

**Seysebayeva R.B.\*, Saitova N.A.**

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University,  
Kazakhstan, Almaty, e-mail: Raykhansey@mail.ru

## **FACTORS OF RISK PERCEPTION IN THE CURRENT POLITICAL PROCESS**

The stability of modern society and the political regime mostly depends on the level of perception of the degree of risk by actors in the political process.

The task of the article is to analyze the characteristics of various factors, conditions and circumstances that affect the risk perception by the public and its impact on political stability. The expediency of the problem analysis in the risk perception by actors of public life is due, that in fact people have different opinions toward the risk theory. The real existence of that fact is presupposed by the necessity in political activity, to analyze possible versions of risk perception by population groups, individuals, political actors of specific risk-based decisions, and in a way or another to assess probabilities of public reaction for these decisions and their consequences. The study of the specifics ratio of the subjective and objective in the perception of the risk level shows the features and general patterns in the activity of political actors on the one hand, and to identify the place of the "risk perception" problem in technologies for the implementation of the political process, on the other.

In political science the study of risk perception makes it possible to evaluate the difference between the level of real risk which were presented by experts and the perceived risk's level that reflects the society reaction based on personal experience and emotional presentation of information. The perceived risk is often a distorted version of actual risk, but in a real political process it is the level that can play decisive role in both as negative and positive. The factors impacted on the perception of the risk level have been considered in the article.

To solve the problem of the level of risk perception, we will analyze the factors, conditions and circumstances that influence the perception of risk by political actors, by analyzing the reaction of the population to the political decisions of the government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, investigating the impact of information technology and means of influence on the level of risk perception by different population groups.

**Key words:** Political process, stability, perception of risks, factors of risks

Сейсебаева Р.Б.\*, Сaitова Н.А.

Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті,  
Қазақстан, Алматы қ. \*e-mail: Raykhansey@mail.ru

### **Қазіргі саяси процестегі тәуекел байымдарының факторлары**

Саяси ғылымда тәуекел деңгейінің байымдарын зерттеу сарапшылар анықтаған шынайы тәуекел деңгейі мен қоғамның жеке тәжірибе мен эмоцияға негізделген тәуекел деңгейінің байымдарының арасындағы айырмашылықты бағалауға мүмкіндік береді. Тәуекел деңгейінің байымдары көп жағдайда шынайы тәуекелдің бұрмаланған нұсқасы болып табылады, дегенмен шынайы саяси процесте байымдалған тәуекел деңгейі шешуші рөл атқарады. Оның әсері теріс те, оң да бола алады. Мақалада тәуекел деңгейін қабылдауына әсер ететін факторлар қарастырылады.

**Түйін сөздер:** саяси процесс, тұрақтылық, тәуекел байымдары, тәуекел факторлары.

Сейсебаева Р.Б. \*, Саитова Н.А.

Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби,  
Казахстан, г. Алматы, \*e-mail: Raykhansey@mail.ru

### **Факторы восприятия риска в современном политическом процессе**

Исследование восприятия риска в политической науке позволяет оценить разницу между уровнем реального риска, представленного экспертами, и воспринимаемым уровнем риска, отражающего реакцию общества, которые основаны на личном опыте и эмоциональной подаче информации. Часто воспринимаемый риск есть искаженная версия фактического риска, но в реальном политическом процессе именно уровень воспринимаемого риска может сыграть свою решающую, как негативную, так и позитивную. В статье рассмотрены факторы, влияющие на восприятие уровня риска.

**Ключевые слова:** политический процесс, стабильность, восприятие риска, факторы риска.

## **Introduction**

The perception of risk in modern political science is investigated depending on the criteria of the research task. First, the study of perceptions on risk-based political decisions allows political scientists to determine political preferences and a possible subsequent reaction of society. At the same time, a real threat or imaginary negative consequences may be absent, but regardless of the presence or absence of risk, the perception of risk can play its own both positive and negative role. Therefore, even a deeply thought out, profitable political decision can for a long time cause rejection and rejection by society and specific social groups and strata.

In the modern world, understanding the preferences of particular groups and segments of the population is the main condition for the development of state programs and the adoption of political decisions. This understanding is possible only on the basis of studying not just public opinion and mood, but on the basis of studying the deep interests and motivations. Perception as the first unconscious assessment of the situation, political decisions, innovations and events is the main indicator of the subsequent actions of the actors of the political process as passive or active .. The study of the perception of risk allows us to predict possible scenarios of the behavior of various social groups and strata of the population, and is also a mirror image of the social political processes taking place in society. Perception of the level of risk is an indicator of the mood of groups and strata of the population, allowing to separate individual as stimuli, and preferences. The study provides a better understanding of how the perception of risk affects policy settings, informs about ways of effective interaction.

## **1. Research methodology and findings**

When studying the perception of risk, it is important to obtain information on three main parameters:

- the possible range and level of public criticism of specific actions of authorities that take risky decisions;
- the attitude of public opinion to the possible consequences of these decisions;
- assessment of the likelihood of public responses and risky decisions, including hostile and critical ones.

1.1. For obtaining this information, several methods can be used.

One of them is connected with an empirical study of sociopolitical reality. Usually it is done on the basis of statistics that are available to government agencies, or if they can be obtained.

As it is known, statistics studies the quantitative aspect of mass social phenomena and therefore serves as one of the important means for developing political decisions. At the same time, it should be borne in mind that due to their cognitive peculiarities, such statistical data as a kind of empirical methods of gathering information, possess the quality of "limitedness". For example, they typically "do not identify the links between the immediate effect of implementing these decisions and their long-term consequences.

Thus, statistical data, and in this their limited nature, reproduce in a systematized form the external, superficial side of political, economic processes and phenomena.[1] The limitations of statistical and empirical methods of perceiving political risk in technologies for the implementation of the political process presuppose the expediency of using other means that do not have these drawbacks.

One of such ways of obtaining information about the perception of risk can be considered sociological research conducted by sociologists and political scientists. They, to a large extent, is lack of the disadvantages inherent in the statistical-empirical way of collecting information, since they suggest the possibility of an "opening", cognition of the laws of development and functioning of the studied processes, the forms of their manifestation under certain conditions of place and time.

## 2.2. Researches

To study the perception of risk by actors of public life, various types of research are used. Among them, the following can be distinguished:

1. The investigative research, it solves the problems, limited in their content, covers, as a rule, small examined totalities on the basis of a simplified program. The need for it usually arises in cases where the subject of such seizures is one of few or not yet studied problems. The perception of political risk is a such problem. Types of investigative research are, for example, express surveys, interviews, questionnaires that allow to obtain information particularly interesting at a given moment for the researcher or government agency.

2. Descriptive research provides information that gives a relatively holistic view of the studied phenomenon. It is used when the object of analysis is a relatively large group of people differing in various characteristics.

The above-mentioned methods, used either individually or in some combination, allow to obtain the data informing political authorities about the level of hostility, critical attitude of the population towards this process, and about reasons of occurrence of such hostility.

The main reason for studying the perception of risk by actors in public life is that there is a real possibility of finding a compromise between the public's views on this issue and the position taken by the authorities and administration.

## 3. Literature review

The perception of risk is the object of studying modern political science as an integral part of political attitudes. Thus, the researchers B. Gerber and G. Nyili consider the perception of risk in the context of realizing the tasks of effective public administration.

### 3.1. Brian Gerber and Grant Neeley views

Brian Gerber and Grant Neeley studied how perceived risk of routine hazards was related to attitudes about government regulation. They found

that increased perceived risk of a hazard was positively related to support for regulation of that hazard, even when the cost of such regulation was stated to be significant. Two other variables affected this relationship: issue awareness and trust in the regulators. If respondents considered themselves to be ill-informed on an issue, there was no relationship between perceived risk and support for regulation. Trust moderated the relationship between perceived risk and support for regulation; if the respondents did not trust the regulators, then they were less likely to support regulation, even if perceived risk was high [2]

### 3.2 Risk study in psychology

The concept of risk is a psychological one. Risk, as opposed to danger, is a socially constructed phenomenon. Riskiness is based on perception rather than fact, and this perception is based on qualitative, not quantitative characteristics of the hazard being considered [3]

According to the researcher P. Slovic, the perception of risk first of all, is a subjective category, deterministic knowledge, the degree of reliability of information. The author studies the problem of risk perception in the context of terrorist actions, therefore he is more inclined to explain the nature of the perception of risk by psychological grounds, the issue of priorities of values.

### 3.3. Risk study is as a socio economic problem

An important aspect of studying the perception of risk is the opportunity to see a clear picture of the conditions under which the response to risk-based solutions is increasing or decreasing. In political science there is the notion of increased risk, as a reaction to socio-economic processes and researchers consider them in different contexts.[4]

As you know, the range of perception of political decisions is multifaceted, it can be full support, partial criticism, neutral attitude to the decision, skeptical critical retraction, or hostile attitude

Various studies, opinion polls show that people are not evaluating the actual levels of risk and dangers in the same way. Among the factors influencing the perception of risk and risk-based decisions by policy actors, there are three main groups: political, including social and economic, socio-psychological and psychological.

Political, social and economic factors that influence the perception of risk have a complex structure. A special place here belongs to phenomena that can be called general sociological and general political. First of all, they include the historically determined organization of society, the socio-economic and social structure of power, the level

of development and the quality of the economy, the system of state power. All of the above creates a real background for the activities of political actors and has an indirect effect on the decision-making processes, risky alternatives, the acceptance of a particular degree of risk or its perception.

Interpretation by the actors of the magnitude of the risk also depends on the existing political, social structure, organizational environment in which actors, norms and laws that regulate their activities, control systems and responsibilities are operating. For example, workers will assess the risk in a different ways for organizations where it is the norm, where the main principle of functioning is the orientation toward success, innovation, in contrast to institutions where the risk is called the "social evil" of the Suns.

Thus, N.F. Pidgeon and B. Fischhoff consider the perception of risk in the context of the interpretation of information. «It is often as important to understand how the actors involved themselves interpret the information that they receive as it is the routes by which information about risks is transmitted. Indeed, citizens should be thought of as active participants in a risk drama. This task calls for rather subtle qualitative research on the discourses, mental models, values and frameworks that people use to translate a particular risk issue into the language of everyday life. This may seem a difficult thing to achieve in a crisis – but, good practice in risk communication is to always seek some understanding of the audience first, what their needs are, and what it is most helpful to communicate to prompt significant behaviour change or decisions» [5]

Kasperson R.E., Renn O., consider risk perception with confidence or distrust with expert assessments.

«It is a first order mistake to assume that as a result of social amplification processes the «true» risk is inevitably low while the public and media in some sense is always misinformed, exaggerates, or lacks key scientific knowledge (to be corrected by suitably designed risk communications). What seems far more important about the framework is to appreciate the dynamic nature of both public and expert representations during a risk crisis. The original social amplification authors were clear to point out that the framework was not intended to imply that such a simple «real» versus ‘perceived’ risk distinction could be drawn» [6]

Rayner, S. in the context of deep internal values and knowledge. «The amplification, if used unreflexively, does seem to imply this, and the instant appeal of this line of argument for policy is not difficult to see, and is one of the reasons why the

framework has endured. Such reasoning should be avoided at all costs.

#### 3.4. Risks caution

There are several reasons for this caution, but chief amongst them are, first, the fact that public and media concerns often reflect legitimate factors that go beyond the simple scientific risk measures of probability and damage. The public will care more about things such as intrinsic values, local identity and knowledges, and their judgements about institutional competence. Hence, simply communicating about the science of risk will fail to address these more deep-seated concerns, and may even exacerbate matters, e.g lead to a loss of trust. A second reason for being wary of any simplistic use of the amplification idea is that an unambiguous expert description of ‘risk’ and its acceptability may be very difficult to specify anyway – in most crises the science will involve gaps in knowledge, uncertainty and contested claims about the nature and quality of evidence. Under such circumstances it is impossible to say that a risk was unambiguously low or high, the base line for gauging a particular concern as «amplified» or «attenuated»[7]

Undoubtedly, this should be taken into account when developing measures to influence the perception of risk. In this connection, T. Parsons's statement that «in this transition it is necessary for the actor to acquire more specific orientations relative to the specific situations and expectations of his adult roles; there is a further process of socialization on a new level. A very important part of this consists in the acquisition of the more complex adult culture of sophisticated knowledge, technical skills, and canons of expressive orientation, tastes and standards of taste. It may be presumed that in detail the paramount learning mechanism in these acquisition processes is imitation, since in the higher societies the level of complexity and sophistication of what has to be learned is such that individual creativity as the primary process is out of the question. It is, of course, above all about this complex cultural content that the processes of formal education come to be organized. But this is not to say either, that identification ceases to be an important learning mechanism on this more mature level, or that it is only specific cultural content which still has to be learned».[8]

The perceptions of risk are also influenced by personal, worldview factors that affect the risk assessment differently. So people who have a high socio-economic status are more conservative and less prone to risk.

In general, the study of risk perception is very informative and useful in implementing policy

decisions. It provides a basis for understanding how the risk is amplified or weakened in a particular situation, and in political culture in general. This contributes to the development of effective management, communication strategies and technologies, provides an understanding of situational and personal factors associated with the perception of risk. [8].

The perception of risk, to a certain extent, depends on the level of democratization of the society, on the degree of freedom of choice by the person of the line of behavior. Here the following dependence is observed: if the authorities mainly focus on administrative prohibitions, the pressure on force to force a person, group or collective to choose a pre-determined alternative without their participation, this often leads to opposite results. Prohibitions, intimidation by prospective options are often factors inadequate evaluation of these hazards. According to a number of studies, "prohibitions, intimidation by incredible dangers become sources of propensity to unreasonable, unjustified risk" [9]. This means the following: in connection with prohibitions, the attractiveness of alternative decisions of actions excludable by external circumstances for a person, as a rule, considerably increases. Conversely, the forcible restriction of freedom of choice associated with external pressure on the part of the authorities reduces the attractiveness of the recommended alternative and contributes to the increased desire for the person to discard the imposed decision.

Therefore, in practice, the pressure exerted on a person, group or collective in order to force them to take a decision approved at a particular management level, intimidation of possible negative consequences often leads to the opposite result.

With the above reasoning, the following provision is also connected: the level of risk assumed by the actor, its perception also depends on the degree of responsibility that he must take on himself and on the actions that he is going to take. These can be actions associated with a voluntary, consciously accepted risk. In some studies, it has been established that people are more likely to commit a thousand times more risky activities related to voluntary risk than actions associated with the risk of involuntary.

## 4. Discussion

### 4.1. Socio-psychological factors

The perception of risk, its assessment depends on the level of people's awareness on the same issues, on the degree of accessibility of information on this issue, on the methods of information delivery.

People, as a rule, overestimate the potentiality of those events, which are often reported in the media. As a rule, this can increase people's feelings of anxiety, fear, and vice versa, the lack of information leads to an underestimation of the likelihood of both negative and positive consequences of a risky political decision. For example, a person can underestimate the danger associated with any political or economic events, if they are set out in a very complex, specific language that is incomprehensible to a non-specialist. At the same time, he can overestimate the degree of riskiness of events, if information is presented in clear language, figuratively.

A certain influence on the perception of risk, on the ratio of actors to risk in social, economic and political activity is indicated by socio-psychological factors. These include the circumstances that affect the behavior, activities and evaluative judgments of people, inspired by the fact of their direct or indirect inclusion in social groups, as well as the psychological characteristics of these groups themselves.

Among the main socio-psychological factors are the following:

- conflicts, antagonisms arising in the society;
- the struggle of motives, interests of various groups in the process of making political decisions and interpreting the consequences of these decisions;
- belonging of the individual to a social or reference group;
- degree of coherence of social groups, group interests and interests;
- unwillingness to change, which could disrupt the existing professional or financial situation, emotional and psychological balance;
- inability to react in a new way to the changes and transformations in society;
- cultural, national values and prejudices of this community of people.

The perception of risk is influenced by the level and emotional tension of the group or person. For example, you can overestimate the degree of threat and fall into a state of panic or vice versa, underestimate it and be in a complacent state.

Along with socio-psychological factors, the perception of risk is influenced by psychological factors themselves. A special place among them is occupied by the personality traits of a person, such as aggressiveness, indecision, doubt, optimism, pessimism, independence, extraversion as openness, sociability, and introversion as a closed, deepened self, recklessness, self-confidence, adventurous character, originality of mind, level anxiety, determination, selfishness or altruism.

Knowledge of political, economic and socio-psychological factors affecting risk perception is necessary for the authorities to proceed from the real fact that their decisions can be criticized by the population and inadequately evaluated by the people they concern. In this regard, state bodies should predict the levels of perception of their decisions by people and be able to influence the perception of the risk contained in these decisions.

Thus, practical political activities must necessarily incorporate such element as the interpretation of the degree of danger by people and their response to information about risk. It is advisable to take into account the following circumstances. Most people are unable to assess the complexity of political risk. In this connection, in practice, simplified risk assessment mechanisms are often used, which although help individuals cope with the risk, but lead to bias and errors.

Data on risk in the political agenda are introduced by social institutions, various groups of experts. Values, attitudes of these groups and institutions will somehow influence the population's interpretation of this risk. Accounting for these circumstances is one of the facets of the technology of the implementation of the political process.

#### 4.2. Psychological characteristics of risks

Let us consider the dependence of the perception of risk from the psychological characteristics of people on the example of such qualities as "decisiveness" and "caution", tendency to risk and prejudiced attitude towards it. Decisiveness is a quality, the presence of which allows to act responsibly in difficult, extreme situations, make independent decisions, optimally behave in an environment of constant changes, in situations where there is a need to take risks.

Resolute people usually have a craving for risky actions and the strategy of their behavior is aimed at while seeking for the realization of intended purposes to achieve success, to get the desired result even at the cost of very and very considerable efforts. A different line of behavior is at people, the dominant feature of whom is caution. The main thing for them is to avoid misfortune, failure while performing controlled actions. Such politicians will direct their efforts mainly to avoid taking risky decisions, even in situations where it is necessary.

Naturally, such personality qualities as decisiveness and caution affect not only the attitude toward risky activities, but also affect the perception of the magnitude of risk. The perception of risk depends on the psychological, ideological, moral,

political orientations and attitudes of people. For example, when a person takes risk, he can understand that this will turn into a pragmatic loss for him, but nevertheless, risk attracts him because he is connected, for example, with probable acquisitions of value character such as the opportunity to support self-esteem, to remain faithful to himself, not to succumb to the pressure of the situation etc.

Psychological features of risk perception are determined by the degree of remoteness or proximity of possible negative consequences. Usually, the following regularity is observed here: if dangers that may occur in the course of the realization of a political decision in life are removed in time, they are usually underestimated and do not cause visible changes in people's behaviour. And vice versa, if the implementation of the solution can immediately entail unfavorable changes for the entity, then the degree of danger, as a rule, is greatly overestimated.

Perception of dangers depends on the quality of an actor such as the preference for risk. In situations of choice people usually have a preferred or "ideal" level of risk. As soon as the expected risk deviates from this "ideal" level, people like these risky solutions much less. For example, he may experience fear at high risk levels, or he is bored, absence of risk, or he is very small, or he experiences pleasant emotions, i.e. the degree of risk that is the optimal for him.

The other point is also associated with the risk preference, if the probability of satisfying the human need with the help of this risk-containing solution is small, then it can cause negative emotions; if it is great – then positive.

The study of the influence of psychological factors on the perception of political risk is also directly related to the personnel training of civil servants. There are special methods by which it is possible to determine the so-called personal risk. Identified styles of personal risk can be used, for example, to assess candidates for vacant public office. Pluralistic political activity is now recognized as necessary for the implementation of political and state decisions. State officials in high political positions can not act only on the basis of precedent or paper procedures, government needs a new approach. A politician the function of whom includes constant decision-making in risk situations, should have a different style and approach to the risk assessment than the manager who operates in a relatively stable environment.

### 4.3. Trilingualism

The situation that developed with the adoption of the Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan "On the state language" when the status of the state Kazakh language assumed its mandatory nature in the activities of all state organizations and structures. [10].

The adoption of the Law undoubtedly entailed the emergence of the need to study Kazakh language by a large part of the population. Since a part of the population who does not speak the language is not ready for this, and partly exaggerates the degree of danger of the establishment of the state language, the discussion of the draft law caused a negative reaction. Emotional tension at the time of discussion and acceptance could play a negative role. Also, the disturbance in society is caused by the introduction of trilingualism.

Trilingualism is declared, but the society still has not received support. Because firstly we must solve the problem with Kazakh language, as it exists, and then we must take steps towards bi- and trilingualism. The goal is great, but it is very difficult to teach all pupils in schools the three languages. This concerns the most of Kazakhstan's population.

### 4.4. Summary of risk interpretation

The interpretation of risk depends on what the information or a specific event notify about. Let us give the following example to explain this situation. Practice shows that some accidents which take away many lives of people can create a relatively minor social concern, except for family members and friends of a victim, if they occur in a familiar, well-known and familiar situation, such as train or car accidents. A minor accident in an area that is unfamiliar or difficult for people, for example, such as an atomic reactor or a genetic engineering research lab, can cause great public anxiety, especially in the event that this accident is explained so that the risk is not fully understood.

The second aspect of the analysis of the problem of risk perception is related, as it was noted earlier, to the characteristics of technologies in which politicians can obtain information on public attitude towards risk-based solutions.

The third aspect of the problem of the relationship of subjects to risk-based solutions is related to the use of technology by the authorities to influence the perception of risk and to develop the necessary measures for this process.

The authorities in their practical activities can influence the individual and group perception of risk and the individual behavior of people in this

connection in various ways. Let us characterize some of them. Psychological or socio-psychological reduction or increase in the perception of risk by actors depends, in particular, on the volume of information about risk. The increase of the data about the risk of its consequences magnifies information flow about them, the dramatization of events, as a rule, lead to the fact that people greatly exaggerate the real level of risk. The weakening of the flow and volume of information about risk leads to opposite results.

It should also be borne in mind that as a result of the numerous and varied information on risk, the incompetence of the masses, the instability and the groundlessness of risk assessments in public opinion may increase. One of the reasons for this situation is a distorted form of information, and it does not lead to a refinement of risk assessments, but to an increase in anxiety and fear.

Another technology aimed at changing the level of risk perception is filtration, data selection, i.e. by means of special processing of information about risk. All this leads to the fact that in those cases when attention is focused primarily on sensational cases, information is served selectively-this creates an incorrect impression, for example, about periodic "explosions", criminality, which are not statistically fixed. It is clear that the consequence can be either a panic in the population, a misunderstanding of the real state of affairs.

As a demonstration of this provision, one can mention the situation connected with the annual Presidential Message in March 2006 on privatization and legalization. The president noted shortcomings in strategy, analyzed them and outlined the ways for further development of our Republic, but the opposition means of the press give a one-sided assessment, and the depressed part of the population had the impression that the President recognized the violation of the law in the upper echelons of power, and instructed the current Government to develop return mechanisms capital, and the restoration of justice.

The perception of risk is influenced by the situation in which the authorities in the decision-making process develop measures to reduce, minimize the risk and inform the public about it. That is why it becomes clear that risk reduction activities should be among the priorities of state bodies that take risky political decisions.[11]

The perception of risk is to a certain extent connected with the phenomenon that can be caused by "risk democratization". It means that from the

political point of view, it looks quite acceptable that the risk is distributed among the population as much as possible maximum evenly. This formulation of the question is reasonable enough, since it solves the problem of ensuring social justice between different groups of the population from the point of view of their preoccupation with those or other types of risk.

It should be borne in mind that often there are situations where the implementation of certain political decisions benefits only some segments of the population, thus increasing injustice in society, for example, the transition to a market economy caused a sharp stratification of the society of rich and poor, many Kazakhstanis found themselves outside the line of poverty.[12]

In the real political process, the following contradiction often arises: a politically just aspiration meets the fact that available means of risk reduction are used inefficiently and do not give proper return. This approach is called the principle of cost effectiveness of risk. But the implementation of this principle in practice may contradict the principle of equal distribution of risks, i.e. the principle of social justice and thus will be unacceptable from the political point of view, that is, from the position of "risk democratization". "Democratization of risk" can occur at any of its poles. On the one hand, the risk is democratized when all members of society are exposed to equal danger. The society can be "taken away" from the democratization of risk by political means, protecting some categories of persons from it, making it possible for the rich to pay those who want to risk instead of them, etc. At the same time, the risk can be democratized by giving each member the right to use collective protection against risk, or at least damage, which increases as the risk increases [13]

## Conclusion

In modern society, the perception of risk and its assessment depend on the level of awareness, on the degree of availability of information, and more importantly, on the methods of submitting information. Consequently, the perception of risk depends on the use of civilized technologies in the implementation of the political process.

The stability of the modern state largely depends on the degree of people's awareness of risk, the perception of which is the result of political technologies, such as risk interpretation, the way of filing, data filtering, the structuring of the society

when submitting information and distribution channels. Any system tends to be sustainable and viable. Any attempt at breaking stability is a risk, a risky action.

The problem of the development of society is related to the viability of not a separate, autonomously functioning system, but with the progress of evolving systems, with a long-term prospect of survival.

We believe that taking into account possible variants of risk perception promote to the search for compromises in the positions of government bodies and varied groups of the population. That is why information on risk perception is the most significant indicator at the degree of adequacy of the coincidence of the needs and interests of various social groups and major political players with their position. The authorities effectiveness, their competence is increased in the eyes of the population, taking into account if the authorities believe that the perception of risk is one of the priorities of their policies. Moreover, this is an important evidence of the real concern of government bodies about the political, economic, environmental and spiritual security of citizens.

The study of risk is necessary, since society can not ignore it and move forward. In the political process, the study of the degree of risk perception is necessary for the "democratization of risk", so that the risk is evenly distributed if possible.

Finally, solving the tasks of influencing the perception of risk, depending on the structure of groups and strata of the population, critical of the likely negative consequences that may occur in connection with the implementation of a decision. Such groups can, for example, include those who are directly at risk-unemployed people, people with low incomes.

To another group of critically inclined to risk-based political decisions are representatives of the scientific community, writers, specialists in various fields of culture. Obviously, the real claims of representatives of these two groups differ, as well as their ability to influence the processes of making risky political decisions.

Similar situations require politicians in each case to find the optimal solutions to the difficulties arising between the economic efficiency of allocating funds to reduce risk and the political expediency of its uniform distribution.

Thus, after summarizing the results of the analysis of perception, we came to the following conclusions:

The level of effectiveness of the implementation of the political process depends to a large extent on the orientation towards the inclusion in the management processes of information on possible options for people to perceive risky political decisions and how authorities influence the perception of risk.

### Acknowledgements

Republic of Kazakhstan. Law on Languages // Akordakz], although the status of the state and official was clearly delineated and was fixed in the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan in 1995,

### References

- 1 Turono S. G., Political Analysis. – M.: Delo, 2005. – P. 206.
- 2 Gerber, B.J., Neeley, G.W. Perceived risk and citizen preferences for government management of routine hazards // Policy Studies Journal. – № 33. – 2005. – 395–419 p.
- 3 Slovic, P. Trust, Emotion, Sex, Politics, and Science: Surveying the Risk-Assessment Battlefield // Risk Analysis.– №19. – 1999. – P. 689–701.
- 4 Pidgeon N., Kasperson R., Slovic P. The Social Amplification of Risk: Publisher: Cambridge University Press, – August, 18. – 2003.– 468 p.
- 5 Pidgeon, N.F and Fischhoff, B. The role of social and decision sciences in communicating uncertain climate risks //Nature Climate Change,1. – 2011. – 35–41pp.
- 6 Kasperson R.E., Renn O., Slovic P., Brown H.S.] The social amplification of risk: a conceptual framework // Risk Analysis, 8, 177–187
- 7 Rayner, S. Muddling through metaphors to maturity: a commentary on Kasperson et al., The Social Amplification of Risk // Risk Analysis, 1988. – 8(2). – 201–204 p.
- 8 British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data Parsons, Talcott The social system. –London. – 2005 // Routledge sociology classics 1. Sociology I. Title 301 <http://home.ku.edu.tr/~mbaker/CSHS503/TalcottParsonsSocialSystem.pdf>
- 9 Abdrakhmanova G.G. Risk and uncertainty—a comprehensive approach to research // Finance of Kazakhstan. – 2003.– №5.–P.21–30.
- 10 Republic of Kazakhstan. Law on Languages // Akordakz], although the status of the state and official was clearly delineated and was fixed in the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan in 1995
- 11 Polyakov V. G. Who does not take risks, he does not win // EKO. – 1993. – No.22 – P. 162–179
- 12 Dynamics of socio–political development in Kazakhstan the experience of sociological monitoring // Sayasat. – 2005. – №3. – P. 12
- 13 Lovi T. Risks of law in the history of the American state. –1992. – 5. – P. 253–267.