

Elena B. PLOTNIKOVA¹

Yulia S. MARKOVA²

Evgeniya V. PLOTNIKOVA³

UDC 316.354

ADDRESSING SOCIOCULTURAL RISKS IN CONTEMPORARY RUSSIA: THE ROLE OF ENTERPRISES*

¹ Cand. Sci. (Hist.), Associate Professor,
Head of the Department of Sociology,
Perm State National Research University
plotnikova1958@yandex.ru; ORCID: 0000-0003-3599-5215

² Cand. Sci. (Soc.), Associate Professor,
Department of Sociology,
Perm State National Research University
julyamarkova@gmail.com; ORCID: 0000-0002-6271-9403

³ Doctor of Philosophy, PhD in Social Policy,
Sociologist, Sociological Center,
Perm State National Research University
evgplotnikova@yandex.ru; ORCID: 0000-0001-6492-8092

Abstract

This paper analyses the academic literature on the role of enterprises in addressing sociocultural risks at the regional level in contemporary Russia. The studied literature was collected using two sources: the database of the Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Science and the Russian Scientific Electronic Library “eLIBRARY.RU”. The search time-scale covered the period between 2000 and 2019. Two questions informed the literature search and analysis: 1) What sociocultural risks are identified in the literature? 2) What is the role of enterprises in addressing these risks?

* The research was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (grant No. 19-011-00369).

Citation: Plotnikova E. B., Markova Yu. S., Plotnikova E. V. 2020. “Addressing sociocultural risks in contemporary Russia: the role of enterprises”. Tyumen State University Herald. Social, Economic, and Law Research, vol. 6, no. 3 (23), pp. 46-58.

DOI: 10.21684/2411-7897-2020-6-3-46-58

The results show that the academic literature distinguishes between two categories of sociocultural risks. Firstly, the risks causing the dysfunction of socio-economic and political structures. Secondly, the risks related to the deterioration of moral values, cultural traditions and social identities at individual, community, and national levels.

The role of enterprises in addressing these risks is revealed in two areas. Firstly, these are the corporate social responsibility (CSR) practices: provision of social benefits to employees, supporting vulnerable groups in local communities, investing in educational and sport activities and events. Secondly, some enterprises introduce innovative instruments, such as sociocultural projects.

However, most studies of such projects refer to either small or non-industrial enterprises. Further analysis should focus on the implementation of sociocultural projects by the industrial enterprises at the regional level in Russia, since there is a lack of empirical studies in this area.

Keywords

Sociocultural risks, enterprises, corporate social responsibility, CSR, sociocultural projects.

DOI: 10.21684/2411-7897-2020-6-3-46-58

Introduction

This paper is a narrative review of the academic literature examining the role of enterprises in addressing sociocultural risks emerging at the regional level in contemporary Russia.

The disproportionate territorial development is one of the historically inherent characteristics of the social system in Russia. Today, this trend has been exacerbated by archaization and deindustrialization of some territories, leading to unequal opportunities for the regional participation in global economic and cultural processes [1, 18]. In recent years, the socio-economic development of municipalities has become a policy priority. As a result, municipalities have experienced significant transformation in socio-economic and legal systems and relations [2, 11]. Understanding the role of various actors in these processes has emerged as an important area for research.

The substantial socio-economic and political role of enterprises in some regions and local areas in Russia explains the decision to focus on this specific category of corporate actors [15]. Therefore, this paper aims to examine how the role of enterprises (as corporate actors) has been portrayed in relation to sociocultural risks emerging in contemporary Russia.

Methods

The academic literature was searched among the two sources: the database of the Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Science and the Russian Scientific Electronic Library “eLIBRARY.RU”. The following keywords (in Russian) were employed: “sociocultural risks or threats”, “region”, and “enterprise”. As the purpose

was to identify the contemporary issues, the search timescale has been restricted to the period of 2000-2019. Two questions informed the literature analysis and the structure of the subsequent presentation of results:

- 1) What sociocultural risks are identified in the literature?
- 2) What is the role of enterprises in addressing these risks?

The regional level (municipal districts, in particular) represents an important unit of analysis. Municipal areas are the key units of the settlement structure in Russia. The latter were recognized as a complex sociocultural community reflecting contemporary societal challenges and existing socioeconomic inequalities [10].

The decision to focus on the role of enterprises is informed by a number of criticisms, articulated in the international literature on corporate responsibility, as a cause of many of the current challenges at local, national and global levels, including environmental risks, social inequalities, and public health issues [12].

Results

The types of sociocultural challenges

At the conceptual level, the literature examines the phenomenon of sociocultural risks from two theoretical perspectives: positivist and sociocultural. The positivist approach perceives risks as part of an objective reality and defines it as a potential or real threat to society, community, or environment [22]. The sociocultural approach focuses on the study of social and cultural conditions of construction and the perception of risks [9, 14, 23, 24].

In this paper, the authors have developed an integrative approach to understanding sociocultural risks as both cultural and social aspects of risks that emerge as a result of contemporary societal processes, i. e. globalization, modernization, and digitalization. The cultural dimension in understanding sociocultural risks is associated with a deterioration of moral values, norms, cultural traditions and social identities at the individual, community, and national levels. The social dimension that appears in the definition of sociocultural risks, relates to the threats causing the dysfunction or instability of socio-economic and political structures resulting in social insecurity and social tensions [17, 24].

At the empirical level, the literature distinguishes between several types of sociocultural risks. The distinction is based on two criteria; the level of association (i. e. individual, national, and global) and the sphere of origin including economic, political or environmental risks, and the risks related to health, family or working life. For instance, an empirical study conducted at the regional level in 2010 found that respondents primarily referred to the following risks as the main national challenges: financial and economic crisis in 2007-2008, terrorism, unemployment, diseases (both communicable and non-communicable), and poverty. Interestingly, some of these national issues (namely unemployment, diseases, and poverty) were also mentioned as the main personal challenges. In relation to global risks, research participants named terrorism, financial and economic crisis in 2007-2008, and environmental problems among their main concerns [16].

Some of these challenges appeared in a subsequent empirical study of sociocultural risks conducted in 85 Russian regions in 2014-2015 by I. V. Dolgorukova et al. [6]. This study revealed that respondents referred to the following issues as their main concerns: family wellbeing, diseases, increasing housing prices, poverty, decreasing quality of medical services, low salaries and pensions.

A certain degree of variation in results reported in these two studies could be attributed to the methodological differences. For instance, in the study conducted by T. A. Rassadina in 2010 [16], respondents were asked to distinguish between global, national, and individual risks. Whereas, in the subsequent study in 2014-2015 [6], this differentiation was not emphasized and research participants were asked to articulate their overall concerns about current socio-economic and cultural issues in their respective regions.

Another possible explanation for this discrepancy in data could be the research timescale. For instance, the first study was conducted in 2010 [16] — just three years after the financial and economic crisis in 2007. Anxiety associated with this crisis dominated in participants' responses. The subsequent survey was conducted in 2014-2015 [6], when the socio-economic situation became more stable, and the respondents' concerns were primarily associated with their day-to-day life rather than developments at the global and national levels.

Apart from the primarily socio-economic challenges mentioned above, the literature identifies the cultural aspects of emerging risks in terms of deteriorating national self-identity and moral principles, ethnic and religious discrimination, and violation of human rights [26]. Some scholars explore sociocultural risks specific to particular groups and communities. That includes the studies examining risks associated with the cross-border migration and adaptation of migrants in the Russian regions [5], and the issues associated with deviant behaviour in young people [8].

Another typology includes two categories of sociocultural risks: tangible and intangible. Tangible sociocultural risks are associated with deterioration of the community infrastructure, monuments and other cultural objects; whereas the intangible ones are related to deterioration of national identity, i. e. the loss of historical memory, destruction of cultural identity and moral norms, violation of human rights and freedoms, ethnic and religious discrimination, and the emergence of deviant subcultures [26]. This study by V. I. Zubok, V. I. Chuprov, and I. S. Shapovalova also reveals that technogenic and environmental risks can lead to new sociocultural risks, including decreasing quality of life, growing social tension within communities, social uncertainty and forced mobility in the region.

Thus, the literature distinguishes between two categories of sociocultural risks:

- firstly, the risks causing the dysfunction of socio-economic and political structures;
- secondly, the risks related to the deterioration of moral values, norms, cultural traditions and social identities at individual, community and national levels.

In the next section we will consider how, and to what extent, these risks are addressed by enterprises at the regional level in Russia.

The role of enterprises

The corporate role in addressing sociocultural risks in contemporary Russia has been primarily discussed in the context of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) practices [4, 25] and innovative (for the Russian context) ideas of “social entrepreneurship” and “social enterprise” [3, 4, 7, 13, 21, 25].

The role of large industrial enterprises has been mainly considered in relation to their CSR programs. These programs are distinguished between occasional charity projects, strategic philanthropy, and social investments [25]. In contrast to the first two types, the latter suggests a long-term corporate policy aiming to address social problems. In addition to presenting this classification, Utting [20] examined priorities and gaps in current corporate social responsibility programmes offered by industrial enterprises in Russia. The key priorities included: supporting vulnerable groups, providing social benefits and professional development opportunities for employees, and investing in sport, educational and leisure programmes for children and young people in local communities. One of the gaps recognized in this analysis was the lack of attention currently being paid to environmental protection programmes and environmental effects on health.

Some authors (e. g., E. Ia. Vittenberg [21]) discuss the proposition that business actors bear a shared responsibility (together with the government institutions and civil society actors) for regional development and its socio-economic sustainability. Meanwhile, other scholars (M. F. Chernysh and A. E. Chirikova et al.) argue that CSR projects focus either on “internal” (enterprise-oriented) social policy, i. e. personnel development, or are of a one-off charity-type nature [3, 4]. Although some of the CSR practices aim to address broader social problems, these attempts are not always translated into long-term commitments due to either economic or political reasons.

The ideas of “social entrepreneurship” and “social enterprise”, when business actors develop long-term commitments to socially-oriented programmes, are explored in a number of articles [7, 13].

For instance, A. A. Moskovskaya analyzes the case-studies of “social enterprises” in four regions of the Russian Federation, looking at their different business models, professional profiles, marketing strategies, and the social impacts of these institutions [13]. Although the latter is not the main focus of analysis in this book, a number of positive developments have been observed in relation to their social outcomes. This includes support to vulnerable groups (i. e. orphans, disabled adults and children), the provision of personal development and educational programmes for children.

A subsequent work by I. A. Klimov and S. G. Klimova refines the definition of a social enterprise [7]. These authors have developed a set of characteristics of such enterprises including: the introduction of social innovations; the development of social networks; and the realization of sociocultural projects. The latter became the specific focus of an empirical study conducted by these authors in 15 enterprises implementing such projects [7]. Although most of the enterprises in this sample are not industrial, the conceptual and methodological findings of this research could be employed in other areas.

For example, the classification of sociocultural projects could be helpful in examining similar programmes provided by industrial enterprises. Another valuable contribution of the work [7] is developing the definition to a sociocultural project as the one which aims to address existing social problems by creating sociocultural practices, behavioural norms and patterns within social communities not only employees, but a broader range of stakeholders, including the primary beneficiaries of these projects from various social groups, in order to insure long-term benefits from the support provided.

For instance, some of the goals of the projects identified in this study [7] included: provision of employment to disabled people and young people without work experience, organization of social spaces for people from low-income groups and homeless people and provision of sporting facilities and educational programmes for teenagers from less privileged backgrounds. One of the common features of these projects is a focus on the proactive engagement of community members in social networks, i. e. employment, educational and recreational activities, as opposed to “passive” provision of social benefits. Although, as mentioned above, most of the identified projects are initiated by non-industrial enterprises, this research could direct future studies aiming to identify the contribution of industrial enterprises in this area [7].

Finally, it is important to note that, apart from the arguably positive role of industrial enterprises in addressing some of the emerging sociocultural risks, some studies (e. g., by T. A. Rassadina [16] and E. V. Shlykova [19]) recognize that these actors contribute to emerging sociocultural risks primarily as a result of their poor environmental policies and lack of consideration of how industrial practices may affect the established and traditional lifestyles of indigenous people.

Discussion

The examined literature distinguishes various types of sociocultural risks emerging in contemporary Russia at the regional level. These types of risks are based on the level and sphere of their origin as well as their relation to specific groups and communities. The conceptual distinction between these two related dimensions in the definition of sociocultural risks is based on whether these risks cause the dysfunction of socio-economic and political structures, or whether they result in a deterioration of moral values, norms and cultural traditions. As mentioned above, this differentiation has primarily been conceptual as in practice, these aspects of sociocultural risks are closely interwoven and often hard to separate.

Furthermore, this literature review identified a variation regarding the sociocultural risks reported in 2010 [16] and 2014-2015 [6]. Two factors should be considered in understanding these results. Firstly, the methodological differences in research designs may have led to some discrepancy in the results. Secondly, there was a time gap between the data collection in 2010 and 2014-2015. After the financial and economic crisis in 2007-2008, the socio-economic transformation and stabilization affected people’s perceptions of risks, and thus, the issues associated with individual well-being grew in priority.

The role of enterprises in addressing sociocultural risks is ambiguous as some authors refer to enterprises as actors contributing to emerging risks, for instance, not paying sufficient attention to environmental issues [12], while other scholars examine how enterprises attempt to resolve some of these risks [3, 4, 7, 13]. Overall, the literature identifies a transformation in corporate practices of enterprises in Russia. There is a shift from occasional corporate social projects towards developing long-term corporate strategic plans addressing social problems at the regional level. This transformation may have important implications for strengthening the social partnership model at the regional level and the regional development.

Conclusion

This paper has analyzed the literature examining the role of enterprises in addressing sociocultural risks emerging at the regional level in contemporary Russia. The academic literature distinguishes various types of sociocultural risks based on the level and sphere of their origin as well as their relation to specific groups and communities. These risks include socio-economic and environmental challenges as well as intangible aspects related to deterioration of national identity and moral principles, ethnic and religious discrimination, and violation of human rights.

The role of enterprises in addressing these risks is two-fold. Firstly, corporate actors introduce CSR practices: provision of social benefits to employees, supporting vulnerable groups in local communities, investing in educational and sport activities and events. Secondly, some enterprises develop innovative instruments, such as sociocultural projects.

However, most studies of such projects refer to either small or non-industrial enterprises. Further analysis should focus on the implementation of sociocultural projects by the industrial enterprises at the regional level in Russia since there is a lack of empirical studies in this area.

REFERENCES

1. Akberdina V. V., Sergeyeva A. S. 2015. "Industrial regions of Russia: comparative analysis". *Bulletin of the Transbaikal State University*, no. 7 (122), pp. 98-117. [In Russian]
2. Andrianova E. V., Davydenko V. A., Romashkina G. F. 2017. "Modernization and reindustrialization: discussion about ways of implementation". *Philosophical Sciences*, no. 10, pp. 91-94. [In Russian]
3. Chernysh M. F. 2004. "Business social responsibility and its impact on social differentiation". In: *Reforming Russia: Yearbook*. Pp. 80-91. [In Russian]
4. Chirikova A. E., Shilova L. S., Lapina N. Iu., Shishkin S. V. 2005. *Business as a Subject of Social Policy: Debtor, Benefactor, Partner?* Moscow: Independent Institute for Social Policy, HSE. 232 pp. [In Russian]
5. Diatlov V. I. 2009. *Cross-Border Migrations and Host Society: Mechanisms and Practices of Mutual Adaptation*. Yekaterinburg: Ural University Publishing House. 396 pp. [In Russian]

6. Dolgorukova I. V., Kirilina T. Iu., Mazaev Iu. N, Iudina T. N. 2017. "Social anxiety and social fears of the Russian population: sociological dimension". *Sociological Research*, no. 2, pp. 57-66. [In Russian]
7. Klimov I. A., Klimova S. G. 2015. "Modernization effects of social entrepreneurship". *Petersburg Sociology Today*, no. 6, pp. 266-299. [In Russian]
8. Kozlova I. V. 2018. "Disadaptation processes in the way of student youth's life as a social problem". *Transbaikal State University Journal*, vol. 24, no. 7, pp. 68-76. DOI: 10.21209/2227-9245-2018-24-7-68-76. [In Russian]
9. Kravchenko S. A. 2017. "The coexistence of riskophobia and riskophilia — an expression of 'normal anomie'". *Sociological Research*, no. 2, pp. 3-13. [In Russian]
10. Lapin N. I. 2006. "Region, its status and functions in Russian society: theoretical and methodological foundations of the study". *Sociological Research*, no. 9, pp. 25-34. [In Russian]
11. Lapin N. I. 2018. "Hybrid transit and the need for 'modernization for all'". *Bulletin of the Institute of Sociology*, no. 27, pp. 105-136. [In Russian]
12. McLennan Sh., Glenn B. 2019. "Reversing the lens: why corporate social responsibility is not community development". *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, no. 26, pp. 117-26.
13. Moskovskaya A. A. (ed.). 2011. *Social Entrepreneurship in Russia and in the World: Practice and Research*. Moscow: HSE. 283 pp. [In Russian]
14. Mozgovaya A. V. 2018. "Social sphere: vectors of change, risks, and adaptation resources (the results of all-Russian monitoring surveys)." *RUDN Journal of Sociology*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 708-718. DOI: 10.22363/2313-2272-2018-18-4-708-718 [In Russian]
15. Nadzhafova M. N. 2017. "On the social role of city-forming enterprises and the directions of their economic support in the Kursk Region . *International Journal of Applied and Basic Research*, no. 2-2, pp. 241-245. [In Russian]
16. Rassadina T. A. 2013. "Russians in a 'risk society'. Emotional and value aspects". *Sociological Research*, no. 11, pp. 84-93. [In Russian]
17. Semernik A. Z., Balahonskaia Iu. V. 2015. "Sociocultural risks as a subject of socio-humanitarian reflection and the phenomenon of modern societies". *Saint Petersburg University Bulletin Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia*, no. 2 (66), pp. 239-244. [In Russian]
18. Shinkovsky M. Yu. 2008. "Glocalization as a subject of scientific research". *Polity*, no. 2, pp. 46-57. [In Russian]
19. Shlykova E. V. 2017. "The profile of the adaptive social well-being of the population in conditions of imposed risk". *Izvestia TulGU. Humanitarian Sciences*, no. 1, pp. 114-126. [In Russian]
20. Utting P. 2007. "CSR and equality". *Third World Quarterly*, no. 28 (4), pp. 697-712. DOI: 10.1080/01436590701336572
21. Vittenberg E. Ia. 2011. *Social Responsibility of Business in the Post-Soviet Space*. Moscow: ITRGGYU. 481 pp. [In Russian]
22. Yanitskiy O. N. 2003. "Sociology of risk: key ideas". *Universe of Russia*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 3-35. [In Russian]
23. Yanitskiy O. N. 2017. "Globalization and civilization risks". *Risk Management*, no. 3 (83), pp. 48-56. [In Russian]

24. Yanitskiy O. N. 2019. "Challenges and risks of globalization. Seven theses". Sociological Research, no. 1, pp. 29-39. DOI: 10.31857/S013216250003745-2 [In Russian]
25. Zorina A. E. 2015. "Social responsibility of business and environmental attitudes of the population (on the example of community at risk)". Cand. Sci. thesis. IS RAN. [In Russian]
26. Zubok V. I. (ed.). 2016. Risks of Transforming Habitats: A Research and Management Challenge. Belgorod: Epitsentr. 208 pp. [In Russian]

Елена Борисовна ПЛОТНИКОВА¹
Юлия Сергеевна МАРКОВА²
Евгения Вадимовна ПЛОТНИКОВА³

УДК 316.354

РЕШЕНИЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ СОЦИАЛЬНО-КУЛЬТУРНЫХ РИСКОВ В СОВРЕМЕННОЙ РОССИИ: РОЛЬ ПРЕДПРИЯТИЙ*

¹ кандидат исторических наук, доцент, заведующий кафедрой социологии,
Пермский государственный национальный исследовательский университет
plotnikova1958@yandex.ru; ORCID: 0000-0003-3599-5215

² кандидат социологических наук, доцент, кафедра социологии,
Пермский государственный национальный исследовательский университет
julyamarkova@gmail.com; ORCID: 0000-0002-6271-9403

³ Doctor of Philosophy, Ph. D. in Social Policy, социолог, Центр социологии,
Пермский государственный национальный исследовательский университет
evgplotnikova@yandex.ru; ORCID: 0000-0001-6492-8092

Аннотация

В данной работе представлен анализ научной литературы о роли предприятий в решении проблем социально-культурных рисков на региональном уровне в современной России. Поиск научной литературы осуществлялся с использованием двух источников: базы данных Института социологии РАН и Российской научной электронной библиотеки «eLIBRARY.RU». Сроки поиска охватили период с 2000 по 2019 г. Поиск и анализ литературы проводились по двум вопросам: 1) Какие социокультурные риски выявлены в литературе? 2) Какова роль предприятий в борьбе с этими рисками?

* Исследование было выполнено при поддержке РФФИ (проект № 19-011-00369).

Цитирование: Плотникова Е. Б. Решение проблемы социально-культурных рисков в современной России: роль предприятий / Е. Б. Плотникова, Ю. С. Маркова, Е. В. Плотникова // Вестник Тюменского государственного университета. Социально-экономические и правовые исследования. 2020. Том 6. № 3 (23). С. 46-58.
DOI: 10.21684/2411-7897-2020-6-3-46-58

В научной литературе были выявлены две категории социокультурных рисков: во-первых, риски, вызывающие дисфункционирование социально-экономических и политических структур; во-вторых, риски, которые связаны с ухудшением моральных ценностей, культурных традиций и социальной идентичности на индивидуальном, общинном и национальном уровнях.

Роль предприятий в устранении этих рисков проявляется в двух областях. Во-первых, это практика корпоративной социальной ответственности (КСО): предоставление социальных льгот сотрудникам, поддержка уязвимых групп в местных сообществах, инвестирование в образовательную и спортивную деятельность и мероприятия. Во-вторых, некоторые предприятия внедряют инновационные инструменты, такие как социально-культурные проекты.

Тем не менее большинство исследований таких проектов относится как к малым, так и к непромышленным предприятиям. Дальнейший анализ должен быть сосредоточен на реализации промышленными предприятиями социально-культурных проектов на региональном уровне в России, т. к. эмпирических исследований в этой области не хватает.

Ключевые слова

Социокультурные риски, предприятия, корпоративная социальная ответственность, КСО, социокультурные проекты.

DOI: 10.21684/2411-7897-2020-6-3-46-58

СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

1. Акбердина В. В. Индустриальные регионы России: сравнительный анализ / В. В. Акбердина, А. С. Сергеева // Вестник Забайкальского государственного университета. 2015. № 7 (122). С. 98-117.
2. Андрианова Е. В. Модернизация и реиндустриализация: к дискуссии о способах реализации / Е. В. Андрианова, В. А. Давыденко, Г. Ф. Ромашкина // Философские науки. 2017. № 10. С. 91-94.
3. Черныш М. Ф. Социальная ответственность бизнеса и ее влияние на социальную дифференциацию / М. Ф. Черныш // Россия реформирующаяся: ежегодник — 2004 / отв. ред. Л. М. Дробижева. М.: Институт социологии РАН, 2004. С. 80-91.
4. Чирикова А. Е. Бизнес как субъект социальной политики: должник, благодетель, партнер? / А. Е. Чирикова, Л. С. Шилова, Н. Ю. Лапина, С. В. Шишкин; Независимый институт социальной политики. М.: Изд. дом ГУ ВШЭ, 2005. 232 с.
5. Трансграничные миграции и принимающее общество: механизмы и практики взаимной адаптации: монография / науч. ред. проф. В. И. Дятлов. Екатеринбург: Изд-во Урал. ун-та, 2009. 396 с.
6. Долгорукова И. В. Социальная тревожность и социальные опасения населения России: социологическое измерение / И. В. Долгорукова, Т. Ю. Кирилина, Ю. Н. Мазаев, Т. Н. Юдина // Социологические исследования. 2017. № 2. С. 57-66.

7. Климов И. А. Модернизационные эффекты социального предпринимательства / И. А. Климов, С. Г. Климова // Петербургская социология сегодня — 2015: сборник научных трудов Социологического института РАН. СПб.: Нестор-История, 2015. Вып. 6. С. 266-299.
8. Козлова И. В. Деадаптационные процессы в образе жизни студенческой молодежи как социальная проблема / И. В. Козлова // Вестник Забайкальского государственного университета. 2018. Том 24. № 7. С. 68-76.
DOI: 10.21209/2227-9245-2018-24-7-68-76
9. Кравченко С. А. Сосуществование рискофобии и рискофилии — проявление «нормальной аномии» / С. А. Кравченко // Социологические исследования. 2017. № 2. С. 3-13.
10. Лапин Н. И. Регион, его статус и функции в российском обществе: теоретико-методологические основы исследования / Н. И. Лапин // Социологические исследования. 2006. № 9. С. 25-34.
11. Лапин Н. И. Гибридный транзит и потребность в «модернизации для всех» / Н. И. Лапин // Вестник Института социологии. 2018. № 27. С. 105-136.
12. McLennan Sh. Reversing the lens: why corporate social responsibility is not community development / Sh. McLennan, B. Glenn // Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management. 2019. No. 26. Pp. 117-26.
13. Социальное предпринимательство в России и в мире. Практика и исследования / отв. ред. А. А. Московская. М.: Изд. дом НИУ ВШЭ, 2011. 283 с.
14. Мозговая А. В. Социальная сфера: вектор изменений, риски и адаптационные ресурсы (по материалам общероссийских мониторинговых исследований) / А. В. Мозговая // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Социология. 2018. Том 18. № 4. С. 708-718.
DOI: 10.22363/2313-2272-2018-18-4-708-718
15. Наджафова М. Н. О социальной роли градообразующих предприятий и направлениях их экономической поддержки в Курской области / М. Н. Наджафова // Международный журнал прикладных и фундаментальных исследований. 2017. № 2-2. С. 241-245.
16. Рассадина Т. А. Россияне в условиях «общества риска»: эмоциональный и ценностный аспекты / Т. А. Рассадина // Социологические исследования. 2013. № 11. С. 84-93.
17. Семерник С. З. Социокультурные риски как предмет социогуманитарной рефлексии и феномен современного общества / С. З. Семерник, Ю. В. Балахонская // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета МВД России. 2015. № 2 (66). С. 239-244.
18. Шинковский М. Ю. Глокализация как предмет научного исследования / М. Ю. Шинковский // Политика. 2008. № 2. С. 46-57.
19. Шлыкова Е. В. Профиль адаптационного социального самочувствия населения в условиях навязываемого риска / Е. В. Шлыкова // Известия ТулГУ. Гуманитарные науки. Вып. 1. Тула: Изд-во ТулГУ, 2017. С. 114-126.
20. Utting P. CSR and equality / P. Utting // Third World Quarterly. 2007. No. 28 (4). Pp. 697-712. DOI: 10.1080/01436590701336572
21. Виттенберг Е. Я. Социальная ответственность бизнеса на постсоветском пространстве / Е. Я. Виттенберг. М.: ИЦРГГУ, 2011. 481 с.

22. Яницкий О. Н. Социология риска: ключевые идеи / О. Н. Яницкий // Мир России. 2003. № 1. С. 3-33.
23. Яницкий О. Н. Глобализация и цивилизационные риски / О. Н. Яницкий // Управление риском. 2017. № 3 (83). С. 48-56.
24. Яницкий О. Н. Вызовы и риски глобализации. Семь тезисов / О. Н. Яницкий // Социологические исследования. 2019. № 1. С. 29-39.
DOI: 10.31857/S013216250003745-2
25. Зорина А. Е. Социальная ответственность бизнеса и экологические установки населения (на примере общности в условиях риска): автореф. дис. ... канд. соц. наук / А. Е. Зорина // Официальный портал ИС РАН. 2015.
URL: <http://www.isras.ru/publ.html?id=4253>
26. Риски трансформирующейся среды обитания: проблема исследования и управления: монография / Ю. А. Зубок (отв. ред.), В. И. Чупров, И. С. Шаповалова и др. Белгород: ЭПИЦЕНТР, 2016. 208 с.