored Gordo into Canada as a live-in-caregiver before Christmas 2007 only to have her quit three weeks later, leaving his four children without a nanny.” This quote reflects the narrative discussed above in section 4.2.3.1, that the media may frame caregivers under the LCP as disingenuous applicants who dupe employers into sponsoring them before moving on to other jobs. Valpy (2009) also discusses the previous employer’s claims,

Over the weeks she was with the family, her behaviour started to change, Mr. Roswell said. After meeting with other nannies, she talked about better-paying jobs to be found elsewhere. Mr. Roswell paid her the minimum wage with a deduction for room and board. Suddenly, after less than a month, she announced she was homesick and needed surgery for internal bleeding, and she quit. A man with an SUV picked her up and drove her away. Mr. Roswell's lawyer, Shawn Philbert, said yesterday: “My client welcomed Ms. Gordo into his home with open arms only to become a victim.” (Valpy 2009, Globe and Mail)

Rather than being an abused employee, these reports create an image of Ms. Gordo as an inconsiderate employee who abandoned four innocent children. Valpy’s comments work to portray Ms. Gordo’s decision to leave as being fueled by her own greed for “better paying jobs elsewhere.” These two articles also contribute to the construction of the “vulnerable” family who

tries to help a poor foreigner with a job and instead gets taken advantage of by a ruthless caregiver. Another article by O'Neill (2009) also discredits the caregivers' claims, stating that Dhalla "has repeatedly denied allegations of mistreatment, insisted the caregivers lived in a spacious and well-furnished suite and suggested the caregivers targeted her in an effort to gain permanent residency in Canada." Emphasizing that the accommodation given to them was "spacious and well-furnished" suggests to the reader that these caregivers are just greedy foreigners who would not have been satisfied in any employment situation.

4.4.3 One of the Family

As a counter narrative to the one of vulnerable LCP caregivers in their labour relationship with employers, there were also journalists that constructed narratives where employers are considerate and treat workers fairly or like part of the family, while caregivers are committed and satisfied. Indeed, Chan (2005) interviews an agency owner who makes the claim that under the LCP "there are good stories but you don't hear about them."

In some of these reports, caregivers are portrayed as caring and sensitive women who easily fill the roles of the dutiful substitute mother/daughter/wife. Proudfoot (2011), in an article for the *Windsor Star*, describes caregivers who work with the elderly, stating,

-many find deep satisfaction in their work and develop close relationships with their clients. "They say when they come here and start working with older people, they feel like members of the family," she says. "They say this was a great route to come to Canada. It was attractive to come and get your papers." (Proudfoot 2011, The Windsor Star)

This quote from Proudfoot reproduces the narrative that the LCP serves as a satisfying and humane way for potential new immigrants to enter the country.

Calugay (2000) continues this narrative by describing the experiences of one caregiver who had terrible work experiences in Asia before arriving in Canada as a LCP worker. Calugay (2000) states that, “after more than a year in Canada, Guillermo talks about those hardships as if they are in the distant past. She is very happy with her employers who she says treat her fairly.” An article by McGinnis (2004) creates an image of the LCP labour experience as unproblematic, stating that for one caregiver “the first two years flew by with few hurtles. She worked for families in Ottawa and Moncton, completed the live-in caregiver program and was granted a work permit.”

Narratives that express the positive aspects of labouring under the LCP also focus on how these caregivers are viewed by children as “second mothers.” Smith (2002) interviews an employer who hired a caregiver from the Philippines to care for her children.

Gabriel’s satisfaction with her nanny, Teresa Paa, is evident. As she chats, Teresa sits on the living room floor, playing with Barbies with Alessandra and Arianna, three. They dress up the dolls and march them around. As Gabriel says, “she’s like a second mother. The girls aren’t upset when I leave. She’s a constant for them and I feel very comfortable.” (Smith 2002, Nanaimo Daily News)

Smith’s description of this scene creates the image of an ideal labour relationship where the employer is satisfied with her caregiver, and the caregiver is given respect for her labour. Pearce and Sokoloff (2007), in an article for the *Globe and Mail*, also quote a caregiver who claims that she was like a second mother to the children. She states, “I loved them like they were my own kids” (Pearce and Sokoloff 2007). These quotes effectively highlight the feminized aspect of care giving, where women are easily framed as substitute mothers, wives, and daughters.

Another aspect of these positive representations of the LCP is the tendency noted above to contrast Canadian employers with employers in other countries while painting Canadian

employers in a positive light. Sherman (2009) quotes an employer who emphasized that with her caregiver, “we had wanted to make her feel like part of the family.” Another article written by McGregor (2005) follows this “happy family” image by quoting an employer who emphasizes that Nanny B, as they refer to her, has become “part of our family.”

Kleiss (2006), in an article for the *Edmonton Journal*, describes one caregiver who was able to take a caregiver training course in Alberta that helped her find great employers. Kleiss (2006) writes, “they will pay her what she asked: \$1,700 a month, with no deduction for her room, private bath or board. They offered to pay for her driver’s education course, give her a car and take her on family vacations if she wants to go.” This description from Kleiss paints an idealistic picture of what the employment relationship is like under the program. Kleiss connects the training course with the notion that this caregiver is highly skilled compared to the majority of caregivers who do not take these courses in Canada. This narrative also hints that since she is better trained than others, the work she receives is also more favourable than what less-skilled caregivers may experience under the program.

4.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I explored three dominant themes that were evident in the media reports that focused on the LCP as a work program. These themes related to: 1) the employer-specific work permit, 2) the live-in requirement, and 3) the potential for abuse in the employer/employee relationship. In general, little attention was paid to the process of gaining the work permit with most reports at best mentioning that a work permit was required. Of those who did mention the employer-specific work permit; there were two somewhat contrasting narratives. A few journalists did describe how the process of changing work permits is unnecessarily long.

Through my analysis, I identified the work permit as indirectly linked to a common narrative of fear, expressed via a concern with allowing low-skilled workers into Canada, and then not ensuring that their status is properly monitored. In this illegality narrative, caregivers were framed as either villainous women looking to circumvent immigration regulations, or as helpless victims at the hands of fraudulent recruitment agents who forge work permits.

Many journalists' discussions of the live-in regulation mostly followed the conclusions of advocates and academics that this is a problematic aspect of the LCP. Indeed, many authors labeled this regulation as the single biggest problem with the program in terms of labour abuse and caregiver security. There were also some journalists who successfully captured the awkward and uncomfortable negotiations and compromises that emerge from the live-in requirement.

Finally, in this chapter I assessed how the labour relations under the program were described. Many articles did acknowledge that the potential for abuse under the program is high, with unpaid overtime being the most common aspect that was raised. There were also authors, however, that allowed employers to describe their caregivers as one of the family, which showed a counterbalance to the abusive employer narrative.

Through discourses on the labour relationship two contrary pictures emerge. On the one hand, journalists looked at the labour relationship through a critical lens. In these articles, journalists focused on either the potential for abuse under the program, or actual cases of labour abuse. On the other hand, some journalists focused on the idea that the majority of labour relationships under the LCP are positive for both the employer and the employee. In both narrative frameworks, LCP caregivers are mostly framed as meek, vulnerable, and passive women who have little control over the labour relationship. However, when the labour

relationship is described as positive, caregivers are overwhelmingly portrayed within the framework of a gendered burden of care. Indeed, those that perform childcare are presented as substitute mothers who allow Canadian women to work outside the home without negatively impacting their children.

The Dhalla case successfully captured some common problems that are identified in labour relationships under the LCP. The framing of these caregivers as “servants” under the “master” within a few of the reports furthers the idea that racialized perceptions of both employers and employees may greatly impact the narratives that are created about the program. The illegality narrative within the reports on the LCP framed caregivers under the LCP as a potential problem. Articles for this analysis reflect that these women occupy a space that intersects many different positions. Indeed, because these workers are: 1) foreigners; 2) from countries with high poverty rates; 3) are not “skilled” enough to qualify for points system immigration classes; 4) are live-in caregivers; 5) are mostly women; 6) are on temporary work permits; 7) are desperate for Canadian residency; greatly impacts how they are framed within these news reports. These interlocking positions allowed for the reports to easily grasp at the common idea that many foreign domestics may choose to labour with an undocumented status.

To answer the first question that guided this chapter, the majority of journalists ignored how the regulations of the employer-specific work permit under the LCP may impact the labour experiences of caregivers. Indeed, the majority of the articles did not include any information on how the processes of gaining a work permit may lead to caregivers being unable to complete the required two years of work within the four-year time period. There was also no discussion on how the work permit process could be altered in order to ease the burden of changing employers under the program. My analysis of the articles also revealed that few journalists acknowledged

the fact that when applying to work for new employers, caregivers are without an “official” income, which may also impact their ability to provide for themselves and their families. Indeed, few articles discussed how, because there is a live-in requirement for the LCP, changing employers could also leave caregivers with no accommodation for the “official” period of unemployment.

The second question for this chapter focused on the live-in regulation. There was a lot of attention paid to this regulation under the LCP. Many journalists emphasized that this was the largest contributor to labour abuse and exploitation under the program. The biggest focus for journalists who did look at this regulation was the possibility for employers to stretch the workday and demand extra hours outside of the authorized contract. Here, more than other aspects of the LCP, caregivers were allowed to share their own thoughts and stories. Some described how they felt isolated in their rooms, while others described how they rented rooms with other women for their days off in order to escape from their employer’s homes. There were also quotes on how these women were placed in inappropriate living arrangements.

The labour relationship was described in great detail through various cases and stories included within the news articles. Many journalists focused on abusive employers under the program, which forwarded the idea that there is often a power imbalance within the employment relationship. Within the narratives created on the employment relationship, caregivers were often presented as vulnerable individuals who are at the mercy of greedy employers and agents. Journalists in the articles analyzed did create a colorful picture of how the LCP labour relationship is full of many negotiations and compromises, often on the part of the caregiver. Indeed, many of the articles captured the fact that there are many informal exchanges that often

occur under the LCP, with, for example, caregivers receiving “gifts” for overtime hours rather than regular wages.

Chapter Five: Conclusion and Future Research Opportunities

5.1 Introduction

This chapter is dedicated to an overview of my main research findings, derived from my analysis of 70 news articles on the LCP. In the first section, I provide a brief summary of my main findings in Chapter 3 and 4, where the LCP is first understood primarily as an immigration and/or temporary residency program and in the second case, as an employment program. In the next three sections I expand on a few topics that were interwoven, sometimes explicitly and sometimes subtly, throughout the various narratives highlighted. In Section 5.3, I provide an outline of the prevalent narrative that emerged through many of the arguments made in the articles. After I discuss this prevalent narrative, I then explore what aspects, questions, or ideas are lacking within this narrative.

In section 5.5, I look more closely at the promise of permanent residency under the LCP as a justificatory strategy for the more problematic aspects of the program. I felt that the permanent residency topic is one of the most prolific narratives that emerged from the analysis. The concept of permanent residency also allowed for journalists to frame caregivers under the LCP in a specific manner that easily resonates with Canadian audiences. In the next section, I explore the gendered and racialized aspects of the narratives that were created within the news articles since this is a prevalent theme within the scholarly literature on foreign care workers. The influence of gendered and racialized constructions of foreign caregivers and care work in general was also important for my own analysis of these media narratives. Finally, I will suggest some future research opportunities, and make some concluding thoughts on the news print media's portrayal of the LCP and migrant caregivers.

5.2 Summary of Research

This research was focused on my critical analysis of 70 news articles pertaining to some aspect of the live-in caregiver program. The analysis centered on both migration topics and labour issues that are associated with this temporary foreign worker program. Specifically, there were six areas of interest for this study that related directly to the main themes that were addressed by many academic researchers dealing either with live-in caregivers, migrant workers, or the live-in caregiver program itself. These themes were: temporary foreign worker programs; citizenship status; globalized, gendered, and racial stereotypes; the live-in regulation; employer-specific work permits, and the potential for abuse in the labour relationship. Through this research, my intent was not to prove or disprove the main findings of the key migrant/domestic worker literature; rather, I focused on how these conclusions are reproduced, interpreted, or challenged within a publically accessible format, Canadian news print media.

In the articles that presented the LCP primarily as an immigration program, there were two main foci. On the one hand, the LCP was compared to and associated with other temporary foreign worker programs (TFWs) as a means to bring short-term workers into the country. On the other hand, the LCP could be constructed primarily as a route for immigrants to enter the country, with the ultimate goal being permanent residency and/or citizenship. And for both of these foci, there were both positive and negative assessments of the program.

The articles mostly utilized an economic lens to construct arguments about the benefits or dangers of the LCP. On one side, the TFW programs are portrayed as a positive contribution to Canada's economic prosperity. Some journalists argue that these programs keep the costs of goods and services down for average Canadians, help keep businesses open, and allow citizens to

obtain better jobs, among other things. However, some articles focused on the negative aspects of these temporary worker programs, including increased vulnerability for migrants, the creation of illegal workers, and the possibility that these programs keep wages too low and force Canadian workers out of certain sectors of the job market.

I found that citizenship and/or residency status was the most popular theme highlighted by journalists who discuss the LCP. The promise of eventual permanent residency status is used as a justification for the negative or controversial parts of the program. The other aspect of citizenship identified in most of the articles was the issue of denial of residency status and deportation of certain individuals.

In chapter 3, I also looked at the stereotypes related to nationality and/or ethnicity that were perpetuated or dismantled within the articles. For global stereotypes, I focused on constructions of Canada and the Philippines that were highlighted within the articles. For the most part, Canada was portrayed as a kind and prosperous nation, while the Philippines was seen as corrupt and poor with the only form of real income emerging from labour exportation. Within the articles, a narrative emerged that framed the LCP and the flow of migrant workers into Canada as a form of international economic aid.

Journalist's constructions of the Philippines support claims that these women are poor, less educated, and with few valuable skills compared to the rest of the Canadian population. This unskilled stereotype is integral to the justification of the temporary resident status offered by the program because it ensures that there is less controversy when these workers are treated differently from other classes of immigrants. Compared to some discourse analyses of the media in Europe, Canadian journalists are quite careful not to utilize many overt racial or ethnic

stereotypes. There were, however, more subtle forms of stereotyping found within the articles that I analyzed. Within the narratives created about this program, the most overt use of stereotyping was related to gender, with journalists never questioning whether all caregivers are or should be women. Most reports also presume that the LCP mostly benefits Canadian women, who as mothers, daughters, housewives, or workers are primarily responsible for care and domestic labour.

In Chapter 4, my analysis focused on three dominant aspects of the LCP as an employment/labour program: the live-in regulation, the employer-specific work permit, and the relations that exist between employer and employee. Many of the arguments constructed by journalists on the labour portion of the program were closely connected to academic research on migrant domestic care work. Most of the articles that highlighted labour issues tended to write in support of caregivers and emphasized how the live-in regulation and employer-specific work permit led to increased vulnerability for the employee. The overlap between research findings and the message put forth in news media about these two areas does support the notion that advocacy groups and researchers have made some strides in educating the public about certain problems with the program. Many authors portrayed the live-in regulation as the most significant problem with the LCP, and as the main cause for abuse within the labour environment.

Certain journalists, mostly from the smaller newspapers, acknowledged the employer-specific work permit as leading to vulnerability for the caregiver, while the rest of the articles merely mentioned that a work permit was required under the LCP. There was an overall focus on recruitment agencies and fraudulence that was quite interesting, with 21 journalists discussing the charging of fees to caregivers, and 15 articles that dealt with the falsifying of work permits by agents.

The final section of Chapter 4 focused on if and how the media approached the relationship between employers and employees and in particular, if and how abuse and exploitation were addressed. For the most part, the journalists seemed, again, to follow academic researchers and community advocates with their focus on the plight of abused or vulnerable caregivers. There was also a large amount of attention paid to the Ruby Dhalla case, which was unsurprising considering her position as a federal politician and Youth and Multiculturalism Critic for the Liberal Party. Finally, I included some discussion of the media reports that constructed the relations between employers and employees in a positive light, emphasizing at times the kin-like relationships that potentially develop.

5.3 The Prevailing Narrative

The articles, when placed together, constructed some conflicting narratives that either supported or critiqued the LCP in its current form. The most prevalent narrative that I identified, however, was: A) Canada has a shortage of live-in home support workers to fill in the gap in private and public care options for children, the elderly, and those with special needs. In order to make private care affordable for the general Canadian public, caregivers need to work for minimum wage, and live-in, which allows for families to have care when it is necessary. Canadians will not fill these positions because the pay is inadequate, and the job is low status. B) Since Canadians will not take on these care jobs, the government must find an alternative source of cheap labour. Thus, the government turns to countries that have high unemployment and poverty rates to find care workers who are willing to come to Canada for minimum wage, live-in labour. These migrants are not highly skilled and would never be able to come to Canada under “regular” immigration points system, thus they are given a temporary status.

C) The ability for these individuals to migrate under the LCP affords them the opportunity to find gainful employment at a wage they would never earn in their home countries. The wages that these workers send home through remittances allow for families to purchase much-needed goods and to improve their own lives. The fact that workers are directly sending money home may be better than other types of aid because it reaches the small communities and is in the hands of the locals who utilize it the best way they see fit. This flow of remittances also benefits the larger “Third World” state because it lowers unemployment levels, promotes consumerism, and allows for more individuals to gain educations and improve their skills.

D) Since LCP caregivers are not highly skilled, they must complete 24 months of work within a private home. These workers are here through a temporary worker program and so their mobility is restricted through the employer-specific work permit. These regulations ensure that the government is able to monitor the workers and ensure that the integrity of the program is upheld. The government understands that some labour situations are abusive; however, the majority of employers are good people who treat the caregivers as if they are “one of the family” and a valued asset. The real problem with the program is exploitative and fraudulent recruitment agencies that prey on the vulnerability of these workers. However, the government has banned the charging of fees to caregivers and is continually cracking down on fraudulent behavior.

E) After the 24 months of work is completed, caregivers are able to apply for permanent residency and also sponsor their own families to come to Canada. The obtainment of residency will afford these families the chance to live in an advanced, privileged, and open society, which would not have been possible without the LCP. The Canadian public should not fear an influx of low-skilled poor workers gaining residency, because these women are hard working, vulnerable, self-sacrificing individuals, who put in their time to earn their status.

5.4 What is Missing from the Prevailing Narrative

In this section I discuss what key questions, ideas, and representations about the LCP are missing from the majority of the articles that I analyzed. While there are some journalists who take a critical view of the program, more attention needs to be given to certain aspects of the program. This includes: A) There needs to be more questioning of why the program exists in the first place. Why are there not enough caregivers and care giving options available in Canada? And why do various levels of government appear to prefer to rely on temporary foreign labour over finding sustainable domestic care options that can be affordable for Canadian families? B) And if we need to rely on foreign caregivers, why are they brought in as temporary foreign workers and not as permanent landed residents? Since the LCP does eventually offer permanent residency to some of the women at the end of the 24 months of full time work, then these workers must have skills that benefit Canada and that could allow them to enter the country as landed immigrants in a skilled worker category. Even if these workers were admitted with residency status, there could be the stipulation that they must work a certain period of time within a care-related occupation. There is also a lack of consideration given to what rights these workers may lose when entering Canada under this program.

C) Not enough journalists are scrutinizing why caregivers are required to be live-in workers. Journalists do not regularly question what the reasoning is behind this regulation of the program, other than pointing out that it lends caregivers to be on call 24 hours in a day. There are not enough journalists who emphasize that the live-in regulation should be optional, based on the needs of the employer and the caregiver. Nor do they acknowledge that home-based care giving would not likely be affordable for many who now rely on it if they were required to employ two or more caregivers who lived out and worked fixed 8 hour shifts.

D) There is a lack of scrutiny paid by journalists to the real effects of these migrations on the caregivers and their families. There is a lot of attention paid to how the LCP allows Canadian families to have more quality time yet hardly any thought is given to the lack of quality time that caregivers have with their own families. Very few narratives raise the issue of why caregivers cannot or should not be able to bring their families with them when they are first accepted into the program. There is not enough concern for how this program impacts the children of these caregivers who grow up without at least one parent present for a significant period of time while the parent works in Canada or elsewhere as a temporary foreign worker. E) Rather than just questioning how the LCP impacts Canada, not enough journalists ponder how migrant worker programs may have large consequences for the source countries too. There is little attention given to how the loss of these skilled workers may be a part of a “brain drain” phenomenon within these countries. Since many LCP caregivers are trained as nurses, teachers, or in related professional fields, not enough journalists discuss how the loss of these caregivers within the source countries may impact care systems for those populations.

F) There are very few authors who scrutinize what is gained and what is lost by requiring an employer-specific work permit. If there is such a shortage of affordable care options in Canada, then why do LCP workers not have an occupation-specific work permit? The problems that are generated by an employer-specific work permit are also not addressed by most reporters, many who simply note that a work permit is required. G) There is not enough consideration paid to the fact that there is little to no external monitoring of the LCP work environment. And given the fact that the labour occurs in the private sphere, there are very few journalists who scrutinize why there have not been any specific external monitoring systems put into place. Most journalists do not ponder why the government’s involvement with the program basically ends at

issuing the work permits and labour market opinions. Even though there is an employment contract under the program, few authors question why there are no officials in place to ensure these contracts are being enforced.

H) There are not enough journalists who investigate what awaits caregivers who do gain permanent residency. Most authors create the impression that if and when caregivers gain permanent residency, their life becomes full of opportunities. Yet research shows that immigrants, especially recent immigrants, suffer from higher poverty levels than native born Canadians. For example, in 2004 the “family income adjusted for family size [of recent immigrant] represented 76% of that of native-born Canadians.... [D]espite a labour market status similar to that of other working-age Canadians (especially for men), the standard of living for recent immigrants was considerably lower” (Fleury 2007:12). There are few authors that recognize how the LCP may negatively impact a caregiver’s future success within the labour market, since wage levels in previous jobs often affect wages in new jobs. There are also limited opportunities to upgrade skills while working under the program.

5.5 Permanent Residency as a Justificatory Strategy

The promise of a possible future offer of permanent residency status seems to be used by journalists as the single most important reason to account for why the LCP has been able to exist for as long as it has in the face of opposition from advocacy groups, current and former caregivers, and academics. The permanent residency aspect also effectively distinguishes the LCP from other temporary foreign worker programs. While lack of citizenship may be used at times to justify poorer wages or unequal treatment of TFWs, in the case of the LCP, it was much more common for media reports to justify these sorts of issues by referring to the LCP as a route

to permanent residency and/or citizenship for those who were otherwise ineligible or wanted to hurry along the process. As such, the LCP was portrayed at times as a form of international humanitarian aid. The focus on the possibility of permanent residency is an effective strategy to downplay certain aspects of the program, as well as to create and maintain particular images of Canada as a country built on immigration.

Through my analysis of these news articles it became clear that the possibility of permanent residency often allows journalists to make certain statements about LCP caregivers. These statements often surrounded the caregiver's own worthiness to be a resident of Canada. Indeed, if these women are constructed as poor, unskilled and vulnerable, then the earning of residency at the end of their work term becomes a form of charity since they never would have qualified under the regular points system for immigration. This strategy is seen in one article where the journalist discusses the potential for caregivers to "win a chance" at staying in Canada (Walkom 2009). However, this can also be a double-edged sword because it allows anti-immigration advocates to portray the caregivers as not a valuable addition to the population, since we are, according to one journalist, "importing poverty" (Mahoney 2010).

In raising concerns about the appropriateness of these women and their families to settle permanently in Canada while also celebrating the country's generosity in offering permanent residency, journalists also create images of other countries, such as the Philippines, where the majority of caregivers for the LCP are from. Most journalists constructing such images primarily focus on poverty, corruption, and a lack of labour and educational opportunities. Journalists also juxtapose these descriptions of the Philippines with images of Canada as a fair and prosperous nation, which then makes permanent residency seem like an even greater gift for LCP caregivers. This follows Henry and Tator (2002:44), who pointed out that, in many Canadian articles, there

is a strict duality created between the west and the rest, where the “Third World is linked with racialized premises; it is defined as traditional, underdeveloped, overpopulated, irrational, disordered, and uncivilized.”

Instead of envisioning the payment of higher wages or allowing for live-out arrangements, many journalists focus on the fact that Canada offers caregivers the chance to apply for permanent residency status and eventually citizenship at the end of this work term. These narratives support the idea that there are hierarchies of citizenship, with countries such as Canada portrayed as providing more rights and opportunities than other countries, such as the Philippines, ever could. Journalists downplayed the fact that Canadian citizenship rights may not be evenly accessible to all individuals. This follows Bakan and Stasiulis (1997a:46) who contend that “the unequal distribution of citizenship rights within the advanced liberal democracies, principally along the lines of class, race, and gender inequalities, recedes in importance when counterposed to societies where the vast majority of citizens suffer from chronic poverty and privation.”

Since LCP caregivers leave their home countries, they also give up access to certain established rights. “These forfeited rights may include the rights of land ownership, associated with citizenship and residence in less developed countries... the right to live with one’s children and other family members, the right to freedom of choice of domicile, and access to networks of support in the provision of health care, child care, food, and so on” (Bakan and Stasiulis 1997a:45-46). These losses were not acknowledged in the vast majority of the narratives, with most journalists focusing on how Canadian residency and/or citizenship allows for economic gains for these caregivers, while ignoring what sort of social rights are eliminated or diminished by the LCP.

Pratt (1999) focuses on the experiences of LCP caregivers after they have completed the program requirements. She concludes, “the experience of coming to Canada as a nanny evidently narrows occupational opportunities long after the requirements of the program have been fulfilled” (1999:216). Through my analysis of the articles, it became clear that very few authors ever pondered what awaits caregivers after the completion of the LCP. This is interesting since so many authors focused on the importance of Canadian permanent residency and how the obtainment of this status increases opportunities for caregivers to improve their lives. Indeed, no authors acknowledged the high rates of poverty among recent immigrants and the higher probability of financial difficulty for these segments of the population compared to native-born Canadians (Fleury 2007).

Furthermore, there seemed to be a disconnect between what is written on the labour related aspects of the program versus what is written about the migratory aspects of the program. Journalists provided a fairly balanced narrative on what sorts of abuse or exploitation may be common within the LCP labour relationship. These labour issues, however, are often hidden under the more prevailing narrative of permanent residency and the idea that caregivers are able to escape poverty and provide for their families.

5.6 Race and Gender- “Immigrants and Women”

In this section, I explore the use of gendered and racial/ethnic stereotypes within the articles analyzed. Within a European context, past research by scholars (Wodak et al. 2009; Van Dijk 1993) has found that immigrants/migrants/refugees are discussed in a limited number of ways, with a focus on the more negative aspects. As Wodak and Matouschek (1993:234) highlight, the news media in Europe focuses on three main topics: that the presence of

‘foreigners’ hurts the national economy, that these people are culturally different, and that immigrants are involved in negative or criminal activities, or are prone to inappropriate behavior. The articles that I analyzed did reflect two of those conclusions, with some focusing on how LCP caregivers as “low-skill” TFWs may hurt Canadian economic interests and others generating fear of illegal, undocumented workers.

Some journalists raised the concern that the LCP is being taken advantage of by less than genuine applicants, and that the poor administration of the program is leading some caregivers into the “underground” trade in illegal foreign workers. There were also arguments made about the misuse of the program as a means for the sponsoring of family members. This was described as “purely disguised immigration” (Friscolanti 2004). Certain articles linked LCP recruitment agencies with an increase in illegal workers as a result of their arranging false employer-specific work permits. These articles did not always cast the caregivers in a criminal role, more often painting these women as helpless victims. These narratives, however, did link the LCP with an increase in the underground trade in undocumented foreign workers.

Ungerleider’s (1991) study of Canadian media found that minorities are most often represented in news reports in dichotomous categories of villain or victim, negating how this may limit the discursive expansion of other identities. Similar dichotomies were uncovered in the articles I reviewed. Over twenty articles contained quotes that specifically mentioned that these workers are extremely vulnerable to exploitation by recruitment agents and unscrupulous employers. Many journalists painted an image of LCP caregivers as helpless victims who are at the mercy of potentially exploitative regulations. However, there were other opinion pieces that presented LCP caregivers more as villains, suggesting that some caregivers had disingenuous reasons for applying to the program and that they were simply using Canadian families as a

means to get into the country. Within many of the articles I analyzed, journalists often stayed within this good/bad dichotomy when describing caregivers, employers, and recruitment agents. The use of these stereotypes effectively limits the possibility for recognizing the complexity of caregivers' and others' identities.

Some scholars also argue that there are new and different racial ideologies linked to neoliberalism that utilize “older notions but speak... the language of individual merit, freedom of choice, and cultural difference” (Mullings 2005:679). This new form of racism, often referred to as “color-blind racism,” explains racial inequality as “due to cultural and, in a pinch, biological limitations... rather than to the history of conquest, enslavement, and continuous discrimination” (Mullings 2005:678). The focus on personal characteristics that Mullings emphasizes is seen within a multitude of the narratives that were analyzed for this study, particularly around the issue of skill or training. For example, in one article a government representative states, “normally, many of the people who come here as nannies would not meet the high criteria that we have to be landed as economic migrants” (Calugay 2000). While another author discusses the problem of untrained caregivers, stating, “a growing number of caregivers have no training whatsoever despite the difficulties of looking after the aged” (Agrell 2007).

Pratt (1999:234), in a discussion of how Filipina caregivers are discursively constructed, emphasizes how “imagined geographies of ‘the Philippines’ and ‘Britain’ enter into definitions of skills and evaluations of wage requirements.” In the articles I analyzed, the construction of the Philippines and its citizens was strongly connected with the image of unskilled labour. This was often juxtaposed with the idea that Canadian citizens are able to achieve more through education and training, and subsequently take on higher status occupations. Thus, journalists portray Canadians as skilled individuals who take professional jobs, while foreign workers from “Third

World” countries are seen as being brought in to do work that is underpaid, undesirable, and insecure.

As mentioned in Chapter 3, the use of the word “immigrant” or “foreign worker” can have some important racial connotations when utilized by the media. Hondagneu-Sotelo (2001:14) found that, in relation to domestic workers in the United States, “their position as ‘foreigners’ and ‘immigrants’ allows employers and the society at large, to perceive them as outsiders and thereby overlook the contemporary racialization of the occupation...[I]mmigration does not trump race but, combined with the dominant ideology of a ‘color-blind’ society manages to shroud it.” Ruben Garcia (1995:122) adds to this by stating that “although the United States is a country of immigrants, whites are not generally thought of as immigrants.” When the articles I analyzed referred to “penniless foreign domestics” or “foreign nannies,” there are a multitude of images and perceptions that the reader can bring to mind and which are based in part on the readers’ own life experiences. Even though there is much research on subtle racism (see for example, Harrison 1995; Bonilla-Silva 1997; McIntosh 1989) it can be a difficult topic to tackle within the context of news media simply because racism is “not necessarily expressed in overt language and consistent practices” (Harrison 1995:58).

Within my analysis, the term “Filipina” was used a number of times to discuss caregivers under the LCP. Indeed, “Filipina” was seen 23 times, while “Filipino” was mentioned 34 times, and the Philippines was mentioned 77 times. Pratt (1999:233) contends that “the word *Filipina* is not only equated with *supplicant-pre immigrant*; the term also connotes *just-a-housekeeper* and *husband stealer*.” Harrison (1995:50) resonates with Pratt’s conclusions, stating that “despite its uneven development and varying systemization, racism is characterized by an international

hierarchy in which wealth, power, and advanced development are associated largely with whiteness or ‘honorary whiteness.’”

The majority of the articles that I analyzed did associate the title of domestic worker/caregiver/nanny with foreign women, and most often with Filipinas. Beyond this, Filipinas were overwhelmingly stereotyped as meek, delicate, passive victims, who have limited skills and poorer education compared to Canadian educational standards, and also suffer from insufficient language abilities and high poverty. Constructions of Filipina women within the Canadian news media help to promote the idea that women from the Philippines make naturally good caregivers because they are docile, nurturing, and hard workers.

Beyond racialized narratives, it was common for journalists to create feminized narratives when discussing and justifying the existence of the LCP. The news discourses that I analyzed for this research reflected interlocking systems of difference that often characterize domestic labour. First, they consistently reflected the gendered burden of care, where women are seen as responsible for care giving. The news articles also reflected the reality that, due to differences in access to resources, certain segments of the Canadian (female) population are able to buy their way out of these responsibilities. These privileged segments are then able to pass on these duties to other women. While perhaps not explicitly acknowledged, these constructions are premised on a fundamental class relationship, which through the LCP often assumes a racialized form. Indeed within these narratives, certain types of women, mostly Filipina in this case, are constructed as natural substitutes for absent female family members, especially mothers in the case of childcare workers.

With journalists perpetuating the idea that the LCP allows Canadian women to maintain jobs outside of the home, this supports the notion that domestic work is a logical extension of what women are supposed to do naturally for their families. An interesting area where the feminized aspect of the LCP starkly shines through is in the topic of migration and familial separations. In these articles, caregivers are often quoted discussing the long periods of time that they have been apart from their loved ones back home and the difficulties of mothering from a distance. One journalist uses the term “dollar mommies” to discuss the fact that women from other countries are coming into Canada to be paid for filling the role of substitute mothers (Howard 2007). This is an example of the concept of stratified reproduction first developed by Colen in the 1980s in the context of her research with Caribbean nannies in New York City.

Colen described inequalities of race, gender, class, culture and legal status that played out in fields that were both domestic and transnational. As Colen (1995:78) contends, the existence of these child care workers in New York during the 1970s and 80s, “opened up a window on a transnational system of stratified reproduction in which global processes are evident in local, intimate, daily events, and in which stratification itself is reproduced, as child care occurs across class lines, kin lines, and oceans.” Here the inequalities between countries are revealed, since some mothers have the privilege of being able to stay with their families, while others have to leave loved ones behind in order to provide for them. Similarly, as Cock (1980:86) emphasized in her South African study, the “inequalities of power” and resources that domestic workers experience at the level of their workplace are a reflection of the “general inequalities” that exist globally. These entangled networks of transnational labour exchange exemplify how women in different locations are afforded unequal opportunities to organize care for their own families.

5.7 Potential Future Research

This study was limited in its ability to make any definitive conclusions based on the fact that the sample size of articles was fairly small. Future research on this topic should try to expand the number of articles for analysis in order to gain an even better picture of how the Canadian news media portrays the LCP. Beyond this, a sample of media representation of foreign caregivers could be taken from more than one country to compare images. It would also be pertinent to compare articles on the LCP with those written on other temporary worker programs, such as those that bring in agricultural labour, to see if there are similar narratives constructed around these workers and the programs. A future study of these articles could also benefit by incorporating other research methods including certain computer based software programs that have been developed to pull out words or phrases more efficiently. The use of software would also be useful because it would allow the researcher to increase the sample size significantly. It would also be interesting to analyze articles over a longer historical period to see how foreign caregivers were discussed before the creation of the LCP, and if narratives change in important ways through the decades.

We often assume that the media impacts our understandings but we seldom look at how they do that and to what extent. A future study of media representations of the LCP could focus more on the impact of these representations on readers. One way to do this would be to analyze readers' comments on the articles. Since the news articles for this study were taken from the Internet, I could have paid attention the readers' comments included on many newspaper websites. This would allow for the study to bring in an audience reception component, which would give the researcher a better idea of how different people engage with this type of information, and if similar understandings are constructed or challenged by readers.

Asking a sample group of individuals to read particular articles, and then have them give their feedback on what they read could also do this. The participant could highlight certain parts of the article and make comments about what was most salient to them within the narrative. This would result in a stronger study since it would allow the researcher to make claims about what kind of effects these articles may have. The participants could also be former or current live-in caregivers. This might allow for the study of how these images and perceptions created and perpetuated in the media actually impact those being discussed.

This study was purely based on the textual component of the article, rather than the layout of the newspaper article and the types of formats used. With discourse studies, what is written can be just as important as how it is organized, so this may lead to another layer of insight. Future research could also look more closely at how articles are titled, if there are pictures included, what picture captions contain, and the overall structure of the article. Using other forms of media within the study, such as television or Internet news coverage, would also be an interesting direction for future research.

5.8 Some Concluding Thoughts

At one level, Canadians have come to rely too much on immigration as the miracle answer to every problem - from the aging baby boom to the lack of family doctors. We fret that we won't have enough immigrants. Then we fret that we won't have the right kind. We insist that permanent immigrants be rigorously screened to ensure that their education standards are as high as possible. Then we wring our hands when, because there aren't enough openings for nuclear physicists and rocket scientists, these highly qualified newcomers end up driving cabs. (Walkom 2009, Toronto Star)

Canadian media narratives frame caregivers in various ways based on particular arguments and understandings about the Live-in Caregiver Program. This analysis revealed how journalists construct important cultural narratives to persuade audiences to either reject the LCP

as exploitative and problematic, or embrace it as a viable form of transnational humanitarian aid. Even though many of the journalists promoted a critical view of the potential for exploitation of workers under the program, there were many that ignored the problematic nature of allowing foreign workers into Canada on temporary permits to work in jobs that are not regulated or secure. Many authors promote the idea that Canadian residency leads to a better life, which helps to gloss over the countless stories of labour exploitation and caregiver abuse.

In order to promote the idea that this program is beneficial for foreign workers, as well as Canadian citizens, journalists emphasize the ability for caregivers to gain permanent residency and help their families out of poverty. Indeed, almost 15 years ago, Bakan and Stasiulis (1997:39) contended that “the fact that Third World female migrants have rights that are relinquished upon migration to Canada is consistently ignored by immigration officials, employers, and scholars of citizenship, who focus only on the gains that migration confers upon those arriving from underdeveloped regions.” This trend of emphasizing what caregivers gain on arrival in Canada is seen throughout the news articles that were analyzed for this research, with many journalists consistently refusing to question what is lost through migration under the LCP.

This research revealed that the news media in Canada constructed a limited number of possible representations of the LCP. Some journalists put forth some very persuasive arguments as to the benefits of temporary foreign workers and of the LCP for the country, for employers, and/or for the workers, while others suggested that these programs are neither good for the country or for the workers. The arguments that were created by the majority of journalists frame the use of temporary labour as an economic strategy that allows for Canadian businesses to be competitive, and for citizens to have affordable care options. The economic arguments for this program show how journalists do not just give a run down on the “facts” of the LCP, rather they

mould these “facts” to fit into accepted ideological frameworks. Framing the LCP (and other TFWs) in terms of economics reflects how much of Canadian immigration policy is promoted as a way to be economically competitive in a global context. The media discourses surrounding the LCP also help to promote the idea that an individual’s identity and/or positionality can be integral for determining how they are able to participate within global labour markets.

LCP caregivers were constructed in a few dominant ways, however, they were overwhelmingly portrayed as self-sacrificing, hard yet needy workers with strong family values, which justified their ability to participate in the Canadian economy, but in a most marginalized, exploited, or limited way. After reading the news media’s coverage of the program, I came to understand the LCP as having two parts that are frequently treated as separated. The migration part is often portrayed in positive terms as the movement of poor women into a prosperous country for jobs that alleviate their problems of chronic poverty and a lack of employment opportunities. This migratory narrative easily obscures the second narrative of abusive permit-specific employers, a lack of employment regulation, and the problematic live-in regulation. The focus on individual sacrifice for economic gain is a discourse that easily resonates with Canadian audiences, as does the idea that citizenship is something that one earns. As such, permanent residency, citizenship and immigration are more about having the right to participate in specific labour markets, rather than simply being about membership in an imagined national community.

The framing of caregivers as hard working, self sacrificing women shows a preference for neoliberal values that may encourage Canadian audiences to see these individuals as potentially valuable additions to the population. As much scholarly research has revealed, this program has a multitude of problematic regulations that can lead caregivers to be consistently on-call for Canadian employers, while also struggling with the inherent difficulties of a

temporary status. Indeed, beyond the reality that many of these women are overworked and exploited, through these persuasive media narratives, LCP caregivers are discursively transformed into permanent workers and temporary residents.

Bibliography

Anderson, Bridget

2000 *Doing the Dirty Work? The Global Politics of Domestic Labour*. London: Zed Books.

2007 *A Very Private Business: Exploring the Demand for Migrant Domestic Workers*. *European Journal of Women's Studies* 14(3):247-264.

Arat-Koc, Sedef

1997 *From Mothers of the Nation to Migrant Workers. In Not One of the Family: Foreign Domestic Workers in Canada*. Abigail B. Bakan and Daiva Stasiulis eds. Pp. 53-79. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

2005 [2001] *Caregivers Break the Silence Live-in Caregiver Program*. <http://www.pinoy-abroad.net/lungga/index.shtml?apc=p—2491->, Accessed June 15, 2010.

Baines, Donna and Nandita Sharma

2002 *Migrant Workers as Non-Citizens: The Case against Citizenship as a Social Policy Concept*. *Studies in Political Economy* 69: 75-107.

Bakan, A.B. & Stasiulis, D.K.

1994 *Foreign Domestic Worker Policy in Canada and the Social Boundaries of Modern Citizenship*. *Science & Society* 58(1):7-33.

1995 *Making the match: Domestic placement agencies and the racialization of women's household work*. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 20(2):303-35.

1997a *Foreign Domestic Worker Policy in Canada and the Social Boundaries of Modern Citizenship*. *In Not One of the Family: Foreign Domestic Workers in Canada*. Abigail B. Bakan and Daiva Stasiulis eds. Pp. 29-52. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

1997b *Negotiating Citizenship: The Case of Foreign Domestic Workers in Canada*. *Feminist Review* 57:112-139.

2003 *Negotiating Citizenship: Migrant Women in Canada and the Global System*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Baker, Paul, Costas Gabrielatos, Majid Khosravini, Michal Krzyzanowski, Tony McEnery, and Ruth Wodak

2008 *A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press*. *Discourse & Society* 19(3):273-306.

- Barber, Pauline Gardiner
2000 Agency in Philippine Women's Labour Migration and Provisional Diaspora. *Women's Studies International Forum* 23(4):399-411.
- Basok, Tanya
2003 Human Rights and Citizenship: The Case of Mexican Migrants in Canada. The Centre for Comparative Immigration Studies. Working Paper #72:1-23.
- Bauder, Harald
2005 Landscape and Scale in Media Representations: the Construction of Offshore Farm Labour in Ontario, Canada. *Cultural Geographies* 12(1):41-58.
- 2008a Foreign Farm Workers in Ontario (Canada): Exclusionary Discourse in the Newsprint Media. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 35(1):100-118.
- 2008b Immigration Debate in Canada: How Newspapers Reported, 1996-2004. *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 9:289-310.
- Bird, S. Elizabeth
2010 The Anthropology of News and Journalism: Why Now? *In The Anthropology of News and Journalism: Global Perspectives*. S. Elizabeth Bird ed. Pp. 1-21. Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Bissett, James
2009 The current state of Canadian immigration policy. *In The Effects of Mass Immigration on Canadian Living Standards and Society*. Herbert Grubel ed. Pp. 3-28. Canada: Fraser Institute.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo
1997 Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural Interpretation. *American Sociological Review* 62(3):465-480.
- Brickner, Rachel K. & Christine Straehle
2010 The missing link: Gender, immigration policy and the Live-in Caregiver Program in Canada. *Policy and Society* 29(4):309-320.
- Canadian Coalition for in-Home Care
2010 LCP Program. <http://www.ccihc.ca/caregiversnannies/lcp-program/>, Accessed June 25, 2010.
- Chaykowski, Richard
2005 Canadian Workers Most in Need of Labour Standards Protection: A Review of the Nature and Extent of Vulnerability In the Canadian Labour Market and Federal Jurisdiction. http://www.rhdcc-hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/labour/employment_standards/fls/research/research02/page00.shtml.

Accessed June 20, 2012.

Cheng, S-J. A.

1996 Migrant women domestic workers in Hong Kong, Singapore and Taiwan: A comparative analysis. *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 5(1):139-52.

2004 Contextual Politics of Difference in Transnational Care: The Rhetoric of Filipina Domestic Employers in Taiwan. *Feminist Review* (77):46-64.

Chiapello, Eve and Norman Fairclough

2002 Understanding the new management ideology: a transdisciplinary contribution from critical discourse analysis and new sociology of capitalism. *Discourse and Society* 13(2):185-209.

Chin, C.B.N.

1997 Walls of silence and late twentieth century representations of the foreign female domestic worker: The case of Filipina and Indonesian female servants in Malaysia. *International Migration Review* 31(2):353-85.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada

2010a Working Temporarily in Canada: The Live-in Caregiver Program.
<http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/work/caregiver/index.asp> , Accessed June 1, 2010.

2010b Facts and Figures 2010- Immigration Overview: Permanent and Temporary Residents- Temporary Residents.
<http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/statistics/facts2010/temporary/04.asp> , Accessed April 24, 2012.

2010c Strategic Outcomes and Program Activity Architecture.
<http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/paa/activity-01.asp> , Accessed July 11, 2012.

2011a Live in Caregiver Program: Employment Contract and Benefits.
<http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/information/faq/work/index-caregiver.asp> , Accessed March 15, 2012.

2011b Processing Live-in Caregivers in Canada.
<http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/manuals/ip/ip04-eng.pdf> , Accessed June 20, 2012.

2012 Preliminary tables: Permanent and Temporary Residents 2011.
<http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/statistics/facts2011-preliminary/04.asp> , Accessed April 24, 2012.

Cock, J.

1980 *Maids and Madams: a study in the politics of exploitation*. Johannesburg: Ravan Press.

Colen, Shellee

1995 "Like a Mother to Them" Stratified Reproduction and West Indian Childcare Workers and Employers in New York. *In* *Conceiving the New World Order: the Global Politics of Reproduction*. Faye D. Ginsburg and Rayna Rapp eds. Pp. 78-102. California: University of California Press.

Constable, Nicole

1997 Sexuality and Discipline among Filipina domestic workers in Hong Kong. *American Ethnologist* 24(3):539-558.

2003 Filipina Workers in Hong Kong Homes: Household Rules and Relations. *In* *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. Barbara Ehrenreich and Arlie Russell Hochschild eds. Pp. 115-141. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Daenzer, Patricia M.

1997 An Affair between Nations: International Relations and the Movement of Household Service Workers. *In* *Not One of the Family: Foreign Domestic Workers in Canada*. Bakan & Stasiulis eds. Pp. 81-118. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

De Cillia, Rudolf, Martin Reisigl and Ruth Wodak

1999 The Discursive Construction of National Identities. *Discourse & Society* 10(2):149-173.

Demirdirek, Hülya

2007 New Modes of Capitalist Domination: Transnational Space Between Turkey and Moldova. *The Anthropology of East Europe Review* 25(1):15-20.

Dill, Bonnie Thornton

1994 *Across the Boundaries of Race and Class: An Exploration of Work and Family Among Black Female Domestic Servants*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Ducharme, Michelle

1986 The coverage of Canadian immigration policy in the globe and mail (1980–1985). *Currents* (Spring):6-11.

Employment Standards Branch

2011 A guide to the Employment Standards Act for Domestic Workers and their Employers. <http://www.labour.gov.bc.ca/esb/domestics/brochure.htm>, Accessed June 10, 2011.

Entman, R

1993 Framing: Toward a clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication* 43(4):51-58.

- Fiss, Peer C. and Paul M. Hirsch
2005 The Discourse of Globalization: Framing and Sensemaking of an Emerging Concept. *American Sociological Review* 70(1):29-52.
- Fleury, Dominique
2007 A Study of Poverty and Working Poverty among Recent Immigrants to Canada. Human Resources and Social Development Canada.
http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/publications_resources/research/categories/inclusion/2007/sp680_05_07_e/page01.shtml , Accessed March 26, 2012.
- Fortin, Myriam and Dominique Fleury
2006 When Working is not enough to Escape Poverty: An Analysis of Canada's Working Poor. Human Resources and Social Development Canada.
http://tamarackcommunity.ca/downloads/vc/When_Work_Not_Enough.pdf , Accessed March 26, 2012.
- Fudge, Judy
1997 Little Victories and Big Defeats: The Rise and Fall of Collective Bargaining Rights for Domestic Workers in Ontario. *In* Not One of the Family: Foreign Domestic Workers in Canada. Abigail B. Bakan and Daiva Stasiulis eds. Pp. 119-147. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

2011 Global Care Chains, Employment Agencies, and the Conundrum of Jurisdiction: Decent Work for Domestic Workers in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 23(1):235-264.
- Garcia, Ruben
1995 Critical Race Theory and Proposition 187: The Racial Politics of Immigration Law. *Chicano/a-Latino/a Law Review* 17:118-148.
- Goldring, Luin
2001 The Gender and Geography of Citizenship in Mexico--U.S. *Transnational Spaces. Identities* 7(4):501-537.
- Grande, Nona with Joanna Kerr
1998 "Frustrated and Displaced:" Filipina Domestic Workers in Canada. *In* Gender and Migration. Caroline Sweetman ed. Pp. 7-12. Oxford: Oxfam.
- Green, Alan G. and David A. Green
1995 Canadian immigration policy: the effectiveness of the point system and other instruments. *The Canadian Journal of Economics* 28(4b):1006-1041.
- Greenburg, Joshua
2000 Opinion Discourse and Canadian Newspapers: The Case of the Chinese "Boat People." *Canadian Journal of Communication* 25(4):517-537.

Hall, Stuart

1997 The Work of Representation. *In* Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices. Stuart Hall ed. Pp. 13-75. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Harrison, Faye V.

1995 The Persistent Power of "Race" in the Cultural and Political Economy of Racism. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24:47-74.

Henry, Frances and Carol Tator

2002 Theoretical Framework. *In* Discourses of Domination: Racial Biases in the Canadian English-Language Press. Frances Henry and Carol Tator eds. Pp. 19-38. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Hier, Sean and Joshua Greenburg

2002 News Discourses and the Problematization of Chinese Migration to Canada. *In* Discourses of Domination: Racial Biases in the Canadian English-Language Press. Frances Henry and Carol Tator eds. Pp. 138-163. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Hodge, Jarrah

2006 "Unskilled Labour:" Canada's Live-in Caregiver Program. *Undercurrent* 3(2):60-66.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, P.

1994 Gendered Transitions: Mexican Experiences of Immigration. California: University of California Press.

1997 Domestic Employment Agencies in Los Angeles. Los Angeles: Southern California Studies Center.

2001 *Domestica: Immigrant Workers Cleaning and Caring in the Shadows of Affluence*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Human Resources and Skills Development Canada

2012a Temporary Foreign Worker Program: Changes to the Live-in Caregiver Program. http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/workplaceskills/foreign_workers/questions-answers/lcp.shtml#Q25 , Accessed February 9, 2012.

2012b Live-in Caregiver Program: Wages, Working Conditions and Occupation. http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/workplaceskills/foreign_workers/caregiver/wages.shtml , Accessed August 20, 2012.

Keough, L. J.

2004 Driven women: reconceptualizing women in traffic through the case of Gagauz mobile domestics. *Focaal* 43:14-26.

- 2006 Globalizing Postsocialism: mobile mothers and neoliberalism on the margins of Europe. *Anthropological Quarterly* 79(3):431-461.
- Khan, Sabaa A.
2009 From Labour of Love to Decent Work: Protecting the Human Rights of Migrant Caregivers in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society* 24(1):23-45.
- Lan, Pei-Chia
2003a Maid or Madam? Filipina Migrant Workers and the Continuity of Domestic labour. *Gender and Society* 17(2):187-208.

2003b Negotiating Social Boundaries and Private Zones: The Micropolitics of Employing Migrant Domestic Workers. *Social Problems* 50(4):525-549.
- Leibel, Geody Cassandra
2007 The Changing Face of Farm Labour in British Columbia: Exploring the Experiences of Migrant Quebecois and Mexican Agricultural Workers in the Okanagan Valley. Master of Arts thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of Victoria.
- Langevin, Louise and Marie-Claire Belleau
2000 Trafficking in Women in Canada: A Critical Analysis of the Legal Framework Governing Immigrant Live-in Caregivers and Mail-Order Brides. *Status of Women Canada*. 1-233. http://www.childtrafficking.com/Docs/langevin_2000__trafficking_.pdf, Accessed July 15, 2010.
- Macklin, Audrey
1992 Foreign Domestic Worker: Surrogate Housewife or Mail Order Servant? *McGill Law Journal* 37(3):681-760.
- Mahtani, M. & A. Mountz
2002 Immigration to British Columbia: Media representations and public opinion. Research on immigration and integration in the metropolis working paper series. No. 02-15:1-36.
- McIntosh, Peggy
1989 Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack. *Peace and Freedom* July/August. <http://www.library.wisc.edu/EDVRC/docs/public/pdfs/LIReadings/InvisibleKnapsack.pdf>, Accessed June 20, 2012.
- Momsen, Janet Henshall
1999 Maids on the Move. *In* Gender, Migration, and Domestic Service. Janet Henshall Momsen ed. Pp. 1-20. London: Routledge.
- Moors, Annelies
2003 Migrant Domestic Workers: Debating Transnationalism, Identity Politics, and Family Relations. A Review Essay. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 45:386-

394.

Mullings, Leith

2005 Interrogating Racism: Toward an Antiracist Anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34:667-693.

Nijeholt, Geertje Lycklama à

1994 The Changing International Division of Labour and Domestic Workers: A Macro Overview (Regional). *In* *The Trade in Domestic Workers: Causes, Mechanisms and Consequences of International Migration*. Noeleen Heyzer, Geertje Lycklama a Nijeholt, and Nedra Weerakoon eds. Pp. 3-31. Malaysia: Asian and Pacific Development Center.

Okongwu, Anne Francis & Joan P. Mencher

2000 The Anthropology of Public Policy: Shifting Terrains. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29:107-124.

Ong, Aihwa

1996 Cultural Citizenship as Subject-Making: Immigrants Negotiate Racial and Cultural Boundaries in the United States. *Current Anthropology* 37(5):737-762.

Oxman-Martinez, Jacqueline, Jill Hanley, and Leslie Cheung

2004 Another Look at the Live-in-Caregivers Program: An Analysis of an Action Research Survey Conducted by PINAY, the Quebec Filipino Women's Association With The Centre for Applied Family Studies. Working Paper #24. Montreal: Metropolis. 1-29.

Parrenas, Rhacel Salazar

2000 Migrant Filipina Domestic Workers and the International Division of Reproductive labour. *Gender & Society* 14(4):560-580.

2001a *Servants of Globalization: Women, Migration and Domestic Work*. California: Stanford University Press.

2001b Transgressing the Nation-State: The Partial Citizenship and "Imagined (Global) Community" of Migrant Filipina Domestic Workers. *Globalization and Gender* 26(4):1129-1154.

Parrott, Daniel

2011 The Role and Regulation of Private, For-Profit Employment Agencies in the British Columbia Labour Market and the Recruitment of Temporary Foreign Workers. Master of Laws dissertation, Faculty of Law, University of Victoria.

Pratt, G.

1997 Stereotypes and ambivalence: The construction of domestic workers in Vancouver, British Columbia. *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 4(2):159-77.

- 1999 From Registered Nurse to Registered Nanny: Discursive Geographies of Filipina Domestic Workers in Vancouver, B.C. *Economic Geography* 75(3):215-236.
- 2002 Studying Immigrants in Focus Groups. *In Feminist Geography in Practice: Research and Methods*. Pamela Moss ed. Pp. 214-229. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- 2005 Abandoned Women and Spaces of the Exception. *Antipode* 37(5):1052-1078.
- Romero, Mary
1992 *Maid in the U.S.A.* New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall, Inc.
- Scott, Joan W.
1987 On Language, Gender, and Working-Class History. *International Labour and Working Class History* 31:1-13.
- Sharma, Nandita
2001 On Being Not Canadian: The Social Organization of 'Migrant Workers' in Canada. *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*. 38(4):415-439.
- 2002 Immigrant and Migrant Workers in Canada: Labour Movements, Racism and the Expansion of Globalization. *Canadian Woman Studies* 21/22(4/1):18-25.
- Silvey, Rachel
2004 Transnational Migration and the Gender Politics of Scale: Indonesian Domestic Workers in Saudi Arabia. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 25(2):141-155.
- Stiell, B. & England, K.
1997a Domestic distinctions: Constructing difference among paid domestic workers in Toronto. *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography*, 4(3):339-59.
- 1997b "They think you're as stupid as your English is:" Constructing foreign domestic workers in Toronto. *Environment and Planning* (29):195-215.
- Tamang, Ritendra
2010 Dynamics of Citizenship and Identity: Obstacles to Sustainable Immigration in a Small Canadian City. *Journal of Identity and Migration Studies* 4(1):51-72.
- Thomas, Derrick
2010 Foreign Nationals Working Temporarily in Canada. Component of Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 11-008-X *Canadian Social Trends*. 34-48.
- Titscher, S., M. Meyer, R. Wodak, and E. Vetter.
2000 *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Tung, Charlene

- 2000 The Cost of Caring: The Social Reproductive Labour of Filipina Live-in Home Health Caregivers. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women's Studies* 21(1/2):61-82.
- Tyner, James A.
 1999 The Web-Based Recruitment of Female Foreign Domestic Workers in Asia. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 20(2):193-209.
- 2004 *Made in the Philippines: gendered discourses and the making of migrants.* London: Routledge Curzon.
- Ungerleider, Charles S.
 1991 Media, minorities and misconceptions: the portrayal by and representation of minorities in Canadian news media. *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 23(3):158-164.
- Valiani, Salimah
 2009 The Shift in Canadian Immigration Policy and Unheeded Lessons of the Live-in Caregiver Program. *Monthly Review*.
<http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2009/valiani030309.html>, Accessed June 14, 2010.
- Van Dijk, Teun A.
 1991 *Racism and the Press.* London: Routledge.
- 1993a Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society* 4(2):249-283.
- 1993b *Elite Discourse and Racism.* California: Sage Publications Inc.
- 2008 *Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Leeuwen, Theo and Ruth Wodak
 1999 Legitimizing Immigration Control: A Discourse-Historical Analysis. *Discourse Studies* 1(1):83-118.
- Widdowson, H. G.
 1995 Discourse Analysis: A Critical View. *Language and Literature* 4(3):157-172.
- Wodak, Ruth & Bernd Matouschek
 1993 'We are Dealing with People Whose Origins One can Clearly Tell Just by Looking': Critical Discourse Analysis and the Study of Neo-Racism in Contemporary Austria. *Discourse & Society* 4(2):225-248.
- Wodak, Ruth, Rudolf de Cillia, Martin Reisigl and Karin Liebhart
 2009 *The Discursive Construction of National Identity.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Wood, Linda A. and Rolf O. Kroger

2000 Doing Discourse Analysis: Methods for Studying Action in Talk and Text.
California: Sage Publications Inc.

Yeoh, B.S.A. & Huang, S.

1998 Negotiating public space: Strategies and styles of migrant female domestic workers in Singapore. *Urban Studies* 35(3):583-602.

Newspaper Articles

Agrell, Siri

2007 No Training or Experience? You're Hired. *The Globe and Mail*, July 03. Accessed August 04, 2011. <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/life/article769509.ece>

Bagnall, Janet

2003 Women of the House. *The Gazette*, March 07: A15. Accessed April 11, 2011. <http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=305850921&sid=60&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Brazao, Dale

2011 Nanny Told to Accept Dhalla Deal; Gag order imposed after caregiver accepts \$5,000 settlement. *Toronto Star*, June 10: A2. Accessed July 18, 2011. <http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=2371084921&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Brazao, Dale

2011 Dhalla Case on Hold Till June; Liberal MP busy with re-election campaign, her lawyer argues. *Toronto Star*, April 20: A4. Accessed July 18, 2011. <http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=2324595841&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Brazao, Dale

2009 Caregiver Denies Using Family to Get into Canada; *Ruby Dhalla's* ex-nanny wonders why another former employer is now making allegations. *Toronto Star*, May 29: A6. Accessed July 18, 2011. <http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1733028541&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Brazao, Dale

2009 Housekeeper 'Paid Under Table.' *Toronto Star*, May 08: A1. Accessed April 11, 2011. <http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1703171091&sid=25&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Brazao, Dale

2009 Nannies Sue Recruiter Over Promised Jobs; Three caregivers claim they were the victims of 'human trafficking.' Toronto Star, October 06: GT4. Accessed April 08, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1872500091&sid=34&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Calugay, Joselito

2000 Not One of the Family. Kingston Whig-Standard, April 08: 1. Accessed April 07, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?index=1&did=294821991&SrchMode=1&sid=1&Fmt=3&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1326845440&clientId=3916>

Carlson, Kathryn Blaze

2009 No Squeaky Clean Rules; Duties of caregivers are vague. National Post, May 14: A3. Accessed April 11, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1714155321&sid=40&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Chai, Carmen

2009 Filipina Caregiver Faces Deportation; Daughter's renal disease may pose 'excess demand' on health care. Times Colonist, May 20: A9. Accessed April 08, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1723688211&sid=14&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Chan, Cheryl

2005 The Nanny Trap. Vancouver Courier, June 26: Front. Accessed April 11, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=860154751&sid=54&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Cherry, Tamara

2008 Foreign Workers Lured with Lies. Toronto Sun, September 30. Accessed April 08, 2011.

<http://www.torontosun.com/news/canada/2008/09/30/6926301-sun.html>

Clough, Peter

2004 Canada's Nanny Pipeline. The Province, May 16: A14. Accessed April 07, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=640297011&sid=6&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Cockburn, Neco

2009 Caregiver Fraud Incidences on Rise. The Ottawa Citizen, April 09: C3. Accessed April 07, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1677546791&sid=7&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Cornacchia, Cheryl

1993 A Domestic Nightmare; Thousands of women work illegally as nannies. The Gazette, February 22: C1. Accessed April 11, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=166122531&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Cribb, Robert and Dale Brazao

2009 Critics Want Crackdown as Nannies Exploited. Toronto Star, March 17. Accessed August 18, 2011.

<http://www.immigrationwatchcanada.org/2009/03/17/critics-want-crackdown-as-nannies-exploited/>

Cryderman, Kelly and Tamara Gignac

2009 Province to Eliminate Recruiting Fee for Nannies; High-profile cases spark change. Calgary Herald, May 28: A5. Accessed April 11, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1736076321&sid=47&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Delaney, Joan

2007 Live-in Nannies Face Exploitation in Canada. Epoch Times, February 22. Accessed April 07, 2011.

<http://www.theepochtimes.com/news/7-2-22/52014.html>

Doolittle, Robyn and Jim Wilkes

2007 *Slain maid had safety fears*; Friends say she worried about back entrance; police tight-lipped about murder in mansion. Toronto Star, October 04: A8. Accessed April 08, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1353534701&sid=50&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Duchamp, Adrian

2009 Caregivers Call on Ontario Government for Urgent Change. Free Press Release, July 28. Accessed April 07, 2011. <http://www.free-press-release.com/news/200907/1248834668.html>

Editorial

2010 Live-in Canadians. The Globe and Mail, August 23: A10. Accessed April 08, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=2116955831&sid=28&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Editorial

2009 Tales from the Life of a Caregiver. The Gazette, May 14: A18. Accessed April 11, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1716113941&sid=51&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Egan, Kelly

2009 What Exactly Defines a Servant?; For most Canadians, our mothers have taught us to do for ourselves, rather than to have done for us. The Ottawa Citizen, May 10: A5. Accessed April 07, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1707699211&sid=57&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Faulder, Liane

1999 The real payoff for foreign nannies is immigration; Ottawa Considering Giving Nannies a Raise. Edmonton Journal, February 04: B1. Accessed April 11, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdwebdid=212004061&sid=56&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Ferrie, Jared

2004 Mary Poppins Had it Great. The Tyee, January 21. Accessed April 08, 2011.

http://thetyee.ca/News/2004/01/21/Mary_Poppins_Had_It_Great/

Friscolanti, Michael

2004 Nanny Plan a Conduit for Illegal Immigration. National Post, April 30: A1. Accessed April 11, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=629726551&sid=38&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Gombu, Phinjo

2000 Family Challenges Visa Decision; Iranian relative denied permit to be caregiver. Toronto Star, July 10: B04. Accessed April 08, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=426870781&sid=13&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Hall, Joseph

1992 Ottawa Defends Policy on Domestic Workers. Toronto Star, April 30: B3. Accessed April 08, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=454362741&sid=43&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Hersch, Manuela Gruber

2010a Overseas Caregivers can use Families to Gain Entry. The Vancouver Sun, December 14: A13. Accessed April 11, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=2214990901&sid=44&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Hersch, Manuela Gruber

2010b ACNA Canada announces Canada Wide 24 hour toll Free C.A.R.E.L.I.N.E. for Caregivers and Employer 1.888.560.5510. Free Press Release, October 06. Accessed April 07, 2011.

<http://www.free-press-release.com/news-acna-canada-announces-canada-wide-24-hour-toll-free-c-a-r-e-l-i-n-e-for-caregivers-and-employers-1-888-560-5510-1286340794.html>

Hersch, Manuela Gruber

2010c Live-in Caregiver Program is Unfair to Families. The Province, August 31: A16. Accessed April 07, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=2128175511&sid=29&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Howard, Cori

2007 The Steep Price of Becoming a 'Dollar Mommy.' The Globe and Mail, October 16. Accessed July 14, 2011. <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/life/article788905.ece>

Jimenez, Marina

2004 The New Nanny: Facing unemployment and bleak economics back home, young Slovak women are coming to Canada and, as MARINA JIMENEZ reports, these caregivers offer more than a new culture to young children. The Globe and Mail, October 16: F7. Accessed April 12, 2011. <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/focus/the-new-nanny/article292400/>

Jimenez, Marina

1997 Nanny Jobs Didn't Exist, RCMP says. The Vancouver Sun, October 29: A1. Accessed 11, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=641938901&sid=37&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Keung, Nicholas

2008 Dying Nanny Told to Leave Country; 'I paid my dues here,' says Filipina woman denied residency after diagnosis of cancer. Toronto Star, June 09: A4. Accessed April 11, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1491753521&sid=11&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Keung, Nicholas

2007 Guest Labour Program Raises Troubling Questions. Toronto Star, March 15. Accessed August 18, 2011.

<http://www.immigrationwatchcanada.org/2007/03/15/guest-labour-programme-raises-troubling-questions/>

Kleiss, Karen

2006 Course Helps Foreign Workers Answer Huge Demand for Live-in Caregivers. Edmonton Journal, October 24: B3. Accessed April 11, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1151211931&sid=9&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Lee-Shanok Philip

1993 MPs Go to Bat for Nanny Facing the Boot; They want minister to show compassion and block deportation of Filipino woman. Edmonton Journal, August 04: B3. Accessed April 11, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=194242981&sid=33&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Loney, Sydney

2009 The Two-Nanny State. The Globe and Mail, August 23. Accessed July 14, 2011.

<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/life/family-and-relationships/the-two-nanny-state/article1261657/>

Mahoney, Jill

2010 Meet Fictional Immigrant Maricel. The Globe and Mail, October 06. Accessed August 04, 2011.

<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/time-to-lead/multiculturalism/meet-fictional-immigrant-maricel/article1743255/>

Mamann, Guidy

2010 "Protections" May End Up Crippling Nanny Program. Metro Canada, April 26. Accessed April 07, 2011.

<http://www.metronews.ca/calgary/comment/article/511731--protections-may-end-up-crippling-nanny-program>

Mamann, Guidy

2008 Six-Month Extension No Solution for Cancer-Stricken Nanny. Metro Canada, June 16. Accessed April 07, 2011. <http://richmobile.metronews.ca/halifax/comment/article/65955>

Mandel, Michele

2010 Security Systems to Mississauga Home Weren't Working. Toronto Sun, May 11. Accessed April 08, 2011.

http://www.torontosun.com/news/columnists/michele_mandel/2010/05/11/13913371.html

McGinnis, Sarah

2004 Mom Reunited with Kids After 8 Years; Leonora Rago finally able to bring her children to N.B. from the Philippines after long battle with Immigration Canada. Telegraph Journal, May 18. Accessed April 07, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1684742791&sid=32&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

McGregor, Glen

2005 Nanny Stranded at Hong Kong Airport. Leader Post, October 15: D10. Accessed April 08, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=912141611&sid=39&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Monsebraaten, Laurie

2011 'She told me to never tell how much I was making'; Caregivers' stories highlight how Ontario's archaic legislation is failing most vulnerable, groups say. Toronto Star, May 30: A1. Accessed July 12 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=2361069321&sid=62&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Montgomery, Sue

2003 Abortion Becomes Price of a Job. *The Gazette*, March 18: A6. Accessed April 11, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=316362451&sid=2&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

O'Neil, Peter

2007 Fake nannies scheming their way into Canada, documents show. *Times Colonist*, October 18: A6. Accessed April, 08 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1369197221&sid=12&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

O'Neill, Juliet

2009 Dhalla Criticized in Caregiver Controversy. *Kamloops Daily News*, June 05: B9. Accessed July 18, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1741491001&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

O'Neill, Juliet

2009 Dhalla Nanny Affair Puts Caregivers in Spotlight; Kenney, gov't reviewing federal program to improve nannies' rights. *Edmonton Journal*, May 19: A4. Accessed July 18, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1722113521&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Palmer, Katie

2010 Domestic Workers get a Break. *Herizons Fall 2010*. Accessed April 08, 2011.

http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_7554/is_201010/ai_n55488708/

Pearce, Tralee

2009 April 30 is Coming Up Quick, but you can always outsource your nanny's return. *The Globe and Mail*, April 28: L3. Accessed April 08, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1689492881&sid=5&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Pearce, Tralee and Heather Sokoloff

2007 The Evolution of Hiring a Nanny. *The Globe and Mail*, August 28. Accessed July 14, 2011.

<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/life/parenting/young-children/child-care/the-evolution-of-hiring-a-nanny/article778137/print/>

Proudfoot, Shannon

2011 Pitfalls and Promise for Foreign Caregivers; As demand rises, critics say program in need of overhaul. *The Windsor Star*, March 05: B3. Accessed April 12, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=2285567851&sid=45&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Purdy, Chris and Norm Ovenden

2000 Nanny is Right to Leave the Country, immigration minister says: 'No guarantees,' but Filipina can apply for re-entry. Edmonton Journal, February 12: A3. Accessed April 11, 2011.
<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=220621081&sid=36&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Rankin, Jim and Nicholas Keung

2007 Lawyer Blamed for Clients' Woes. Toronto Star, August 13: A1. Accessed April 08, 2011.
<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1318988261&sid=26&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Sanders, Carol

2009 Lawyer Suspended, Charged. Winnipeg Free Press, May 31: A3. Accessed 08, 2011.
<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1736107681&sid=27&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Sherman, Neilia

2009 Nanny State. The Globe and Mail, June 08. Accessed July 14, 2011.
<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/life/facts-and-arguments/nanny-state/article1172838/>

Simons, Paula

2000 Prosecute Those Who Pay Illegal Workers. Calgary Herald, February 24: A21. Accessed April 11, 2011.
<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=206219061&sid=46&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Smith, Elaine

2002 The Nanny Alternative: Live-in Caregivers aren't just for the wealthy anymore. Nanaimo Daily News, May 11: B7. Accessed April 07, 2011.
<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=313062611&sid=53&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Tebrake, Rebecca

2009 Health Ruling Blocks Resident Application; Caregiver and family denied status when daughter discovered to have chronic kidney failure. The Vancouver Sun, May 20: A4. Accessed April 11, 2011.
<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1723697571&sid=24&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

The South Asian Post

2007 Visa Fraud in Punjab. The South Asian Post, October 26. Accessed August 18, 2011.
<http://www.immigrationwatchcanada.org/2007/10/26/visa-fraud-in-punjab/>

Thompson, Allan

2009 What to Do When it's the Nanny Who Needs Care. Toronto Star, July 18: L6. Accessed April 08, 2011.
<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1792829011&sid=58&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Thompson, Kristen

2009 Group Seeks End to Caregiver Program. Metro Vancouver, December 24. Accessed August 18, 2011.

<http://www.immigrationwatchcanada.org/2009/12/24/group-seeks-end-to-caregiver-program/>

Toneguzzi, Mario

2010 Making Ends Meet in a New Country; Immigrants can struggle to balance finances. Calgary Herald, October 10: E2. Accessed April 11, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=2160570611&sid=31&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Valpy, Michael

2007 Nanny Quit, Made Sham Claims, First Boss Says. The Globe and Mail, May 27: A4. Accessed July 18, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1729665771&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Walkom, Thomas

2009 The Real Moral of Nannygate. Toronto Star, May 19: IN1. Accessed July 18, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1712698351&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Whittington, Les

2009 'Guest Worker' Abuses Blasted. Toronto Star, November 04: A1. Accessed April 08, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=1892759281&sid=23&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

White, Robert

2010 The Live-in Caregiver Program in Canada is in Serious Trouble. Wire Service Canada, July 05. Accessed April 07, 2011.

<http://www.wireservice.ca/index.php?module=News&func=display&sid=2742>

Wilton, Suzanne

1998 Filipina nannies faced broken dreams. Calgary Herald, November 14: B2. Accessed April 11, 2011.

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/pqdweb?did=196284141&sid=21&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>