

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Poverty for profit: Comparing the former Australian Coalition Federal Government's representations of Coronavirus Supplement and Cashless Debit Card recipients

Tom Griffiths¹ Christine Morley^{1*}¹ School of Public Health and Social Work, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, QLD, Australia

Correspondence to: Christine Morley, School of Public Health and Social Work, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, QLD, Australia; E-mail: c3.morley@qut.edu.au

Received: January 2, 2024;

Accepted: April 14, 2024;

Published: April 19, 2024.

Citation: Griffiths T, Morley C. Poverty for profit: Comparing the former Australian Coalition Federal Government's representations of Coronavirus Supplement and Cashless Debit Card recipients. *Soc Work Soc Welf*, 2024, 5(1): 278-288. <https://doi.org/10.25082/SWSW.2023.01.003>

Copyright: © 2024 Tom Griffiths et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.



Abstract: This paper reports key findings of a critical discourse analysis (CDA) that compares the dominant constructions of both groups of welfare recipients. A total of 17 artefacts from the former ACFG press engagement were analysed. It should be noted that as of 6 March 2023, the Labor Federal Government replaced the CDC with the mostly voluntary SmartCard (remaining involuntary in the Northern Territory, as well as Cape York and Doomadgee in Queensland) (Department of Social Services (DSS) 2023). However, the findings of this study remain instructive, as they highlight hostile and anti-welfare recipient discourses that problematise individuals receiving social security payments evident in many Western Anglophone countries and point to the importance of promoting critical literacy among policy makers, the helping professions, and society generally.

Keywords: poverty for profit, critical discourse analysis, income management

1 Introduction

In 2020, the former Australian Coalition's Federal government's (ACFG) economic response to the extensive job losses and financial strain caused by lockdowns and other restrictions associated with the COVID-19 pandemic, was the introduction of a Coronavirus Supplement (CS). The CS temporarily increased fortnightly rates to a selection of social security payments. It remains the largest increase to social security payments in the history of Australia's welfare system. Simultaneously, however, the same government maintained the Cashless Debit Card (CDC) program; a widely criticised income management program that quarantined 80% of a recipient's social security payment to a card that cannot be used to purchase alcohol or gambling products. While there is substantial research highlighting the problems with CDC discourse, there is a lack of research into the construction of CDC recipients, particularly when compared to CS recipients.

This paper reports key findings of a critical discourse analysis (CDA) that compares the dominant constructions of both groups of welfare recipients. A total of 17 artefacts from the former ACFG press engagement were analysed. It should be noted that as of 6 March 2023, the Labor Federal Government replaced the CDC with the mostly voluntary *SmartCard* (remaining involuntary in the Northern Territory, as well as Cape York and Doomadgee in Queensland) [1]. However, the findings of this study remain instructive, as they highlight hostile and anti-welfare recipient discourses that problematise individuals receiving social security payments evident in many Western Anglophone countries [2–4] and point to the importance of promoting critical literacy among policy makers, the helping professions, and society generally.

1.1 Background: the history of income management in Australia

Despite being a wealthy country, Australia is known to have a sub-standard welfare system, with unemployment benefits set well below the poverty line [5–7], and at a rate that positions the country as second lowest out of all the OECD countries [6]. Australia first introduced income management strategies in June 2007 when the ACFG began the Northern Territory Emergency Response (NTER). The NTER was based on a report that found unreported and widespread child sexual abuse, particularly with Aboriginal children [8]. In response, one of the goals of NTER was to reduce the accessibility of alcohol in Aboriginal communities in the Northern Territory [9], which was implemented through income management. The underpinning assumption was that income management would ensure that welfare payments were spent on welfare recipients'

children, instead of alcohol, cigarettes, pornography, or gambling [10]. Such targeted (and racialised) measures [11] required a suspension of the Racial Discrimination Act [10].

Income management in Australia has seen a number of iterations, however, the CDC is the most recent and widely imposed. This program places 80% (or 30-80% for Northern Territory and Cape York regions) of welfare payments onto the titular card and can only be used at businesses that use EFTPOS that agree to not sell alcohol or gambling products to cardholders [12]. In 2022, the CDC continued into its sixth year following numerous, almost yearly extensions since its inception [13, 14]. However, the Labor Federal Government announced on 3 June 2022 that it would honour its election promise of discontinuing the CDC [15], following the release of a damning report by the Australian National Audit Office (ANAO), which found that the DSS had ‘not demonstrated that the CDC program [was] meeting its intended objectives’ [16]. This announcement is a welcome move [17].

1.2 The former ACFG COVID-19 welfare response

As with other countries throughout the world, Australia’s workforce was severely impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. After cases of community transmission began to occur in Australia, in mid-late March 2020, the former ACFG progressively introduced public health measures, including lockdowns [18], which literally closed thousands of businesses overnight [19]. This unprecedented situation rendered more than 600,000 Australian workers unemployed in early 2020 [20]. The ACFG responded by introducing the CS; an uncharacteristic increase to welfare payments to which millions flocked to receive cash bonuses designed to keep economic recession at bay [21].

In March 2020, these welfare recipients were framed in the media as people who were ‘doing it tough’ [22]. The ACFG’s inconsistent approach to the framing of CDC recipients, against the framing of the CS is worthy of further exploration. Given there is only limited research into the CS and how its recipients are constructed [23], this study sought to explore the question: *how are CS recipients represented in the ACFG political rhetoric compared to CDC recipients?*

2 The study

2.1 Methodology

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) was chosen as the method of inquiry for this qualitative study because it goes beyond linguistic analysis, to examine how this discourse influences power structures [24, 25]. A bricolage approach to CDA was employed, loosely informed by Fairclough, Foucault, and Van Dijk. From Fairclough (1992) [24] we drew upon 1) analysis of discursive practices, which examine devices employed strategically by the text’s actor (such as drawing from various discourses and rhetoric) and how they are interpreted by the audience; and 2) social practices, which place discourse in the broader context of structural and institutional power in a way that emphasises hegemonic and ideological influences on texts. A Foucauldian approach was used to highlight the social and historical moment when particular texts were produced [26]. And Van Dijk’s (2006) [25] demarcation of *ingroups* and *outgroups* was used to identify processes designed to polarise individuals. This polarisation effectively creates an *us* versus *them* scenario in which the ingroup emphasise their *good deeds* and expose the *bad deeds* of the outgroup, whilst simultaneously ignoring their *bad deeds* and the outgroup’s *good deeds* [25].

2.2 Theoretical framework

With a foundation in critical theory, CDA is situated within critical and social constructionist paradigms [27, 28]. A social constructionist paradigm rejects an absolutist understanding of reality [27] and contends that ‘community consensus’ defines what is considered real, or *true* [27]. A critical paradigm critiques how a universal truth (or truths) informs power structures that shape our society in order to challenge and take action against power imbalances in favour of social justice [27, 29]. A critical approach is crucial to reorientating a political context characterised by widespread inequality, entrenched neoliberalism, unhindered climate change, and the onset of the recent pandemic [30]. It is believed that CDA can contribute to dissent – a concept further elaborated in the discussion

This CDA aimed to deconstruct power and dominant social structures, with the ultimate goal of inspiring social change [28]. Concepts underpinning the CDA include: Foucault’s *discourse*, which is understood as a communication of knowledge that is equal to an assertion of power, as any transmission of knowledge holds implications for political outcomes [26]; Marx’s concept

of *ideology*, which is created and used to justify the needs of the ruling class (or ascending class), which come to be represented as dominant ideologies or *dominant discourses* [31]. In addition, Gramsci's concept of *hegemony* is also central as dominant discourses seek to maintain power and control by strategically stamping out competing discourses (and, consequently, ideologies) to become the universal truth that is considered common sense [28, 30]. Essentially, the CDA is employed to unmask the operations and implications of hegemonic discourses and ideology in relation to CS and CDC recipients. Additionally, the CDA theoretical framework incorporates poststructuralism, which challenges binaries and assumptions of universal truths that are embedded in dominant discourses [32].

2.3 Texts for analysis

Nine CS texts and eight CDC texts constituted the data for this study. The selected texts were obtained from various news media websites and official Australian Government websites for media releases, press conferences, doorstep interviews, and radio and news media interviews by primary definers from the ACFG. As the texts are freely available in public discourse, formal ethical approval was not required for this analysis [33, 34]. CS texts were sourced from March 2020 to March 2021, as this was the period of time in which the CS was in operation. CDC texts were sourced from September 2019 to October 2021. Analysed texts are included in Tables 1 & 2.

Table 1 CS texts

Speaker	Topic	Type of Discursive Medium	Date
Josh Frydenberg (Treasurer)	Introduction of CS policy	Television – <i>The Today Show</i> (Frydenberg 2020a) [35]	23/03/2020
Michael Sukkar (Assistant Treasurer)	Introduction of CS policy	Television – <i>The Bolt Report</i> (Sukkar 2020) [36]	24/03/2020
Michaelia Cash (Minister for Employment)	Unemployment in relation to the CS	Doorstop interview (Cash 2020) [37]	14/05/2020
Scott Morrison (Prime Minister)	Unemployment in relation to the CS	Radio – <i>2GB</i> (Morrison 2020) [38]	29/06/2020
Michaelia Cash	Unemployment in relation to the CS	News media – <i>The Australian</i> (The Australian 2020) [39]	30/06/2020
Mathias Cormann (Finance Minister)	Initial CS policy extension & reduction	News media – <i>SBS News</i> (Stayner 2020) [40]	20/07/2020
Scott Morrison & Josh Frydenberg	Initial CS extension & reduction	Press conference (Frydenberg and Morrison 2020) [41]	21/07/2020
Josh Frydenberg	Initial CS extension & reduction	Television – <i>Insiders</i> (Frydenberg 2020b) [42]	26/07/2020
Scott Morrison & Anne Ruston (Minister for Social Services)	Second CS extension & reduction	Media release (Morrison and Ruston 2020) [43]	10/11/2020

Table 2 CDC texts

Speaker	Topic	Type of Discursive Medium	Date
Scott Morrison (Prime Minister)	CDC expansion	Television – <i>The 7:30 Report</i> (Morrison 2019) [44]	10/09/2019
Anne Ruston (Minister for Social Services)	CDC expansion and further development	Doorstop interview (Ruston 2020a) [45]	01/02/2020
Anne Ruston	CDC expansion, extension, and functionality	Media release (Ruston 2020b) [46]	05/05/2020
Anne Ruston	Proposed permanency of the CDC	Radio – <i>ABC</i> (Ruston 2020c) [47]	09/12/2020
Anne Ruston	CDC extension and expansion	Media release (Ruston 2020d) [48]	10/12/2020
Anne Ruston	CDC extension and expansion	Radio – <i>ABC Adelaide</i> (Ruston 2020e) [49]	10/12/2020
Rowan Ramsey (Member for Ceduna)	CDC functionality	News media – <i>ABC News</i> (Lysaght 2021) [50]	04/02/2021
Anne Ruston	Further funding to CDC	Media release (Ruston and Pitt 2021) [51]	09/02/2021

3 Findings

3.1 Deserving and undeserving discourses

Deserving and undeserving discourses were evident in the presentation of both CS and CDC recipient groups. Initially, CS recipients were represented as more deserving than other welfare recipients:

'[W]e are very conscious that people still need to meet the costs of their groceries and other bills even though they might be stood down or they might have lost their job, or their hours worked have been reduced.'

– Josh Frydenberg, Treasurer (*The Today Show* interview 23 March 2020)

'[W]e're absolutely determined to make sure that we can get people through to the other side as unscathed as possible.'

– Michael Sukkar, Assistant Treasurer (*The Bolt Report* interview 24 March 2020)

'[T]he Government is incredibly sympathetic to people who are on JobSeeker [one of the welfare payments receiving the CS] ...'

– Michaelia Cash, Minister for Employment, Skills, Small and Family Business (Doorstop interview 14 May 2020)

However, within just four months, the presentation of CS recipients mutated and flipped to an undeserving discourse, as the necessity of the payment was questioned and described as unsustainable in the long term:

'This support was necessary, we will continue to provide it for a further period, but ultimately this is not something we can continue to do on an ongoing basis ...'

– Mathias Cormann, Finance Minister (*SBS News* interview 20 July 2020)

'... JobSeeker at the elevated levels cannot go on forever.'

– Josh Frydenberg, Treasurer (Press conference 21 July 2020)

Such examples present the CS as a strain on the economy, progressed further when the ACFG urged recipients to liberate themselves from government support and *earn* their money:

'... [it is] now time for jobseekers to start to re-engage with the job market.'

– Michaelia Cash, Minister for Employment, Skills, Small and Family Business (The Australian interview 30 June 2020)

While initially represented as deserving at the introduction of the policy in March, as the rate of pay reduced during the June to July period, CS recipients began to be represented as unworthy of additional financial support, reflecting the ACFG's ideology. Conversely, CDC recipients were only ever represented as being undeserving. The ACFG framed CDC recipients as being irresponsible by misusing their welfare payments. The following quotes, for example, indicate a perception that welfare recipients require restrictions to control their spending:

'... to help them better manage the resources that they have and to ensure that there's food on the table for the people who depend on these payments that are going into these families ...'

– Scott Morrison, Prime Minister (*The 7:30 Report* interview 10 September 2019)

'... ensuring more money is being spent on essentials ...'

– Anne Ruston, Minister for the DSS (Media release 10 December 2020)

Alongside this undeserving discourse, the ACFG simultaneously implies CDC recipients have a choice in their involvement of the program through the language of participation. This discourse creates the illusion that recipients elect to be involved, rather than being involuntarily conscripted:

'... people were actually very keen to be able to move over to the card.'

– Anne Ruston, Minister for the DSS (Doorstop interview 1 February 2020)

'Participants are now earning interest on their Cashless Debit Card accounts ...'

– Anne Ruston, Minister for the DSS (Media release 5 May 2020)

'... the trial sites have come on board because the communities in those areas have fought for the card to be put in place.'

– Anne Ruston, Minister for the DSS (4BC interview 9 December 2020)

'... the Cashless Debit Card will give income management participants far greater choice and control over where and how they spend their social security payments.'

– Anne Ruston, Minister for the DSS (Media release 10 December 2020)

The ACFG obfuscate their construction of recipients as undeserving, thus guiding public opinion towards support for the program. Additionally, by presenting CDC recipients as *participants* who had requested the card in their communities, the ACFG portray a community desire that justifies the provision of the card to financially disadvantaged communities. This was imperative for the ACFG to shape public opinion to reflect their policy direction.

3.2 Neoliberal discourse: individual responsibility and market logic

Within the construction of both groups of welfare recipients is the pervasive discourse of neoliberalism, punctuated by the rhetoric of individual responsibility and market logic. It is through this neoliberal lens that the ACFG emphasised that both groups of welfare recipients were in of need assistance to engage in employment. Examples are shown below:

'What we have to be worried about now is that we can't allow the JobSeeker payment to become an impediment to people out and doing work [or], getting extra shifts.'

– Scott Morrison, Prime Minister (Interview with 2GB 29 June 2020)

'JobSeeker and JobKeeper ... are not designed to prevent them from going out and seeking work and to improve their circumstances.'

– Scott Morrison, Prime Minister (Press conference 21 July 2020)

'It's about getting the balance right so that there are incentives for people to return to work.'

– Josh Frydenberg, Treasurer (Interview with *Insiders* 26 July 2020)

'As the jobs market improves, we want to encourage people to re-engage with the workforce because we know that even a few hours of work a week while on payment can have a dramatic impact on the pathway off income support.'

– Anne Ruston, Minister for the DSS (Media release 10 November 2020)

These discursive constructions suggest that CS recipients were refusing employment because of the increased welfare payment. However, there is no evidence to suggest that increasing welfare payments dis-incentivises work [52]. In fact, SEEK (2020) [53], one of Australia's biggest job listing websites, indicated a drop in job listings by 12.8% during the period of global rises in COVID-19 cases. Interestingly, now the CS supplement has been discontinued for almost two years, and businesses are still complaining that they cannot attract the staff they need to operate. Staff shortages may therefore have more to do with illness related to the pandemic [54,55], and/or poor wages and conditions [5,56], rather than being related to the CS.

Conversely, while CDC recipients were subject to the same scrutiny and expectations about gaining paid employment, the neoliberal discourse of individual responsibility was used to justify why CDC recipients should remain on the card:

'... this has been helping people actually get into jobs and better manage their own affairs...'

'... and that they can get themselves into position to deal with issues in their own lives and they can ... find themselves in employment and be in even greater control of their own lives.'

– Scott Morrison, Prime Minister (Interview with *The 7:30 Report* 10 September 2019)

Within these examples, the discourse of individual responsibility is invoked to justify the continuation of the CDC policy. This is supported by a market logic that is used to reinforce paid employment as the ideal outcome for CDC recipients:

'... we've seen some really good results in terms of young people who have been on the Youth Allowance payment, seeing them come off payment and get into a job.'

– Anne Ruston, Minister for the DSS (Interview with 4BC 9 December 2020)

'We want to get people off welfare and into work.'

– Scott Morrison, Prime Minister (Interview with *The 7:30 Report* 10 September 2019)

In these examples, CDC recipients are represented as in need of government intervention into their personal budgeting in order to transition into the job market. Both groups of welfare recipients are represented with a job-centric rhetoric.

3.3 Divisive discourses

Van Dijk's (2006) [25] concept of defining ingroups and outgroups was also evident within ACFG discourse:

'Australians, your listeners. . . And we are getting a lot of anecdotal feedback from small businesses, even large businesses, where some of them are finding it hard to get people to come and take the shifts because they're on these higher levels of payment.'

– Scott Morrison, Prime Minister (Interview with *2GB* 29 June 2020)

'We have always said that the JobKeeper and the JobSeeker COVID supplement were temporary measures. And, look, I think Australians understand that. They know that a current scheme that is burning cash, their cash, taxpayers' cash to the tune of some \$11 billion a month cannot go on forever. Australians understand that.'

– Josh Frydenberg, Treasurer (Press conference 21 July 2020)

In these examples, Morrison and Frydenberg construct CS recipients as the outgroup in contrast to *Australians*, business owners, and taxpayers as the ingroup. The ACFG presents as aligned with the ingroup, as they construct themselves as defending the economy against parasitic CS recipients. In each of these examples, CS recipients are represented as burdening *Australians*, business owners, and taxpayers, who are divisively positioned as disadvantaged by CS recipients.

In contrast, the ACFG and taxpayer are constructed as the saviours of CDC recipients, who are victims of themselves:

'... this program has saved lives...'

– Anne Ruston, Minister for the DSS (Media release 10 December 2020)

'The Cashless Debit Card can be a successful financial management tool and this funding builds on its existing success in the region of supporting vulnerable people and families...'

– Anne Ruston, Minister for the DSS (Media release 9 February 2021)

The discourse of vulnerability (i.e., in need of government control and management) is further reinforced by constructions of CDC recipients as alcoholics and gamblers:

'... but it also, hopefully, prevents them from moving into a cycle where you know alcoholism or gambling addictions don't take place...'

– Anne Ruston, Minister for the DSS (Interview with *4BC* 9 December 2020)

'What this program does is reduce the amount of taxpayer-funded social security which is available to be spent on alcohol and gambling products and by doing so helps limit the ability for problem consumption to cause social harm for individuals, their families and communities.'

– Anne Ruston, Minister for the DSS (Media release 10 December 2020)

'... respondents are saying that there is a reduced incidence of alcohol consumption, excessive alcohol consumption. . . they are reporting they're reducing the amount of gambling that is occurring. . . the programme is having a positive effect in community.'

– Anne Ruston, Minister for the DSS (Interview with *ABC Adelaide* 10 December 2020)

Such discourses disempower CDC recipients by implying that people on income management programs are incapable of supporting themselves and need to be saved, justifying paternalistic policy interventions that curb the autonomy of the outgroups and affirm the ingroups.

In sum, the ACFG's rhetoric in relation to both CDC and CS recipients propagated 1) an undeserving discourse to manipulate public opinion; 2) an *othering* discourse to divide ingroups (non-recipients) against people excluded from the labour market and reliant on the government; and 3) a job-centric individual responsibility construction. These themes cultivate a broader overarching anti-welfare recipient discourse.

4 Discussion

The findings from this inquiry indicate that governments and policymakers have used discourse to try to establish their own (perceived) *moral superiority* and to manufacture a dichotomy between *the poor* and *everyone else* that rationalises paternalistic and punitive welfare policy while othering the impoverished. Othering is a process that is synonymous with humiliation, ostracism, exclusion, stigmatising, and shame, in which the othered are represented as ‘less-than’ [3, 57, 58]. Policymakers often draw upon othering as a discursive tactic to ‘bolster policy discourse’ [3], feed into ‘discourses of an underclass’ [58], and to frame particular groups as ‘threats’ [57]. All of these linguistic devices were evident in ACFG discourse. As Klein (2016: 503) [59] further elaborates, this tactic is employed by policymakers and the media to shame and blame citizens that do not comply with the ‘market logic’ that neoliberal governmentality has promoted in Australia over the last four decades. Keskinen et al. (2016: 322) [57] argues this process creates a kind of ‘welfare chauvinism’, that conservative parties use to distinguish between *us* (taxpayers and business owners) and *them* (CS and CDC recipients). Similarly, Garrett (2018: 52) [60] refers to this divide as a rhetorical distinction between ‘productive “makers” (the employed) and the indolent, freeloading “takers” (the unemployed having recourse to welfare)’. The findings from this study show how discourse was used in divisive ways to invalidate need, highlight the supposed burden of the CS to society, taxpayers, and businesses (who were purportedly struggling to attract staff due to excessively high welfare payments), and reinscribe individual responsibility and pressure for recipients to find paid employment.

Garrett (2018: 69) [60] argues this discourse is predicated on the ‘myth’ that individuals experiencing poverty ‘are merely unable to effectively manage their money’; a notion for which ‘no evidence exists to empirically support’. Increasingly, available evidence suggests that the CDC and other income management programs are ‘exacerbating the underlying problems that contribute to homelessness’ [61], impacting recipients’ ‘capacity to exercise budgetary autonomy’ [62], ‘increasing dependence on the welfare system’ [63], and imposing ‘restrictions discouraging budgeting’ [64]. Therefore, it appears that the ACFG supported a program that exacerbates poverty under the guise of connecting recipients with paid work.

In addition, research by Stevens (2020) [65] revealed that the CDC is a tool for the private company Indue to profit from the poverty that the CDC perpetuates. Larry Anthony, an ex-Member of Parliament for the ACFG has benefitted financially from connections to Indue [66]. It is, therefore, possible that the ACFG endeavoured to entrench poverty for personal gain and profit.

Vested interests in maintaining inequality and poverty are evidenced by the increasing casualisation of the labour market, the resulting rise of precarious work, and the stripping of union powers, which disempowers individuals, leaving them vulnerable to exploitation [67–69]. Precarious employment has risen to prominence in Australia in recent decades, impacting the ‘sectors of the workforce with the least bargaining power’ [68]. In fact, Australia has relied on precarious employment since the 1800s [70], with ascendancy in recent decades being ‘legitimised by conservative ideology’ [68]. With a long-standing reliance upon this economic model, it is unsurprising that those that benefit seek to maintain it through hegemonic discourse. Therefore, it appears the discursive tactics employed by the ACFG to encourage support for the CDC and to discontinue the CS are strategic devices intended to deepen poverty for as long as possible to serve their own interests.

5 Implications and conclusion

The findings of this research point to the importance of critical approaches to social policy and the helping professions. Through a process of critically analysing discourse, the present study indicates that neoliberalism has informed the ACFG’s anti-welfare recipient discourse. Consequently, this study emphasises the importance of understanding structural factors that create the disadvantage that welfare recipients experience, and critically analysing how dominant perceptions of welfare recipients are constructed. As a society, we need to comprehensively develop critical analysis to expose hegemonic discourses and the injustices they produce.

Critical literacy is one of the solutions put forward by researchers to enhance the benefits of CDA [59, 71, 72]. Garrett (2018: 208) [60] refers to the imperative of a ‘critical vigilance’ that is essential to contesting and rejecting neoliberalism. This aligns with the process of critical reflection, which Fook (2016: 54) [32] defines as a process that ‘questions and disrupts dominant structures and relations and lays the ground for change’ through the deconstruction and

reconstruction of knowledge, which can challenge dominant discourses and resist perpetuating systemic injustices [28]. Similarly, CDA has the ability to ‘make visible the unseen’ by shining a spotlight on ‘the insidious power of language’ [72]. When combined with critical reflection, CDA has the potential to improve critical literacy by unmasking ideology veiled by dominant discourses.

Adopting a critical lens has the potential to shift the consciousness of citizens and the ways in which they consume media and political rhetoric [71]. Critical literacy activates individuals’ cognisance of the discursive tactics (including those that are presented in this CDA) used by politicians and the media to perpetuate poverty [73, 74]. Raising consciousness and critical action ‘can occur anywhere, in any context, and in any circumstance’ [29], but must begin with awareness, which is one of the contributions made by this research. By equipping ourselves with a critical lens, we can question the unquestioned and autonomously resist systemic oppression [29].

This research has offered examples of how the media can be a very powerful tool in shaping public opinion. Therefore, developing a critical literacy of the media and how it is exploited by the ruling class is essential [74, 75]. Critical literacy enables us to be dissenting in the face of neoliberalism and poverty [30] in order to ‘illuminate a way out of the morass in which [society is] mired’ [30]. Only then, might policy makers and the helping professions transcend neoliberal discourse and participate as agents of change for social justice and democracy.

Conflicts of interests

The Authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Queensland University of Technology’s Centre for Justice - Winter Research Experience Scheme.

References

- [1] Department of Social Services. Frequently Asked Questions, 2023. <https://www.dss.gov.au>
- [2] Wright S. Conceptualising the active welfare subject: welfare reform in discourse, policy and lived experience. *Policy & Politics*. 2016, 44(2): 235-252. <https://doi.org/10.1332/030557314x13904856745154>
- [3] Amundson K, Zajicek A. A Case Study of State-Level Policymakers’ Discursive Co-Constructions of Welfare Drug Testing Policy and Gender, Race, and Class. *Sociological Inquiry*. 2017, 88(3): 383-409. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soin.12208>
- [4] O’Grady T. *The Transformation of British Welfare Policy*. Oxford University Press, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192898890.001.0001>
- [5] Marmo M, Sinopoli EA, Guo S. Worker exploitation in the Australian gig economy: Emerging mechanisms of social control. *Griffith Law Review*, 1-22. Melbourne Institute 2020 ‘Poverty Lines: Australia (December quarter 2019)’, 2022. <https://melbourneinstitute.unimelb.edu.au>
- [6] Coates B, Cowgill M. *The JobSeeker rise isn’t enough: Submission to the Senate Standing Committee on Community Affairs*, 2021. <https://grattan.edu.au>
- [7] Services Australia. *JobSeeker Payment: How much you can get*, 2022. <https://www.servicesaustralia.gov.au>
- [8] Wild R, Anderson P. *Little Children are Sacred*, 2007. <https://www.humanrights.gov.au>
- [9] Macklin J. *Northern Territory Emergency Response: One Year On*, 2008. <https://www.dss.gov.au>
- [10] Mendes P, Waugh J, Flynn C. Income management in Australia: A critical examination of the evidence. *International Journal of Social Welfare*. 2013, 23(4): 362-372. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsw.12066>
- [11] Bielefeld S. Compulsory income management, indigenous peoples and structural violence-implications for citizenship and autonomy. *Australian Indigenous Law Review*. 2014, 18(1): 99-118.
- [12] Department of Social Services. *Cashless Debit Card*, 2022. <https://www.dss.gov.au>
- [13] Klein E, Razi S. Contemporary tools of dispossession: The cashless debit card trial in the East Kimberley. *Journal of Australian Political Economy*. 2018, 82: 84-106.

- [14] Australian Parliament House. Social Security (Administration) Amendment (Continuation of Cashless Welfare) Bill, 2020.
<https://www.aph.gov.au>
- [15] Rishworth A. Minister Rishworth interview with Andy Park, 2022.
<https://ministers.dss.gov.au>
- [16] Australian National Audit Office. Implementation and Performance of the Cashless Debit Card Trial-Follow-on, 2022.
<https://www.anao.gov.au>
- [17] Loram L, Varley R. Cashless Debit Card trial to end with auditor-general's report the final nail in its coffin, 2022.
<https://www.abc.net.au>
- [18] Lupton D. Timeline of COVID-19 in Australia: the first year, 2020.
<https://deborahaluption.medium.com>
- [19] Munawar HS, Khan SI, Ullah F, et al. Effects of COVID-19 on the Australian Economy: Insights into the Mobility and Unemployment Rates in Education and Tourism Sectors. *Sustainability*. 2021, 13(20): 11300.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su132011300>
- [20] Australian Government. Economic response to the Coronavirus, 2020a.
<https://treasury.gov.au>
- [21] Whiteford P, Bradbury B. Coronavirus supplement: your guide to the Australian payments that will go to the extra million on welfare, 2020.
<https://theconversation.com/>
- [22] Layt S. Good news, bad news: no new virus cases as QLD jobless rate soars, 2020.
<https://www.brisbanetimes.com.au>
- [23] Mendes P. Conditionalising the unemployed: Why have consecutive Australian governments refused to increase the inadequate Newstart Allowance? *Australian Journal of Social Issues*. 2020, 56(1): 42-53.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ajs4.140>
- [24] Fairclough N. *Discourse and social change*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1992.
- [25] VAN DIJK TA. Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies*. 2006, 11(2): 115-140.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310600687908>
- [26] Macias T. On the Footsteps of Foucault: Doing Foucauldian Discourse Analysis in Social Justice Research, in S. Strega and L. Brown (eds) *Research as Resistance: Revisiting Critical, Indigenous, and Anti-Oppressive Approaches*, 2nd ed, Canadian Scholars' Press, Toronto, 2015.
- [27] Denzin NK, Lincoln YS. *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*, 5th ed. SAGE Publications, Los Angeles, 2018.
- [28] Morley C, Ablett P, Macfarlane S. *Engaging with Social Work*. Published online January 17, 2019.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108681094>
- [29] Morley C, Ablett P, Noble C, et al. *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Pedagogies for Social Work*. Routledge, 2020.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351002042>
- [30] Garrett PM. *Dissenting Social Work*. Routledge, 2021.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003024019>
- [31] Drucker HM. Marx's Concept of Ideology. *Philosophy*. 1972, 47(180): 152-161.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0031819100040882>
- [32] Fook J. *Social work: A critical approach to practice*, 3rd ed, SAGE Publications, London, 2016.
- [33] Australian Institute of Family Studies. *Demystifying ethical review*, 2013.
<https://aifs.gov.au>
- [34] National Health and Medical Research Council. *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007) - Updated 2018, 2018*.
<https://www.nhmrc.gov.au>
- [35] Frydenberg J. Interview with Karl Stefanovic and Allison Langdon, *The Today Show*, Channel 9, 2020a.
<https://ministers.treasury.gov.au>
- [36] Sukkar M. Interview with Andrew Bolt, *Sky News Australia, The Bolt Report*, 2020.
<https://ministers.treasury.gov.au>
- [37] Cash M. Doorstop Interview, Parliament House, 2020.
<https://ministers.dese.gov.au>
- [38] Morrison S. Interview with Ray Hadley, *2GB*, 2020.
<https://pmtranscripts.pmc.gov.au>
- [39] *The Australian*. Jobless opt for dole over employment, 2020.
<https://www.theaustralian.com.au>
- [40] Stayner T. JobKeeper and JobSeeker to be extended beyond September at lower rate with stricter eligibility, 2020.
<https://www.sbs.com.au>
- [41] Frydenberg J, Morrison S. Press conference, Australian Parliament House, ACT, 2020.
<https://ministers.treasury.gov.au>
- [42] Frydenberg J. Interview with David Speers, *Insiders*, ABC, 2020b.
<https://ministers.treasury.gov.au>

- [43] Morrison S, Ruston A. JobSeeker Supplement Extended to March, 2020.
<https://pmtranscripts.pmc.gov.au>
- [44] Morrison S. Interview with Leigh Sales, ABC 730 Report, 2019.
<https://pmtranscripts.pmc.gov.au>
- [45] Ruston A. Cashless Debit Card - Doorstop Interview, 2020a.
<https://formerministers.dss.gov.au>
- [46] Ruston A. Cashless Debit Card update, 2020b.
<https://formerministers.dss.gov.au>
- [47] Ruston A. Cashless Debit Card – 4BC, 2020c.
<https://formerministers.dss.gov.au>
- [48] Ruston A. Cashless Debit Card extension provides certainty for participants, 2020d.
<https://formerministers.dss.gov.au>
- [49] Ruston A. Cashless Debit Card – ABC Adelaide, 2020e.
<https://formerministers.dss.gov.au>
- [50] Lysaght G. Cashless debit card out of step with Ceduna families scrambling to buy school shoes after trader fails, 2021.
<https://www.abc.net.au>
- [51] Ruston A, Pitt K. Funding boost for Queensland Cashless Debit Card support services, 2021.
<https://formerministers.dss.gov.au>
- [52] Morley C, Ablett P, Mays J. A universal basic income: What difference might it make? *Social Alternatives*. 2019, 38: 11.
- [53] SEEK. September: SEEK Employment Report - Three rates of recovery emerging across Australia, 2020.
<https://www.seek.com.au>
- [54] Andrews D. Statement From The Premier, 2020.
<https://www.premier.vic.gov.au>
- [55] Griffiths D, Sheehan L, van Vreden C, et al. Returning to the Workplace During the COVID-19 Pandemic: The Concerns of Australian Workers. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*. 2021, 31(4): 711-720.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-021-09990-7>
- [56] Clibborn S. Australian industrial relations in 2020: COVID-19, crisis and opportunity. *Journal of Industrial Relations*. Published online May 12, 2021: 00221856211012813
<https://doi.org/10.1177/00221856211012813>
- [57] Keskinen S, Norocel OC, Jørgensen MB. The politics and policies of welfare chauvinism under the economic crisis. *Critical Social Policy*. 2016, 36(3): 321-329.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0261018315624168>
- [58] Lyndon S. Tangled narratives of poverty in early childhood: othering, work, welfare and 'curveballs'. *Journal of Poverty and Social Justice*. 2019, 27(3): 389-405.
<https://doi.org/10.1332/175982719x15626279221341>
- [59] Klein E. Neoliberal subjectivities and the behavioural focus on income management. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*. 2016, 51(4): 503-523.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1839-4655.2016.tb01246.x>
- [60] Garrett PM. Welfare Words: Critical Social Work & Social Policy. Published online 2018.
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526418661>
- [61] Peterie M, Bielefeld S, Marston G, et al. Compulsory income management: Combatting or compounding the underlying causes of homelessness? *Australian Journal of Social Issues*. 2019, 55(1): 61-72.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ajs4.79>
- [62] Bielefeld S. Administrative burden and the Cashless Debit Card: Stripping time, autonomy, and dignity from social security recipients. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*. 2021, 80(4): 891-911.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8500.12509>
- [63] Bray JR. Seven years of evaluating income management - what have we learnt? Placing the findings of the New Income Management in the Northern Territory evaluation in context. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*. 2016, 51(4): 449-468.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1839-4655.2016.tb01243.x>
- [64] Tennant D, Brody G. The fraught relationship between the cashless debit card and basic transaction accounts, *Social Alternatives*. 2020, 39(1): 14-19.
- [65] Stevens K. Subversive control via punitive means? The role of stigma and profit in Australia's cashless debit card policy. *Social Alternatives*. 2020, 39(1): 5-13.
- [66] Jokovich E. Indue and the small matter of political corruption, 2019.
<https://newpolitics.com.au>
- [67] Standing G. *A Precariat Charter*. Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2014.
<https://doi.org/10.5040/9781472510631>
- [68] Rawling M. Regulating Precarious Work in Australia. *Alternative Law Journal*. 2015, 40(4): 252-256.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1037969x1504000408>
- [69] Beer A, Bentley R, Baker E, et al. Neoliberalism, economic restructuring and policy change: Precarious housing and precarious employment in Australia. *Urban Studies*. 2015, 53(8): 1542-1558.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098015596922>
- [70] Quinlan M. The 'Pre-Invention' of Precarious Employment: The Changing World of Work in Context. *The Economic and Labour Relations Review*. 2012, 23(4): 3-23.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/103530461202300402>

- [71] Kellner D, Share J. Critical media literacy, democracy, and the reconstruction of education, in D. Macedo and S.R. Steinberg (eds) *Media literacy: A reader*, Peter Lang Publishing, New York, 2007.
- [72] Willey-Sthapit C, Jen S, Storer HL, et al. Discursive decisions: Signposts to guide the use of critical discourse analysis in social work. *Qualitative Social Work*. 2020, 21(1): 129-146.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1473325020979050>
- [73] Strega S. The View from the Poststructural Margins: Epistemology and Methodology Reconsidered, in S. Strega and L. Brown (eds) *Research as Resistance: Revisiting Critical, Indigenous, and Anti-Oppressive Approaches*, 2nd ed, Canadian Scholars' Press, Toronto, 2015.
- [74] Kellner D, Share J. *The Critical Media Literacy Guide*. Published online May 9, 2019.
<https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004404533>
- [75] Kellner D. *Technology and Democracy: Toward A Critical Theory of Digital Technologies, Technopolitics, and Technocapitalism*. Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 2021.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-31790-4>