SW&S | Social Work and Society
International Online Journal

Punitiveness and Devaluation among Social Work Gatekeepers

Johanna Pangritz, Bielefeld University

Wilhelm Berghan, Bielefeld University

1 Introduction

Over recent years, social work research has increasingly focused on the topic of punitiveness. The empirical and theoretical debate associates punitivity with a shift or change in the ideal of resocialization. In this context, punitiveness stands as an expression or symptom of the erosion of welfare state structures and attitudes at a time when social work is moving away from a welfare state ideal of social rehabilitation towards a "post-welfare state" with selective risk management and associated coercive and control measures (Wacquant 2009; Dollinger 2017; Lutz 2017; Lutz & Ziegler 2005). Here the question arises: to what extent does this transformation coincide with a shift in the attitudes and mentality of agents of the welfare state? In particular, the question asks how the shift is specifically related to antidemocratic attitudes and intergroup conflict. Here, the devaluation of minorities in the form of prejudices should be considered, since they are the primary addressees of social work. In this context, social work acts as a so-called "gatekeeper" of the welfare state, as it actively shapes the welfare state through its professional actions. This also includes assumptions about citizenship, as this involves assertions about who belongs to society and who does not.

2 An Attempt to define punitiveness

The term punitiveness is widely used in social work literature, even though there is no agreement on its definition. It is therefore also viewed as a "blurry" (Kury, Brandenstein & Obergfell-Fuch 2009: 63), "fuzzy" (Markusen 2003) or "largely undefined" (Mathew 2005: 175) concept. However, it is probably this indistinctness that makes the concept so successful. Punitivity proves a difficult construct to determine for three principal reasons which are associated with Punitivity's:

1. Dimensions,

2. Relationality, and

3. Traits

Dimensions: Punitiveness is not only a useful concept for characterizing attitudes, but it can also be used to analyse and examine forms of practice, social structures, and discourses. Kury, Brandenstein, and Obergfell-Fuchs (2009), for example, differentiate three dimensions of punitivity at the micro-, meso- and macro-level.

> "On the micro perspective punitiveness can be seen as a penal mentality or need for punishment of singular persons. On this individual level, especially personal assumptions, attitudes, values, concept and emotions, about which persons report are of interest," (Kury, Brandenstein & Obergfell-Fuchs 2009: 65).

On the meso-level the authors differentiate between political and judicial punitiveness. While political punitiveness focuses on the effects of policy and political practice, judicial punitiveness concentrates on legality and decisions of the courts. The macro level also includes social values that are important for the entire population such as media discourses (Kury, Brandenstein & Obergfell-Fuchs 2009). This makes punitivity difficult to pin down, since different developments are possible at each level.

Relationality: The relationality of the term makes it difficult to grasp. Dollinger (2011a: 32) argues that punitiveness cannot be specified in itself, but rather describes a complex network of relationships. Lautmann and Klimke (2004) make it clear that punitiveness can be understood as an excessively punitive reaction to perceived norm deviations:

> "A person or institution that describes the actions of another person or institution as deviant from normative point of view and supports negative sanctions is punitive in the literal sense. Punitiveness is the generalized attitude or tendency to react with negative sanctions to perceived norm deviations. [...] It refers to the tendency to prefer retaliatory sanctions and neglect forgiving ones. [...] Punitive is a certain way of using punitive sanctions, namely with harshness and strictness," (translated from Lautmann & Klimke 2004: 10).

The relationality of punitivity under this definition is especially pertinent in two respects: on the one hand, the norm deviation to which it refers serves as a starting point for punitivity. The category of deviance is never neutral or descriptive, but always pervaded by ideas about socially recognized and acceptable concepts of social order and human nature. It also determines the point of intervention and subsequent action (Dollinger 2008). This starting point is historically negotiable and contingent and can therefore be described as relational. On the other hand, categorization as "excessive" or "harsh" punishment must be described as relational. What is understood as such in each case depends on different institutional, cultural, or historical contexts and, therefore, on norms. It is also assumed that there is an alternative possibility of action that can be described as less or not punitive (Scheer & Ziegler 2013). Punitivity can therefore only serve as a "relational variable" (Dollinger 2011a: 33) that depends on specific reference points. One example is the term "punitive turn," which has emerged in social work discourses in recent years. This can only happen with reference to a previous status, which is "not" or "less" punitive, and is dependent on a normative reference point. These relational variables are essential to identifying what constitutes a punitive turn and what it actually represents.

Traits of punitivity: Finally, we have to consider which characteristics punitivity includes. Some authors equate punitivity with authoritarianism or draw strong parallels to it (Lautmann & Klimke 2004). The dimension of authoritarian aggression in particular is described as an expression of punitivity (Mühler & Schmidtke 2012; Mansel 2004). In this argumentation, punitiveness is part of the syndrome of authoritarianism and not understood as an independent concept. This characterization of punitivity is challenged by newer theoretical perspectives on authoritarianism that argue that authoritarian individuals do not necessarily tend to be aggressive.

> "In a complex society full of ambiguous situations, the individual must surely face many attacks. Even a strong tie to leading authorities and rigid orientation towards their values and norms cannot completely protect one against insecurity and anxiety. Because authoritarian personalities have to develop mechanisms for dealing independently with crisis situations, they feel themselves attacked very easily. In combination with this lack

of independence, the authoritarian personalities' poorly developed conflict-solving strategies place them in a state of emotional and cognitive overload that in turn causes hostile tendencies. […] From the point of view of the new theory described here authoritarian individuals are usually not aggressive. The authoritarian reaction as a flight into security excludes overt aggression. Aggressive behavior always includes personal risks. Such risks are precisely what the authoritarian reaction is designed to avoid. Yet although the authoritarian personality is not aggressive in general, it could be considered hostile," (Oesterreich 2005: 284).

In this understanding, authoritarianism can be considered as almost contrary to punitivity. As long as punitivity is conceptualized as both hostile and aggressive, the punitive actor is placed in the forefront of conflict and therefore at risk. In the form of harsh punishment, punitivity has a clear aggressive orientation, aimed at rigid adherence to normative values. Punitivity can be characterized by an aggressive component such as punishment which is based on and oriented towards norm-conforming behavior. Punitivity therefore also includes conventionalism. The authoritarian submissiveness conceptualized by Oesterreich (2005) and the associated flight into security and stability do not focus on this element of punitivity. Consequently, punitivity can be regarded as an orientation that is related to authoritarianism but can also be quite distinct from the authoritarian personality. Punitivity attempts to hierarchically subordinate normatively deviant individuals, positions, and institutions (Stehr 2014). In addition, punitivity suggests *how* to deal with deviation. This aspect is still rather neglected in the conceptualization of authoritarianism. In this context, punitiveness has a much more practical relevance.

The research presented here is based on the definition of punitivity as an attitude on the micro-level. The normative point of reference is the educational ideal, which is oriented towards democratic and humanistic goals such as maturity, autonomy, and participation. The importance of this educational ideal is particularly emphasized against the background of current and historical dehumanization (Adorno 1982; Benner & Brügge 2004). Punitiveness is therefore understood as a strong move away from this normative ideal. In particular, the punitive shift is characterized by aggressive procedures (harsh punishments), and pressure towards normative conventions whereby penalties are applied to deviations from the social norm.

3 State of research: Punitive attitudes of social work professionals and the link to devaluations of minorities

Previous theoretical and empirical studies have drawn attention to the punitive shift away from the humanistic oriented ideal of resocialization, often taking the attitudes of future professionals into consideration (Oelkers 2013; Scheer & Ziegler 2013; Dollinger 2011b; Dollinger & Raithel 2005). The attitudes of students tend to show a hard line against deviant behavior, but also deviancy in the broadest sense. These are indications that social work is in danger of moving away from its ideals. Oelkers (2013) showed that more than half of students consider punishment to be the best response to criminal behavior: social work professionals should communicate clear limits (79 % agreement) and educate young people to behave decently (66 %). This support is often coupled with skepticism about welfare state structures. Scheer and Ziegler (2013) show that around 40 % of students taking the introductory course in social work believe that the welfare state leads people to take less and less responsibility.

Even if there is no direct link between the attitudes of students and their later actions as professionals in the field, research on professions shows that professional attitudes have a

biographical component (cf. Dollinger 2011b); as such, attitudes of students can be regarded as indicative of later action. It is therefore not surprising that similar trends can also be found among professionals in the field, (Mohr 2017; Clark & Schwerthelm 2017; Mohr & Ziegler 2012). Mohr and Ziegler (2012), for example, found that around 40 % of professionals agreed with the idea that the problems of social work clients are attributable to their unwillingness to assume any responsibility. Furthermore, two fifths of respondents wanted more possibilities for sanctions in the event there is a lack of cooperation. Mohr (2017) found similar results. In his survey, around 40 % agreed with the idea that social work must reconsider values like "discipline" and "order." According to Mohr (2017), this mindset, which he calls „respondilizing-disciplinizing" problem interpretation, is related to the structures of the organization. Social workers in organizations that show professional characteristics (i.e. autonomy, collegial decision-making, and orientation toward the client's needs) tend to show less of this mindset.

Lastly, it is worth highlighting findings that suggest that punitiveness can be understood as a form or mechanism of devaluation that solidifies current power relations (Dollinger 2017; Häßler & Werner 2012; Klein & Groß 2011). These studies show that the punitive tendency is intensified in relation to minorities (e.g. migrants or homeless people). The findings of an experimental study by Häßler and Werner (2012) are particularly noteworthy for the context of social work and citizenship. Using a student sample of (mainly German) future social workers, they were able to show that longer and harsher sentences were advocated for juvenile offenders who had a first name that sounded "foreign". However, the authors add that these findings do not automatically suggest devaluing attitudes towards other ethnic groups, but instead, they argue that this must be examined separately.

4   Punitiveness and devaluation: Interim conclusion and hypotheses

Previous research on punitivity provides some evidence that punitivity is a mechanism that contributes to the maintenance of social hierarchies. It also shows that a punitive educational orientation in social work weakens or strongly limits the democratic or humanistic ideal. A punitive orientation on the part of the educators is difficult to reconcile with democratic and humanistic educational ideals and furthermore it is connected with an education aimed at adaptation and conformity. It is also clearly related to antidemocratic attitudes of social workers themselves, who in this context act as gatekeepers of the welfare state. Those who demand tougher punishments and discipline and unquestioned adherence to a given framework of norms are more likely to devalue groups that are seen as foreign (e.g. "the Muslims") or deviant (e.g. due to homosexuality) under socially established norms that are subjectively considered important. Punitivity is therefore related to the denial of the democratic ideals of equality and belonging by devaluing certain social groups through negative prejudices. Following these considerations, it will be demonstrated empirically that punitivity is not only detrimental to democratic ideals, but fundamentally contrary to them by devaluing vulnerable groups through punitivity. From this, the following hypotheses can be derived:

1. H1: Respondents who agree with a punitive educational orientation are more likely to show negative prejudices toward certain social groups.
2. H2: There is a relationship between a punitive educational orientation and the devaluation of differing groups.

5   Method

5.1   Execution and Sample

The results are based on data from an online survey conducted in January and February of 2018. With the help of a so-called snowball sampling procedure, the request for participation was sent to colleagues of the two authors, who then forwarded it via their respective networks – mainly in educational, academic, and social work institutions. The survey was thus aimed at a group who can be categorized as "street-level bureaucrats." Out of a total of 266 respondents in this convenience sample, 161 (60.5 %) completed the questionnaire completely. As far as possible, the analyses also include those respondents who completed a large part of the questionnaire; as a result, the sample on which the main analysis is based contains 178 respondents. The majority of the sample consists of students (n=130). The students varied in their studies: social work (44.3 %), educational science (39.4 %) sociology (9.0 %), psychology (3.3 %), and other subjects (4.0 %). The sample also included other social or nursing occupations (10.0 %), and other professions (8.7 %). All occupational groups are included in the calculations.

5.2   Operationalization

Prejudices were operationalized using instruments for measuring group-focused enmity that have been in use for many years and published in numerous studies (Zick, Küpper & Berghan 2019; Zick, Küpper & Krause 2016; Zick & Klein 2014; Zick et al. 2008). The items were answered on a five-point Likert response scale with the following (ad hoc translated) characteristics: 1 = completely disagree, 2 = partly disagree, 3 = partly agree/partly disagree, 4 = partly agree, 5 = completely agree. The following elements of group-focused enmity were captured with two items each: racism, hostility towards foreigners, hostility towards Muslims, devaluation of Sinti and Roma, devaluation of asylum seekers, privileges of the established (or hostility towards newcomers/outsiders), antisemitism, devaluation of the long-term unemployed, devaluation of the homeless, classical sexism, devaluation of trans people, and devaluation of people with disabilities.[1] Two additional items to classical sexism were included to operationalize modern sexism to complement the coverage of classical sexism.

Table 1: Original German wording of the Group Focused-Enmity items and ad-hoc translation in English (means, standard deviations, and Cronbach's alpha values)

Racism (V = RA; M = 1.25; SD = .55; n = 174; α = .61)
Aussiedler sollten besser gestellt sein als Ausländer, da sie deutscher Abstammung sind.
[Resettlers should be treated better than foreigners, because they are of German descent.]
Die Weisen sind zu Recht führend in der Welt. [White people rightly lead the world.]
Hostility towards foreigners (V = HF; M = 1.48; SD = .71; n = 163; α = .77)
Es leben zu viele Ausländer in Deutschland. [There are too many foreigners living in Germany.]

---

[1] GFE follows Allport's (1954) finding that different prejudices cannot be considered as purely separate from each other, but are interrelated. It conceptualizes a syndrome of negative prejudices based on a common core: "In social science, a syndrome is a group of interrelated factors that together form a specific state of conditions. The GFE syndrome encompasses prejudices toward different groups that are, within a stable structure, substantially interrelated over a period of time even though the level of approval can vary across time, cultures, and individuals. They are proposed to be interrelated because they all mirror a generalized devaluation of out-groups" (Zick et al. 2008: 364).

Wenn Arbeitsplatze knapp werden, sollte man die in Deutschland lebenden Ausländer wieder in ihre Heimat zurückschicken. [If a shortage of jobs occurs, foreigners living in Germany should be forced to return to their home country.]

Hostility towards Muslims (V = HM; M = 1.48; SD = .77; n = 163; α = .73)

Durch die vielen Muslime hier fühle ich mich manchmal wie ein Fremder im eigenen Land.

[Because of the large number of Muslims living here, I sometimes feel like a stranger in my own country.]

Muslimen sollte die Zuwanderung nach Deutschland untersagt werden.

[Muslims should be prohibited from immigrating to Germany.]

Hostility towards asylum-seekers (V = HAS; M = 2.36; SD = .90; n = 167; α = .63)

Bei der Prüfung von Asylantragen sollte der Staat großzügig sein.

[The state should be generous in evaluating applications for asylum.]

Die meisten Asylbewerber werden in ihrem Heimatland gar nicht verfolgt.

[Most asylum-seekers are not persecuted in their home country.]

Devaluation of Sinti and Roma (V = SR; M = 1.66; SD = .82; n = 175; α = .78)

Ich hätte Probleme damit, wenn sich Sinti und Roma in meiner Gegend aufhalten.

[I would object to Sinti and Roma being in my area.]

Sinti und Roma neigen zu Kriminalität. [Sinti and Roma have a tendency toward criminal behavior.]

Traditional antisemitism (V = aSt; M = 1.23; SD = .48; n = 165; α = .48)

Juden haben in Deutschland zu viel Einfluss. [Jews have too much influence in Germany.]

Durch ihr Verhalten sind Juden an ihren Verfolgungen mitschuldig.

[Jews are partly to blame for their persecution because of their behavior.]

Modern antisemitism (V = aSm; M = 1.76; SD = .73; n = 154; α = .76)

Viele Juden versuchen, aus der Vergangenheit des Dritten Reiches heute ihren Vorteil zu ziehen.

[Many Jews try to take advantage of the history of the Third Reich today.]

Bei der Politik, die Israel macht, kann ich gut verstehen, dass man etwas gegen Juden hat.

[Due to the politics of Israel, I can understand that people have something against Jews.]

Was der Staat Israel heute mit den Palästinensern macht, ist im Prinzip auch nichts Anderes als das, was die Nazis im Dritten Reich mit den Juden gemacht haben. [What the state of Israel is doing with the Palestinians today is basically the same as what the Nazis did with the Jews in the Third Reich.]

Traditional sexism (V = SXt; M = 1.36; SD = .67; n = 168; α = .70)

Für eine Frau sollte es wichtiger sein, ihrem Mann bei seiner Karriere zu helfen, als selbst Karriere zu machen. [For a woman it should be more important to support her husband in his career than to pursue her own career.]

Frauen sollten sich wieder mehr auf die Rolle der Ehefrau und Mutter besinnen.

[Women should return to the role of housewife and mother.]

Modern sexism (V = SXm; M = 2.09; SD = .79; n = 162; α = .57)

Die Diskriminierung von Frauen ist in Deutschland immer noch ein Problem.

[Discrimination against women is still a problem in Germany.]

Heutzutage werden Frauen im Berufsleben fair behandelt.

[Nowadays, women are treated fairly in the labor force.]

Devaluation of homosexuals (V = HS; M = 1.27; SD = .79; n = 174; α = .89)

Es ist ekelhaft, wenn Homosexuelle sich in der Öffentlichkeit küssen.

[It is disgusting when homosexuals kiss in public.]

Homosexualität ist unmoralisch. [Homosexuality is immoral.]

Devaluation of trans*people (V = TR; M = 1.42; SD = .76; n = 162; α = .73)

Ich finde es albern, wenn ein Mann lieber eine Frau sein will oder umgekehrt, eine Frau lieber ein Mann.

[I find it ridiculous that a man wants to be a woman or the other way around, a woman wants to be a man.]

Transsexuelle und Transgender sollten versuchen, nicht so aufzufallen.

[Transsexuals and transgender people should try not to attract so much attention.]

Devaluation of homeless people (V = HL; M = 1.68; SD = .82; n = 162; α = .73)

Die meisten Obdachlosen sind arbeitsscheu. [Most homeless people are unwilling to work.]

Bettelnde Obdachlose sollten aus den Fußgängerzonen entfernt werden.

[Begging homeless people should be removed from pedestrian zones.]

Devaluation of long-term unemployed (V = LU; M = 2.12; SD = 1.00; n = 168; α = .84)

Die meisten Langzeitarbeitslosen sind nicht wirklich daran interessiert, einen Job zu finden.

[Most long-term unemployed people are not really interested in finding a job.]

Ich finde es empörend, wenn sich die Langzeitarbeitslosen auf Kosten der Gesellschaft ein bequemes Leben machen. [I find it outrageous if long-term unemployed people make a comfortable life at the expense of society.]

Devaluation of people with disability (V = DA; M = 1.24; SD = .45; n = 175; α = .74)

Behinderte erhalten zu viele Vergünstigungen. [Disabled people receive too many benefits.]

Für Behinderte wird in Deutschland zu viel Aufwand betrieben.

[Too much effort is made for disabled people in Germany.]

Hostility towards newcomers/outsiders (V = HN; M = 1.78; SD = .78; n = 175; α = .60)

Wer irgendwo neu ist, sollte sich erst mal mit weniger zufrieden geben.

[Whoever is new somewhere, should be satisfied with less.]

Wer schon immer hier lebt, sollte mehr Rechte haben, als die, die später zugezogen sind.

[Those who have always lived here should have more rights than those who moved here later.]

V = variable acronym, M = mean, SD = standard deviation

Punitive attitudes were operationalized using five items which represent the latent construct of a punitive educational orientation. The construct has already been tested (Pangritz 2019). The internal consistency of the measuring instrument was tested with the aid of exploratory multi-stage scale analysis (oblique rotation) in order to ensure the quality of the results. The measure of punitive educational orientation shows internal consistency (Cronbach's α = .77; M = 2.92; SD = .73).

We also included a measure of authoritarianism to explore the connection between authoritarianism and punitivity, and to test whether the relationship between punitivity and group-focused enmity would hold true when controlling for authoritarianism. For this we used an established nine-item short scale of authoritarianism, the KSA-3 (see Beierlein, Asbrock, Kauff & Schmidt 2014 for a documentation of items and quality criteria). This scale operationalizes the three dimensions – authoritarian aggression, authoritarian submission, and conventionalism – with three items each. Incorporating this measure allows us to differentiate between these dimensions and their connection to punitivity and group-focused enmity. Again a fully verbalized five-point Likert scale was used.

6 Results

First, results of a correlation analysis carried out using SPSS 25 statistics program were reported. As can be seen from Table 2, a punitive educational orientation shows moderate positive correlations with all the elements of GFE. Devaluation of the long-term unemployed (.616**), devaluation of homeless people (.511**) and hostility towards foreigners (.521**) are strongly correlated with punitivity. All correlations (despite the devaluation of homosexuals) are highly significant. This suggests a close relationship between punitivity and group-focused enmity.

Table 2: Correlation coefficients of punitivity and elements of GFE

V	PUN	RA	HF	HM	HAS	SR	aSt	aSm	SXt	SXm	HS	TR	HL	LU	DA	HN
PUN	1															
RA	.36**	1														
HF	.52**	.58**	1													
HM	.45**	.59**	.72**	1												
HAS	.48**	.45**	.63**	.53**	1											
SR	.45**	.46**	.50**	.52**	.50**	1										
aSt	.21**	.31**	.47**	.36**	.29**	.41**	1									
aSm	.34**	.29**	.53**	.38**	.31**	.40**	.61**	1								
SXt	.39**	.50**	.49**	.40**	.28**	.32**	.33**	.35**	1							
SXm	.30**	.26**	.29**	.21**	.22**	.29**	.02	.12	.45**	1						
HS	.19*	.21**	.19*	.15	.10	.19*	.22**	.19*	.56**	.34**	1					
TR	.33**	.45**	.40**	.29**	.24**	.26**	.29**	.33**	.70**	.42**	.69**	1				
HL	.51**	.47**	.68**	.55**	.53**	.49**	.36**	.54**	.46**	.34**	.15	.38**	1			
LU	.61**	.51**	.67**	.55**	.59**	.48**	.32**	.46**	.47**	.36**	.16*	.38**	.71**	1		
DA	.28**	.46**	.43**	.47**	.35**	.33**	.32**	.27**	.37**	.14	.16*	.21**	.33**	.37**	1	
HN	.46**	.51**	.66**	.53**	.55**	.53**	.37**	.32**	.44**	.17*	.24**	.37**	.44**	.45**	.41**	1

N = 178; *p < .05, **p < .01; V = variable acronym

Following the correlation analysis, two multiple linear regression models were tested for each GFE element (dependent variables) individually to test the hypothesized relationship while

controlling for authoritarianism and other relevant constructs. In the first model, punitive educational orientation serves as an independent variable, while age and political orientation (on a left-right scale) serve as control variables. In prejudice research, age and political orientation often prove to be (sociodemographic) influencing factors on prejudices (Zick, Küpper & Berghan 2019). They have been included as independent variables in the regression model so that the influence of the other variables is analyzed while controlling for them. The three dimensions of authoritarianism (authoritarian aggression, submission, and conventionalism; Altemeyer 1981) were added to Model 2 in order to enable the analysis of the changes in the strength of the effect of punitivity between Models 1 and 2.

Table 3. Linear regression analysis of group-focused enmity by age, left/right political orientation, punitivity, authoritarian aggression, authoritarian submission and conventionalism (standardized coefficients, std. error, statistical significance)

		Age	Left/right political orientation	Punitivity	Authoritarian aggression	Authoritarian submission	Conventionalism	Explained variance (Adjusted R^2)	n
Racism	Model 1	-.055 (.004)	.148 (.065)	.296 (.063)***				14.2 %	158
	Model 2	.010 (.004)	.039 (.071)	.117 (.074)	.223 (.085)	-.020 (.078)	.189 (.084)	18.6 %	152
Hostility towards foreigners	Model 1	-.092 (.004)	.266 (.073)**	.381 (.070)***				31.9 %	159
	Model 2	.000 (.004)	.089 (.076)	.148 (.080)	.235 (.091)*	.109 (.084)	.220 (.090)*	42.4 %	153
Hostility towards Muslims	Model 1	.038 (.005)	.231 (.086)**	.352 (.083)***				23.0 %	159
	Model 2	.088 (.006)	.108 (.094)	.203 (.099)*	.145 (.112)	-.042 (.104)	.270 (.111)*	28.0 %	153
Hostility towards asylum seekers	Model 1	.050 (.006)	.322 (.096)***	.343 (.093)***				30.1 %	159
	Model 2	.109 (.006)	.171 (.102)*	.136 (.106)	.284 (.121)*	-.023 (.112)	.219 (.120)*	38.5 %	153
Devaluation of Sinti and Romanies	Model 1	.049 (.006)	.099 (.092)	.432 (.089)***				21.4 %	159
	Model 2	.136 (.006)	.011 (.097)	.232 (.102)*	.338 (.116)**	.009 (.108)	.035 (.115)	26.1 %	153
Traditional antisemitism	Model 1	.147 (.003)	.112 (.053)	.210 (.051)*				6.7 %	156
	Model 2	.197 (.004)*	.033 (.060)	.084 (.063)	.127 (.072)	.011 (.066)	.135 (.070)	7.7 %	151
Modern antisemitism	Model 1	.036 (.005)	.120 (.086)	.300 (.085)**				11.6 %	150
	Model 2	.057 (.006)	-.023 (.096)	.153 (.101)	.220 (.115)	-.066 (.106)	.239 (.112)*	17.5 %	145
Traditional sexism	Model 1	-.071 (.005)	.131 (.074)	.337 (.071)***				16.9 %	159
	Model 2	-.029 (.005)	.037 (.083)	.208 (.087)*	.160 (.099)	.018 (.092)	.126 (.098)	18.8 %	153
Modern sexism	Model 1	-.202 (006)**	.249 (.091)**	.160 (.088)*				17.2 %	159
	Model 2	-.142 (.006)	.183 (.100)*	.010 (.105)	.094 (.119)	.115 (.110)	.088 (.118)	18.3 %	153
Devaluation of homosexuals	Model 1	.167 (.005)*	.204 (.083)*	.131 (.080)				7.7 %	158
	Model 2	.197 (.006)*	.153 (.095)	.040 (.099)	.152 (.113)	-.043 (.104)	.075 (.112)	7.7 %	152

Devaluation of trans*people	Model 1	.065 (.005)	.236 (.087)**	.237 (.084)**				14.1 %	159
	Model 2	.110 (.006)	.169 (.098)	.104 (.102)	.156 (.117)	.015 (.108)	.095 (.116)	15.0 %	153
Devaluation of homeless people	Model 1	-.165 (.005)*	.160 (.087)*	.413 (.084)***				29.6 %	158
	Model 2	-.055 (.005)	-.074 (.082)	.094 (.087)	.426 (.098)***	.010 (.092)	.306 (.099)**	50.4 %	152
Devaluation of long-term unemployed	Model 1	-.132 (.006)*	.265 (.094)***	.473 (.091)***				44.0 %	159
	Model 2	-.054 (.006)	.137 (.099)	.272 (.103)**	.348 (.118)**	.018 (.109)	.068 (.117)	50.3 %	153
Devaluation of people with disability	Model 1	.045 (.003)	.030 (.053)	.278 (.051)**				6.6 %	159
	Model 2	.064 (.004)	-.031 (.060)	.211 (.063)*	.061 (.072)	-.080 (.067)	.190 (.071)	6.6 %	153
Hostility towards newcomers/outsiders	Model 1	.111 (.005)	.226 (.086)**	.370 (.083)***				24.2 %	159
	Model 2	.184 (.006)*	.129 (.096)	.211 (.100)*	.111 (.114)	.217 (.106)	.014 (.113)	26.9 %	153

$*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.$

In the first regression models, punitivity has a hypothesis-compliant significant effect across all elements (despite devaluation of homosexuals). Respondents who harbor punitive educational orientations consistently show higher values in nearly all elements of GFE. Taking authoritarianism into account in the following regression models, six elements still show significant correlations: hostility towards Muslims (.203*), devaluation of Sinti and Roma (.232*), devaluation of the long-term unemployed (.272**), hostility towards newcomers/outsiders (.211*), traditional sexism (.208*) and the devaluation of people with disabilities (.211*). This speaks for the predictive power of punitive orientation on negative prejudices but we can also see a close interplay of punitive and authoritarian orientations. If the dimensions of authoritarianism are added, the effect of punitivity on some GFE elements is reduced. At the same time, authoritarian aggression (which has significant connections to the devaluation of Sinti and Roma, devaluation of asylum seekers, devaluation of long-term unemployed, devaluation of the homeless, and hostility towards foreigners) and conventionalism (with significant links to hostility towards Muslims, devaluation of asylum seekers, hostility towards foreigners, devaluation of the homeless and modern antisemitism) are relevant factors influencing GFE. It is also noticeable that no predictor has a significant relationship with GFE in two of the second models (racism, devaluation of trans*people) but the whole model is still significant in these cases. Therefore, we conclude that multicollinearity between the different independent variables might play a role. In general the punitive educational orientation does, however, have acceptable (but not too high) correlations with the three dimensions of authoritarianism (.638** with authoritarian aggression; .584** with submission; .474** conventionalism), showing that the constructs are closely related but still distinct from each other.[2] The conceptualization of the relationship between authoritarianism and punitivity still seems to be a desideratum and needs further theoretical and empirical consideration. However, the empirical closeness of authoritarianism and a punitive educational orientation further constitutes that this educational orientation is in contradiction to humanistic educational ideals like maturity, autonomy, and participation.

7 Conclusion

The results show that a punitive educational orientation is positively related to antidemocratic attitudes in the form of prejudices, and can also be seen as a predictor of them. Even after the addition of theory-related constructs such as authoritarianism, punitivity remains an explanatory variable for a number of prejudices. A close relationship between punitivity and authoritarianism is evident but still needs further analysis. Our analysis does have its limitations. Because we used a convenience sample, we cannot generalize our results to society as a whole. Furthermore, the data is cross-sectional and the analysis is, therefore, correlational, which precludes causal testing of our hypotheses.

Our results are particularly relevant for the gatekeeper function of social work, in that it functions as a bridge to the welfare state and has involvement in implementation and concrete management of the welfare state. If the former ideal of resocialization is abandoned in favor of a punitive orientation, this risks actively devaluing the addressees of social work. In this

---

[2] However, there seems to be multicollinearity within authoritarianism. The three dimensions correlate significantly with each other: authoritarian aggression with submission = .748***; authoritarian aggression with conventionalism = .691***; authoritarian submission with conventionalism = .656***. Calculated with a single authoritarianism scale that incorporates all nine items without differentiating between the three dimensions, the regression coefficients of this scale are significant and the scale predicts the GFE constructs in question. We decided against working with this single scale because that would mean losing information about the relevance of the different dimensions of authoritarianism and their influence in the models.

way, social work reproduces and reinforces precisely those relationships of power and domination that social policy seeks to avoid. Our results indicate that a punitive attitude and consequent practice can also be understood here as an "antidemocratic educational practice" that promotes and supports social hierarchies, is focused on normative conventions, and devalues vulnerable groups. It stands in contrast to democratic ideals of equality and belonging. The analysis of this change is, therefore, fundamental when considering citizenship. Punitivity can serve here as a mechanism to clearly express who does not belong and who does; who is equal and who is not.

References

Adorno, T. W. (1982). *Erziehung zur Mündigkeit*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Allport, G.W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge: Preseus Books.

Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada: University of Manitoba Press.

Beierlein, C., Asbrock, F., Kauff, M., & Schmidt, P. (2014). *Die Kurzskala Autoritarismus (KSA-3): Ein ökonomisches Messinstrument zur Erfassung dreier Subdimensionen autoritärer Einstellungen. Zusammenfassung sozialwissenschaftlicher Items und Skalen*. Retrieved August 2019, from: https://zis.gesis.org/pdfFiles/Dokumentation/Beierlein_Kurzskala_Autoritarismus_v1.01.pdf

Benner, D. & Brüggen, F. (2004). Mündigkeit. In D. Benner & J. Oelkers (Eds.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Pädagogik* (pp. 687-699). Weinheim, Basel: Beltz.

Clark, Z., & Schwerthelm, M. (2017). Manualisiertes Strafen oder demokratisches Verzeihen? Von den Möglichkeiten und Bedingungen des Verzeihens in der stationären Heimerziehung. *Sozial Extra*, *41*(5), 15-18.

Dollinger, B. (2008). Problem attribution and intervention. The interpretation of problem causations and solutions in regard of Brickman et al. *European Journal of Social Work, 11*(3), 279-294.

Dollinger, B. (2011a). Punitivität in der Diskussion. Konzeptionelle, theoretische und empirische Referenzen. In B. Dollinger & H. Schmidt-Semisch (Eds.), *Gerechte Ausgrenzung? Wohlfahrtsproduktion und die neue Lust am Strafen* (pp. 25-73). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Dollinger, B. (2011b). Punitive Pädagogen? Eine empirische Differenzierung von Erziehungs- und Strafeinstellungen. *Zeitschrift für Sozialpädagogik, 9*(3), 228-247.

Dollinger, B. (2017). „Sicherheit" als konstitutive Referenz der Sozialpädagogik. Begriffliche und konzeptionelle Annäherungen. *Soziale Passagen, 9*(13), 213-227.

Dollinger, B., & Raithel, J. (2005). Problematisierungsformen sozialpädagogischer Praxis: Eine empirische Annährung an Einstellungen zu sozialen Problemen und ihrer Bearbeitung. *Soziale Probleme*, *16*(2), 92-111.

Häßler, U., & Greve, W. (2012). Bestrafen wir Erkan härter als Stefan? Befunde einer experimentellen Studie. *Soziale Probleme*, *23*(2), 167-181.

Klein, A., & Groß, E. (2011). Gerechte Abwertung? Gerechtigkeitsorientierungen und ihre Implikationen für schwache Gruppen. In B. Dollinger & H. Schmidt-Semisch (Eds.), *Gerechte Ausgrenzung? Wohlfahrtsproduktion und die neue Lust am Strafen* (pp. 145-165). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Kury, H., Brandenstein, M., & Obergfell-Fuchs, J. (2009). Dimension of punitiveness in Germany. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research, 15*(1-2), 63-81.

Lautmann, R., & Klinke, D. (2004). Punitivität als Schlüsselbegriff für eine Kritische Kriminologie. *Kriminologisches Journal. Beiheft, 36*(8: Punitivität), 9-29.

Lutz, T. (2017). Sicherheit und Kriminalität aus Sicht der Sozialen Arbeit: Neujustierungen im Risiko- und Kontrolldiskurs. *Soziale Passagen, 9*(2), 283-297.

Lutz, T., & Ziegler, H. (2005). Soziale Arbeit im Post-Wohlfahrtsstaat - Bewahrer oder Totengräber des Rehabilitationsideals? *Widersprüche: Zeitschrift für sozialistische Politik im Bildungs-, Gesundheits- und Sozialbereich*, *25*(97), 123-134.

Mansel, J. (2004). Wiederkehr autoritärer Aggression. Soziale Desintegration und gruppenbezogene Menschenfeindlichkeit. *Kriminologisches Journal. Beiheft, 36*(8: Punitivität), 105-137.

Markusen, A. (2003). Fuzzy concepts, scanty evidence, policy distance: The case for rigour and policy relevance in critical regional studies. *Regional Studies, 37*(6-7), 701-717.

Matthews, R. (2005). The myth of punitiveness. *Theoretical Criminology, 9*(2), 175-201.

Mohr, S. (2017). *Abschied vom Managerialismus. Zum Verhältnis von Organisation und Profession in der Sozialen Arbeit*. Bielefeld: Universität Bielefeld. Retrieved May 2019, from: https://pub.uni-bielefeld.de/record/2908758

Mohr, S., & Ziegler, H. (2012). Professionelle Haltungen, sozialpädagogische Praxis und Organisationskultur. *Schriftenreihe EREV, 53*(2), 20-30.

Mühler, K., & Schmidtke, C. (2012). Warum es sich lohnt, Alltagstheorien zum Strafen ernst zu nehmen: zur Vermittlung zwischen autoritären Einstellungen und Strafverlangen. *Soziale Probleme*, *23*(2), 133-166.

Oelkers, N. (2013). Punitive Haltungen in der Sozialen Arbeit. Kontroll- und Straforientierungen im Umgang mit Abweichenden und Wohlfahrtsempfängern bei Studierenden der Sozialen Arbeit. *Sozial Extra, 37*(9-10), 34-38.

Oesterreich, D. (2005). Flight into security: A new approach and measure of the authoritarian personality. *Political Psychology, 26*(2), 275–298.

Pangritz, J. (2019): Fürsorgend und doch hegemonial? Zum Verhältnis von Männlichkeit, Feminisierung und Punitivität in pädagogischen Kontexten. *Gender (forthcoming)*

Stehr, J. (2014). Repressionsunternehmen Konfrontative Pädagogik. Vom Versuch, Soziale Arbeit zu einer Straf- und Unterwerfungsinstanz umzubauen und dies als Hilfe und Unterstützung zu verkaufen. *Sozial Extra, 38*(5), 43-45.

Wacquant, L. (2009). *Punishing the poor. The neoliberal government of social insecurity*. Durham, London: Duke University Press.

Zick, A., & Klein, A. (2014). *Fragile Mitte – Feindselige Zustände. Rechtsextreme Einstellungen in Deutschland 2014* (published on behalf of the Friedrich Ebert Foundation by Ralf Melzer). Bonn: Dietz.

Zick, A., Küpper, B., & Berghan, W. (2019). *Verlorene Mitte – Feindselige Zustände. Rechtsextreme Einstellungen in Deutschland 2018/19* (published on behalf of the Friedrich Ebert Foundation by Franziska Schröter). Bonn: Dietz.

Zick, A., Kupper, B., & Krause, D. (2016). *Gespaltene Mitte – Feindselige Zustände. Rechtsextreme Einstellungen in Deutschland 2016* (published on behalf of the Friedrich Ebert Foundation by Ralf Melzer). Bonn: Dietz.

Zick, A., Wolf, C., Küpper, B., Davidov, E., Schmidt, P., & Heitmeyer, W. (2008). The syndrom of group-focused enmity: The interrelation of prejudices tested with multiple cross-sectional and panel data. *Journal of Social Issues, 64*(2), 363-383.

Ziegler, H., & Scherr, A. (2013). Hilfe statt Strafe? Zur Bedeutung punitiver Orientierungen in der Sozialen Arbeit. *Soziale Probleme*, *24*(1), 118-136.

Author's Address:
Johanna Pangritz, MA, Dipl. Päd.
Bielefeld University, Germany
Faculty of Educational Science, Institute for Interdisciplinary Conflict and Violence
Researchjohanna.pangritz@uni-bielefeld.de

Author's Address:
Wilhelm Berghan, MA Educational Science
Bielefeld University, Germany
Faculty of Educational Science, Institute for Interdisciplinary Conflict and Violence Research
wberghan@uni-bielefeld.de