

УДК [316.346.32-053.6:316.343.36](477)

THE CONCEPT OF «RISK» IN SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE: ETYMOLOGY, FEATURES OF THE DEFINITION AND CONTEMPORARY APPROACHES IN RESEARCH

Deineko Oleksandra – PhD in sociology, V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University

У статті проаналізовані особливості змісту та походження поняття «ризик» крізь оптику різних соціологічних підходів. Виходячи з дуалізму об'єктивістського та соціально-конструктивістського підходів до визначення ризику, автор акцентує увагу на дуальності ризиків діяльності та ризиків середовища. В роботі спростовується декілька «міфів» про ризик – міф про «закріпленість» та міф про «катастрофічність» ризику. При цьому ризик розглядається як атрибутивна характеристика людської діяльності, що сприяє розкриттю суб'єктності агента у прийнятті рішень. На думку автора, саме перспектива усвідомлення та осмислення ризиків має потенціал часткового керування ризиками. Дослідницька увага приділена вивченню етимології поняття «ризик», в результаті чого зроблено висновок щодо відсутності «часової» і «просторової» локалізації ризику та поширеності використання цього терміну для номінування тотожних феноменів у різних культурах. Здійснено порівняльний аналіз змістовного навантаження поняття «ризик» у соціології та інших соціоуманітарних дисциплінах. Автором запропоновані дослідницькі акценти, які допомагають зрозуміти специфічні особливості такого соціального феномену, як ризик, у логіці розвитку соціологічної думки та наукової доктрини в цілому. Особлива увага сфокусована на аналізі синтетичних соціологічних підходів до вивчення ризику, які автор вважає найбільш евристичними для дослідження цього феномену.

Ключові слова: ризик, ризики діяльності, ризики середовища, суспільство ризику, суб'єктність, суб'єкт.

В статье проанализированы особенности содержания и происхождения понятия «риск» сквозь оптику различных социологических подходов. Исходя из дуализма объективистского и социально-конструктивистского подходов к определению риска, автор акцентирует внимание на дуальности рисков деятельности и рисков среды. В работе опровергается несколько «мифов» о риске - миф о «закрепленности» и миф о «катастрофичности» риска. При этом риск рассматривается как атрибутивная характеристика человеческой деятельности, которая способствует «раскрытию» субъектности агента в принятии решений. По мнению автора, именно перспектива осознания и осмысления рисков имеет потенциал частичного управления рисками. Исследовательское внимание уделяется изучению этимологии понятия «риск», в результате чего сделан вывод об отсутствии «временной» и «пространственной» локализации риска и распространённости использования этого термина для номинирования тождественных феноменов в различных культурах. Осуществлен анализ содержательного наполнения понятия «риск» в социологии социогуманитарных дисциплинах. Автором предложены исследовательские акценты, которые помогают понять специфические особенности такого социального феномена, как риск, в логике развития социологической мысли и научной доктрины в целом. Особое внимание сфокусировано на анализе синтетических социологических подходов к изучению рисков, которые автор считает наиболее эвристическими для исследования данного феномена.

Ключевые слова: риск, риски деятельности, риски среды, общество риска, субъектность, субъект.

The article analyzes the features of the content and origins of the concept of "risk" through the optics of different sociological approaches. On the basis of dualism objectivist and socio-constructivist approaches to the definition of risk, the author focuses on the duality of activity risks and the environmental risks. The paper refuted several "myths" about the risk - the myth of the "tightness" and the myth of the "catastrophic" risk. The risk is considered as a characteristic attribute of human activity that contributes to the "disclosure" of subjectivity in the decision-making agent. According to the author, the prospect of awareness and understanding of risk has the potential partial risk management. The research focuses on the study of the etymology of the concept of "risk" as a result it was concluded that there is no "time" and "space" the containment of risk and the prevalence of the use of the term for nomination of identical phenomena in different cultures. The analysis of the substantive content of the notion of "risk" in the sociology of social and humanitarian disciplines. The author offers the research emphases,

which help to understand the specifics of such a social phenomenon as the risk, in the logic of the development of sociological thought and scientific doctrines in general. Particular attention is focused on the analysis of synthetic sociological approaches to the study of the risks, which the author considers most heuristic for the study of this phenomenon.

Keywords: risk, activity risks, the risks of the environment, risk society, subjectiveness, subject.

A. Mozgova notes that contemporary society needs a sociological analysis of social disaster to successfully prevent them, and ideally – to avoid [1, p. 7]. Thus, updating of risk-concepts (not only in sociology) is associated as a «technological boom of our time» (as a property of social reality) and the increasing reflexivity – the characteristic of ordinary consciousness and scientific discourse (for example, well-known Bourdieu's and Gidden's concepts putting at the center of attention the reflexivity).

Contemporary contexts of different levels of social reality creates daily risk-scenarios for population. Thus, contemporary sociology often reproduces itself exactly as the sociology of risk. However, the sense of «risk» concept. in spite of numerous attempts sociological conceptualization, is still not clear in sociological discourse.

That is why the purpose of this research is a sociological analysis of scientific category of «risk» by reference to the evolution of the meaning of the concept and the analysis of its features in the light of various sociological approaches.

Phenomena that indicates the concept of «risk» is not only a product of European civilization, and the history of the term has more than 1500 years. Such a conclusion can be drawn from the semantic relationship of words denoting risk in different languages. In particular, U. Felenchak shows the following examples: in the English version risk – a «risk», Albanian – «rezik», Bulgarian – «risk», Czech – «risiko», Finnish – «riski», the French – «risqué», Italian – «rischio», German – «risiko», Spanish – «riesgo», Romanian – «risk» and others [2].

Exploring the historical features of risk categories interpretation U. Felenchak notes that the original meaning of the term «risk» is unclear exactly – its origin is associated with the Latin «risicum» (danger rock) and the Greek «ridsikon», «ridsa», which literally means «danger maneuvering area rocks». The etymology of the word indicates the areas of public life, which began to emerge the concept of risk: navigation and maritime trade, where contact with the coastal cliff was considered the greatest danger [2]. However, there are other opinions as to the origin of the term «risk». In particular, N. Luhmann mentions the Arabic root of the word that was later borrowed by the Italians and Spaniards [3]. M. Klapkiv, comparing the hieroglyphic signs of the Chinese and Japanese languages, highlights the similarities root word «risk», «accident», «insurance» [4]. I. Evdokimova points that the Russian and Ukrainian word «risk» comes from European languages [5]. Such diversity of researcher views on the origin of risk indicates universality of the concept of marking phenomena of social life that exist in all cultures and societies that led to the articulation of the concept of «risk».

Despite the diversity of views on the origin of the concept of «risk» all researchers agree with the scope of its original application. Thus, the Ukrainian researcher I. Evdokimova, analyzing the factors of the concept of «risk», points that the first idea of the risk incurred in 16-18 century Europe in trade and shipping during the great geographical discoveries that were made in the absence of reliable nautical maps, accurate navigation devices, reliable system communication. Then the first idea that can be associated with risk awareness arose, accompanied by the emergence of relevant legal institutions that carried insurance on features of sailors and owners of capital and insure them against loss of valuable cargo or ship [5]. But, as U. Felenchak points, this approach to understanding the risk has not provided the decision making process that could manage the risk [2]. It should be emphasized that, firstly, the risk becomes a social and cultural phenomenon of social life, which is fixed at the level of social institutions, norms and values. Secondly, given opinion shows that awareness of risk is not always preceded by his insurance and the strategy of risk insurance (or minimizing) is not universal.

In the Middle Ages the term «risk» is found in Italian, Spanish and Portuguese documentary sources – initially rare and in various subject areas [4]. From the sixteenth century meaning of the term expanding and starting to use it to refer to problematic situations in the various spheres of public life, to identify which could be clearly made using definitions that existed at the time. During this period in Europe there is the concept of hedging (limiting) the risks associated with contracting for the supply of grain in due time for the pre-established prices and size of supply [6]. U. Felenchak concludes that hedging and future agreements are the first attempts of rational and reasonable risk management with a view to reducing that laid the fundamentals of its property-value estimates [2]. This stage launched quantitatively-oriented approaches in the study of risk that began a new stage study of risk through the prism of mathematical and economic connotations. This is not only an attempt to make

the risk clear and predictable, but with the rise of mathematics and science as cognitive explanation schemes in the late Renaissance.

The researchers and economists believe that the first scientific definition of «risk» was made in 1786 by J. Tetensom mathematician who proposed to consider a quantitative measure of risk-half standard deviation value, considering its expected loss amount [7]. Unlike the original meaning of risk as existential threats, economic-mathematical discourse draws attention both to influence the risk on an increase in profits (which allows «open» it constructive) and the possibility of adjustment, prevention of risk. In particular, Adam Smith, focusing on economic grounds in the definitions of risk, noted that the risk factor is profit-sharing, as well as achieving normal profit margins associated with higher or lower risk [8]. Researcher G. Tyunen stressed the differences between risk that can be insured and the risk that can not be insured – it must meet the share of profits, which is regarded as payment for the possibility of bankruptcy [9]. Such cost-oriented definition of risk open *constructive risk in relation to the subject of action: now risk can be presented as an integral part of human activity that not only promotes the emergence of threats and challenges, but also has the prospect of increasing the efficiency of action.* This conclusion aptly illustrates the point of M. Loschynina's view, who said that the presence of risk in public life endowed with positive qualities and need to accept the fact that completely eradicate the risk is too expensive or practically impossible [10].

A. Alhin in the development of the scientific understanding of risk highlights a few basic steps. If at first the risk was studied only by some sciences (mathematics, statistics, probability theory), then the expanding of risk research has happened (psychology, economics, demography, medicine, biology, law, etc.) In 1960, first interdisciplinary study of risk acquires its status of general scientific concept [11, p. 4]. A. Alhin's work is the first socio-philosophical research of risk in Soviet science. The author defines risk as «... activities related to overcoming the situation of uncertainty in the inevitable choice, in which is the ability to quantitatively and qualitatively assess the likelihood of achieving the intended result, failures and deviations from the target» [11, p. 19]. The worth of Alhin's definition is associated with the emphasis on situation of choice as the essential characteristics of risk and the need for both qualitative and quantitative evaluation of it.

The question of risk in the late 19th – early 20th centuries was associated by researchers with the conditions of contemporary social life and consciousness, which formed in terms of rational-instrumentalist attitude to reality and were associated with the transition from traditional to modern society [5]. In this regard, sociologists distinguish classical and modern interpretation of the concept of risk. In particular, the Russian scientist A. Dorozhkin, considering the formation of the classical concept of risk as an example the works of T. Hobbes, D. Hume, P. Cardano, B. Pascal, M. Condorcet, P. Laplace, J. Mill, J. Keynes, F. Ewald, points that the classical theory of risk is value-theoretical reflection of risks in the closed social system which is generally characterized by linear dynamics [12]. Other researcher A. Ivanov stresses that the result of social and cultural development in traditional society was almost proportional to the interaction of social actors, allowing to predict the future based on accurate formal methods. Sociality in these societies was created by using instrumentally rational activity [13]. Although this argument seems to us extremely doubtful, but the thesis about the ability to predict in traditional societies confirmed results of other studies. With the dominant of instrumentally rational action is linked the growth of potential decisions, the dominant future in relation to the past, the formation of the new socio-cultural matrix of historical consciousness and social time noncyclic models (M. Weber, J. Davydov, V. Fedotov, J. Markowitz, N. Luhmann, A. Nassim).

Formation of the increased interest to risk as the part of science in the 60th was triggered due to the occurrence of undesirable effects of technological development: the destruction of the ozone layer, acid rain getting in the biosphere, degeneration of trees, destruction of biodiversity resulting from changes in land use and deforestation, a threat of atomic explosion. It led to danger increasing process due to the life of the individual, society and nature as a whole [14, p. 219].

Research of risk in 60-70th have a «natural colour» with a focus on environment risk analysis. As A. Alhin points heuristic potential of the concept of «risk» begins to be used in the natural sciences to analyze the hazards of natural origin (risk of earthquake, volcanic eruption risk, the risk of floods, epidemics, etc.) [11].

According to contemporary researchers the next 10-20 years led to the institutionalization of risk. We agree with this position, because in addition to academic activities, which were involved in the laboratories and research centers, the real «industry of risk» appears. It includes a variety of periodicals, the scientific community, institutions that are preparing «experts in risk technologies». During this time the appropriate institutional structures on the state level were formed [14, p. 216]. For example, in the United States and France for 4 years the demand for «safety engineers» significantly increased and their numbers increased costs of labor. It happened due

to an increase of major industrial accidents in these years [15, p. 16]. Thus the risk becomes the constant of society with help of institutionalization on the level of the environment (as a permanent attribute of the environment), and on the level of state institutions and media discourses. That is what we see as the one of the key factors of risk society and the emergence of sociological theories of its research.

According to I. Evdokimova, the impulse for the emergence of a new surge in the development of risk theories in 90 years was triggered by the features of the transition of industrial society into a new form of existence nominated by some scientists as «late» or «high» modernity [5]. This transition was accompanied by not only increasing the number of hazards and risks, but also due to the change of their scope and nature. The immediate impetus for the development of risk research (particularly in the area of humanitarian approaches) was the Chernobyl accident [5]. As we have noted above, it is this ecological disaster contributed to the development of the theory of risk society, the features of which we will focus on.

Despite the intensive development of risk theories in recent years, in scientific publications on this topic a variety of the risk definition can be met, some of which contain some inconsistencies. The most popular of them in humanities discourse include the definition of risk as the probability of realization of unwanted consequences, as the size of possible losses and as a combination of the probability and size of losses [16]. Although these definitions give initial understanding of the nature of risk, they do not reveal neither the type nor the distinctions of this concept. Therefore the difference of risk notion and related concepts – danger, safety, luck and chance is missing.

The attempts of theoretical conceptualization of the risk concept are already undertaken in the framework of sociological discourse. In particular, N. Luhmann the contemporary definitions of risk conditionally divided into two groups. Some authors define the concept of «risk» as opposite in meaning to the concept of «security»: risk is a mathematical category, which helps to determine the size of the effort to ensure security solutions. Others – define risk as the opposite of the notion of «danger» when it comes to the negative effects of nature, the environment. Under this risk group of researchers understand the negative consequences of human decisions [3]. Although this definition of risk are more sociological (because the activity focuses on the aspect of risk), but remains very limited due to the fact that: a) the risk should be linked not only with the consequences of making (of result), but with procedural activities to achieve certain decisions; b) risk describes not only the activities through which reaching negative consequences of human decisions, it is often due to increased risk achieved success (this thesis proves particularly popular wisdom, «nothing ventured, nothing gained»).

In sociological discourse the term «risk» has a wide range of definitions that vary depending on the methodological principles of research. According to N. Luhmann, the term «risk» is characterized by a multiplier effect – the growth of multiple contexts of use [3]. In the «Sociology of risk» the researcher notes that a number of terms from the field of technological risks found sound and new social contexts. «Multiplier effect « is accompanied by a boomerang effect: diverse attempts to «make clear» in the discussion of relationships between concepts and contradictory desire to «rewrite history of risk» were counterproductive and led to a general feeling of «dense fog when you can not even see the bumper of the car» [11, p. 9].

Individual approach to structuring the debate around the concept of «risk» reflects the contemporary discussion of the role and nature of scientific knowledge. These views of researchers on cognitive status of risk, I. Evdokimova nominated objectivist and socio-constructivist approaches [5]. Proponents of the first part view on a risk as on a cognitive category, as on the indicator of the objective world, the content of which is not influenced by sociocultural factors. On the other hand, proponents of socio-constructivist approach argue that the «risk» is a cognitive category, meaning and interpretation of which are caused by the influence of sociocultural factors, that is, who and in what context, interprets risk. Each of the approaches is associated with a certain logic assessment and risk management that are listed in the J. Bradbury work [17].

In 80-90th objectivist approach, which understood the risk (R) as the probability (P) and loss (H), is calculated by the formula $R = P(H)$, is becoming less popular among social scientists, due to recognition in philosophy, cultural studies, sociology, that the truth does not exist independently of man and that all knowledge (expert or not expert) is subjective meaning. Research questions, methods and results of the analysis are formulated by social and cultural experiences. Basing on constructivist approach, social and cultural contexts determine what groups and society perceive and define how the dangers and risks [18].

One of the first ideas on this knowledge of risk was expressed by Fishhoff, who noticed that although risks do exist, but no one knows what they really are. Therefore, all that is known about them, should be designated as the perception [17]. The focus of this approach is the knowledge of risk, including expert knowledge, it was suggested regarded as «a risk that is perceived» or as a product of socio-cultural interpretation. This position marks the extreme point on phenomenological axis of risk interpretation.

The theory of risk that is perceived gained urgency within the «engineering» concept in psychology [19], according to which every agent acts as an engineer, who is looking for evidence that assure its safe technology (through sociological optics – safe action and its consequences). However, this theory can not explain the factors of social rejection technology with low objective risk and under significant public awareness about it. This finding gave rise to further distinguishing on the risk of environment (objective aspect) and the risk as an attribute of the mind. As I. Evdokimova points in 70 years own sociological studies of risk gained popularity that emphasized on the study of factors that influence the formation of risk that is perceived [5]. This aspect in our opinion emphasizes proper sociological approach to the study of perceived risk.

In parallel, in 70 years as part of a special distribution of socio-psychological theory has become the theory of stress [20]. Following psychologists the basic tenets of the theory in the study of risk sociologists began using in particular the study of public perceptions of risk. For instance, during the poll the person was asked to assess his environment from the point of view there is a threat or risk, and choose the means available to it to counter them. Both assessments help to determine whether environmental requirements exceed available to human resources. If they are exceeded, the emotional state could be regarded as a stress, and this is an evidence of the awareness of risk. *Sociological studies have confirmed that stress not always based on objective contained risk, defined by experts* [21]. This conclusion is further isolating heuristic two aspects of risk - objective (the risk of environment or institutionalized risk) and subjective aspects (as internalized risk on the level of values and externalized on subject's practices).

The above approaches to understanding the risk reproduce both methodological features sociological vision of risk and outline the «polarity» positions of researchers about the nature of risk events. We emphasize separately synthetic approach to interpretation of the nature of risk within the objectivist as methodological optics (particularly in the presence of the risk environment as the objective conditions of the subject), and socio-constructivist approach (which focuses on the importance of perception, comprehension of risk and developing appropriate strategies of risk).

Something different, but consonant view on unfounded notion of separation «objective risk» and «perceived risk» expressed researcher K. Srader-Frechett [22]. Criticizing objectivist dominant in the analysis of risk in his study he cites evidence of its limitations. K. Srader-Frechett emphasizes the imperfections of positivist methods in expert risk assessment, giving information that does not reflect the real incidence of adverse effects, ignores the consequences that can not be measured. He drew attention to the imperfection of categories in objectivist theory of risk, which consists of a set of concepts that can not be compared («individual risk», «objective risk», «real risk») and with different amounts of values and areas of use. The author notes the inevitable influence of subjective factor on the results of scientific risk assessment, but it opposes artificial separation methodology objectivist and subjectivist at the poles.

Referring to the works of contemporary sociologists – U. Zubok, A. Yanytskiy, K. Gavriloв it should be noted that researchers have proposed different approaches to the duality of risk analysis, but their essence is based on those of us. In particular, the researchers propose realistic (naturalistic) and socio-cultural (interpretative) approaches in the studying of risk. By the first risk is interpreted in scientific and technical terms, in particular through the concept of danger (injury), and by calculating the possibility of its occurrence and costing implications. In this case, risk is defined as «the product of the potential hazards and severity its consequences» [23, p. 40]. Risk is objective, independent of the social and cultural environment.

Socio-cultural approach to the study of risk is most actively used within the socio-humanitarian discourse. In the socio-cultural term risk is seen as a social construct, rooted in the culture, social relations and institutions of society. In this area some scientists consider the risk as «objectively existing danger» mediated social and cultural context. Others argue that risk, in contrast to the dangers – is a social construct, the product of historically and culturally conditioned interpretations [23, p. 8]. L. Lupton identifies three areas within the socio-cultural approach – «cultural and symbolic», «governmental» and the theory of «risk society» [24].

Cultural and symbolic approach draws attention to the culture medium risk, which involve individuals creating risk groups. Risk is defined as the reaction of people to interact with these groups, in symbolic form, and the concept of risk used to study the boundaries between «I» and «others». This trend gets the beginning in the early M. Douglas's analysis of environmental pollution [19], focusing on the importance of socio-cultural context. Based on the ideas of M. Fokalt about the problems of our time and public administration, representatives of governmental approach exploring ways of targeting the masses of people using the strategies and discussions centered is the problem of risk. Risk in this context is interpreted as a measure of deviation from the set parameters of social norms and criteria of individuals, groups or society as a whole [19].

Concept of «risk society», presented in the works of classics of world sociology – W. Beck, N. Luhmann, A. Giddens is the most heuristic for our study because they nominated social reality as a sphere of risk. Thus, William Beck's work «Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity», published in the late 80s of last century, struck the international sociological community. For Liverpool sociologist G. Mythen [25], the book «risk society» entered the list of the most influential academic works of the second half of the 20th century. Contemporary society by William Beck should be considered as risk society, as simultaneously exposed to global threats and to local risks of various kinds. In risk societies former stratification criteria lost their power (education, wealth, property, gender, age, etc.). They are replaced by stratification axis «risk syndrome». Financial prosperity does not guarantee security, and science and politics are both producers and consumers of risks. Humanity finds itself trapped by technological progress which brought equilibrium harmony with society and nature. Risk is an inherent characteristic of reflexive modern society. At the institutional level stable social structures – the economy, family, political system, science, class division of society and other base frames of industrial society – cannot be a reliable guides. «People are released from forms of life and habits of the industrial modern era...civic coordinate system...life and thinking of industrial modernism axis – family and profession, belief in science and progress – shaken, there is a link between chances and risks looming outlines risk society» [26, p. 16].

A similar opinion on the current processes of disintegration leads P. Sztompka noting that «there is the unknown vector of social development, in this context the activity of such subjects is growing, who consider social reality as a field of implementation of «life chances»» [27]. These points pay attention to the special «logic» of contemporary social institutions.

The foundation of the transition from an industrial society to contemporary society of risk is «change the logic of the distribution of wealth in society based on lack of benefits, on the logic of the distribution of risk in contemporary developed countries» [26, p. 21]. The development of productive forces, technology, progress of science, the mastery of nature give rise to risks that are superior to the previous ones. Modern risks are the product of reflexive modernization and relate to the qualitatively new «socially dangerous situations», assuming the nature of civilization [26, p. 22].

Summarizing, we note that we were able to refute the myth of time and space «basis of risk»: the risk category and as a phenomenon of social life risk is not solely the product of European civilization, its history and existence has more than 1500 years. The thesis of «catastrophic» character of risk also is relevant: the risk is an essential component of human activity that not only promotes the emergence of threats and challenges, but also has the prospect of increasing the efficiency of action. Risk is a constant feature of human activity and contribute to solving agent subjectivity in decision making. That prospect awareness and understanding of risks has the potential to risk management, disclosure of the nature of their constructive actions to increase efficiency. Most heuristic, in our view, is a synthetic approaches to the interpretation of the essence of risk that distinguish «environmental» and «risk activity» and combine both objective and subjective nature of risk. In this connection important to note the dual nature of contemporary risk – their simultaneous presence both on the level of the action and the level of social structures.

Bibliography:

1. Мозговая А. В. Риск как социологическая категория / А. В. Мозговая // Социология 4М: методология, методы, математические модели. – 2006. – №22. – С. 5-18.
2. Українське суспільство 1994–2008. Соціологічний моніторинг / [за ред. д.е.н. В. Ворони, д.соц.н. М. Шульги]. – К. : Інститут соціології НАН України, 2008. – 656 с.
3. Луман Н. Понятие риска / Н. Луман // Thesis. – М. : Начала-пресс, 1994. – Выпуск 5. – С. 135-160.
4. Клапків М. С. Питання етимології економічного ризику / М. С. Клапків // Фінанси України. – 2001. – № 4. – С. 14-20.
5. Євдокимова І. А. Соціальний ризик техногенного характеру / І. Євдокимова // Соціальні ризики та соціальна безпека в умовах природних і техногенних надзвичайних ситуацій та катастроф / [відп.ред. В. В. Дурдинець, Ю. І. Саєнко, Ю. О. Привалов]. – К. : Стилос, 2001. – С. 23-70.
6. Покатович И. В. Экологический риск: теоретические и прикладные аспекты социологического исследования / Покатович И. В. // Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В.Н. Каразіна. «Соціологічні дослідження сучасного суспільства: методологія, теорія, методи». – 2009. – № 844. – С. 112 – 119.
7. Лук'янова В. В. Економічний ризик : [навч. посібник] / В. В. Лук'янова, Т. В. Головач. – К. : Академвидав, 2007. – 464 с.
8. Вітлінський В. В. Ризикологія в економіці та підприємстві : Монографія / В. В. Вітлінський, Г. І. Великоіваненко. – К. : КНЕУ, 2004. – 480 с.

9. Райзберг Б. А. Предпринимательство и риск / Райзберг Б. А. – М. : Знание, 1992. – 64 с.
10. Лощинин М. Персональный и коллективный социально–экономические риски в принципиально неоднородном социуме / М. Лощинин // Соціальні ризики. Т.2 – К. : ПЦ «Фоліант», 2004. – С. 271-333.
11. Альгин А. П. Риск и его роль в общественной жизни / А. П. Альгин. – М. : Мысль, 1989. – 188 с.
12. Дорожкин А. М. Риск в социальном пространстве: историческая ретроспектива и современность / А. М. Дорожкин, Н. Е. Григорьева // Вестник Нижегородского университета им. Н. И. Лобачевского. Серия: социальные науки. – НУ имени Н.И. Лобачевского, 2008. – С. 1-10.
13. Иванов А. В. Социосинергетическая динамика общества риска: методологический аспект : автореф. на соискание ученой степени к. филос.н./ Иванов А. В. – Саратов, 2007. – С. 3-12.
14. Буржуазная социология на исходе 20 века : Критика новейших тенденций / В. Н. Иванов, Ю. Н. Давыдов, М. С. Комаров и др. – М. : Наука, 1986. – 278 с.
15. Бурдые П. От правила к стратегиям // Начала / П. Бурдые : [пер. с франц. Н. А. Шматко]. – М. : Socio-Logos, 1994.– 288 с. (С. 11–57).
16. Мечитов А. И. Восприятие риска / А. И. Мечитов, С. Б. Ребрик // Психологический журнал. – 1990. – Т.11. – №3. – С. 87-95.
17. Bradbury J. The policy implications of differing concepts of risk // Science, technology and human values. – Cambridge (mass), 1989. – Vol.14, N4. – P.380 – 399.
18. Бергер П. Социальное конструирование реальности. Трактат по социологии знания / П. Бергер, Т. Лукман; [Пер. с англ.] – М. : Медиум, 1995. – 324 с.
19. Douglas M. Risk acceptability. According to the social science (Social research perspectives: occasional reports on current topics). – New York : Russell Sage Foundation, 1985. – 115 p.
20. Бабосов Е. М. Катастрофы: социологический прогноз / Е. М. Бабосов. – Минск : Наука и техника, 1995. – 472 с.
21. Lidskog R. In science we trust? On relation between scientific knowledge, risk consciousness and public trust // Journal of the Scandinavian sociological association. – 1996. – Vol.39, №1. – P. 31-57.
22. Srader-Frechett K. Perceived risks versus actual risks: managing hazards through negotiation. – <http://www.fplc.edu/RISK/rskarts.htm>
23. Яницкий О. Н. Социология риска: ключевые идеи / О. Н. Яницкий // Мир России. – 2003. – Т. XII. – № 1. – С. 3-45.
24. Lupton D. Risk and sociocultural theory: new directions and perspectives / D. Lupton. – Cambridge University Press, 1999. – 300 p.
25. Mythen G. Reappraising the Risk Society Thesis: Telescopic Sight or Myopic Vision? / Gabe Mythen // Current Sociology. – November, 2007. – Vol. 55(6). – P. 793-813.
26. Бек У. Общество риска: на пути к другому модерну / Ульрих Бек. – М. : Прогресс-Традиция, 2000. – 384 с.
27. Sztompka P. Society in Action. The theory of Social Becoming / Piter Sztompka. – Cambridge Polity Press, 1991.