Order, Opportunity, and Consequences: What Urban Crime Policy and School Discipline Have in Common

J. Christian Edgar, EdD

December 18, 2025

Introduction

Debates about crime policy in the United States are often framed as ideological battles—"law and order" versus "social justice," enforcement versus compassion. Yet this framing obscures a more fundamental reality: crime, especially violent crime, is largely **opportunistic**, and human behavior responds predictably to **signals about risk and consequence**. The question is not whether social welfare programs or long-term reforms are valuable, but whether **order is established first** so that those reforms can function.

This paper argues that effective crime reduction depends less on ideology and more on **deterrence through consistent enforcement**, particularly at the lower levels of disorder that signal permissiveness. Using New York City's adoption of Broken Windows policing in the 1990s and the contemporary divergence between Dallas and Fort Worth as real-world examples, this paper demonstrates that when consequences are predictable, crime declines—and when enforcement is selectively withdrawn, crime increases. Finally, this framework is applied to a high school setting, where similar dynamics play out daily in the absence of consistent discipline for minor infractions.

Opportunistic Crime and the Logic of Deterrence

Criminological research has long shown that most crime is not the result of elaborate planning, ideological motivation, or moral deliberation. Instead, it emerges from opportunity. Routine Activity Theory posits that crime occurs when three elements converge: a motivated offender, a suitable target, and the absence of a capable guardian (Cohen & Felson, 1979). Remove any one of these elements, and crime becomes less likely.

Deterrence theory further refines this framework by emphasizing that **certainty of punishment**, not severity, is the most powerful inhibitor of criminal behavior (Beccaria, 1764; Nagin, 2013). Offenders—especially repeat offenders—are acutely sensitive to whether consequences are likely, immediate, and consistent. When enforcement is perceived as inconsistent or unlikely, opportunistic behavior flourishes.

Importantly, deterrence does not require moral reform. It does not assume that offenders suddenly internalize societal values. It simply alters the **cost-benefit calculation** in the moment. This distinction is critical and often misunderstood in contemporary debates.

New York City in the 1990s: Broken Windows in Practice

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, New York City faced staggering levels of violent crime. In 1990 alone, the city recorded more than 2,200 homicides. Public spaces were characterized by disorder: fare evasion, vandalism, public drug use, and aggressive panhandling were widespread. Confidence in public safety was low.

Beginning in the early 1990s, NYC implemented a multifaceted enforcement strategy under Mayor Rudolph Giuliani and Police Commissioner William Bratton. Central to this strategy was **Broken Windows policing**, based on the theory articulated by Wilson and Kelling (1982), which argued that visible disorder communicates a lack of control and invites more serious crime.

Key components included:

- Aggressive enforcement of low-level offenses
- Increased police visibility
- Data-driven accountability through CompStat
- Strong coordination with prosecutors and courts
- Swift consequences for repeat offenders

The results were dramatic. Between 1990 and 2000, homicides fell by roughly 70%, and violent crime declined across every major category (Zimring, 2011). While scholars debate the relative contribution of demographic shifts, economic improvements, and environmental factors (such as reduced lead exposure), there is broad consensus that **increased enforcement certainty played a meaningful role**.

Crucially, Broken Windows was not primarily about punishing poverty. It was about **reasserting guardianship**—making it clear that public norms would be enforced and that escalation would not be tolerated. For opportunistic offenders, this changed behavior rapidly.

Dallas and Fort Worth: A Modern Natural Experiment

A contemporary illustration of the same principles can be found in North Texas. Dallas and Fort Worth are geographically close, economically intertwined, and demographically similar in many respects. Yet in recent years, their approaches to criminal justice—and their outcomes—have diverged.

Dallas County, under District Attorney John Creuzot, adopted policies aimed at reducing incarceration for low-level offenses. These included:

- Declining prosecution for certain categories of crimes
- Expanded diversion programs
- Higher thresholds for filing charges
- Reduced reliance on bail and pretrial detention

The philosophical goal was equity and decarceration. However, following these changes, Dallas experienced notable increases in violent crime and property crime. Law enforcement agencies reported reduced morale, decreased proactive policing, and repeat offenders cycling quickly back onto the streets.

By contrast, neighboring Tarrant County (Fort Worth) maintained a more traditional prosecutorial approach:

- Greater likelihood of charges being filed
- Less tolerance for repeat offenders
- Stronger alignment between police, prosecutors, and judges
- Clear messaging that criminal behavior would carry consequences

While Fort Worth is not crime-free, its crime trends have remained more stable than Dallas's. Importantly, offenders appear to recognize these differences. Jurisdictional "shopping"—where offenders operate in areas perceived as more lenient—is a well-documented phenomenon (Cook et al., 2015).

This comparison reinforces a core insight: **criminal behavior responds quickly to enforcement signals**, even when broader social conditions remain unchanged.

Why Leniency at the Margins Produces Escalation

One of the most common errors in modern reform efforts is the assumption that so-called “low-level” offenses are inconsequential. In reality, these offenses are often:

- Committed by repeat offenders
- Predictive of escalation
- Highly visible signals of enforcement strength

When minor offenses go unaddressed, they communicate permissiveness. This does not merely fail to stop crime—it actively **lowers the perceived risk of escalation**. Broken Windows policing recognized this dynamic decades ago, and the Dallas–Fort Worth contrast illustrates its persistence.

The withdrawal of enforcement does not eliminate criminal motivation; it removes the guardian.

Applying These Principles to High School Settings

The same behavioral dynamics that govern urban crime apply strikingly well to schools. High schools are not immune to opportunism, boundary testing, or escalation. Students—particularly adolescents—are acutely sensitive to norms, consistency, and enforcement.

In many schools today, administrators intentionally minimize discipline for minor infractions such as:

- Dress code violations
- Cell phone use (even where prohibited by state law)
- Tardiness and absenteeism
- Failure to wear IDs
- Classroom disruption

The intent is often compassionate: to avoid exclusionary discipline, reduce disparities, and keep students engaged. However, the outcome frequently mirrors what happens in permissive criminal justice systems.

Minor rule violations go unaddressed. Students quickly learn that:

- Rules exist mostly on paper

- Consequences are unlikely
- Escalation is tolerated until it becomes unavoidable

As a result, schools experience:

- Increased classroom disruption
- More serious behavioral incidents
- Greater strain on teachers
- Reduced instructional time
- Declining perceptions of safety

This is not a failure of student character; it is a **failure of structure**.

Just as in policing, school discipline works best when:

- Expectations are clear
- Enforcement is consistent
- Consequences are predictable
- Interventions occur early

Addressing dress code violations or cell phone use is not about control for its own sake. It is about **establishing authority, predictability, and order** so that learning—and support—can occur.

Order as the Precondition for Support

Both criminal justice and education policy often fall into the same sequencing error: attempting to deploy support systems in environments that lack basic order. Social services, counseling, restorative practices, and academic interventions are all valuable—but they require a stable environment to function.

In chaotic schools, just as in high-crime neighborhoods:

- Trust erodes
- Compliance declines
- Authority weakens

- Outcomes worsen

The lesson from NYC, Fort Worth, and countless schools is not that compassion fails. It is that **compassion without structure is ineffective**.

Order Maintenance in Schools: Evidence Beyond Analogy

Skeptics of applying order-maintenance concepts to schools often argue that comparisons between criminal behavior and student misbehavior are merely rhetorical. However, education research directly supports the core behavioral mechanism underlying Broken Windows theory: visible disorder weakens norms, increases opportunistic misbehavior, and accelerates escalation. This relationship has been empirically documented within school environments, independent of criminal justice analogies.

Disorder and Misbehavior in Schools: Direct Evidence

One of the most explicit applications of Broken Windows logic to education appears in research published in the *American Journal of Education*. Plank, Bradshaw, and Young (2009) examined the relationship between physical disorder (graffiti, vandalism, poorly maintained facilities, and disorderly spaces) and social disorder (student misbehavior, aggression, and rule violations). They also analyzed the effects of disorder on fear and collective efficacy—the shared belief among students and staff that adults can maintain order.

Their findings demonstrate a direct association between physical disorder and student misbehavior, even after controlling for demographic and socioeconomic factors. Importantly, disorder was not merely a byproduct of misbehavior; it actively shaped expectations about norms and enforcement. Schools with higher levels of visible disorder exhibited weaker collective efficacy and higher levels of social disorder, consistent with Broken Windows theory (Plank et al., 2009).

This evidence is especially useful in addressing concerns about correlation. The pattern observed in cities—disorder signaling permissiveness and inviting escalation—has been empirically documented inside schools themselves. This is not analogy by metaphor, but by mechanism.

PBIS as an Outcomes-Based Model of Order Maintenance

A concrete, outcomes-based example of order maintenance in education is Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). PBIS represents one of

the most rigorously studied behavior frameworks in K–12 education and operationalizes the same logic as Broken Windows while avoiding its political baggage.

PBIS emphasizes:

- Clearly defined behavioral expectations (hallways, classrooms, transitions, phones, IDs)
- Immediate and consistent correction of minor infractions
- Ongoing data monitoring to identify behavioral "hot spots"
- Tiered supports for students with chronic or high-risk behavior

A large multi-year randomized controlled trial found that schools implementing PBIS experienced fewer office discipline referrals, lower levels of aggressive and disruptive behavior, and improved prosocial behavior compared to control schools (Bradshaw, Mitchell, & Leaf, 2010). These improvements occurred without an increase in exclusionary discipline.

Functionally, PBIS operates as a school-based version of CompStat: track patterns of disorder, deploy adult presence strategically, reinforce expectations consistently, and intervene early before escalation. Its strength lies in combining structure with support, making it highly defensible in education settings.

Authoritative School Climate: Structure Paired with Support

Another research-backed framework that aligns with order-maintenance principles is authoritative school climate, developed by Dewey Cornell and colleagues. This model distinguishes between authoritarian discipline (harsh, punitive, inconsistent) and authoritative discipline, which combines high structure with high student support.

An authoritative school climate is characterized by:

- Rules that are enforced consistently and fairly
- Adults who are perceived as respectful, caring, and legitimate
- Predictable consequences rather than arbitrary punishment

Multiple studies have found that authoritative school climate is associated with lower levels of aggression and misbehavior, greater student engagement, and improved academic outcomes (Cornell, Shukla, & Konold, 2016). This framework is particularly valuable because it rejects the false dichotomy between strict discipline and compassion.

The evidence suggests that predictable boundaries and strong relationships are mutually reinforcing, not contradictory.

Conclusion

Crime policy and school discipline are often treated as separate domains, but they are governed by the same human behaviors. Opportunism, boundary testing, and sensitivity to consequences are universal. Whether on city streets or school hallways, environments that lack consistent enforcement invite escalation.

New York City's experience in the 1990s and the present-day contrast between Dallas and Fort Worth demonstrate that **order precedes reform**. Predictable enforcement does not eliminate the need for social programs or support systems—it enables them.

For policymakers, educators, and administrators, the implication is clear: restoring order is not regressive or cruel. It is foundational. Without it, even the best intentions collapse under the weight of unchecked opportunism.

Disclosure: This essay was drafted and revised with assistance from an AI-based writing tool for organization and citation support. All arguments, interpretations, and conclusions are the author's.

References

Beccaria, C. (1764). *On Crimes and Punishments*.
Bradshaw, C. P., Mitchell, M. M., & Leaf, P. J. (2010). Examining the effects of schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports on student outcomes. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 12(3), 133–148.

Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review*, 44(4), 588–608.
Cook, P. J., Braga, A. A., & Turchan, B. (2015). When prevention and punishment compete: A short-run analysis of firearm arrests and gun crime. *Journal of Public Economics*, 121, 45–59.
Cornell, D., Shukla, K., & Konold, T. (2016). Authoritative school climate and student academic engagement, grades, and aspirations. *Journal of School Psychology*, 58, 9–24.

Nagin, D. S. (2013). Deterrence in the twenty-first century. *Crime and Justice*, 42(1), 199–263.
Plank, S. B., Bradshaw, C. P., & Young, H. (2009). An application of “broken windows” and related theories to the study of disorder, fear, and collective efficacy in schools. *American Journal of Education*, 115(2), 227–247.

Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. L. (1982). Broken windows. *The Atlantic*.
Zimring, F. E. (2011). *The City That Became Safe: New York’s Lessons for Urban Crime and Its Control*. Oxford University Press.