

# 'Risk' and the challenges in moving beyond marginalizing frameworks

*Grace Gordon and Robert Webb*

---

This chapter examines the development and application of risk approaches over the last three decades in various criminal justice jurisdictions. It draws attention to how the deployment of risk-based responses and interventions has particular consequences for the development of crime control policies aimed at Indigenous peoples and ethnic minority populations. Critical research has identified systemic racism and disproportionate levels of criminal justice interventions in Indigenous communities in settler states as a product of colonialism and systemic discrimination (Anthony, 2013; Cunneen & Tauri, 2016; Jackson, 1988). Yet, in examining the development of crime control policies in recent decades, it is possible to observe the ways some state criminal justice agencies have favoured explanations that emphasize individualistic causes and factors. Illustrative examples from the US, the UK, Australia, and Aotearoa New Zealand (NZ) are presented, highlighting the differing conceptions of risk factors and criminogenic needs and associated assessment tools that emerge in criminal justice and correctional practices that impact Indigenous and minority communities. These risk frameworks ignore the wider social and structural inequalities that exist in society and thus their impact on criminalization and victimization.

This exploration and discussion of risk in state policies and its disproportionate impact on minority and Indigenous populations draws upon a critical criminology lens (Cunneen & Tauri, 2016) to discuss the growth of administrative practices that rationalize and maintain punitive crime control policies in the international context. There is also a history of colonial and neo-colonial state policies that negatively impact Indigenous peoples globally, which necessitates a critical understanding of state social control practices.

The first section examines the theoretical basis of risk and the growing developments of risk-based approaches internationally in criminal justice settings. The second section outlines various issues with reliance on risk and algorithms in determining future actions and we argue that the deployment of state and agency policies and practices has particular consequences for Indigenous communities and young people, racialized ethnic minorities, and marginalized youth. Thirdly, we examine how within the discursive risk formulation of groups that are viewed to be vulnerable to harm, members of these groups are also potentially considered a future risk to others in society, and how this justifies intervention by the

state welfare and criminal justice apparatus. Lastly, we propose that the decolonization of risk requires challenging and rethinking the ongoing harm that risk policies and practices cause to Indigenous and racialized minority populations.

## Theorizing risk

Risk discourses have continued to expand and feature in many areas of social life globally. Regarding the justice system, risk is commonly associated with the predictability of future events (most notably, recidivism), but can also be used to label people based on their perceived dangerousness and riskiness. Additionally, risk can be framed as a mode of governance, demonstrating the way risk is managed, controlled, or governed by states or individuals (Werth, 2019). Risk will be discussed through these three frameworks throughout this chapter.

Risk logics have become increasingly pervasive and demonstrate the expansion of our consciousness of risk (Pratt & Anderson, 2020). The prioritization of risk within the justice system can be demonstrated through the movement in the last three decades toward what has been characterized as the ‘new penology’ by Feeley and Simon (1992). This involves managing prison populations under a ‘culture of control’ (Garland, 2001), alongside the development of correctional assessments which Carlen (2008) describes as “risk-crazed governance” (p. 1). Through this period, alongside the presumption in rehabilitation that ‘nothing works’, the justice system adapted its rehabilitative and welfarist approach. Instead, the focus was on efficiency and effectiveness in addressing crime and protecting the community (O’Malley, 2010; Phoenix, 2009). New forms of managerialism in crime control responses were introduced across many countries such as the UK, the US, Australia, and NZ to manage and control risk.

Rising concern about risk has encouraged multiple strategies for addressing the ‘problem’. Clear and Cadora (2001) identified risk reduction, risk management, and risk control as commonly utilized strategies. Risk reduction prioritizes intervention programmes that seek to rehabilitate risky people. Risk management utilizes managerial techniques, with a focus on people categorized as high risk. Lastly, risk control relies on exerting control over people through punitive approaches. Within this approach, the “primary intent is thus containment, not change” (Clear & Cadora, 2001, p. 59). In a society that is fixated on risk aversion, risk reduction and risk management may not provide certainty in terms of eliminating risk. Therefore, risk control is favoured, due to its ability to give higher assurance that risk will be contained.

Pat O’Malley (2008) argues that the emergence of risk paradigms coincided with the rise in neoliberal politics. Neoliberal assumptions are reinforced through the prioritization of self-management of risk (Carlen, 2012; Kendall, 2013). Risk management approaches such as “responsibilisation” (Gray, 2005, p. 938) and the “individualization of risk” (Furlong & Cartmel, 2007, p. 6) function to make people responsible for managing their own risk levels (Gray, 2005). These approaches intend to be empowering and encourage people to have agency through their self-management of risk. As Anthony (2013) notes, “[t]his presumes that offenders exercise freedom and choice in committing offences. In the instance of Indigenous offenders, the state and judiciary not only regard offenders as disavowing their responsibility, but also impute irresponsibility to the Indigenous community” (p. 74). Critics argue that individual responsibility for risk management ignores broader structural issues that trap people in positions of social and economic disadvantage (Furlong & Cartmel, 2007; Gray, 2009). This inevitably restricts a person’s ability to negotiate and manage the risk. Individual-level interventions are prioritized, which limits the potential for structural change, and thus as Gray (2009) notes it reinforces social marginalization:

When transformation becomes synonymous with individual empowerment or responsabilization without simultaneous attempts to remove structural barriers, it acts as a strategy of social discipline and regulation which simply reinforces and deepens social inequality and injustice.

(pp. 452–453)

Two simultaneous processes of responsabilization and de-responsibilization occur. While individuals are increasingly held responsible for self-managing their risk, the actors within the justice system experience 'de-responsibilization' (Hannah-Moffat, 2016). Policymakers, police, judges, lawyers, correctional officers, and parole board members can influence the experiences of those who go through the justice system. This can be through risk-based decisions to divert someone from the justice system, the length of time someone may spend in prison, and whether someone is released from prison. Through the de-responsibilization process, they evade the responsibility for the consequences of their decision-making (Hannah-Moffat, 2016).

Algorithmic-based risk assessments were introduced to supposedly assist in standardization and transparency of decision-making around risk (Eckhouse et al., 2019). Since their introduction, risk assessment tools have become preferable and now "dominate correctional management and programming" (Hannah-Moffat, 2015, p. 113). The popularity of these tools informs Starr's (2015) claim that the justice system is in a "risk assessment era" (p. 205). Within risk assessment tools, 'risk factors' are used to categorize people into a *risk pool* (O'Malley, 2010) within which a combination of unchangeable, static factors (e.g., criminal history) and adaptable, dynamic factors (e.g., lack of prosocial leisure activities) are used to categorize people (Miller et al., 2022). While certain countries may differ in what risk factors are utilized to determine risk levels, the central eight risk factors are often core features. They involve the following: (1) criminal history; (2) pro-criminal attitudes; (3) pro-criminal peers; (4) anti-social personality pattern (i.e., impulsive, aggressive); (5) family/marital (i.e., level of conflict and supervision); (6) school/work (i.e., quality of relationships, performance); (7) substance abuse; and (8) leisure/recreation (i.e., prosocial activities) (Heffernan et al., 2019).

However, as Ugwudike (2022) observes, the deployment of predictive algorithmic risk assessments relying on criminal history such as arrest data may not be neutral and can integrate data from the over-policing of ethnic minorities. The racially biased outcomes and decision-making in policing and other justice practices may be present in what is considered criminal history, thus distorting and integrating this bias into the risk assessment of racialized minorities (Ugwudike, 2022, p. 87). Concerningly, risk assessment tools are often developed with no input from the populations they are deployed against and may be opaque in both their development and use. Ugwudike (2022) notes that power and control in the development process can be viewed as 'digital capital', which is "a key structural conduit of bias: the uneven distribution of digital resources with which predictive algorithms are created. Such inequality excludes affected populations from creational processes, conferring on others the power to inject their choices and preferences into algorithm design" (p. 88).

### **Risk and marginalization: reinforcing the 'risky subject'**

Scholars globally have recognized how 'objective' risk factors disproportionately attribute the social conditions of marginalized communities to greater levels of risk (Cunneen, 2020; Harcourt, 2015; Werth, 2019). Risk-based models tend to focus on "individualised psychosocial factors which can produce an isolated view of a young person and ignore the wider historical, cultural and social structural context of their development" (Johns et al., 2017, p. 5).

For example, substance abuse, having a parent in prison, and lack of stable housing are “treated as discrete ‘facts’ devoid of historical and social context”, and are then identified as risk factors (Cunneen, 2020, p. 528). These risk factors are commonly experienced by ethnic minorities and Indigenous populations due to long-standing consequences of oppression, marginalization, and colonization (Webb, 2018). In the American context, Goddard and Myers (2017) argue that risk assessments “*transform life experiences* rooted in race and class inequalities into individual attributes that elevate a youth’s total risk score” (p. 155).

Despite their proposed objectivity, there are concerns about the potential for bias to be embedded within them (Werth, 2019). Risk assessment tools seek to predict future behaviour, and thus function as a “mirror of the past” (Mayson, 2019, p. 2282). While a range of factors is used in risk assessment tools, a lot of weight is given to criminal history as a determinant for future offending. Extensive scholarship has debated how criminal history as a risk factor may operate in a way that disproportionately affects ethnic minorities and Indigenous populations (Cunneen, 2020; Goddard & Myers, 2017; Harcourt, 2015; Miller et al., 2022; Tonry, 2019). The criminalization process of racialized minorities leads to higher levels of engagement in the justice system. Therefore, segments of society that are subjected to heavy policing and more severe punishment are inclined to have an elevated risk score. This, in turn, justifies and legitimizes police presence in and high incarceration rates of those communities (Goddard & Myers, 2017). Cunneen (2020) argues that risk assessment “both *masks* race in its practices and *marks* race in its outcomes” (p. 522). Through the guise of objectivity, these “technologies of racial governance” appear to be race neutral, but in reality, they “operate silently in producing highly racialized outcomes including state surveillance, supervision and incarceration” (Cunneen, 2020, p. 528).

Risk assessment tools create a cycle of repeating previous statistical and data patterns to determine future events (O’Malley, 2015). Criminal history, therefore, does not operate as an objective risk factor and instead is the product of subjective decisions made by actors in the justice system (Goddard & Myers, 2017). This enables criminal history to function as a “proxy for class and race” (Werth, 2019, p. 9). Mayson (2019) argues that it is not necessarily the risk-based tools that are problematic, however; it is the process of using past behaviour from an unequal and socially stratified setting, to predict future action:

[T]he source of racial inequality in risk assessment lies neither in the input data, nor in a particular algorithm, nor in algorithmic methodology per se. The deep problem is the nature of prediction itself. All prediction looks to the past to make guesses about future events. In a racially stratified world, any method of prediction will project the inequalities of the past into the future.

(p. 2218)

Criticisms of using static factors to determine riskiness have led to the privileging of dynamic risk factors (alternatively known as criminogenic needs). The introduction of the risk-need-responsivity (RNR) intervention across several jurisdictions since the late 1990s demonstrates a commitment to risk-based intervention. In addressing dynamic risk factors, the intention is that this will reduce a person’s likelihood of reoffending (Hannah-Moffat, 2016). However, dynamic factors have become increasingly criticized for their universal approach to criminogenic needs, lacking consideration of the specific needs of certain segments of society (Hannah-Moffat, 2015, 2016). Criticism of the RNR intervention suggests that the criminogenic needs identified may differ from self-defined or socio-cultural needs (Maurutto & Hannah-Moffat, 2007). Criminogenic needs are often viewed through a deficit lens and are

identified as needing to be addressed to reduce the likelihood of recidivism. However, a fixation on reducing recidivism can result in other needs – such as “individual well-being, a sense of hope or purpose, developing human capital, or reconnecting with family and friends” – being ignored or sidelined (Werth, 2019, p. 9). Approaches to determining risk that rely heavily on the identification of static and dynamic risk factors continue the criminalization and marginalization of ethnic minorities and Indigenous peoples (Anthony, 2013). Cardoso (2020), for example, reviewed risk assessments for Indigenous and Black inmates in Canadian federal prisons, noted that they were biased and found that Indigenous and Black inmates were more likely than other inmates to receive the worst risk scores in assessments, which affected access to rehabilitation programmes and reduced the likelihood of gaining parole.

In the interests of risk aversion, the identification of ‘risky subjects’ is prioritized over upholding human rights. Decisions on risk have a large impact on the experience that a person has with/within the justice system. Whether they are diverted from the justice system, the level of supervision that is required, or their access to programmes or treatment are all decisions impacted by the risk pool a person is categorized into (Campbell et al., 2018). Risk management and control paradigms are “strategies of inclusion and exclusion” (Hudson, 2003, p. 76), in which people who are labelled as dangerous or risky are deprived of their humanity:

[People] are deprived of their rational humanity and become determined creatures of statistical risk-assessment systems; instead of being flesh and blood, inconsistent, unpredictable humans acting out of their own interests and desires, free to change their perceptions of these and their moral cognitive sets at any time in the present and future, they become the predictable embodiment of databases, for whom the behavioural uncertainty of actual choices in actual situations is replaced by the statistical certainties of factorial calculations.

Risk-based governance has informed a shift towards increased risk prediction, categorization, and control (O’Malley, 2004a). Individualized responses and treatments have gone by the way-side, in the interest of identifying and controlling “risky subjects” (O’Malley, 2004b, p. 334). Young people – particularly those on social, cultural, and economic margins – are frequently perceived as dangerous or risky (Hudson, 2003). Risk management technologies in the justice system privilege group classification, rather than personalized support and treatment (Werth, 2019). This process can be identified as dehumanizing, as individual identity is stripped away for the sake of group classification (Dagan & Dancig-Rosenberg, 2020; O’Malley, 2008).

Incorporating “colonization-specific” factors (i.e., social conditions that have been produced through coloniality) into risk assessment tools, enforces individuals to be held responsible for the ongoing consequences of colonization (Lockwood et al., 2018, p. 1701). As Cunneen (2011) notes:

Within the risk paradigm, any rights of Indigenous peoples (such as self-determination or self-government) are seen as secondary to the membership of a risk-defined group. In other words the group’s primary definition is centered on the risk characteristics they are said to possess, and risk is measured through factors such as the incidence of child abuse, domestic homicide, drug and alcohol problems, school absenteeism, juvenile offenses, and so on.

*(p. 319)*

Colonialism for Indigenous peoples in white settler colonies has resulted in a disproportionate level of state interventions and control of communities, and for Indigenous peoples, there is the

risk of institutional harms, institutionalized racism, and ongoing systemic violence. The application of the risk framework to other policies and sociological phenomena, such as Indigenous child removals in the child protection rubric, mental health responses, surveillance in education, control of alcohol, and management of Indigenous organizations, reveals that it is a framework that is not peculiar to just the criminal justice system (Blagg, 2008). Keddell (2022), for example, discusses the child protection system in NZ and argues that the concept of risk is weighted toward identifying factors that arise from structural inequalities, which are a product of colonization for Indigenous people. This risk concept combines with a history of ongoing disproportionate control and institutional bias – with state agencies more likely to intervene in the lives of Māori people. Keddell (2022) argues, “[b]oth risk and bias, as sources of disparities, can be related to patterns of racism, colonization, and class inequity through history, rooted in both cultural and economic imperialism” (p. 4).

Thalia Anthony (2013) has examined the Australian settler state’s characterization of risk and argues that it is used to demarcate the Indigenous population as the ‘other’ requiring state intervention and control under the auspices of supervision and treatment. Anthony (2013) notes that the language of ‘risk’ may be new when referring to punishment, but for Indigenous peoples, it is a continuance of a history of control since colonization in ongoing neocolonial state policies. Cunneen (2020) also observes that many Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island communities collectively experience socio-economic deprivation and that this economic marginalization may produce more punitive and intrusive interventions due to risk thinking. He notes that “[r]isk thinking reinforces structures of cultural, social and economic exclusion, either explicitly solidifying race as a predictor of criminality or more generally through assessment processes which reinforce deficit discourses surrounding the intersection between race and social and economic marginalization” (Cunneen, 2020, p. 531).

## Youth, vulnerability, and risk

Central to the notion of deficit is also the idea of vulnerable populations. Individuals and groups identified as vulnerable are viewed as needing support and protection, which in some instances can promote greater governmental intervention and state control. Within this framing, vulnerability as an identity becomes infused with notions of risk. Furedi (2008) describes how the concept of risk is used to portray the existence of vulnerability in groups, in a way that also subjectively defines them as powerless:

To be at risk assigns to the person a passive and dependent role. To be at risk is no longer about what you do – it is about who you are. It is an acknowledgement of powerlessness – at least in relation to that risk. Increasingly, someone defined as being at risk is seen to exist in a permanent condition of vulnerability.

*(p. 656)*

Stanley and Monod de Froideville (2020) observe that the meaning of vulnerability can change over time and is an elastic term that can be deployed according to shifting political demands. Under neoliberalism, they argue, discourses of vulnerability merge with understandings of risk and danger, whereby young people identified as vulnerable are simultaneously viewed as being ‘at risk’ of harm or ‘as a risk’ to others (Stanley & Monod de Froideville, 2020). Young people who have experienced trauma, abuse, or economic hardship in their upbringing are “no longer ‘innocent’ children, but unpredictable and potentially dangerous ‘others’” (Stanley & Monod de Froideville, 2020, p. 528). This has particular consequences for Indigenous people and the

ongoing experiences of overt colonial state control. Stanley and Monod de Froideville (2020) note that ongoing state interventions in Indigenous communities and lives rely on notions of vulnerability and risk. These interventions are discursively portrayed by the state as being undertaken for the benign ends of 'well-being' or the 'best interest' of the community, regardless of the actual community concerns over state actions.

In NZ, the government agency responsible for the well-being of children, Oranga Tamariki (Ministry for Children), has been heavily criticized for removing 'vulnerable' children from their whānau under the guise of care and protection. As Stanley's (2016) interrogation of abuse in state care demonstrates, successive governments have removed Māori children from their homes and placed them in state 'care' where a considerable amount of abuse and harm occurred. Māori rangatahi who were once deemed vulnerable often become identified as "deficit-laden risks to be managed, policed and incarcerated" (Stanley & Monod de Froideville, 2020, p. 542). Any behaviour perceived as anti-social in the community by the state can be categorized as a risk that forms part of a youth's history.

The subjective allocation of risk categories can also be revealed in the example of biased policing practices and the extension of surveillance over populations deemed to be at future risk of offending. In late 2020 and early 2021, concerns were made public that the NZ Police were deliberately stopping innocent Māori youth and children on the street to photograph and record personal details to add to a police intelligence database (Hurihanganui, 2021; Hurihanganui & Cardwell, 2020). In the Wairarapa region, in which this illegal practice was first reported by the media, NZ Police had to acknowledge that they had acted inappropriately by photographing children who were not under arrest and who had not been stopped in relation to any criminal activity. The practice had occurred without the children being informed of their legal rights and in the absence of parental knowledge or consent. A national investigation into this practice by the Office of the Privacy Commissioner (OPC) and the Independent Police Conduct Authority (IPCA) (2022) produced findings that were highly critical of policing behaviour and noted that it breached children's rights. The report identified that this practice was widespread and that rangatahi Māori (young people) made up more than 50 percent of the youth stopped and photographed. Therefore, the police practice has received criticism for the ongoing racial profiling and criminalization of the minority Indigenous population, by reinforcing stereotypes about who is deemed as being risky and thereby amplifying negative relationships between Māori and the NZ Police (Norris & Tauri, 2021).

Parallels can be drawn with the deployment of risk tools to youth populations, which highlight the consequences of such an approach. In the US, African-American youth are disproportionately policed, prosecuted, and imprisoned (Goddard & Myers, 2017). Selman, Myers, and Goddard (2019) argue that the collateral consequences of the growth of carceral punishments in the US are the extensions of shadow carceral innovations and crime control into communities, whereby the assessment of 'risk' or 'dangerousness' is applied to manage and control minority young people in community settings such as school. Once young people come to the attention of the criminal justice system, they are subjected to risk tools that produce disproportionate outcomes.

Cunneen (2020) has drawn comparisons between risk assessment tools in Australia and the UK to highlight disproportionate outcomes for Black, ethnic minority, and Indigenous young people. Risk assessment tools such as ASSET (England and Wales) and the YLSI-CMI (Australia) rely on measuring negative individual behaviour and attributes to determine levels of risk for young people. The reductionist approach to risk has been criticized for oversimplifying complex social conditions into quantifiable risk factors (Case & Haines, 2015). A study of Youth Offending Teams (YOT) workers' experiences of ASSET found the risk-based tool to be "an unhelpful and at times problematic tool in assessing young people" (Phoenix, 2009,

p. 120).<sup>1</sup> For young people, risk-based models are often reductionist in that they are problem orientated, and deficit focused (Johns et al., 2017).

While the explicit mention of race or ethnicity may be removed within many of these assessments, it functions in a less overt way which continues the perpetuation of racial discrimination within the justice system (Cunneen, 2020). The markers of risk (e.g., unemployment, parental incarceration), which a person has limited control over are used to criminalize and justify further contact with authorities and the criminal justice system. Social conditions as a result of systemic discrimination and the ongoing legacy of colonization are removed from their historical context for the sake of risk categorization (Cunneen, 2020).

## Decolonizing risk

Alongside the growth and development of risk tools in criminal justice settings, it must be recognized that they have the potential to reinscribe and intensify the marginalized position that certain segments of society already face (Werth, 2019). It requires the consideration of the historical and social structures that are embedded in settler states and challenging the social structures of racism and colonialism that continue to inform crime control responses. As Cunneen (2011) notes, there is a need to challenge the orthodoxy of mainstream criminal justice interventions that continue to perpetuate marginalization.

In decolonizing risk, the broader social history and context need to be considered before making judgements on risk levels. In doing so, this will ensure that ‘risk factors’ are reconsidered in light of the colonial history that forced people into a marginalized and oppressed social condition. Cunneen and Rowe (2015) demonstrate how Eurocentric victimization frameworks are limited due to their lack of consideration of the ongoing impacts of colonization. We argue that their suggestions for decolonizing victimization frameworks can be applied to decolonizing risk paradigms:

[T]here is a need for a much deeper understanding of Indigenous ontologies and the way in which the ‘self’ is understood in connectivity to the social, physical and spiritual world. The centrality of interrelationality to Indigenous worldviews means that the understandings of particular situations and contexts, and the decisions which people make, are formed from within a worldview that is in strong contrast to colonising assumptions regarding individual decision making based on autonomous self-interest.

*(Cunneen & Rowe, 2015, p. 27)*

It is important to recognize the power dynamics in the deployment of policies in settler societies and the ways different states generate data and information on groups in society. As Cunneen (2011) argues, “the rise of risk paradigms, ‘governing’ through crime, both domestically and internationally, and the focus on statistical populations rather than people who are the bearers of rights are all working against the development of Indigenous approaches to criminal justice” (p. 319). Maggie Walter (2016) argues that the state control and deployment of data on Indigenous populations, should be understood and contextualized in the wider legacy of colonial control:

In First World colonised nations such as Australia, Aotearoa New Zealand, Canada and the United States, the question is not just ‘are these numbers real’, but also ‘how are these numbers deployed and whom do they serve’. The reality query is not the numbers themselves but of what they purport to portray.

*(p. 79)*

This is also shaped by a colonial state legacy of viewing minority communities through a 'deficit' lens. Harris (2008) argues that this type of thinking, which has its roots in colonialism, continues to problematize and attribute the social problems arising from histories of marginalization and social exclusion to supposed 'deficits' in those groups that are marginalized. Indigenous data sovereignty over the official information and statistics used by government institutions should be prioritized to prevent the ongoing state policies of social exclusion (Walter, 2016).

There also needs to be a transformation of the wider societal structures that embed risk and carceral logics. Speaking to these societal transformations required for an abolitionist future, Lamusse and McIntosh (2021) observe that we need a new set of "societal structures which create the conditions that allow freedom from poverty, freedom from inequality, freedom from racism and practices of discrimination and marginalization, and free from harm" (p. 289). Similarly, we also argue that decolonizing risk requires a critique of the ways various jurisdictions have deployed these tools that further embed colonial logics of control into criminal justice policies and practices. Thus, while contemporary risk tools fixate on risk at the individual level, it is imperative that the focus remains on unveiling the risks that institutions pose. A proposed alternative to contemporary risk-based models – one that operates in tandem with decolonizing oppressive structures – is the concept of 'humanizing risk' (Gordon & Webb, 2022). Through this approach, human relationships and rights are brought to the forefront, which enables those that go through the justice system to be seen as people, rather than as risks to be managed. Understanding the interplay between risk assessment techniques and the disproportionate outcomes within the justice system is essential. For Indigenous peoples and racialized minorities globally, oppressive institutions and the risk tools themselves pose the greatest risk.

## Note

- 1 In NZ, similar concerns have been raised about the Youth Offending Risk Screening Tool (YORST) that has been deployed by NZ Police since 2007. The NZ Law Foundation raised concerns that although the tool does not record ethnicity, several of the factors used are proxies for it (Gavaghan et al., 2019).

## References

- Anthony, T. (2013). *Indigenous people, crime and punishment*. Taylor & Francis.
- Blagg, H. (2008). *Crime, aboriginality and the decolonisation of justice*. Federation Press.
- Campbell, C., Papp, J., Barnes, A., Onifade, E., & Anderson, V. (2018). Risk assessment and juvenile justice: An interaction between risk, race, and gender. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 17(3), 525–545.
- Cardoso, T. (2020). *Bias behind bars: A Globe investigation finds a prison system stacked against Black and Indigenous inmates*. <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/canada/article-investigation-racial-bias-in-canadian-prison-risk-assessments/>
- Cardwell, H. (2020, December 3). Children's Commissioner probing how widespread police photographing incidents are. *Radio New Zealand*. <https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/national/433443/children-s-commissioner-probing-how-widespread-police-photographing-incidents-are>
- Carlen, P. (2008). Imaginary penalties and risk-crazed governance. In P. Carlen (Ed.), *Imaginary penalties* (pp. 1–25). Willian Publishing.
- Carlen, P. (2012). Against rehabilitation; for reparative justice. In K. Carrington, M. Ball, E. O'Brien & J. Tauri (Eds.), *Crime, justice and social democracy: International perspectives* (pp. 89–104). Palgrave.
- Case, S., & Haines, K. (2015). Risk management and early intervention: A critical analysis. In B. Goldson & J. Muncie (Eds.), *Youth crime and justice* (pp. 100–119). Sage.
- Clear, T., & Cadora, E. (2001). Risk and community practice. In K. Stenson & R.R. Sullivan (Eds.), *Crime, risk and justice: The politics of crime control in liberal democracies* (pp. 51–67). Willan.
- Cunneen, C. (2011). Indigeneity, sovereignty, and the law: Challenging the processes of criminalization. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 110(2), 309–327.

- Cunneen, C. (2020). Youth justice and racialization: Comparative reflections. *Theoretical Criminology*, 24(3), 521–539.
- Cunneen, C., & Rowe, S. (2015). Decolonising Indigenous victimisation. In D. Wilson & S. Ross (Eds.), *Crime, victims and policy: International contexts, local experiences* (pp. 10–32). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cunneen, C., & Tauri, J. (2016). *Indigenous criminology*. Policy Press.
- Dagan, N., & Dancig-Rosenberg, H. (2020). Character retribution as a brake on risk-driven criminal justice. In J. Pratt & J. Anderson (Eds.), *Criminal justice, risk and the revolt against uncertainty* (pp. 69–89). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Eckhouse, L., Lum, K., Conti-Cook, C., & Ciccolini, J. (2019). Layers of bias: A unified approach for understanding problems with risk assessment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 46(2), 185–209.
- Feeley, M., & Simon, J. (1992). The new penology: Notes on the emerging strategy of corrections and its implications. *Criminology*, 30(4), 449–474.
- Furedi, F. (2008). Fear and security: A vulnerability-led policy response. *Social Policy & Administration*, 42, 645–661.
- Furlong, A., & Cartmel, F. (2007). *Young people and social change: New perspectives*. Open University Press.
- Garland, D. (2001). *The culture of control: Crime and social order in contemporary society*. Oxford University Press.
- Gavaghan, C., Knott, A., Maclaurin, J., Zerilli, J., & Liddicoat, J. (2019). *Government use of artificial intelligence in New Zealand*. The New Zealand Law Foundation.
- Goddard, T., & Myers, R.R. (2017). Against evidence-based oppression: Marginalized youth and the politics of risk-based assessment and intervention. *Theoretical Criminology*, 21(2), 151–167.
- Gordon, G., & Webb, R. (2022). Reframing risk in Aotearoa New Zealand: A humanising approach. *New Sociological Perspectives*, 2(1), 20–36.
- Gray, P. (2005). The politics of risk and young offenders' experiences of social exclusion and restorative justice. *British Journal of Criminology*, 45(6), 938–957.
- Gray, P. (2009). The political economy of risk and the new governance of youth crime. *Punishment & Society*, 11(4), 443–458.
- Hannah-Moffat, K. (2015). Needle in a haystack: Logical parameters of treatment based on actuarial risk-needs assessments. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 14(1), 113–120.
- Hannah-Moffat, K. (2016). A conceptual kaleidoscope: Contemplating 'dynamic structural risk' and an uncoupling of risk from need. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 22(1/2), 33–46.
- Harcourt, B.E. (2015). Risk as a proxy for race: The dangers of risk assessment. *Federal Sentencing Reporter*, 27(4), 237–243.
- Harris, F. (2008). Critical engagement with the deficit construction of Māori children as learners in the education system. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices*, 2(1), 43–59.
- Heffernan, R., Wegerhoff, D., & Ward, T. (2019). Dynamic risk factors: Conceptualization, measurement, and evidence. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 48, 6–16.
- Hudson, B. (2003). *Justice in the risk society*. Sage.
- Hurihanganui, T.A. (2021, March 26). Police using app to photograph innocent youth: "It's so wrong". *Radio New Zealand*. <https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/in-depth/437944/police-using-app-to-photograph-innocent-youth-it-s-so-wrong>
- Hurihanganui, T.A., & Cardwell, H. (2020, January 26). Questions raised after police officers stop youths to take their photos. *Radio New Zealand*. <https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/national/460279/police-internal-review-on-photographing-youth-given-to-independent-watchdogs>
- Jackson, M. (1988). *The Māori and the criminal justice system: He Whaipanga Hou: A new perspective*. <https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/Digitization/108675NCJRS.pdf>
- Johns, D.F., Williams, K., & Haines, K. (2017). Ecological youth justice: Understanding the social ecology of young people's prolific offending. *Youth Justice*, 17(1), 3–21.
- Keddell, E. (2022). Mechanisms of inequity: The impact of instrumental biases in the child protection system. *Societies*, 12(3), 1–19.
- Kendall, K. (2013). Time to think again about cognitive behavioural programmes. In P. Carlen (Ed.), *Women and punishment* (pp. 182–198). Routledge.
- Lamuse, T., & McIntosh, T. (2021). Prison abolitionism: Philosophies, politics, and practices. In E. Stanley, T. Bradley, & S. Monod de Froideville (Eds.), *The Aotearoa handbook of criminology* (pp. 289–302). Auckland University Press.
- Lockwood, I., Peterson-Badali, M., & Schmidt, F. (2018). The relationship between risk, criminogenic need, and recidivism for Indigenous justice-involved youth. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 45(11), 1688–1708.

- Maurutto, P., & Hannah-Moffat, K. (2007). Understanding risk in the context of the Youth Criminal Justice Act. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 49(4), 465–491.
- Mayson, S.G. (2019). Bias in, bias out. *Yale Law Journal*, 128(8), 2218–2301.
- Miller, W.T., Campbell, C.A., Papp, J., & Ruhland, E. (2022). The contribution of static and dynamic factors to recidivism prediction for Black and White youth offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 66(16), 1779–1795.
- Norris, A.N., & Tauri, J. (2021). Racialized surveillance in New Zealand: From the Tūhoe raids to the extralegal photographing of Indigenous youth. *Race and Justice*, Online First. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21533687211063581>
- O'Malley, P. (2004a). The governing of risk. In A. Sarat (Ed.), *The Blackwell companion to law and society* (pp. 292–308). Blackwell Publishing.
- O'Malley, P. (2004b). The uncertain promise of risk. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 37(3), 323–343.
- O'Malley, P. (2008). Risk and governmentality. In J.O. Zinn (Ed.), *Social theories of risk and uncertainty: An introduction* (pp. 52–75). Blackwell Publishing.
- O'Malley, P. (2010). *Crime and risk*. Sage.
- O'Malley, P. (2015). Uncertainty makes us free: Insurance and liberal rationality. In L. Samimian-Darash & P. Rabinov (Eds.), *Modes of uncertainty: Anthropological cases* (pp. 13–28). University of Chicago Press.
- Office of the Privacy Commissioner and Independent Police Conduct Authority. (2022). *Joint inquiry into police conduct when photographing members of the public*. <https://www.privacy.org.nz/assets/New-order/Resources-/Publications/Commissioner-inquiries/8-SEPTEMBER-2022-IPCA-AND-OPC-Joint-Inquiry-into-Police-photographing-of-members-of-the-public.pdf>
- Phoenix, J. (2009). Beyond risk assessment: The return of repressive welfarism? In M. Barry & F. McNeill (Eds.), *Youth offending and youth justice* (pp. 113–153). Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Pratt, J., & Anderson, J. (2020). Introduction. In J. Pratt & J. Anderson (Eds.), *Criminal justice, risk and the revolt against uncertainty* (pp. 1–13). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Selman, K.J., Myers, R., & Goddard, T. (2019). Young people, shadow carceral innovations, and the reproduction of inequality. *Critical Criminology*, 27(4), 527–542.
- Shepherd, S.M., & Anthony, T. (2018). Popping the cultural bubble of violence risk assessment tools. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 29(2), 211–220.
- Stanley, E. (2016). *The road to hell: State violence against children in postwar New Zealand*. Auckland University Press.
- Stanley, E., & Monod de Froideville, S. (2020). From vulnerability to risk: Consolidating state interventions towards Māori children and young people in New Zealand. *Critical Social Policy*, 40(4), 526–545.
- Starr, S. (2015). The risk assessment era: An overdue debate. *Federal Sentencing Reporter*, 27(4), 225–227.
- Tonry, M. (2019). Predictions of dangerousness in sentencing: Déjà vu all over again. *Crime and Justice*, 48, 439–482.
- Ugwudike, P. (2022). Predictive algorithms in justice systems and the limits of tech-reformism. *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy*, 11(1), 85–99.
- Walter, M. (2016). Data politics and Indigenous representation in Australian statistics. In T. Kukutai & J. Taylor (Eds.), *Indigenous data sovereignty: Toward an agenda* (pp. 79–98). ANU Press.
- Webb, R. (2018). Rethinking the utility of the risk factors and criminogenic needs approaches in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Journal for Global Indigeneity*, 3(1), 1–21.
- Werth, R. (2019). Risk and punishment: The recent history and uncertain future of actuarial, algorithmic, and “evidence-based” penal techniques. *Sociology Compass*, 13(2), 1–19.