

The article examines the theoretical and methodological foundations of political riskology within the public governance system under the conditions of socio-political transition and high security uncertainty. The conceptual and categorical apparatus at the intersection of public governance and political sociology is analyzed. The author proposes a structural division of political risk levels, providing a detailed substantiation of the municipal, regional, state-wide (national), and interstate levels of threat identification. Special attention is paid to the sociocultural dynamics of risks through the prism of M. Douglas's "grid-group" model and S. Crook's concept of social orders. It is demonstrated that effective public governance in a transitive society requires a shift from linear crisis prevention to reflexive mechanisms aimed at ensuring national resilience and social consensus.

Keywords: public governance, political riskology, political risk, transitive society, security uncertainty, national resilience, sociocultural dynamics, threat identification.

УДК 351:323.21:005.334

Лісний М. В., здобувач Національного університету цивільного захисту України

Political Riskology In The Public Governance System: Theoretical-Methodological Foundations And Levels Of Threat Identification

Problem statement. Politics is an activity related to the relations between large social groups regarding the acquisition, retention, and use of power, which serves as a means of securing their interests. The political sphere of society can be represented by state power, the functioning of political institutions (political parties, various public and socio-political organizations), mass political actions (opposition or law enforcement activities, participation in the formation of authorities through elections, determining the programs of these bodies' activities, participating in their work, and exercising control over them). Hence arises the need to distinguish between individual, group, and mass political behavior, although political risk is more accurately considered collective.

Recent research and publications analysis. The following scholars have researched this subject matter: Ya. Halych, O. Hordiichuk, Yu. Hrytsenko, S. Drobotov, V. Melnyk, V. Naida, Yu. Shevchuk, Yu. Shemshuchenko, and others.

Research purpose. To develop theoretical foundations and public governance mechanisms for identifying and mitigating political risks to enhance national resilience and social stability.

Presenting main material. Some scholars understand riskology not as a science in the strict sense of the word, but as an interdisciplinary field of knowledge composed of various scientific disciplines that are comprehensively used to identify, study, and optimize risks.

In general, the conceptual and categorical apparatus of political sociology, as well as political riskology, includes such concepts as "socio-political processes", "political risks", "civil society", "social mechanism of power", "political mentality", "socio-political stability", "subjects of politics", "political consensus", "protest political behavior", "maintenance of social order", "political interaction", "socio-political conflict", "socio-political crisis", "political consciousness", "political behavior", "political position", "leadership", "interest group", "opposition", "political interest", "political extremism", "political culture", "political pressure", "political ideology", "political cooperation", "electoral behavior", etc.

In other words, there are general concepts, and there are categories developed primarily within the framework of political sociology and the political branch of riskology.

Due to the development of democratic institutions and the involvement of an increasing number of subjects in the political process, public policy and governance decision-making is not only extremely complex but also a multi-stage process. These stages constitute the external side and are associated with the work of a large circle of people on developing a general strategy and specific ways of its implementation, conducting expert evaluation of the decision, its public discussion, adjustment, forming public opinion regarding the adopted decision, preparing implementers, monitoring execution, etc.

Political risk is collective in its very essence, as it is determined not so much by the personal qualities of politicians or technologies of power, but rather by group political interests. Often, a political subject is forced to enter into various types of associations to implement their own

initiatives, which, of course, requires them to transform their plans and behavior. Furthermore, the activity of a public governance actor is limited by established standards of perception and the specific features of the population's political culture [1, p.184].

Political decisions are made under conditions of confrontation among a multitude of other subjects whose behavior is difficult to predict, and the consequences (more or less remote) are measured by rather ambiguous criteria. Therefore, contemporary researchers consider political risk to be involuntary, non-calculable, and uncertain in terms of the timing of its consequences, large-scale, complex, characterized by the difficulty of evaluation, and by an imbalance of responsibility (a decision can be made by one person, while the entire society may have to pay for its consequences).

The transitional (transitive) period in the development of any society is distinguished by certain most characteristic features, regardless of the specific content and direction of social processes. These include instability, rapid change in the forms and methods of economic and political activity, intensive struggle between the old and the new, the emergence of new social groups and interests, a multi-structural economy, a special role of the state in the economy, etc.

However, along with these general features, there are also specific ones characteristic of a particular country. For Ukraine at the current stage of development, burdened by the consequences of full-scale war and geopolitical transformation, such a specific feature is a high level of socio-political and security uncertainty. It is expressed in:

1. First, the prolonged transformation of value orientations and the consolidation of society around the idea of national resilience, which requires a clear ideological formulation within public policy;
2. Second, the need for constant adaptation of social and infrastructural transformation programs to changing security conditions;
3. Third, a certain forced discreteness (discontinuity) and sometimes inconsistency of the methods and means applied in solving urgent crisis problems;
4. Fourth, the dynamic change and adaptation of legal, social, and moral norms to the conditions of martial law and post-war state.

The greatest difficulty for the conditions of a transitional period is the problem of the regularities of social development. For example, in Soviet times, such regularities were declaratively considered to be the building of a socially homogeneous society, the establishment of social justice and equality, socialist democratism, the development of a system of public self-government, etc. Moreover, these "regularities" expressed not so much the objective processes taking place in society, but rather officially proclaimed ideological dogmas and goals. At the current stage, regularities have shifted into the plane of building a state of law, European integration, and forming sustainable civil society institutions.

To date, within riskology, the following levels of risks have been defined:

Individual (personal) level refers to isolated intellectual systems. Each variety of systems at this level develops according to its own laws. For example, from the perspective of analyzing the existing potential of an institution, at this level, it is necessary to highlight the degree of preparedness of a specific individual to conduct analysis and evaluation of the risk of their own activity and of those involved in the managerial or production process.

Organizational (local, institutional) level is a set of individual intellectual systems and technical devices during the implementation of purposeful activity, and this set is united organizationally and spatially (logistical chains are unambiguous and analyzable). The successes and failures of an organization's activity are viewed as the interaction of a number of factors: external (which the organization cannot influence at all or this influence is weak) and internal (which, as a rule, depend on the efficiency of the management of the structure itself). Research and risk analysis conducted at this level allow for determining trends in the development of science and technology, optimizing the choice of scientific and technical policy, and providing recommendations on decision-making regarding investment policy and resource planning.

State (national, regional) level is a set of organizational and individual objects for solving riskological problems, united by a single politico-managerial system and geographical borders of the state. At this level, solving riskological problems is directly linked to ensuring the national and economic security of the country.

Interstate (global, worldwide) level is a set of subjects for solving state-level riskological problems. Super-complex objects function at this level, and sets of global economic hypercycles or socio-cultural and ethnic cycles of great duration operate here.

Within the framework of our dissertation research, there is a need to consider the state and interstate levels in more detail.

At the state level, problems associated with long-term cycles (covering 50–100 years) are studied, and the riskological methods used are primarily based on the structural-functional approach. It involves considering the object of study not from the perspective of its internal structure, but from the position of its functioning and connections with the environment. As world experience shows, ensuring economic resilience to risks is a guarantee of the country's sovereignty and independence, a basic condition for the stable and effective vital activity of society. This is explained by the fact that the economy represents one of the vital arenas of activity of the state and the individual, and, consequently, the concept of national security will be incomplete without assessing the riskological problems of the economic system and its strength under the influence of external and internal threats.

Economic risks are traditionally viewed as a crucial qualitative characteristic of an economic system, which determines its ability to maintain normal living conditions for the population, sustainable provision of resources for development, as well as the consistent implementation of national-state interests. Economic risk-protection in this context is interpreted as a set of systematically organized managerial influences ensuring autonomy, crisis-resilience (which is associated not so much with linear prevention of crises, but with using crisis periods to accelerate homeostatic processes and modernization), and synergy for economic units of various scales.

To us, such an approach seems too narrow. While the importance of the economic aspect is undeniable, such categories as "development" and "sustainability", which lie at the heart of full-fledged risk-protection and are baseline in the concept of national security, are comprehensive and complex. They must encompass all positions of national interests declared, in particular, in the Law of Ukraine "On National Security of Ukraine".

In the process of transition from totalitarian command-and-control systems to a state of law and a mature civil society, overcoming a certain alienation of the people from the real levers of power is a difficult task. With the change in institutional forms of public governance, the real state of affairs requires constant improvement so that population participation in governance is not episodic (linked exclusively to elections) but transforms into a constant dialogue through public-private partnership mechanisms and public control [2].

The absence of a sizeable and stable middle class in the presence of significant social polarization makes the socio-political situation in society as a whole quite sensitive to risks. However, an increase in dissatisfaction or an intensification of tension does not necessarily mean the inevitability of destructive political upheavals. Social studies show that with proper communication from public authorities and the involvement of citizens in recovery processes, this potential can be directed into a constructive channel. Consolidating the interests of the politico-managerial elite and broad segments of the population is a mandatory condition for minimizing political risks.

We propose to divide the state (national) level of defining and studying political risks in the public governance sphere into the following sub-levels:

- municipal (local);
- regional;
- state-wide (national).

Accordingly, at the *municipal level*, politico-managerial relationships between individual citizens and local authorities, municipal executive bodies, and civil society institutions are considered. At the *regional level* — interaction between public organizations and political institutions at the level of oblasts, between regional legislative (representative) and executive authorities, as well as interregional cooperation. At the *state-wide level* — strategic relations between civil society and political power as a whole, vertical "center-regions" communications, as well as interaction between major political, public, and religious organizations.

When studying political risks at the *interstate level*, riskology must take into account super-global trends in the development of society, science, security architecture, and production, since extremely complex problems of Ukraine's national security are solved at this level [4, p.22].

In contemporary analytical literature, the formulation of the problem is often reduced to the analysis of destructive processes in the economy, the exacerbation of social polarization, or military threats. Historical analysis of transitional societies indicates that peak risks are usually characterized by: uncontrolled capital flight; an increase in the emigration of qualified personnel ("brain drain"); growing technological dependence on foreign manufacturers of high-tech equipment; degradation of knowledge-intensive industries, and a decline in investments in strategic spheres. A drop in scientific and technical potential leads to a loss of the state's advanced positions in the world, a decrease in the quality of research in strategically important areas of scientific and technical progress, an increase in the probability of anthropogenic accidents, and the undermining of defense potential, which makes a cardinal modernization of the national technological base impossible.

A threat in the social sphere, as a consequence of crisis phenomena, is an increase in the proportion of the population living below the poverty line and an intensification of social tension, which leads to a decrease in the intellectual and productive potential of the country, deterioration of demographic indicators, and the depletion of sources of spiritual development.

The threat of natural resource depletion and deterioration of the ecological situation is directly dependent on the level of economic development and the readiness of society to realize the globality of these problems. This threat is exacerbated by the dominance of resource-intensive industries, insufficient development of environmental legislation, and low riskological culture. At the same time, the weakening of state supervision and the lack of effective legal and economic mechanisms for preventing emergencies significantly increase the risk of technological disasters.

In the political sphere, negative processes can strengthen centrifugal tendencies, creating threats to the territorial integrity and unity of the legal space of the state. Manifestations of radicalism and ethnocentrism can provoke internal conflicts, which, besides political instability, lead to the weakening of a unified economic, transport, and logistical space of the country. Mass

migration processes also belong to the factors exacerbating these threats. No less dangerous is the destructive external informational-psychological and political interference of foreign states aimed at destroying the socio-cultural and spiritual unity of the country.

Of particular urgency is the threat of criminalization of public relations and the merging of corrupt elements in government bodies with criminal structures, which transforms the fight against corruption from a purely legal task into a strategic political priority. Also, as a result of a large-scale redistribution of property or an intensification of the struggle for political influence based on group or ethno-nationalist interests, the threat of internal elite terrorism or subversion may grow.

The threat to the physical health of the nation accumulates from practically all spheres of society's life, vividly manifesting itself in the crisis state of the healthcare and social protection systems. Global systemic crises lead to a deformation of the demographic composition of society, the undermining of labor resources, and the weakening of the institution of the family.

In the international and defense spheres, threats to national security manifest themselves through the attempts of other geopolitical actors to counteract the strengthening of the state, weaken its positions on the international arena, or commit direct armed aggression to violate territorial integrity. The greatest real threat is posed by military conflicts, the use of weapons of mass destruction, as well as the widening spectrum of international terrorism.

Thus, we have outlined the circle of problems constituting the baseline issues of the interstate and state levels of political risks.

We propose the following approach to defining the subject of political risk research: they are defined as the identification of socio-political and security threats to all forms of power manifestations, the interaction processes between public governance bodies and civil society institutions, as well as interactions at the interstate level. Political risks, combined with political sociology, should provide generalized knowledge of how a particular transformation in the socio-political structure, mobility, or status of groups affects the functioning of the public governance system as a whole. This allows for the timely detection of factors leading to "dysfunctions",

tension, or political extremism, and for finding ways to ensure political stability and social consensus.

If we consider the category of "the social" as a qualitative determinacy that expresses the essential side in the activity of subjects as carriers of a certain way of human interaction, then the most successful definition is the following: "The social is a set of certain properties and features of social relations, integrated by individuals or communities in the process of joint activity (interaction) under specific conditions and manifesting itself in their relations to each other, to their position in society, to the phenomena and processes of social life." This fully applies to the politico-managerial sphere, where interests and ways of interaction are coordinated precisely in the field of political risks.

The structure of political riskology is represented schematically as a set of three interconnected sections:

- historical (evolution of views on the nature of risk);
- general theoretical (methodology of studying risks using the baseline of sociology and public governance theory);
- practical / applied (risk management technologies).

The general theoretical part analyzes specific areas of political activity in the following directions: political processes; parties and movements; political behavior, consciousness, and culture; political conflicts; foreign policy activity; socio-political forecasting.

The main directions of scientific research in the field of political risk analysis are:

1. Diagnosis of socio-political development, determination of indicators of societal stability, identification of threats, and substantiation of ways to overcome them.
2. Analysis of the political interests of social groups and development of mechanisms for ensuring social consensus.
3. Socio-political and managerial expertise of decisions made by government authorities.
4. Forecasting possible political changes, identifying zones of tension, and preventing unmanageable situations.

5. Development of preventive technologies for averting crisis situations and determining strategies for exiting them at the state and interstate levels.

The general analysis of risk (its essence, genesis, functions, and typology) allows for outlining the subject field of political risk research: analysis of contemporary risks and optimization of ways to reduce them; studying the role of risks in communications at the municipal, regional, and state-wide levels; analyzing the mutual influence of risks and institutions, cultures, ethnic groups, and confessions (determination of mentality, electoral behavior, etc.). In the context of our study, the political theory of risk should be attributed to the group of political behavior analysis, viewing risk simultaneously as a mechanism of socio-political changes and as one of the levers of social control and public administrationM[3].

From our point of view, in the study of political risk, the typologization of actors according to their attitude to risk is important. Thus, O. Renn identifies the following types:

- *atomized individuals* (relying on luck);
- *bureaucrats* (accepting socially controlled risk);
- *entrepreneurs* (individualists);
- *egalitarians* (oriented toward cooperation — collectivists);
- *hermits* (potential mediators in risk-based conflict resolution).

A similar typology resonates with the cultural theory of M. Douglas, which is presented in the "grid-group" model, where socially conditioned lines of individual behavior are traced. Each of the four fields in the model symbolizes a specific type of social organization:

Type A (active individualism): weak structure and weak interdependence (market relations)

Type B (isolated/marginalized individuals): a limiting case of structural constraint without a group tie.

Type C (hierarchical groups): cohesive, centralized, bureaucratically managed, and hierarchically structured communities.

Type D (egalitarians): voluntary, cohesive, but weakly differentiated groups (communities, communes).

These types of social organization largely determine the perception of risk by public governance subjects. The works of M. Douglas, J. Alexander, and P. Smith prove that without prior identification and interpretation of risks, their management cannot be effective. However, the simplification of M. Douglas regarding the homogeneity of cultures can be overcome if we consider the "grid-group" model dynamically — from the perspective of the dominance of certain types in different historical periods.

The problems of socio-cultural dynamics are clarified by the hypothesis of Stephen Crook, who analyzes the relationship between socio-cultural orders, risk awareness, and their management regimes. Social frameworks are understood as general matrices within which patterns of solidarity or conflicts are formed. S. Crook identifies three basic social orders:

The "modern" order — national societies with a system of differentiated, rationalized institutions of the state and the market based on competition. They create solidarity around the distribution of rights and resources.

The "hyper-reflective" order — a global space operating through social networks, computerized communications, and technologies. It is based on radical individualization and reflexive self-control. Conflicts here arise around the right to self-expression, access to information, and exposure to risks.

The "neo-traditional" order — operates in enclaves of intense "mechanical" solidarity based on ethnic, religious affiliation, or shared interests. The prefix "neo-" emphasizes the element of independent choice of a reference group by an individual and the role of contemporary communication technologies in maintaining this solidarity.

Since all three orders are simultaneously distinguished in modern developed socio-political systems, the social dynamics of risks are extremely complex. According to the findings of researchers, these orders gradually alternate their predominance in society, shifting the emphasis toward autonomous individuals and reflexive network communications, which must be taken into account when designing contemporary public governance mechanisms.

References:

1. Aven, T. and Renn, O. (2010), Risk management and governance: concepts, guidelines and applications, Springer, New York, USA. 276 p.
2. Hardy, K. (2010), Managing Risk in Government: An Introduction to Enterprise Risk Management, IBM Center for The Business of Government, Washington, USA.
3. Kryvoshein, V.V. (2009), Politychna ryzykologhiia: epistemolohichnyj status, predmetna, sfera, analitychni instrumenty [Political riskology: epistemological status, subject, sphere, analytical tools], Innovatsiia, Dnipropetrivs'k, Ukraine.
4. Podolska, Ye. A., & Nazarkin, P. O. (2015). Novyi sens y innovatsiini sposoby zabezpechennia sotsialnoi bezpeky [New meaning and innovative ways to ensure social security]. Visnyk Odeskoho natsionalnoho universytetu. Seriia: Sotsiolohiia i politychni nauky, 20(2), 19–25.