

ANNOTATIONS OF THE PUBLICATIONS

submitted by Assoc. Prof. PhD Stoyka Petrova Penkova

in applying for a competition for the academic position of Professor in sphere of higher education 3 *Social, economic and legal sciences*, professional field 3.1 *Sociology, anthropology and sciences of culture*, scientific speciality *Historical sociology of inequality and discourse*

1. Monography

Пенкова, С. 2025. *Фигури на дистинктивността. Фигури на афективността*. Пловдив: УИ „Паисий Хилендарски“

[Penkova, S. 2025. *Figures of distinctiveness. Figures of affectivity*. Plovdiv: University Publishing House “Paisii Hilendarski”].

This study unites two seemingly quite different – not only temporally and spatially but also in their affective attunements – worlds of ‘life’, the one representing the ‘there-and-then’ of a Bulgarian village and the other expressing the here-and-now of affective otherness, by outlining the operational opposition between 1) *positive distinctiveness*, described in the first part of the monograph as ‘having’ a world, as the ‘being a gift’ of distinctive persons and places; and 2) *negative distinctivity* as the privation of the ‘people without future’, as the exclusion of the ‘affective others’, interpreted in the second part of the analysis. This essential position is embedded in the very conceptual framework of the book and becomes problematized many times in the course of its progressive deployment. What brings together these seemingly incompatible, in their polarity, world fragments is my attempt to throw light on the subtle mechanisms of essential differences through which inequalities can be recognized affectively internally and as perceptible in interpersonal meetings. And this is so because the very human togetherness and coexistence are deeply connected to affect and emotion: it’s visible in the most banal and routine face-to-face interaction as well as in the community relations marked by most diverse forms of affective solidarity; but also in the context of social differences and inequalities marking diverse forms of affective inclusions and exclusions. Moreover, the very creation and spreading of cultural ideals of common existence, forms of belonging or ways of existing of late modern humans are entirely affective and often connected to specific emotions. And this is

valid primarily for those social situations in which inequalities and power relations have marked our interhuman relations, in including affective processes of difference and otherness.

The deployment of the research perspective so declared is structured in a few argumentative chains of key importance, assisting the praxeological understanding of *distinctivity and affectivity* and hence of the different figures in which they are cast – the distinctive hero of labour, the demonstratively model worker, the ‘honourable pioneers of this cause to the good of the people’, but also the affective otherness of the refugee, the ethnic other, the ‘hideous’, ‘frightening’, ‘disgusting’ others who fill ‘our’ imagination. Thus the figure of affective otherness is presented as a mirror image of the figure of distinctiveness that is interpreted in the first part – *both, of course, are distinctive but with a different sign, both affective but in a different sense*. Distinctive with a different sign as far as they are positively or negatively ‘doing’ differences, differentiations, exclusions; affective in a different sense as far as they stand in the basis of two different ontologies of the life-world: *those of affective closeness and those of affective distance*.

Their deployment in different but always maximally concrete and empirically ascertainable approximations happens with the opening of each next chapter of the book. Chapter One focuses on life transitions as central for the understanding of the social structures and life experience in the Bulgarian village, interpreting them in a praxeological perspective as performatively done, by which their diverse forms are filled with life, i.e. they are loaded with time and lived. Chapter Two puts life transitions and transformations in the context of the distinctive village whose affective-discursive justification happens through a specific – I would say, emotive – discursive practice as is the *Book of Impressions*. An Appendix is added to it which contains descriptions of all visits in the period under consideration and the impressions from them. Applying this archive historical background aims at solidifying the expounded theoretical argumentations, including the whole affective history, describing agents, spaces, times, knowledge, practices, through which we glance at the there-and-then of the demonstrative model farm, created in the context of an *affective ontology of closeness* as an intensive and engulfing form of affective solidarity implemented by positive distinctiveness. Chapter Three deliberates on affective practices and their link to discourse. Chapter Four introduces the problem of affective otherness in the context of hate speech. Chapter Five discusses the emotions of hatred, fear and disgust as technologies of affect, raising the problem of the invisible everyday racism towards Bulgarian Roma under the conditions of COVID-19. Thus the last three chapters include analyses of practical situations of ‘doing’ inequity as generating (or not) relations of *affective inequality*. They make explicit the practical logic of

the encounter of different (affective) individual and collective bodies and discourses in which some of them are ‘heard’ and ‘seen’ as affective others. In these chapters, the discursive analytic of emotions reveals the ways in which certain emotions act performatively, ‘cleaving’ the experience of living together and manifesting singular forms of ‘being hurt’. This cleavage of experience is in the basis of the specific *affective ontology of distance* that shapes the outlines of the social and corporeal space in the late modern human condition in corporalizing social vulnerability, distorting and deforming the sense of ‘oneself’ as self-non-identity and hence generating a multitude of forms of social suffering among those who bear on themselves the effects of negative distinctiveness. Retaining the effects of the ontologies of closeness and of distance on the human condition, the Afterword provides some insights into the liminality and demarcation as a paradigmatic experience of late modern living, demonstrating how Simmel’s concepts of ‘door’ and ‘bridge’ can be metaphors of a practiced *affective ontology of ourselves, unfolding in the horizon of care*.

Speaking more generally, the object of the study are the distinctiveness and the affectivity whose manifestations I’ve been exploring on different research *material*: 1) historical archive documents collected in the course of many years of work in the State Archive of Plovdiv; 2) empirical cases drawn from my own mental archive as well as ones described in different research texts problematizing affective mechanisms, emotional repertoires, affective practices and technologies, knowledge, possible solutions through affects; 3) discursive segments from different media (TV news, newspapers, magazines, social media) and from official discourse (statements of public servants, institutional positions, legal documents).

The methodology of the study combines a number of analytics as possible approaches to the empirics that is complex and multidimensional, affective and pulsating with its many facets and discourses: historical sociology of discursive practices, discursive analytic of emotion, analytic of performativity and indexicals, social praxeology, ethnomethodology – all of them subjected to the common purpose of developing an *affective-discursive sociology of inequality* and its problematization in a transdisciplinary key.

From this analytic and methodological perspective, the *goal* of the study can be formulated – somewhat enigmatically – as the description of the ways in which *distinctivity is affective and affectivity is distinctive*. The main *research strategies* are directed towards: description of everyday scenes in which, by means of negative categorizations and identifications, otherness is loaded with affectivity, as a result of which inequity is generated, and in some cases affective inequality; presenting the interweaving between affective/corporeal/discursive interactions as a dynamic structures of incorporated mutual

orientation; making explicit the ways in which the structures of domination exist in affective forms through the emotions of hatred, fear, disgust, which work as technologies of the affect for marginalization and stigmatization of affective otherness; problematization of the ways in which distinctiveness is inherited and hence the ways in which vulnerability, being hurt and being suffering become the social fate of affective others and their heirs. Hence the important question: can one still exit the spiral of vulnerability that leads to the cleavage of experience, of biography, of identity, and fractalizes the sense of ‘oneself’ and ‘the other’? This the circle is closed and we face again the problem of inequality and hence of inequity, marginalization, stigmatization, vulnerability, suffering, being hurt – all of them grave and pressing social problems that painfully affect interhuman relations and justify my desire as a researcher not to stay with merely negativity but to propose its counterpoint. In the latter, *affectivity is ‘doing’ positive distinctivity* through the ontological energizing and self-energizing as observed in the ‘demonstrative model farm’ and *distinctivity is ‘doing’ affectivity* through the transformations in the primary dispositions of participants in the process – those who, habitualizing their being chosen and forming specific dispositions of investment, put them as social investments into the common, symbolically configured idea of a world in which the farm and ‘us’ are to be an ‘example’ and its/our successes are shared with and by everyone wanting to partake in its/our being chosen.

My pathos is that this fragment of the world can serve as a ‘door’ to the past from which we can draw energy, knowledge, narratives, strategies of affective solidarity as well as a ‘bridge’ along which to transfer the ‘gifts’ and ‘promises’ from the past to the future – it is in this ‘gift exchange’ of time as ‘transmission’ and ‘promise’ for a new temporization that I see the possibilities of overcoming the effects of affective inequality, and hence of practicing a *new ontology of ‘ourselves’ in the horizon of care*, one in which the ‘change’ of what we are and what we no longer want to be passes through the ‘practical critique’ of our limits, which inevitably presupposes a philosophical ethos and way of life (Foucault, 1997).

2. Other publications (articles)

2.1. Penkova, S., Stoilova, E., Tasheva, M. (2025). Specifics of the biocultural approach and its potential for interdisciplinary studies: on the example of anthropobiotic community. *Ecologia Balkanica*, 17/1, 281-290. (WoS).

The article makes an attempt at an analytical interpretation of the specifics of the biocultural approach and its potential for interdisciplinary research. Starting from the premise that the interest is incessantly growing in studies viewing the link between man and environment beyond the traditional disciplinary borders, and also that combining the expertise of natural and social sciences is in increasingly greater demand, this article will show the importance of the biocultural approach as an analytic instrument working on the borders between ecology, biology, anthropology and sociology. Linking into one ecological knowledge, cultural practices, and social structures, this approach fosters the analytic and methodological overcoming of hard limits between natural and social sciences. The article dwells on the case of beekeeping as an example of such a biocultural unity of human knowledge and experience in which the biological and the cultural are in dynamic interaction. As a theoretical and empirical contribution, we introduce the concept of anthropobiotic community, understood as a form of joint interaction between man and another form of life – the bee colony. This concept permits rethinking the coexistence of human communities and animal groups based on mutual dependence, care and co-participation in which humans are ‘with’ and not ‘against’ their environment which is ‘between’ humans and the things in it and which can connect them – also affectively, personally, emotionally – as a space of creation of a community, as a new form of togetherness.

2.2. Пенкова, С., Ташева, М. (2025). Антропобиотната общност в контекста на биокултурните наследства: към преосмисляне на понятието „зелен хабитус“ по примера на пчелите и хората. В: Антонов, С., Митрев, Г. (съст.). *Хуманитарното и социалното познание - разкази и хоризонти*. Сборник от юбилейна конференция на ФИФ.

[Penkova, S., Tasheva, M. (2025). The anthropobiotic community in the context of biocultural inheritances: toward rethinking the concept of ‘green habitus’ on the example of bees and humans. In: *Life transitions in the (self-)transforming village: memory, identity, inheritance*. Zlatkova, M., Penkova, S., Tasheva, M. (eds.). 2024. Plovdiv University Publishing House].

Nowadays, the climate changes that affect human’s everyday life and overall quality of life, is no doubt among the greatest problems the world is facing. Lead by the tenet that the ‘how’ of humans entering into interaction with the environment is not independent of what they ‘do’ to it, this study fits into the research field that is interested in the problems of environment in turning its focus to studying human impact on the biophysical world. It emphasizes the study

of factors that motivate and predict pro-ecological behaviour and attitudes to the environment as far as an essential aspect of man's relation to nature and its preservation is the presence of precisely a pro-ecological way of thinking based on pre-reflective dispositions oriented in the same direction; it is these that shape, in a specific way, the interrelations between humans and the biophysical world, giving a particular meaning to the man-nature relation. Therefore, the study's centre is the analysis of the impact on the biophysical world through the exploration of an anthropobiotic community including humans and bees where cultivating pro-ecological behaviour as a specific way of life is an explicit and governing principle. To show how such anthropo-biotic link with elements of the environment is formed, we first dwell on clarifying the concept of habitus taken from Pierre Bourdieu's sociological perspective. Expanding that concept onto ecological practices and actions of humans who are interested in problems of the environment permits us, as the next step, to introduce the so-called 'green habitus' as an analytic instrument through which to deploy the specific content of the newly introduced notion of 'anthropobiotic community'. Then the next step is the gradual elucidation of the ways of bio-cultural interaction between the human/non-human agents of practice, exemplified in a concrete empirical case in the end of the study, aiming at making explicit the endogenous logic of the natural pro-ecological behaviour of participants who, formulating their habitualized relations to themselves and stepping into active interaction with their non-human co-agents (the bees), come to form a new bio-cultural human-non-human (anthropobiotic) community that can be inherited and passed down in the form of a craft (beekeeping).

2.3. Пенкова, С. (2025). Жизнените преходи в контекста на перформативността: взаимното проникване на тела, пространства и неща при „вършенето“ на преходи. В: Антонов, С., Митрев, Г. (съст.). *Хуманитарното и социалното познание - разкази и хоризонти*. Сборник от юбилейна конференция на ФИФ.

[Penkova, S. (2025). Life transitions as a praxeological attitude: methodological contexts and analytic interpretations. In: *Life transitions in the (self-)transforming village: memory, identity, inheritance*. Zlatkova, M., Penkova, S., Tasheva, M. (eds.). 2024. Plovdiv University Publishing House].

The article raises the problem of life transitions in the context of the performativity of bodies, spaces and things. The processes of interpenetration of habituality (bodily thinking incorporating habitat structures) and habitat-ness (forms of things incorporating life practices)

are analytically problematized: bodies move through spaces and act with things; the special dispositions of bodies and things make the places in which bodies are situated; and all three dimensions together can bark or conceal, facilitate or hinder, materialize or sediment in memory the life transitions made in the past and present, as well as structure those that are yet to come, including the different dimensions of temporality.

2.4. Пенкова, С. (2024а). Трансформации и дистинкции в българското социалистическо село: как ТКЗС „Георги Димитров“ с. Ръжево Конаре се превърна в демонстративно образцово стопанство. В: *Жизнени преходи в трансформиращото (се) село: памет, идентичност, наследяване*. Златкова, М., Пенкова, С., Ташева, М. (съст.). 2024. Пловдивско университетско издателство, с. 41-76. ISBN 978-619-7768-09-1.

[Penkova, S. (2024). Transformations and distinctions in the Bulgarian socialist village: how the Georgi Dimitrov collective farm in Rajevo Konare became a demonstrative model farm. In: *Life transitions in the (self-)transforming village: memory, identity, inheritance*. Zlatkova, M., Penkova, S., Tasheva, M. (eds.). 2024. Plovdiv University Publishing House].

The study is an attempt at interpreting the transformations taking place immediately after the creation of the Georgi Dimitrov collective farm in the village of Rajevo Konare that have led to its becoming a demonstrative model farm, i.e. a distinctive place specially constructed by the new regime in order to normalize the identity of the future ‘model’ cooperative farmers who have not yet become what they have to be, namely, ‘honorable pioneers of this great work to the good of the people; (as bequeathed by Georgi Dimitrov himself in the telegram he sent from Moscow on the occasion of the farm’s creation). The analytic focus is on the complex double process including 1) vertical top-down transformations of persons, places and times, by which they are bestowed an identity by discourses and strategies of power, norms, and ideologies; 2) horizontal bottom-to-top transformations from persons, places and times, by which agents are energized, their practices are temporized and the effects of distinctiveness are deployed. To describe this specific ‘double reality’, I will first introduce the historical context against whose background the transformations in Rajevo Konare took place. Then, I will problematize the connection between distinctivity and inheritance, trying to establish whether and how the being chosen of the place is inherited. Finally, I will dwell on the praxeological understanding of the process of accepting/transmitting of ‘inheritance’ in the

situation of socialist transformations taking place in the village, such as they are revealed in the testimonies of archive documents and living narratives of persons participating in these processes.

2.5. Пенкова, С. (2024б). Жизнените преходи като праксеологическа нагласа: методологически контексти и аналитични интерпретации. В: *Жизнени преходи в трансформиращото (се) село: памет, идентичност, наследяване*. Златкова, М., Пенкова, С., Ташева, М. (съст.). 2024. Пловдивско университетско издателство, с. 12-37. ISBN 978-619-7768-09-1. [15]

[Penkova, S. (2024). Life transitions as a praxeological attitude: methodological contexts and analytic interpretations. In: *Life transitions in the (self-)transforming village: memory, identity, inheritance*. Zlatkova, M., Penkova, S., Tasheva, M. (eds.). 2024. Plovdiv University Publishing House].

The study problematizes the praxeological perspective of ‘doing’ life transitions. Questioning the appearance of the conventional approaches studying the so-called ‘life path’ which often conceive of it as a rational, ordered string of events subjected to the telos of life’s own history, the study puts the thematization of life transitions in the context of the ways in which agents talk about them, negotiate, legitimate or negate them by discursive, institutional and everyday practices. Thus the life story is not continuous, linear, consistent, coherent – and therefore ordered – succession of actions, practices and strategies directed to reaching the ‘coveted’ goal shining at the life horizon, but is ‘done’ by life transitions that are the effect and manifestation of local membership and categorizations and are socially constructed and constituted, and therefore are social practices that are the result of interactions in the social reality. Such an analytic problematization of life transitions as a part of the ‘history of life’ requires a socioanalytic study of subjectivity because, as Bourdieu himself tells us, ‘by the narrative of the most “personal” difficulties, of the seemingly most strictly subjective tensions and contradictions, the deepest structures of the social world and their contradictions are often revealed’ (Bourdieu, 2008: 116). And it is hardly doubtful that most narratives of completed life transitions – be they positively or negatively evaluated in the narrators’ own self-descriptions – are affective as far as they set in motion habitualized practical schemes of retaining the relation to ‘oneself’. Hence the important connection, made by the study, of this habitualized layer of relating to oneself and to one’s own life history with the problem of

‘inheritance’ and ‘continuity’ – this connection results from the fact that, in practice, through the figure of ‘inheritance’ both social positions and biographical trajectories are ‘eternalized’.

6. Penkova, S., Tasheva, M. (2022). Inequality, privation, social vulnerability: hate speech toward Bulgarian roma in the context of COVID-19. *Trakia Journal of Sciences*, 20/1, 67-78.

This study thematises hate discourse against Bulgarian Roma in the situation of Covid-19. The thesis is that the pandemic ‘awakens’ repressed affectations related to socially inherited stereotypes and prejudice, and the forms of privation in which the Roma are conceived (‘*un-disciplined*’, ‘*un-safe*’, ‘*not washing their hands*’, ‘*not like us*’) mark the cracks in the symbolic efficiency of the official and everyday discourses by which social order is created. In everyday interhuman relations, there is not only the invasion of the fear of the ethnically other, of her ‘unhygienic’ body that breaks the regulations, a body that the ‘healthy’ and ‘uncontaminated’ body passes by, but the object itself of fear is over-determined: it acts by constructing the other as a danger menacing *life itself*. Hence the important questions: 1) how hate speech, having ‘contaminated’ everyday and institutional discourses, entails social actions of exclusion and stigmatization; 2) how a practical logic funded on conceiving the Roma solely through the prism of their privation of what is naturally proper to ‘us’ stands in the basis of their unequal treatment, putting them into a permanent situation of social vulnerability; most generally: how hate discourse ‘does things with words’.

2.7. Penkova, S., Tasheva, M. (2023). Pro-environmental dispositions of young people in their attitudes towards water, *ICERI2023 Proceedings*, 8629-8637.

The global spread of Covid-19 demonstrated the human impact on living nature and once again revealed the need of changing attitudes towards the planet and the life on it. Taking into account the emergence of a new culture related to ecological values and their globalization as one of the main cultural transformations in the recent decades, this study focuses on making explicit the conditions of possibility of this emergence. An essential aspect of the attitude toward nature and its protection is the formation of pro-environmental behaviour based on a pro-environmental mindset on the grounds of similarly oriented pre-reflexive dispositions. The study here presented aims at making explicit the deep dispositions of young people toward a

disappearing and increasingly more valuable and valued natural resource – water. Unlike conventional empirical sociological research with, as Bourdieu warns, its asymmetry and specific symbolic violence, the pre-sent study adapts an already tested nonclassical qualitative methodology – the so-called ‘Projective Study by Free Associations’ (PSFA). It incorporates elements from three hetero-geneous approaches – 1) ethnomethodological interventions in the world of everyday life (Garfinkelian breaching experiments), 2) the method of free associations in psychoanalysis, and 3) the projective test in psychology. Rethought with regard to the goals of this study, the proposed non-conventional qualitative methodology provides access to the un-conscious ideas of respondents related to water that are revealed in the course of the study through their free associations. The study was done within the *specific Laboratory for Applying Non-conventional Sociological Methods* that was organized and carried out online in 2021 as a part of the practical training of sociology students. The participants in the Projective Study by Free Association (PSFA) were students whose presence at the training was obligatory as a part of the curriculum. The experiment itself was done by us in the double role of both teachers and researchers. The goal was, by the so-called ‘*training by research*’, to create a dialogical space where students should meet in leaving the, so to say, virtual classrooms, in order to take part in the fieldwork, the immediate process of obtaining data, and also in the very development and application of the methods of analyzing these data. In result of the described procedure, the pre-reflexive attitudes toward water in the young people participating in the projective study by free associations are objectivated in several interpretive keys: life, raw natural force, danger, occupation, hygiene, nature-beauty, value, industry. The participant’s explanations as to the connection between associations, keywords and relations between the revealed interpretive keys permit the conclusion that the pre-reflexive dispositions of the studied persons demonstrate a high level of pro-environmental behaviour in everyday life with regard to water, as well as an orientation to viewing water as an increasingly more valuable capital of key importance to all spheres of life and daily affairs which therefore must be used very reasonably and with the due attention and respect.

2.8. Пенкова, С. (2019). „Който иска да разбере какво значи - „народна Република“ – нека посети Ръжево Конаре“: хетеротопни и хетерохронни измерения на трансформиращото се социалистическо село. В: *Трансформиращото (се) село*. Съст. Златкова, М., Пенкова, С., Антонов, С., Кацаров, С., Митев, Т. 8-57. ISBN 978-619-7249-56-9.

[Penkova, S. (2019). 'If you want to understand what a People's Republic means, visit Rajevo Konare': heterotopic and heterochronic dimensions of the transforming socialist village. In: *The (self-)transforming village*. Eds. Zlatkova, M., Penkova, S., Antonov, S., Katsarov, S., Mitev, T., 8-57. ISBN 978-619-7249-56-9].

The study focuses on a specific discursive practice of the early years of state socialism in which we can find a representation of the ongoing transformations on the village of Rajevo Konare. It is a guestbook, named *BOOK of impressions inscribed by their own hand by visitors in the Georgi Dimitrov cooperative farm in Rajevo Konare, region of Plovdiv*, that has been kept from 1948 to 1971 with varying consistency and intensity. People visiting the collectivized farm inscribed in it their impressions and, most of all, their messages of enthusiasm about what they saw. The thesis is that the book is a **discursive heterotopia** in which the heterochronies are deployed of the (self-)transformation of the socialist cooperative village through which the identities are retained of the agents who are external to this specifically distinctive place as well as of the agents who are within are fill that place with life through their everyday practices. Thus it becomes a representation of socialist ideology that symbolically constructs and constitutes the private (the everyday work space, the model farm, family, home) and contributes to the normalization of socialist subjectness. For that purpose, I will first introduce the historical context of the transformations of Rajevo Konare into a 'demonstrative model farm', in the language of documents, or into a distinctive place, said theoretically. I will then problematize what the functions are of this distinctive place 'from within' and 'from without' and what its heterotopic and heterochronic functions are. Finally, I will dwell on the *BOOK of impressions* to describe the ways in which, through it, the processes are represented of normalizing socialist subjectness.

2.9. Пенкова, С. (2018а). Дискурсивна аналитика на емоциите: омразата като социоаналитичен проблем. В: Пенкова и колектив. *Езикът на омразата – хейтърският дискурс и отношението към другия*. Съст. и ред. Стойка Пенкова. Пловдив: ИКСИ, 69-105. ISBN: 978-619-7249-27-9.

[Penkova, S. (2018a). Discursive analytic of emotions: hate as a socioanalytical problem In: *Hate speech: hate discourse and the attitude toward the other*, edited by S. Penkova. Plovdiv: ICSR, 69-105. ISBN: 978-619-7249-27-9].

This analysis offers an experimentation with the possibility to explore the discursive manifestations of hate as a specific emotional mode. It is an attempt to combine the *analytics of discourse* with an *analytic of emotions* and to incorporate the analysis of affective structures and emotional expressions in the objects researched by the historical sociology of discursive practices, or HSDP (Penkova). For this purpose, the paper first explains the basic prerequisites of the HSDP and the sociology of emotions in order to clarify the need for their mutual exploration in a *discursive analytic of emotions*. Going through the socioanalytical problem of hate, the next step is to introduce the concept of „emotive“ (Reddy) in order to prove the thesis that the **hate emotives** are special discursive and bodily expressions directed at the *Other* as an object of affection that categorize it negatively and which by themselves contribute to the attribution of essentially negative discursive identities. Emotives are directly influenced by affective interactions, and with this they change what they relate to. This reveals the more general research intention to problematize hate and fear as those increasingly intrusive emotional regimes in which we try to grasp the befalling events in the „long“ 21st century, and thus to highlight the main accents, by which a discursive analytics of emotions could interpret the particular ontological ambivalence of the late-modern life situation – both risky and vulnerable, as well as the need for new research approaches and methodologies for its problematization.

2.10. Пенкова, С. (2018б). Неравенството в социоаналитична перспектива: към всекидневните му формулирания като емпирични данни. *Социологически проблеми* 2018/1, с. 161-184.

[Penkova, S. (2018b). Inequality in a socioanalytic perspective: towards its everyday formulations as empirical data. *Sociological Problems*, 1, 161-184].

This study proposes a praxeological optic towards inequality in problematizing the ways in which it ‘happens’ in everyday interactions as a member achievement. In this meaning context, the question how inequality exists is not simply ontological and/or epistemological, but also methodological: inequality as a social fact cannot be understood analytically if we don’t take into account that 1) it is a concept borrowed from natural language (and therefore is essentially indexical); and 2) the way in which members ‘grasp’ inequality as a meaningful social phenomenon is a constitutive part of the objective relations themselves of inequality into which they are immersed. The study’s last section dwells on two empirical cases that provide

data on how agents ‘do’ the practical formulations of their social positions, relations, and forms of interaction, and hence ‘manage’ and ‘negotiate’ the inequalities between themselves as a part of their everyday affairs.

2.11. Penkova, S., Zlatkova, M. (2017). Migration, family life and cultural inheritance on the two sides of the Bulgarian-Turkish border. In: *The New Diversity of Family Life in Europe. Mobile Ethnic Groups and Flexible Boundaries*, Citlak, B., Kurtenbach, S. Lueneburg, M., Zlatkova, M. eds. Springer Publishing House, Germany, 99-123. (SCOPUS)

Yet again, the issue of borders in Europe gained prominence in 2015, not only for politicians and diplomats but also for people’s everyday lives. This issue entered public discussions in relation to the new waves of moving people, called refugees, migrants – illegal, economic, labour and so on. One of the borders that became especially charged with significations and functions was the one between Bulgaria and Turkey. Our text focuses on this border and the forms of its crossing by a particular group of people and their descendants; people who have had different designations across time – migrants, re-settlers, and göçmen, Turks born in Bulgaria, who in different periods and for different (most often political) reasons had moved to settle in Turkey and who recently began ‘coming back’ to Bulgaria or started sending their children to study in the country. In our paper, we discuss the movements of these people and their interactions with institutions and other groups across the border, and their ‘play’ with identities, as a play with the status of being citizens of two countries. On the other hand, problematizing dual citizenship entails making visible the historical and cultural layers constituting the construction of identities and the interaction between the cultural models which mobile people master in the process of socialization in different countries. This is the reason why we focus on the particular manifestation of ‘borderlines’ in the uses of cultural and social capital in new social spaces; as one that can be inherited in Bourdieu’s sense – in other words, through the strategies of families and their children. What is more, the emergence of new strategies for personal and group identification – for cultural contact and intercultural dialogue between ‘the first generation’ of migrants and their receiving communities – gradually articulates the necessity for the inception of strategies with which these will be passed on to their inheritors, ‘the second generation’. The generational dynamic of strategies are influenced by the changes in both Turkish and in Bulgarian societies from the 1990’s¹. The study of various types of migration across the Bulgarian-Turkish border calls for an emphasis on the

forms of crossing at the beginning of the twenty-first century, whose form then entails different ways of cross-border returns for the children of Bulgarian out-migrants; returns which are fostered by the particular ways of inhabiting the border – simultaneously ‘on both sides of the Bulgarian-Turkish border’. Resulting from the particularities of this form of liminality, there appears a wide range of life and biographical strategies (educational, social, and economic) of the children of out-migrants whereby the ‘new young’, that is the ‘inheritors’ of Bulgarian out-migrants to Turkey, exercise their everyday social interactions ‘across’ the border. A closer look into the forms of crossing one border actually gives us the opportunity to contemplate the multiple dimensions of the lives and worlds of the young mobile people of Europe who, with the support of their families, develop strategies for investing in social capital and in inheriting cultural models from different countries.

2.12. Todorova, B., Velcheva, I., **Penkova, S.** 2018. The attitude of adolescents towards the management of food wastes. *Ecologia Balkanica*, 10/2, 83-92. (WoS)

Efficiency in managing different types of waste is more important than ever. High urbanization and industrialization alter food production and consumption. Resources taken from nature are used in the production of goods that are consumed or disposed of and treated as waste. Consumers can be considered as the most important group in total waste production, resource consumption and the creation of different environmental impacts. One of the means to achieving sustainable environmental development is to choose the right and appropriate mechanisms of school and family education, intertwined with effective technologies in the different spheres of life. Through proper education, you can create a base for the construction of a new life-style, value orientations, and readiness for the conservation of natural resources. Conducting adequate studies can present problems for environmental treatment of adolescents with food and to propose specific recommendations for enhancing the training in different aspects, with the aim of forming a proper environmental culture and consciousness. The material aims to trace the environmental attitude towards food and nutritional resources in adolescents of different age groups and social strata, and to find solutions to reduce food waste through responsible environmental considerations. It monitors trends in family-friendly, school-friendly and circular behavioural. Good intentions are not always reflected in everyday practices. Among the main factors are food perception and consumer efficiency knowledge, level of education, as well as general beliefs and concerns about the environment. For the purposes of this study, questionnaires have been developed and applied for selected groups of

participants. 224 adolescents aged 12 to 18 were interviewed. With the help of 19 questions we were looking for in-depth analysis, flowing through the specific views of adolescents on educating them on the issue and events in their day-to-day life. The results obtained are processed using quantitative methods for analyzing the respondents' answers to the given environmental problem.

2.13. Пенкова, С. (2015). Дискурсът за Родината като репрезентация на социалистическата идеология: дискурсивни форми и деривации в детски личен дневник от периода 1948/1953 г. *Социологически проблеми* 2015/1-2, с. 171-190.

[Penkova, S. (2015). The Discourse of the Fatherland as a Representation of Socialist Ideology: Discursive Forms and Derivations in a Child's Personal Diary from the 1948/1953. *Sociological Problems*, 1/2, 171-190].

The Discourse of the Fatherland as a Representation of Socialist Ideology: Discursive Forms and Derivations in a Child's Personal Diary from the Period 1948–1953 / This study makes an attempt at critical analysis of the discursive forms into which the image of the Fatherland is cast in a child's personal diary from the early years of socialism. There are two main emphases: 1) on the image of the Fatherland as an ideological construction; 2) on the symbolic efficiency of the discourse of the Fatherland. Hence, the thesis that the discourse of/on the Fatherland forms a specific discursive regime by which socialist subjecthood is invented: functioning as a normalizing ecstatic discursive machine, it effectuates the process of normalization of socialist phenomenality. This is possible, on the one hand, because through that discourse, identities are ascribed – the essentially affirmative distinctive identities of those who are over-gifted and sanctioned by it, as well as the essentially negative identities of those deprived of such sanction; and on the other hand, because the stereotyped representations of the Fatherland correspond to specific discursive expectations and pre-givennesses that depend on the way in which the subjects of discursive practice have been questioned condition- ally or unconditionally by the official ideology of/on the socialist Fatherland.

2.14. Пенкова, С. (2015). Да преосмислим фукоанското интелектуално наследство през възможностите на една историческа социология на дискурсивните практики. *Критика и хуманизъм*, 44/1, 103-121.

[Penkova, S. (2015). Rethinking Foucault's intellectual heritage through the possibility of a historical sociology of discursive practices. *Critique & Humanism*, 44/1, 103-121].

The study tries to read ‘displacingly’ that Foucault for whom such concepts as freedom, activity, subjectness are important with regard to the constant focus on the critique of Modernity and the ‘critical ontology of ourselves’. Hence the stakes of this study and the challenges it faces: 1) to critically rethink the Foucauldian intellectual heritage, putting a stress on the ontological and epistemological thematisations of the conceptions of discourse, subject, practices of the self and of the possibility of changing ‘ourselves’ 2) in taking advantage of the methodological heuristic value of the Foucauldian problematisations, to try to present a reversed perspective towards subject constitution and its activity (being-active), and hence: 3) to present a research stance of working on the borders of the specific and concrete methodologies of Foucault and simultaneously retaining them, as a chance to develop a sociology of discursive practices that will be nonclassical in its conception and historical in its methodology.

Participant in the competition

(Assoc. Prof. Stoyka Penkova, PhD)