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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’...

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, doorstop 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 include in Tables 1 and 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>CS texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Frydenberg (Treasurer)</td>
<td>Introduction of CS policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michaelia Cash (Minister for Employment)</td>
<td>Unemployment in relation to the CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Morrison (Prime Minister)</td>
<td>Unemployment in relation to the CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michaelia Cash</td>
<td>Unemployment in relation to the CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathias Cormann (Finance Minister)</td>
<td>Initial CS policy extension &amp; reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Morrison &amp; Josh Frydenberg</td>
<td>Initial CS extension &amp; reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Frydenberg</td>
<td>Initial CS extension &amp; reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Morrison &amp; Anne Ruston (Minister for Social Services)</td>
<td>Second CS extension &amp; reduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>CDC texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Morrison (Prime Minister)</td>
<td>CDC expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Ruston (Minister for Social Services)</td>
<td>CDC expansion and further development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Ruston</td>
<td>CDC expansion, extension, and functionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Ruston</td>
<td>Proposed permanency of the CDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Ruston</td>
<td>CDC extension and expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Ruston</td>
<td>CDC extension and expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowan Ramsey (Member for Ceduna)</td>
<td>CDC functionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Ruston</td>
<td>Further funding to CDC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 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 need of 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.’
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) 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 AFCG 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.
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