Seeing people in the computer: The role of information technology in remote employment services

Lisa Fowkes

Australian National University,
Canberra, ACT, Australia

Correspondence

Lisa Fowkes, Australian National
University, Canberra, ACT, Australia
Email: lisa.fowkes@anu.edu.au

Received 26 June 2019. Accepted 18
September 2019

Abstract

Information technologies have been important in the emergence of new forms of control and surveillance of welfare recipients and of those who administer labour market programmes. These technologies have often appeared at the margins of accounts of welfare reform, for example as means of increasing the efficiency or consistency of services, or as constraining frontline discretion. Henman has argued, however, that information technologies need to be analysed not just as administrative tools, but as “non-human actors,” shaping policy development and implementation in ways beyond the intentions of their human creators (Henman, *Governing Electronically: E-government and the Reconfiguration of Public Administration, Policy and Power*, Palgrave MacMillan). This paper explores the way that the use of government information systems has shaped employment services in remote Australia where over 80 per cent of those included are Indigenous people. The article describes how the production and use of administrative data within employment services have supported and extended the framing of Indigenous people in remote communities as non-compliant and as needing external direction.

KEYWORDS

electronic surveillance, employment policy, Indigenous peoples, mutual obligation, remote areas

SEEING PEOPLE IN THE COMPUTER: THE ROLE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY IN THE DELIVERY OF REMOTE EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

... I can see a lot in the computer. I guess that's my main reference – I can see a lot about them there about how consistent and reliable they are. I was asked by someone to give a reference for a client and I thought 'I don't know them at all'. But then I realised that it was there in the computer.
(interview: remote employment services case manager)

Information technologies have been important in the emergence of new forms of control and surveillance of welfare recipients and of those who administer labour market programmes. These technologies have often appeared at the margins of accounts of welfare reform, for example as means of increasing the efficiency or consistency of services, or as constraining frontline discretion. Henman has argued, however, that information technologies (IT) need to be analysed not just as administrative tools, but as “non-human actors,” shaping policy development and implementation in ways beyond the intentions of their human creators (Henman 2010). He argues that information systems not only make new ways of governing possible, but can change the landscape in which governing takes place in particular ways—human behaviour, for example, becomes “informatisable,” and through this, new ways of governing become imaginable (Henman 2010; Zuboff 2015). This paper seeks to contribute to understanding how the governmental properties of information technologies have played out in remote employment services.

This paper explores the role of a specific government information system (ESS) in shaping the development and delivery of remote employment services under the Remote Jobs and Communities Program (RJCP) (1 July 2013–30 June 2015) and the Community Development Programme (CDP) (1 July 2015–present). These were the mandatory labour market programmes to which all activity-tested income support recipients living in remote areas were referred over this period—the counterparts to Job Services Australia (to 30 June 2015), jobactive (from 1 July 2015) and Disability Employment Services (Figure 1). From 2013 to 2017, around 35,000 people participated in remote employment services at any given time—around 4 per cent of the total number in employment services Australia-wide. Over 80 per cent of participants in remote employment services were Indigenous.

METHOD

This paper draws on research conducted from 2013 to 2017 as part of a larger project funded by the Australian Research Council and the peak body for nonprofit employment providers, Jobs Australia. Data for this paper were gathered through observation of frontline practice and semi-structured interviews with provider staff across five service regions (from a total of 60) in three jurisdictions. Two regions were visited three times and two were visited twice, each for 4–5 days at a time. Visits of 1–3 days were conducted to another eight regions. Regions visited included a range of different geographies and labour markets, allowing identification of common practices. Interviews were also conducted with nine public servants involved in the design and management of the programme, and programme material, including material for frontline workers covering

FIGURE 1 Remote employment services delivery regions (coloured areas)

the use of online systems, was reviewed. The project was approved by the Australian National University’s ethics committee.

Information Technology (IT) systems and the development of the employment services market

In 1998, Australia became the first OECD country to fully privatise delivery of its public employment services. It contracted service delivery to a mix of private and nonprofit organisations, measuring and rewarding their performance on the basis of the proportion of long-term unemployed people that providers placed and kept in work (OECD 2012; Considine et al. 2015). The programme was “work first”—designed to deliver “light touch” assistance and to pressure job seekers to take up employment, regardless of job quality (Davidson 2011). Administration of income support payments remained a government function through the Department of Human Services (DHS), but the setting of the specific obligations attached to benefit receipt (like job-search) and reporting on compliance were delegated to contracted providers (Fowkes 2019).

The outsourcing of employment services and the integration of these services with administration of income support payments were made possible by the development of an IT system that

allowed continuous exchange of information about unemployed people between DHS and contracted providers (Henman 2010). Over time, the functions of the computer system expanded to incorporate more frontline tasks and allow greater access to real-time information, facilitating the increased prescription and auditing of frontline activities (Considine et al. 2011). By the mid-2000s, case managers working in contracted employment services were doing much of their work online, accepting client referrals, updating assessments, creating individual job plans and recording appointments and activities in the government's IT system.

The officials who oversaw the quasi-market made extensive use of system-generated data to measure performance and to identify and track programme and policy effects (Considine et al. 2011, 2015). They could “see” hundreds of thousands of individuals through the computer and monitor millions of transactions. Data gathered were used to construct performance ratings through which the “market” could be “managed.” These uses of the IT system underpinned claims that, in Australia, a market model had been applied successfully to provision of employment services (OECD 2012).

The emergence of RJCP and CDP

For the first decade of outsourced employment services delivery, their reach in remote areas was limited by the granting of exemptions from income support conditions for many living remotely and by access to the long-running Community Development Employment Projects (CDEP) scheme. CDEP gave many unemployed Indigenous Australians the option of working for a form of wages under the supervision of (predominantly) Indigenous organisations rather than being subjected to the mainstream framework of welfare conditionality (Jordan & Altman 2016). Unlike mainstream activation programmes, CDEP gave government officials little visibility over the activities and attendance of individual participants. Concerns were raised repeatedly that the scheme failed to discipline those who failed to work (Rowse 2001; Jordan & Altman 2016). It was a Labor Government that finally abolished CDEP, arguing it inhibited Indigenous peoples' entry into the mainstream labour market (Fowkes 2018; Sanders 2017). In 2011, Labor announced a review of remote employment services which resulted in the closure of CDEP and the establishment of the Remote Jobs and Communities Program (RJCP) in 2013 (Sanders 2017).

While framed as a response to the “unique conditions” of remote communities, RJCP was, as one senior bureaucrat described it—essentially a “topped and tailed” version of the mainstream programme (Fowkes 2018, p. 110). During its development, there had been a debate within the bureaucracy over whether the mainstream, “work first,” approach was appropriate in Indigenous communities with few jobs or social services. The advocates of “work first” within the employment department prevailed (Sanders 2017; Fowkes 2018). It followed that the employment IT system (ESS) would be used, even though there was limited capability on the ground:

The computer side of it was always part and parcel of what is needed to report on employment services. You can always bring in [IT] expertise ...

(senior employment department official involved in programme design)

When the Coalition won office in September 2013, RJCP moved into the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (PM&C), but the programme continued to rely on the employment department's IT system. The new government announced the reinvigoration of Work for the Dole within the mainstream employment programme with a national roll-out from 2015

(Bita 2014). ESS was “enhanced” to make it easier to track and report individual Work for the Dole attendance.

In 2015, the Coalition Government also made substantial changes to RJCP, including renaming it the Community Development Programme (CDP). While the Minister for Indigenous Affairs claimed that the changes were community-driven, the Australian National Audit Office (ANAO) reported that the government sought greater alignment with mainstream programme settings (ANAO 2017a). Despite this, the rules established for Work for Dole in the remote and non-remote programmes were very different. In non-remote areas, Work for the Dole was applied to those who had been unemployed for at least a year, and required them to perform 15–25 hours of “work like” activity for 26 weeks in each year (DESSFB 2018). However, in applying the policy to remote areas, PM&C argued:

... that implementing Work for the Dole for only six months of each year would not work in remote communities which often had virtually non-existent labour markets and where there was a need to establish social norms. Consequently, PM&C advised that ‘only a comprehensive full time Work for the Dole program applied to all jobseekers will work in remote regions’. ‘Continuous’ Work for the Dole activities was also considered a key factor in reducing the ‘high level of idleness in communities’. (ANAO 2017a, p. 27)

Under CDP from July 2015 to March 2019, remote unemployed people with full-time work capacity were required to work 25 hours per week over five days per week, for at least 46 weeks in each year from their first day in assistance (ANAO 2017a). In addition, provider payments were linked to recording individual hours of attendance and reporting non-compliance, constraining provider discretion to “forgive” instances of non-attendance (Fowkes 2018, p. 140; Fowkes 2019).

Case management and IT

Case managers play a central role in the provision of Australian employment services. Through their relationships with individual job seekers, it is case managers who are expected to administer appropriate doses of pressure and assistance in order to produce employable and employment seeking citizens (Marston et al. 2005). Case management has been described as a “people changing technology,” built around provision of individually tailored approaches, by case managers attuned to the specific needs of clients and of local employers (Hasenfeld 2000; Marston et al. 2005). Over time, however, frontline work in Australian employment services has become increasingly standardised, and its workers deskilled (Considine et al. 2015). The government’s computer system has been implicated in this shift—for example, Considine et al. reported that in 2012, 50.4 per cent of frontline workers they surveyed agreed that “our computer system tells me what steps to take with jobseekers and when to take them”—more than double the 17.4 per cent reporting this in 1998 (Considine et al. 2015, p. 57). While standardisation has delivered efficiencies in moving many into work, it has shown poorer results for those who face significant obstacles to employment (Considine et al. 2015; Borland et al. 2016). When the architects of remote employment services decided to require providers to use ESS, they created an environment that favoured standardisation over personalised assistance. These tendencies were exacerbated by the circumstances in which remote employment services were delivered (O’Sullivan & Walker 2018).

IT and case management in remote employment services

In the process of designing and reforming remote employment services, both Labor and Coalition governments stressed the importance of having local Indigenous organisations involved in delivery, emphasising that they “knew their job seekers.” However, the need for a high level of digital literacy and administrative skill limited the ability of these organisations to employ local Indigenous people in case management roles (Fowkes 2018). Where local Indigenous caseworkers were employed, they tended to be younger women with limited labour market experience, poorly placed to exercise authority over community members:

...[it is] hard for younger community members that have computer skills to advise older clients who may be family members, vice versa with older members that could enforce these obligations [do] not have sufficient IT abilities. (provider survey respondent, 2014)

Many case management roles were held by non-Indigenous people from outside the community, who often only stayed for a short period. These workers usually had limited knowledge of the cultures or dynamics of the communities they were in. In the sites visited, none spoke the local language/s. Because many did not know, and found it difficult to understand their clients, case managers often started appointments by asking clients to provide, not their name, but their job seeker identification number, allowing quick retrieval of their records (and name) in the IT system.

Despite poor Internet coverage in many communities, case managers were required to record information and conduct transactions for each client appointment through the web-based ESS system on a “real time” basis. Where they travelled to places without Internet access, this meant hours of data entry on their return, limiting time on the ground:

We were told that reports have to be done on the same day but we don't get back from our outreach visits until late – it's about 2.5 hours each way to get out to [community]. ... We try to visit activities when we are out there but this takes time away from just managing the numbers. (non-Indigenous case manager)

Those working in full-time offices rarely left their desks, conducting appointments in front of the screen, even though this setting made many clients uncomfortable:

A lot of them are closed in the office. They get shy. It's like they lose their voice all of a sudden. (local Indigenous case manager)

Case managers' days were structured by their schedule of appointments in the online calendar. But this did not mean that those on the schedule attended. Lack of access to phones, phone credit, transport and failure of systems (usually texts) designed to remind people to turn up contributed to a constant workload of scheduling and rescheduling appointments and compliance reporting (O'Sullivan & Walker 2018). Unpredictability of attendance meant that it was rare for clients to be assigned to a single case manager. When appointments did take place, the time and effort needed for case managers to work through the mandatory tasks in the system crowded out other types of conversation:

What happens in a typical appointment?

They know me. I say "hello, are you still in an activity? Have you been attending?" I'll have a look at the system and tell them "OK, I need to update your JSCI, or extend your dates." I try not to talk that much because I am doing stuff on the system and I need to concentrate. When I am on the system they tend to get bored and off track so it's hard to keep them engaged. You try not to do that, but you need to get everything into the system.

(local Indigenous case manager)

It's hard to engage with job seekers because the job is so heavy on IT. It can get very frustrating because the system goes down and then people are waiting. By the time we have got through the computer screens there is not a lot of time left to talk with people about what is going on for them.

(non-Indigenous Case manager)

Case management appointments were reduced to the most basic, routine, transactions:

What happens in a typical appointment?

In an appointment I start off asking how they are going, and if there is anything they need to tell me. I go through the [job plan] see whether they want to change anything.

(Indigenous case manager)

Q: What happens when you go into the office [for an appointment]?

They ask the same questions over and over.

Q: Do they help you find work?

No, not really. They ask if you like the activities, whether you want to change.

(Indigenous participant)

At each appointment, it was mandatory for case managers to check individual "job plans" which set out individual obligations, check recent Work for the Dole attendance and report that this appointment had been attended. Additional screens allowed case managers to create "free text," but these were used sparingly and were not readily searched or retrieved. Other types of information could be recorded in resumes or gathered through the Job Seeker Classification Instrument (JSCI) (see below). But in most cases, the information that case managers retrieved, what they worked with, and what they knew of their clients, was contained in couple of screens concerning their obligations and extent of compliance:

Q: How do you know who to refer to jobs?

Personal experience, who turns up every time on time. Then we know that they will be able to work.

(non-Indigenous case manager)

Records of attendance or non-attendance, in turn, drove each person's treatment.

Sanctions

Prior to the introduction of daily Work for the Dole obligations, case managers usually decided whether to recommend penalties those who failed to attend. Attitudes varied. Many non-Indigenous case managers saw penalties as necessary to bring about change:

So this is about re-education... As cruel as it sounds, definitely the only way is the hip pocket. To the mainstream – people in Sydney or Melbourne – that might sound harsh – they have no idea. Unless there is a consequence change is not going to happen.

(non-Indigenous case manager)

Local Indigenous workers tended to be more mindful of the harm that penalties could do:

You need to put your feet in their shoes, not look down on them. Most people have issues. What I do if a person doesn't contact me and doesn't turn up I reschedule that person, but then I will go and look for them if there is a spare car. But they say you are spoiling them. But it is their money. It's what they live on. If you go to visit they feel more comfortable, less shame.

(Indigenous case manager)

With the introduction of daily Work for the Dole, the intensity of mandatory reporting of attendance and of non-compliance soared. In two years of RJCP, 47,200 penalties were applied to a caseload of roughly 35,000 people; in the two years following the introduction of CDP, this increased sevenfold to 351,868 penalties (Fowkes 2019). These represented only a fraction of the “participation reports” submitted by providers for each instance of non-compliance (Fowkes 2018, p. 285).

The volume of transactions drove a shift in the frontline workforce:

Providers centralised compliance teams in regional centres, engaged external contractors or used third-party organisations to assist with the compliance process due to reported complexity of the [compliance framework] and the difficulty in employing local staff with relevant skills and experience.

(ANAO 2017a, p. 46)

Workers hundreds or thousands of kilometres away from those affected took over the work of responding to participant non-compliance. These workers were even more heavily reliant on information in the system to inform their work, often lacking even the most basic local context for their activity. ESS prompted workers to verify that the conditions had been met for each penalty to be applied (Figure 2). This meant an attempt at contact (necessarily by phone, if a number had been provided)—calls that were rarely successful (O'Sullivan & Walker 2018). Sometimes DHS officials attached a “vulnerability indicator” to a participant record, which meant that the worker had to report that this had been taken into account. Workers often cut and paste standard responses to these system questions in order to speed up processing (Figure 3) (Fowkes 2018, p. 288). Compliance workers might pause in cases where a participant's compliance history was good, make more than one attempt at contact and even talk to case managers at the local site about the person. But this was not usual. As the penalties mounted, those with “clean” compliance histories warranting such extra effort became increasingly rare.

FIGURE 2 System screenshot with prompts to verify conditions for penalty have been met

secure | https://essnigov.au/ess/participationreport/jobseekerconsideration/view.html

Job Seeker

Job Seeker Diary

▼ Notifications

Participation Profile

▼ Referral

Recently Accessed

☐ Job seeker's vulnerability(s) did not impact their ability to comply.
 ☒ Job seeker's vulnerability(s) could have impacted their ability to comply, but I am submitting a report because

Support and flexibility is provided to link with various agencies if required.

Provider Statements

Do you want to include any of the following statements as they are relevant to this job seeker and incident?

☐ The activity was arranged on a day advised by the job seeker as being the most suitable.
 ☐ The job seeker nominated this activity as they were interested in participating and we supported them to do so.
 ☒ The job seeker's requirements were discussed in detail with them to ensure they understood their requirements and possible consequences of not participating.
 ☐ The job seeker has used this excuse multiple times but I do not consider it valid, given their circumstances.

Other Relevant Information

Please record any other relevant information for Human Services to consider as part of this investigation

Provider Contact Details

Contact Name:

Representing individual disadvantage

Within ESS, the main source of information about individual circumstances was contained in responses recorded during the administration of the Job Seeker Classification Instrument (JSCI) (PM&C 2015). The JSCI was a standardised questionnaire designed to predict each person's relative risk of becoming long-term unemployed so that they could be "streamed" into different levels of assistance (OECD 2012). Each factor in the JSCI was assigned a weighting so that a single score—a measure of disadvantage—could be generated. While there was only one level of assistance in remote employment services (so streaming was not necessary), government officials insisted that the JSCI be used to capture "individual circumstances and barriers to employment" (PM&C 2015).

The JSCI was developed through analysis of the characteristics that predicted unemployment across the whole job seeker population, of which Indigenous people were only a small fraction. It asked about factors like disability and homelessness, which, along with unemployment duration, were identified as predictive of long-term unemployment. However, those that developed the instrument found it necessary to assign "Indigeneity" its own, separate, weight:

...to take into account Indigenous disadvantages not accounted for by other factors in the JSCI that are related to a number of Indigenous specific issues including standards of health, cultural requirements, cross-cultural norms and language first spoken as a child.

(DoE 2015, p. 9)

An additional "Indigenous location" factor was included, recognising lack of jobs in remote communities (DoE 2015, p. 9). Even with these factors, the tool was overly optimistic in its predictions of employment rates for Indigenous people (ANAO 2017b, p. 54).

FIGURE 3 Example of standard responses to system queries

While the construction of the JSCI had the effect of identifying Indigenous people as “risky,” the assessment process systematically underreported factors that were likely to have an impact on their ability to participate—issues such as chronic illness, disability, family violence or insecure housing (DEEWR 2012). The JSCI questions took no account of cultural differences in definitions of “disability,” or of caring roles beyond immediate households, nor did they capture information about poor or overcrowded housing.² Yet when DHS officials conducted assessments to determine whether the most serious sanctions should be applied to Indigenous CDP participants, they looked at the JSCI to identify personal circumstances that might affect the ability to comply. Despite the poor living conditions and health of many remote Indigenous people, and their higher rates of disability, DHS officers were substantially less likely to identify CDP participants as having obstacles to participation than their non-remote counterparts and more likely to identify them as “deliberately” non-compliant (Fowkes 2019).

That the “majority of participants had moderate to extreme barriers to employment as measured by the JSCI” was described by PM&C as a “cause of joblessness” in remote communities, even though living in a remote community was, itself, a factor in elevating the JSCI score (PM&C 2017, p. 4). In this way, Indigeneity and residence in Indigenous communities became markers of both group and individual disadvantage and deficiency, justifying additional and more intensive government intervention, at the same time that individual barriers to participation were overlooked (Henman 2010, ch10, Walter 2016).

Administrative data were also used to evidence the success of government intervention. When the Senate held an Inquiry into the CDP in 2017, PM&C told the Inquiry:

89 per cent of eligible job seekers have been placed in work like activities, up from 45 per cent at the end of RJCP. Reported attendance and valid non-attendance in activities is up from 7 per cent in July 2015 to 70 per cent (as at April 2017). (PM&C 2017, p. 7)

They argued that:

Remote job seekers are now standing up and participating, building daily routine and establishing social norms. Many remote job seekers have a renewed sense of pride as they are contributing to their communities. (PM&C 2017, p. 7)

This narrative was undermined by escalating penalties for non-attendance and evidence that thousands of people, particularly younger people, were withdrawing from the scheme (and sometimes income support) altogether (Fowkes 2019; PM&C 2018).

IT and governing in remote employment services

As this account of remote employment services highlights, information technology has played a critical role in the development, implementation and experience of remote employment services delivery. For policymakers and frontline workers, it appeared almost impossible to imagine employment services without “the IT system.” However, the system’s design and use had far-reaching effects.

Henman uses a governmentality analytic to describe how IT systems produce power effects (Henman 2010, Ch 2). Information technologies, he argues, are “governing technologies”—in the sense that they translate political narratives and ideas into practices and techniques—into the “world of people and things” (Miller & Rose 1990; Henman 2010). In doing so, they also present the world of the governed in ways that open up new ways of thinking about them—in the way that the accumulation of masses of data about individual behaviour online makes it imaginable to intervene to shape that behaviour in new ways (Zuboff 2015).

The “action” of the IT system can be seen on the frontline of remote employment services delivery, in shaping how case managers saw their clients and how they produced representations of those clients for others. The fields and screens of ESS reflected human decisions about what data should be collected (or not), what processes must be followed by whom, what tasks were discretionary and which were automated. Once deployed, however, these structures for capturing and processing information “acted” in ways beyond the intentions of their creators. Workers with limited skills, working with slow systems in settings that their clients found alienating, struggled to do anything more than complete tasks that were required by “the system,” only rarely asking their clients “what was going on for them.” Cultural biases embedded in the JSCI (and its

surrounding processes) failed to capture individual obstacles to compliance, while its scoring method reinforced perceptions of Indigenous people as a group as “risky.” Clients were represented primarily through their (non-)compliance. The centralisation of compliance teams and of DHS officers meant that these data were read in places and by people even further removed from the lives and voices of people in remote Indigenous communities (Walter & Andersen 2013). Escalating penalties were taken as evidence that non-attendance was “wilful” and “deliberate” contributing to harsher and more punitive action (Fowkes 2019, p. 14).

These micropolitics reflected a longer transformation of Indigenous welfare politics—one in which technologies also played a pivotal role. For decades, effective inclusion of remote Indigenous Australians had been inhibited by the practical limitations of government agencies to administer individual unemployment benefits for remote Australians (Sanders 1986). These limitations, in the context of political rationalities of self-management, led to the creation of CDEP which operated as a vehicle (albeit constrained) of Indigenous collective action (Rowse 2001; Sanders 2017). IT systems underpinned the development and implementation of systems of activation and new forms of welfare conditionality. However, until the early 2000s, the activities, and even the locations, of individual remote Indigenous community residents remained opaque to central bureaucracy—shielded by collective structures and the lack of practical means by which their data could be systematically collected (Henman 2010). By 2004, new rationalities of neoliberal paternalism were on the ascendance (Howard-Wagner 2018). The abolition of CDEP in 2013 brought 10,500 former participants into the mainstream activation system, making them individually obliged, and individually visible, to the state. Almost immediately following their inclusion in the mainstream system, the “poison” of “passive welfare” was invoked to justify differential obligations and increased surveillance of participants through mandatory Work for the Dole. As penalties rose in response, the government used this to argue for new measures for remote employment services participants which would have had the effect of reducing income support protections³:

Current arrangements are too complicated and not easily understood by remote job seekers which means that behavioural change happens slowly, if at all. . . .

Immediate and easy to understand financial penalties for non-attendance in activities are necessary if CDP mutual obligations are to be effective. . . . (PM&C 2016, pp. 5–6)

This trajectory is what appears in Henman’s analysis as a process of “fragmentation of the social”—a process of dividing and subdividing populations so that the burdens and benefits of citizenship are increasingly stratified (Henman 2010; pp. 231–8). A process enabled by IT systems that reflected and entrenched racial divisions, and punished those who refused to “comply.”

CONCLUSION

The deployment of information technologies had a profound effect on the daily experience of frontline workers and on participants in the remote employment services programmes considered here. The specific form and embedded structures of the system have reinforced political narratives of Indigenous dysfunction and, in doing so, contributed to new attempts to differentiate and target Indigenous unemployed people. Indigenous people and perspectives have been systematically excluded from the process of their “representation” at every point—from their exclusion from

case management roles, the construction of the JSCI and the ways in which they are revealed to white administrators through their (non) compliance. The implementation of remote employment services has made Indigenous people more “visible” to the state, but their ability to represent themselves and their communities’ aspirations has been denied.

NOTES

¹ The questions within the JSCI are set out in DoE, 2017. *Assessments Guideline Job Seeker Classification Instrument (JSCI) and Employment Services Assessment (ESAt)*, v2.0 effective 27 March 2017, Commonwealth.

² These measures were contained in the *Social Security Legislation Amendment (Community Development Programme) Bill 2015* and the *Social Security Legislation Amendment (Community Development Programme) Bill 2018*. Neither Bill passed the Senate.

REFERENCES

- ANAO (Australian National Audit Office) (2017a). *Design and implementation of the community development programme (report No. 14 2017–18)*, Canberra, Commonwealth Government.
- ANAO (2017b) jobactive: Design and monitoring (report no. 4 2017–18), Canberra, Commonwealth Government.
- Bitá, N. (2014) Abbott government set to revive and expand work-for-dole scheme (27 January 2014), News Limited Network.
- Borland, J., Considine, M., Kalb, G. and Ribar, D. (2016). *What are best-practice programs for jobseekers facing high barriers to employment?* Melbourne Institute Policy Briefs Series Policy Brief No. 4/16, University of Melbourne.
- Considine, M., Lewis, J.M. and O’Sullivan, S. (2011) ‘Quasi-markets and service delivery flexibility following a decade of employment assistance reform in Australia’, *Journal of Social Policy*, **40** (4), 811–833.
- Considine, M., Lewis, J., O’Sullivan, S. and Sol, E. (2015) *Getting Welfare to Work*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Davidson, P. (2011) ‘Did ‘Work First’ work? The role of employment assistance programs in reducing long-term unemployment in Australia (1990–2008)’, *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, **37** (1), 51–96.
- DEEWR (Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations) (2012) *Servicing Indigenous Job Seekers in Job Services Australia*, Canberra, Commonwealth Government.
- DESSFB (Department of Employment, Skills, Small and Family Business) (2018) *Explainer: Work for the dole*. <https://www.employment.gov.au/newsroom/explainer-work-dole> (accessed 21 August 2019).
- DoE (2017) *Assessments Guideline Job Seeker Classification Instrument (JSCI) and Employment Services Assessment (ESAt)*, v2.0 effective 27 March 2017, Commonwealth.
- DoE (Department of Employment) (2015) *Job seeker classification instrument overview and factors v1.0*, Commonwealth.
- Fowkes, L. (2018) Settler-state ambitions and bureaucratic ritual at the frontiers of the labour market: indigenous Australians and remote employment services 2011–2017 (A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy of the Australian National University).
- Fowkes, L. (2019) ‘The application of income support obligations and penalties to remote indigenous Australians, 2013–2018’. Working Paper 126/2019, Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research, ANU.
- Hasenfeld, Y. (2000) ‘Organizational forms as moral practices: The case of welfare departments’, *Social Service Review*, **74** (3), 329–351.
- Henman, P. (2010) *Governing Electronically: E-government and the Reconfiguration of Public Administration, Policy and Power*, Basingstoke, Palgrave MacMillan.
- Howard-Wagner, D. (2018) ‘Governance of indigenous policy in the neo-liberal age: indigenous disadvantage and the intersecting of paternalism and neo-liberalism as a racial project’, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, **41** (7), 1332–1351.
- Jordan, K. and Altman, J. (2016) ‘From welfare to work or work to welfare’. In K. Jordan (ed.) *Better than Welfare?* Research Monograph No. 36. Canberra, ANU Press, pp. 1–30.
- Marston, G., Larsen, J. and McDonald, C. (2005) ‘The active subjects of welfare reform: A street-level comparison of employment services in Australia and Denmark’, *Social Work & Society*, **3** (2), 141–157.

- Miller, P. and Rose, N. (1990) 'Governing economic life', *Economy and society*, **19** (1), 1–31.
- OECD (2012) *Activating Jobseekers: How Australia Does It*, Paris, OECD Publishing.
- O'Sullivan, S. and Walker, C. (2018) 'From the interpersonal to the internet: social service digitisation and the implications for vulnerable individuals and communities', *Australian Journal of Political Science*, **53** (4), 490–507.
- PM&C (2017) *Submission to the Senate Finance and Public Administration References Committee, Inquiry into the appropriateness and effectiveness of the objectives, design, implementation and evaluation of the Community Development Program*.
- PM&C (2018) *The Community Development Programme: Evaluation of Participation and Employment Outcomes*, Canberra, Commonwealth Government.
- PM&C (Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet) (2015) *RJCP Programme Management Framework Guidelines* (effective 1 July 2015).
- PM&C (Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet) (2016) *Submission to the Senate Finance and Public Administration Legislation Committee, Inquiry into the Social Security Legislation Amendment (Community Development Bill) 2015*.
- Rowse, T. (2001) 'The political dimensions of community development'. In F. Morphy and W.G. Sanders (eds) *The Indigenous Welfare Economy and the CDEP Scheme*, Research Monograph No 20/2001, Canberra, Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research, ANU E Press, pp. 39–46.
- Sanders, W.G. (1986) *Access, administration and politics: The Australian Social Security System and Aborigines*. Doctoral thesis, Australian National University.
- Sanders, W.G. (2017) 'Three accounts of the emergence of the remote jobs and communities program: changing timeframes and types of actors', *Australian Journal of Political Science*, **52** (2), 272–287.
- Walter, M. (2016). 'Data politics and Indigenous representation in Australian statistics.' In T. Kukutai and J. Taylor (eds) *Indigenous Data Sovereignty: Towards an Agenda*, Research Monograph No. 38/2016. Canberra, ANU Press.
- Walter, M. and Andersen, C. (2013) *Indigenous Statistics: A Quantitative Research Methodology*, Walnut Creek, Left Coast Press.
- Zuboff, S. (2015) 'Big other: surveillance capitalism and the prospects of an information civilization', *Journal of Information Technology*, **30** (1), 75–89.

Lisa Fowkes has worked in senior roles in, or for, the non profit employment services sector for more than fifteen years. She completed a PhD at ANU in 2018 which examined the operation of employment services in remote areas. She is a Visiting Fellow at the Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research at ANU.

How to cite this article: Fowkes L. Seeing people in the computer: The role of information technology in remote employment services. *Aust J Soc Issues*. 2020;55:13–26. doi: 10.1002/ajis4.81.