5.11 Environmental Crime Prevention: Broken Windows and Zero Tolerance Policing: 30-minute Pack

AQA 8192 · about 30 minutes

Total Marks

Name: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / _____

Answer ALL questions. Write full sentences for questions worth 4 marks or more. Use sociological terms where appropriate.

1 Explain one ethical concern about zero tolerance policing in relation to human rights or fairness in a diverse urban neighbourhood.

(Total for Question 1 is 2 marks)

2 Explain two reasons proponents give for why zero tolerance policing might reduce petty crime in city neighbourhoods.

(Total for Question 2 is 4 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

3 Discuss how far sociologists would agree that zero tolerance policing is an effective response to crime in urban neighbourhoods. In your answer, consider different sociological perspectives, evidence about outcomes, and possible social consequences. Reach a supported judgement.

(Total for Question 3 is 12 marks)

---

4 Define the term 'environmental crime prevention' as used in neighbourhood policing contexts.

(Total for Question 4 is 2 marks)

---

5 Identify and explain two features of zero tolerance policing as it was applied in neighbourhoods inspired by 1990s New York policing.

(Total for Question 5 is 4 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Mark scheme · 5.11 Environmental Crime Prevention: Broken Windows and Zero Tolerance Policing: 30-minute Pack

Question 1

identifies an ethical concern, e.g. risk of discriminatory enforcement against ethnic minorities or the homeless	**B1**
develops the concern, e.g. this can lead to breaches of fairness and equal treatment, and may raise human rights questions about targeting vulnerable groups	**B1**

Answer: An ethical concern is discriminatory enforcement, where ethnic minorities or the homeless may be targeted more often, leading to unfair treatment and human rights questions about policing vulnerable groups.

Question 2

identifies a reason, e.g. deterrence: visible enforcement and punishments deter would-be petty offenders	**B1**
develops reason, e.g. immediate consequences for minor acts send a signal that disorder will not be tolerated	**B1**
identifies a second reason, e.g. broken windows logic: removing signs of disorder reduces cues that encourage petty crime	**B1**
develops second reason, e.g. repaired environment can increase guardianship by residents and businesses, reducing opportunities for petty offences	**B1**

Answer: Proponents argue deterrence, where visible enforcement and immediate consequences deter petty offenders, and the broken windows logic, where removing signs of disorder reduces cues encouraging petty crime and increases guardianship by residents and businesses.

Question 3

Level 1 Basic statements about zero tolerance with little development. Limited sociological knowledge and few or no contrasting perspectives. Conclusion, if any, is weak or absent.	**1-3**
Level 2 Some relevant sociological points and at least one perspective presented. Some use of evidence about outcomes or criticisms, but limited depth. A simple judgement is offered with limited support.	**4-6**
Level 3 Clear discussion including at least two sociological perspectives and some evidence. Considers benefits such as reduced petty crime and criticisms such as displacement or discriminatory effects. Produces a supported judgement.	**7-9**
Level 4 Thorough, balanced discussion drawing on several perspectives and evidence. Analyses strengths and limitations of zero tolerance, including long term social consequences, community relations and structural causes of crime. Reaches a well-reasoned and supported conclusion that acknowledges uncertainty and trade offs.	**10-12**

Indicative content:

- Functionalist or New Right style arguments that visible order and strict enforcement can restore social norms and deter crime, citing reductions in petty offences as supportive evidence
- Empirical evidence claimed by some studies, such as reductions in vandalism or subway crime in specific cases, and the need to weigh correlation versus causation
- Criticisms from conflict and Marxist-informed perspectives that zero tolerance criminalises poverty and targets marginalised groups, producing discriminatory outcomes
- Feminist or community-oriented critiques that over-enforcement damages trust between police and communities and can reduce cooperation needed to tackle serious crime
- Discussion of displacement versus genuine reduction in crime, and the difficulty of attributing long term fall in serious crime to zero tolerance alone due to other factors like economic change, demographic shifts or policing technology
- Ethical and human rights considerations, including proportionality, fairness and impacts on vulnerable groups such as the homeless
- Consideration of alternatives, for example community policing, environmental design, and social investment to address root causes
- A balanced conclusion that recognises zero tolerance may reduce some visible disorder and reassure parts of the community, but also has significant risks and limitations and should not be the sole response to urban crime

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Question 4

identifies that environmental crime prevention is changing the physical or social environment to reduce crime (oe)	**B1**
development, e.g. examples such as improving street lighting, removing graffiti, or clearing litter to reduce opportunities and signals for crime	**B1**

Answer: Environmental crime prevention is changing the physical or social environment to reduce crime, for example improving lighting, removing graffiti or clearing litter to reduce opportunities and signals for offending.

Question 5

identifies a feature, e.g. rigorous enforcement of minor offences such as public drinking or subway fare evasion	**B1**
explains how it works, e.g. policing minor disorder is intended to prevent escalation into more serious crimes by restoring order	**B1**
identifies a second feature, e.g. high police visibility and proactive stop-and-search or stop-and-question actions	**B1**
explains how it works, e.g. visible policing is intended to deter both minor and potential serious offenders and reassure residents	**B1**

Answer: Features include rigorous enforcement of minor offences, such as public drinking or fare evasion, intended to prevent escalation into more serious crimes; and high visible policing, including proactive stops, intended to deter offenders and reassure residents.

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk