

KONSTANTIN PRESLAVSKY UNIVERSITY OF SHUMEN

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

**DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND THEORY OF
LITERATURE**

TSVETELINKA TOSHEVA DRAGANOVA

**LITERATURE EDUCATION IN THE UPPER SECONDARY
STAGE OF SCHOOLING**

ABSTRACT

of a Doctoral Dissertation

for the acquisition of the educational and scientific degree of
"DOCTOR" (PhD)

in the Doctoral Programme "Methodology of Teaching Bulgarian
Language and Literature"

from Professional Field: 1.3. Pedagogy of Teaching...

Field of Higher Education: 1. Pedagogical Sciences

Supervisor:

Prof. Dr. Temenuzhka Gancheva Teneva

Shumen, 2026

The dissertation consists of 252 pages and includes an introduction, three chapters, a section presenting the results of a survey questionnaire, a conclusion, a summary of research contributions, appendices, a bibliography, and an abstract in English.

The doctoral dissertation has been discussed and recommended for public defense by the extended faculty of the Department of History and Theory of Literature at the Faculty of Humanities of Konstantin Preslavsky University of Shumen, organized in accordance with Order No. RD-16-106/ 02.07.2026.

The public defense of the dissertation will be held on **September 28, 2026**, at **1:00 PM** in **Hall 309** – Building 1 of Konstantin Preslavski University of Shumen.

The defense materials are available in Room 107 (Building 1) of the Konstantin Preslavski University of Shumen.

CONTENTS

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DISSERTATION

1. Object, Subject, Aim, and Objectives of the Research
2. Research Hypothesis
3. Research Methods and Tools

MAIN BODY OF THE DISSERTATION

1. Chapter One: **Contexts of the Literary-Educational Discourse**

- 1.1. The New Reality – Cultural Aspects: Reading in the Digital World
- 1.2. Philosophical, Literary, and Methodological Aspects of the Literary-Educational Discourse
- 1.3. Curriculum Changes in the Upper Secondary Stage – Institutional Framework, Regulatory Background, and Critical Reflections

2. Chapter Two: **On Certain Systemic Deficits within the Curricula and Literature Course Content**

- 2.1. The Upper Secondary Stage Curriculum and the Literary Canon in an Educational Context
- 2.2. The Historical Background as Concept and Context in High School Literature Curricula
- 2.3. Literature Textbooks for the Upper Secondary Stage and the Construction of Contexts

3. Chapter Three: **The Literary-Educational Discourse and Competence Building – Theoretical and Applied Aspects**

- 3.1. Genre: Problematizing the Key
- 3.2. Comparative Interpretation as a Learning Task
- 3.3. The Student Essay and Competence Building
- 3.4. On the Civic-Educational Potential of Literature Education

4. Results of a Survey Questionnaire: **The Voice of the Literature Teacher**

CONCLUSION

RESEARCH CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE DISSERTATION

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS ON THE TOPIC OF THE DISSERTATION
REFERENCES

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DISSERTATION

The introductory section of the dissertation substantiates the choice of topic. The motivation behind the writing of this doctoral dissertation rests upon several grounds, foremost among which is the desire to actively observe "from within" the transformation that school literature education has undergone in recent years following the implementation of the new curricula, and to reflect on the tensions that naturally constitute it. The present text is the product of both comprehensive theoretical research and the author's own teaching experience in the upper secondary stage of schooling.

The expansion of the research framework during the course of the study is thoroughly justified—moving from a narrow focus on the thematic-problem-oriented approach as a leading paradigm in literature education toward a broader examination of the field of literary education itself. This field constitutes a segment of the social sphere laden with unconscious biases, conscious expectations, and deliberate applications—a multi-factor environment where every element, to a greater or lesser degree, explicitly or implicitly, constructs the ongoing processes. This understanding conditions the interdisciplinary and intertextual nature of the research, in which the domain of methodology intersects with observations from other fields, including cultural, sociological, and partially historical perspectives.

The **object of the research** is literature education in the upper secondary stage (grades 11 and 12) of secondary education in Bulgaria.

The **subject of the research** is the functionality of the new curricula for general education training (GET) and the new thematic-problem-oriented approach in literature teaching.

The **aim** is to investigate the literary-educational discourse as a field of complex and dynamic interaction determined by factors of diverse nature—global and national, culturally mutual, with their own educational specifics, institutional and subjective. Based on the correlation between the declared and the actual, theory and practice,

regulatory prescriptions and educational reality, the study aims to identify and conceptualize the emerging tensions.

The **main objectives** addressed in the individual chapters of the research are:

1. To investigate the various contexts from which the current literary-educational discourse stems and within which it functions.
2. To examine specific components of the literary-educational discourse (curricula and course content, methodological concepts and literature textbooks, perspectives of the discourse participants) by analyzing texts relevant to the issues under consideration.
3. To map the research field by studying the views and stances of experts and analysts, along with current reports on educational issues (including literature education), and to evaluate the degree of coherence between their findings and recommendations, on the one hand, and the actual educational reality, on the other.
4. To articulate and reflect upon the author's own pedagogical experience regarding the regulatorily declared goals of literature education—namely, competence building, the problematic areas within the new curricula and course content, and the possibilities for compensating for structural and content deficits.

The specifics and parameters of specialized literature training, as well as the concrete characteristics and functionality of the State Matriculation Examination (SME), remain outside the scope of this research. Although digitalization and its dimensions in the educational process are noted as an essential part of the contemporary context of literature education, they are not the subject of a specific focus.

The **research hypothesis** posits that the new curricula—a natural consequence of the need for education to evolve in harmony with changing realities—are grounded in a concept that shifts the educational objectives of literature studies and presupposes new approaches, offering greater opportunities for reflection on and experiential

engagement with literary works in schools. Concurrently, this transformation encounters constraints of various nature, deficits, and inert models, due to which its full potential remains underutilized.

The **research approaches, cognitive methods, and tools** employed in the course of this study comprise the following:

1. Investigation and review of theoretical research, alongside the synthesis of key ideas from the fields of cultural studies, philosophy, literary theory, and the methodology of literature education;
2. Investigation and review of regulatory documents, scholarly research, and critical analyses directly related to contemporary literary education;
3. Reflection upon individual components of the studied field from both a diachronic perspective (by situating them within the context of brief historical retrospectives) and a synchronic perspective (by correlating them with international educational practices);
4. Content analysis of literature textbooks for general education training (GET) in the upper secondary stage based on selected criteria;
5. Description of applied approaches and methodological solutions derived from the author's own teaching experience;
6. Presentation of the results from a current survey questionnaire examining the attitudes and degree of satisfaction with the curricula among active literature teachers.

MAIN BODY OF THE DISSERTATION

Drawing upon classical and contemporary research, **the first section of Chapter One** presents the aggregate of profound cultural-historical, cognitive, and axiological (value-oriented) transformations that define the radical novelty of the contemporary global cultural situation—the profound cultural shift within which modern literature education is situated. Referencing key ideas and concepts by scholars such as M. Castells and M. Doueihi, alongside theorists of postmodernism and philosophers of the contemporary world, this study attempts to outline the complex, multifaceted nature of the context in which modern educational processes are embedded.

Particular attention is dedicated to Zygmunt Bauman's concept put forward in his book *Liquid Modernity*, where he describes and analyzes a range of socio-economic, cultural, psychological, and epistemological phenomena marking the transition from a "solid" to a "liquid" society. Bauman views this as a foundational shift in the existential paradigm with numerous ramifications across all spheres of individual and social life. According to Bauman, we live in an individualized version of modernity, devoid of stable anchors, burdened by overlapping perceptions, and witnessing the collapse of traditional self-evident truths. Fundamental categories and concepts—such as time and space, work and cooperation, social roles, social interaction, individual efforts, life, and death—are undergoing radical alteration.

As a distinctive Bulgarian enrichment of this concept, the study examines the ideas of K. Krumov, who reflects on ubiquitous and all-consuming mediatization as a baseline for understanding the new reality. This reality is marked by new forms of conformity, the decline of language, the dominance of the digital, the "death of silence," and a deficit of authenticity—all of which condition the "fictional living" of contemporary humans. Virtualization, Krumov posits, is "the new organon of human behavior in the world." The new type of intellect—the medial Leviathan—is a "self-regulating system of continuous flow that extrapolates the workings of human consciousness" and is "poised

to bring all secrets to light, to lay bare the human being, and ultimately to replace them" [1].

The study highlights one of the fundamental consequences of informational capitalism and the attention economy, which is rapidly redefining the issues of literary education: the changes in the cognitive and psychological characteristics of the new generations of "digital natives." These shifts raise the question of the necessity for a new type of digital pedagogy adequate to the so-called "new actuality."

Special emphasis is placed on the transformations in reading as a foundational cultural practice directly linked to literature education. The section presents observations, analyses, and ideas from Bulgarian and foreign researchers and experts who note both the crisis in traditional reading—with its negative cognitive and educational consequences—and the "proliferation" of reading practices alongside the multiplication of reading styles among younger generations. Grounded in rich empirical data, significant findings regarding new reading realities are put forward by the authors of the study *Reading Practices in Bulgaria 2006–2022*. The project team formulates a series of recommendations for cultural and educational policies concerning reading, which presuppose a radical change in both course content and the role of the teacher.

This section also adduces other examples of reflection on the problems of reading and diverse visions for potential educational approaches. These include the observations and ideas of N. Hristova, who reflects on the global crisis in school-based reading; the insights of Tz. Todorov and G. Biesta; the Russian school of methodology; and the recent research by I. Velchev and A. Glavanakova, among others. Collectively, they underscore that contemporary literary education

¹ Krumov, K. *The New Conformity* [Noviyat konformizam]. Sofia: Agatha-A, 2015, p. 168.

faces complex, heterogeneous internal and external challenges that it must overcome. Concurrently, it must manage the tension between two distinct cultural paradigms and their respective codes—that of the "classical" works, which are inherently analog, and that of the student-reader, who is a "digital native." The necessity of integrating new approaches into the literary-educational process is becoming increasingly vital, where the ultimate stake is a high-quality literature education in harmony with live processes and trends.

The purpose of this overview of perspectives and ideas is to present a radically new educational situation, unique in its complexity and multi-layered nature. This situation increasingly challenges us for an answer and raises questions of a fundamental character, revealing the irreplaceable power of humanitarian knowledge in a new light.

The **second section of Chapter One** presents key philosophical, literary, and methodological aspects of the literary-educational discourse. The study proceeds from the complex, multifaceted nature of the examined object itself, which constructs the semantic field wherein it is situated, recognizing it within the rich philosophical tradition of dialogism and of the humanities viewed as interpretive knowledge.

On the one hand, literature itself—"the first of the humanities," in the words of Tzvetan Todorov—is born out of the human endeavor to comprehend oneself and the world, and to share that comprehension. On the other hand, the act of reading is a response to this call to enter into a dialogue with an alterity (another consciousness), whereas the articulation of the reader's experience and reflection, essential to the literary-educational interaction, takes place in a mode of conversation that likewise strives to evolve into a dialogue—concerning the values and meaning of both reading itself and human existence. Conceived in this manner, these three dimensions open a perspective toward heterogeneous ideas and concepts that intersect at a single point: the formation of human individuality through engagement with otherness and relationships with others, and the defense of subjectivity against all attempts at its objectification and instrumentalization. Thus, a single

semantic order aligns the views of thinkers from different periods and schools who, read through a contemporary lens, voice anxiety over the fate of the human condition—E. Levinas, Tz. Todorov, and H.-G. Gadamer, who unfold the philosophical aspects of otherness, difference, dialogism, and the linguistic nature of human existence. According to Gadamer's hermeneutic philosophy, language is not merely a means of transmitting information, but a vital environment—"not only the home of being, but the home of man, in which he lives, settles, meets others, and meets himself in the other," and "one of the most inhabited rooms in this home is that of poetry, of art"². In this sense, human existence is fundamentally hermeneutic. The various dimensions of dialogue and dialogism are highlighted through references to the sociology of G. Fotev, along with ideas by M. Heidegger, K. Popper, and H. Todorov.

The theoretical propositions underpinning the conceptualization of interpretation as a foundational existential event and cultural act directly linked to literature education are drawn from H.-G. Gadamer's seminal work *Truth and Method*, P. Ricœur's philosophical hermeneutics, H.-R. Jauss's reception aesthetics, and the theories of W. Iser and U. Eco regarding the active recipient and the open work. These concepts, on the one hand, substantiate interpretation as a leading literary-educational concept and, on the other, when considered from a contemporary perspective, raise the question of seeking new educational approaches and solutions through which its potential can be realized under the new conditions of crisis and transformations in traditional reading.

On this foundation is derived the theory of intertextuality, which defines the parameters of literature curricula in the upper secondary stage. At the very coining of the term, its author, J. Kristeva, posits the isomorphic connection between the relationship among texts and that among subjects. "Any text," Kristeva states, "is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another.

² Gadamer, H.-G. *The Legacy of Europe* [Nasledstvoto na Evropa]. Sofia: Critique and Humanism, 2009, p. 180.

The notion of 'intersubjectivity' (*intersubjectivité*) is replaced by the notion of 'intertextuality' (*intertextualité*), and poetic language is read as at least double"³. Within the context of Bulgarian literary criticism, the concept of *intertextuality* is problematized by Nikola Georgiev, who justifies its rendering as *mezhdutekstovost* (intertextuality/intertextualness). The researcher emphasizes that "intertextual formations are built upon and through works, but by and within individual and social literary thinking"⁴. In the context of school education, this thesis directly articulates the potential of the comparative principle within the curriculum. According to Georgiev, the palimpsestic nature of text does not operate automatically in the reader's mind—other works "shine through indeed, but only for a perception that is somewhat knowledgeable, combinatorially active, and attuned by its upbringing"⁵. It is precisely here that the role of purposeful literature education is revealed, the task of which is to "attune" and foster in young people this "knowledgeable" and "capable" thinking that transforms reading into an active creative act. Understood in the light of this conception, the intertextual approach becomes the most secure opportunity not only for literary studies but also for the school itself "to step across the boundary of its specialization into the world of fundamental human problems"⁶, connecting literary analysis with the lived experience of students.

The study adduces other theorists and analysts of intertextuality in literature as well. Furthermore, a significant contemporary aspect is outlined—the connection between intertextuality/intertextualness and network-centricity (networked environments). Present-day students inhabit an environment where, among other things, intertextuality is technologically materialized. The hypernym "network-centricity"

³ Quoted in N. Georgiev. *Chasms and Bridges of Intertextuality* [Propasti i mostove na mezhdutekstovostta]. Plovdiv: P. Hilendarski University Press, 1999, p. 10.

⁴ Georgiev, N. *Silent Dialogues in Literature* [Malchalivite dialozi v literaturata]. // *Literary Theory*. Vol. I. Sofia: Iztok-Zapad, 2017, p. 413.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 413.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 414.

(networkedness)—superordinate to concepts such as intertextuality, on the one hand, and hyper-connectivity and interactivity, on the other—subsumes the pre-digital vs. digital binary opposition, thereby enriching the notion of dialogism and outlining the horizon of a new type of digital humanities.

Building upon the outlined cultural, philosophical, and literary aspects of the educational context, the study also draws on their conceptualization and operationalization within the field of the methodology of literature education. Methodology is understood here not as a mere set of "recipes," but as a sophisticated instrument for self-reflection on the teaching and learning process, according to which the literary-educational discourse is viewed as a specific communicative event—an interaction and an action of complex nature. The section presents key ideas and concepts by leading scholars such as R. Yoveva, D. Dobrev, V. Atanasov, T. Teneva, A. Damyanova, among others, who in their works substantiate the necessity of a transition from traditional teaching to a dialogic type of humanitarian education. In this model, rather than remaining a passive object of educational impact, the student is actively engaged through interpretation in order to become an active subject and an equal participant in the educational dialogue. In this manner, the essential task of literary education can be achieved: the building of the very image—the "uniqueness, the personal integrity of the human being—with the help of imagined worlds of words"⁷.

The methodological core of the concept of literary education upon which this study relies is "problematization as an essential characteristic of the educational type of literature teaching in schools"⁸. It is operationalized through the introduction of the problem-based situation

⁷ Teneva, T. *Grounds and Practices of the Lesson "Performance" in Literature Classes (Grades 5–12)* [Osnovaniya i praktiki na urochnoto "predstavlenie" v chasovete po literatura (5. – 12. klas)]. Shumen: Bishop Konstantin Preslavsky University Press, 2020.

⁸ Dobrev, D., T. Teneva. *Literature Education and Interpretation of Literary Texts in School* [Literaturno obrazovanie i interpretatsiya na hudozhestven tekst v uchilishte]. Sofia: Glauks, 1992, p. 63.

and the problem-oriented question. Questioning/the methodological question drives the student's reception, which finds its ultimate fulfillment in the implementation of intertextuality as one of the interpretive approaches to the literary text⁹. Viewed from the perspective of the thematic-problem-oriented principle of literature education, the ideas of R. Radev are highlighted as particularly significant. He further develops and enriches the understanding of the leading role of problematization within the educational discourse and emphasizes the need for the student to become a generator of questioning. Radev conceptualizes the thematic principle, upon which the current curriculum is structured, as a stimulus that encourages the student's activity as an autonomous subject of knowledge.

By presenting leading ideas and concepts regarding the philosophy and pragmatics of literature education in a contemporary context, this section of the study references works by V. Atanasov, A. Damyanova, N. Hristova, Tz. Todorov, S. Pinker, and others.

The third section of Chapter One traces the changes within the curriculum of the upper secondary stage—describing its institutional framework and regulatory foundations, while presenting key critical reflections.

A series of European educational documents issued over the past decades, with which Bulgarian education is closely aligned, substantiate the concept of *competence*. Through this concept, knowledge is conceptualized and valued based on what can be "done" with it, focusing on the triad of knowledge, skills, and attitudes, whose synthesis should constitute the primary objective of education. The section cites Recommendation 1833 of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe from 2008—one of the few European documents

⁹ Yoveva, R. *Methodology of Literature Education* [Metodika na literaturnoto obrazovanie]. Shumen: Bishop Konstantin Preslavsky University Press, 2002, pp. 35–42.

explicitly dedicated to literature education—which outlines the essential steps individual countries ought to take within their own educational policies. At that time, the old regulatory framework was still in effect in Bulgaria. Part of this framework included the State Educational Requirements (SER) for the course content of Bulgarian Language and Literature, which were the subject of various analyses, sharp critical reflections, and recommendations. The study presents analyses and reflections on these issues by R. Yoveva, A. Damyanova, and N. Hristova.

The development of the competence framework for educational purposes is a natural outcome of Bulgaria's integration into European educational policies. In October 2015, competencies were formally integrated into the Pre-school and School Education Act (PSEA), which entered into force in 2016, as well as into the relevant secondary legislation, foremost among which is Ordinance No. 5, establishing the "State Standard for General Education Training." Without altering subject-based instruction as the structural foundation of the Bulgarian school system, the regulatory instruments "embed" contemporary competencies into the description of school education objectives. The study presents reflections on the competence-based approach that problematize various aspects of it. Its epistemological ambiguity, multi-layered nature, and problematic character are noted—characteristics that, to some extent, condition the difficulties in operationalizing it at different levels of the educational system: from regulatory documents, through concrete implementation practices, to the measurement of outcomes. The section cites specific analyses of the Ordinance and its accompanying curricula, which uncover weaknesses and deficits that, in turn, compromise the practical realization of the formulated goals. Special attention is dedicated to the analyses of regulatory documents conducted by literary scholars and experts in the methodology of literature education, such as A. Damyanova and A. Panov, who highlight both the educational potential and positive changes in the new curricula, as well as the deficits and factors likely to block this potential.

The study highlights the lack of comprehensive analyses and reflections regarding the efficacy of the reform several years after its implementation. The statistical data presented annually by the Ministry of Education and Science (MES) following the State Matriculation Examinations fail to serve an analytical function and do not provide a clear indication of the effectiveness of these changes. Despite the established goals and expected outcomes aimed at achieving qualitative change, the published data remain entirely quantitative. Concurrently, data on the reading literacy of Bulgarian students provided by the eighth edition of the international PISA study in 2022 confirm the urgency of such comprehensive analyses. The findings are definitive and deeply alarming: the performance of Bulgarian students in PISA 2022 is comparable to their lowest achievements to date. According to experts, attention should be centered precisely on the concrete educational reality—specifically, the curricula and the manner in which educational objectives are defined within them.

Based on these and other presented analyses, the final section of this part summarizes the regulatorily embedded content and systemic deficits of the new curricula in terms of: the vaguely articulated connection between the lower and upper secondary stages of schooling; the lack of concrete focus on significant contemporary issues, including civic education; the absence of differentiation to address the needs stemming from various forms of educational inequalities; the pressure exerted by the State Matriculation Examination on educational practice; and the lack of sufficient methodological support for literature teachers, among others.

The **second chapter** of the study aims to present the primary structural and systemic deficits of literature education in the upper secondary stage by examining specific components of educational discourse in literature. Within this chapter, the content modifications in the curricula and course content are examined through several key focal points. **The first section** presents the shifts within the literary canon in an educational context and details the new structural design of the

course content. It cites classical definitions of the canon that outline its complex discursive nature. For the purposes of this research, the term is employed in its narrow sense: a corpus of authors and titles prescribed by school curricula as compulsory for study, thereby metonymically establishing a "miniature model" of literary classics. Drawing upon a brief diachronic cross-section of the historical shifts within the school canon, this section presents and analyzes the changes introduced by the new curricula. It highlights the "unburdening" of the reading list through a reduction in volume, which provides greater opportunities for in-depth work during classroom hours. Emphasis is placed on the new mode of contextualizing the compulsory works, which stems from the thematic-problematic principle of structuring course content; this framework establishes a different perspective for reception and interpretation compared to the traditional literary-historical principle. Furthermore, the weak points of these canonical shifts and the approach toward them are critically discussed—namely, the marginalization of historicism, the "tunnel-vision" problematization of literary works, the extremely limited presence of female voices and contemporary texts, and a general aesthetic uniformity. Through synchronic observations, the issue of the school canon and its surrounding debates is also viewed within a broader transnational context. The study concludes that the Bulgarian educational canon in literature is still searching for its identity amidst its goals and objectives—poised between fostering national identity and developing sociocultural, civic, literary, and communicative competencies, its profile often becomes blurred and utilitarian, subordinated to a teaching approach designed primarily for passing the State Matriculation Examination.

The second section focuses on the transition from a literary-historical to a thematic-problematic principle in literature education, and the accompanying contextual vacuum identified as a primary deficit. The study draws upon key interdisciplinary theoretical propositions and observations regarding the social existence of historical discourse—including within the realm of literature education—as well as the fundamental nexus between the literary and

the historical. The problematization of this relationship is grounded in the understanding of the literary as a form of legitimizing memory that remains in continuous dialogue with the historical without coinciding with it; furthermore, it functions as an instrument for "implanting" enduring perceptions, clichés, and myths that enter social circulation and serve as a potential foundation for political ideologemes and propaganda clichés. The thesis advanced by this study is that the new literature curricula fail to meet the outlined needs and responsibilities of the school in this context, possessing deficits whose remediation rests entirely upon the shoulders of the literature teacher. The lack of continuity between the curricula of the lower and upper secondary stages, which leads to "contextual illiteracy" among contemporary students, is highlighted and illustrated with examples from practice. Specific aspects of the 11th and 12th-grade curricula are discussed, revealing problematic areas related to, for instance, the historiographical narrative of the totalitarian era, alongside the necessity to carefully reflect with students upon artistic representations of the past and to foster the capacity for an adequate reception of historical myths (following R. Barthes). On this basis, the study presents concrete methodological ideas and projects from the author's own teaching experience involving supplementary texts, through which avenues for overcoming the identified deficits are sought.

The third section of Chapter Two establishes a focal point that naturally arises from the first two—namely, the content of literature textbooks for the 11th and 12th grades as a primary didactic medium and functional tool. This tool is tasked with textualizing the course content to achieve the objectives of the curriculum, and it possesses a genuine potential to partially compensate for its weaknesses. The underlying premise is that textbooks are not merely static repositories of content; they indirectly articulate and shape a specific philosophy, conveying messages that influence pedagogical strategies, occasionally serving "hidden" curricula, and undoubtedly acting as instruments for the transmission of cultural and social capital.

The content analysis conducted on the ten approved literature textbooks for the 11th and 12th grades seeks to determine the extent to which the various textbooks offer an adequate contextual framework to ground interpretative efforts during literature classes, thereby validating the methodological reliability of the thematic-problematic approach. This inquiry is operationalized through two distinct lines of investigation: first, the extent to which the textbooks facilitate the construction of a dialogic space where compulsory works can enter into a "conversation" with foreign literary masterpieces—thus overcoming the complex of backwardness and marginality, allowing national literature to be read and understood as part of a broader semantic and symbolic realm, and enabling intercultural dialogue within the sphere of literature; second, the manner in which the textbooks construct the urgently needed educational narrative regarding the totalitarian era. The analysis leads to the finding that the authors of all textbooks, albeit to varying degrees and in different forms, have sought to include distinct cognitive units aimed at expanding the approach to the compulsory works of Bulgarian literature and potentially encouraging the collection and research of information. However, those textbooks proved functional in terms of constructing a broader context wherein foreign works are not merely mentioned but are genuinely integrated into various rubrics and embedded within tasks across diverse cognitive levels, particularly those requiring the creation of oral and written interpretative texts. It is established that while the textbooks do offer contextual knowledge regarding the period between 1944 and 1989, this field needs to be presented more comprehensively, and the relevant issues must be reflected upon more consistently as an element in fostering not only literary and historical, but also civic literacy within the contemporary school system.

Regardless of their differences, and precisely because of them, the examined textbooks provide extensive opportunities for the teacher. By understanding the educational concepts and methodological designs of each individual textbook, teachers can create their own blueprint for the literature education process, tailoring it to the specific characteristics of

their students without losing sight of the core objectives of literary study.

The third chapter of the study is subordinated to one primary task—to articulate and reflect upon the author's own pedagogical experience in relation to the regulatorily prescribed objectives of literature education (namely, competency building), the problematic areas within the new curricula and course content, and the avenues for compensating for these structural and content-related deficits. Various sections outline practices through which it is possible to adapt and manage the mandated curricula, to experiment within their frameworks, and to expand them in order to align more closely with the core objectives of studying literature in school. In this manner, it becomes possible to delineate a more nuanced picture of pedagogical reality. References to theoretical ideas and concepts serve to outline the methodological context of the presented experience.

The object of reflection in **the first section** is the work with genre in literature classes. The guiding premise is that literature education should cultivate sensitive and competent readers who are capable of analyzing and interpreting structures and signs across various semiotic levels, as well as constructing such structures themselves. Genre, as a constitutive unit and primary structural marker, is one of the instruments through which literature operates; therefore, comprehending it is crucial for the objectives of educational discourse in literature. Significant educational potential lies in understanding genre not as a ready-made given, but as a variant of an invariant model—as a construct and a specific form of convention linked to the social function of literature, its ideological resource, and the opportunity to enrich the reader's social and cultural competence through and by means of it. As Rumyana Yoveva points out in her *Methodology of Literature Education*, "The most stable anchor for studying a literary text is its genre affiliation. The invariant characteristics of the genre outline the blueprints according to which the text is interpreted. In applying any blueprint, however, the distinct

existence of each element of poetics within the specific text must be respected."¹⁰ In a broader communicative context, knowledge of genre as a discourse type—an element of a specific communicative event with a social nature—constitutes a component of an individual's discourse competence, which is integrated into the processes of social interaction.¹¹

Drawing upon these insights, the study presents results from specific learning tasks related to the generic nature of the works studied, corresponding to different levels of the Bloom–Anderson taxonomy of educational objectives. The data unequivocally indicate that efforts to develop knowledge of genre must transcend a mere declarative approach—which reduces it to managing a set of definitions for the needs of working memory during the State Matriculation Examination, or to reproducing rote-learned knowledge without comprehension—and must instead lead to the formation of a clear understanding of the nature of genre and its social function. It should support the understanding that genre is not an end-in-itself theoretical construct, but a product of relationships—between texts, and between texts and readers with their social characteristics and connections—thereby becoming one of the ways in which fiction functions as a fact of culture and social interaction. Within this context, concrete methodological ideas are presented for problematizing the concept of genre as an approach and a key to the world of the literary work. These ideas stem from the hypothesis that meaning expands through the enrichment and reconstruction of research work within educational discourse, serving as a tool in the process of building a framework of competencies—not

¹⁰Yoveva, R. *Methodology of Literature Education* [Metodika na literaturnoto obrazovanie]. Shumen: Bishop Konstantin Preslavsky University Press, 2002, p. 152.

¹¹ See Petrov, A. *The Problems of Discourse and Students' Discourse Competence in the Theory and Practice of Bulgarian Language Teaching* [Problemite za diskursa i diskursnata kompetentnost na uchenitsite v teoriyata i praktikata na obuchenieto po balgarski ezik]. // *LiterNet Electronic Magazine*.
<https://litternet.bg/publish/apetrov/discourse.htm>

merely narrowly literary ones, but also sociocultural and communicative competencies.

The second section expands into a reflection on the theoretical (philosophical, literary, and methodological) and practical foundations of the intertextual approach and comparative interpretation as the conceptual core of the curricula in the upper secondary stage. Literature education is defined as an "event of social communication," a "specialized form of dynamic social relationship"¹² – a developing field for the exchange of intersubjectively shared knowledge that demands an incessant updating of tools and, precisely for this reason, gives rise to a constructive restlessness. One of its manifestations is the transition from a literary-historical to a thematic principle of organizing course content in literature—a transition that "provides an opportunity to explore aspects of literature (and culture more broadly) that remain entirely inaccessible when employing any other methodological toolkit"¹³ and presents the problem-thematic approach not as a pre-established framework, but as a "discovered key within the interpretative process," during which "associative fields are achieved, opening up thought and allowing spontaneity to manifest as liberated energy for experiencing the text."¹⁴

¹² Atanasov, V. Toward a Critical Methodology [Za edna kriticheska metodika]. // *Bulgarian Language and Literature [Balgarski ezik i literatura]*, 2018, Issue 5, p. 550.

¹³ Protohristova, K. Thematology on the Rise: Methodological Assumptions and Methodological Utilization [Tematologiyata v nastaplenie. Metodologicheski predpostavki i metodicheski opolzotvoryavaniya]. // *The Great Inscription, or What Does Comparative Literature Compare [Golyamoto vpisvane, ili kakvo sravnyava sravnitelno literaturoznanie]*. Sofia: St. Kliment Ohridski University Press, 2010, p. 19.

¹⁴ Radev, R. The Thematic Principle and the Structuring of Course Content in Literature: Present and Prospects [Tematichniyat printsip i strukturirano na uchebno sadarzhane po literatura. Nastoyashte i perspektivi]. // *Education and Media: Collection in Honor of Prof. Dr. Vladimir Atanasov [Obrazovanie i medii. Sbornik v chest na prof. d-r Vladimir Atanasov]*. Sofia: Prosveta, 2020, p. 340.

Comparativity is laid at the foundation of literature education in the upper secondary stage, which justifies the necessity of designing and implementing a different type of learning activities tied to the specific nature of the course content. Read through the classical Bloom–Anderson taxonomy, comparative interpretation presupposes higher-order cognitive activities (conceptual and procedural knowledge) and the development of skills to categorize, to operate according to an algorithm, and to reflect upon and utilize acquired fragments of information (facts, phenomena) within a new context and toward a new task, including creative ones, as well as to synthesize, evaluate, and project. Consequently, their inclusion into the system of pedagogical and didactic technologies cannot be sudden or abrupt; it must be progressive and gradual, adhering to Vygotsky's classical principle of the student's zone of proximal development, and operationalized by breaking it down into individual components and didactic steps. The study offers a possible paradigm along with concrete examples of learning tasks drawn from the author's own teaching experience. The task of comparative interpretation between a studied text and an unstudied text is conceptualized as an opportunity to partially compensate for certain content deficits within the curricula, insofar as it allows missing yet necessary texts to enter the scope of the students' attention—texts which, however, require special attention and sufficient accompanying exercises to develop the competencies for adequate reception and interpretation.

The third section aims to present certain aspects of the work directed toward developing skills for essay writing—one of the two types of argumentative texts that students are expected to master by the end of their secondary education, and the text type chosen by the majority of matriculants in the State Matriculation Examination. Working on the assimilation of its generic conventions is a significant element in mastering discourse strategies in general. Key theoretical (methodological) propositions are presented, and prevailing prejudices and misconceptions regarding the essay are discussed. The subject of observation and reflection is the intersection between the specific

literary competencies that students are implicitly required to form during their education, and their ability to produce an essayistic text within a high-stakes exam setting. The study examines how the essay, as an element of literary-educational discourse, integrates into this discourse and, in turn, incorporates the outcomes not of language proficiency in general, but of the literary literacy of the graduating youth. After clarifying several significant nexus points (essay–interpretation, essay–literary and civic competencies, critical thinking, and essay–interdisciplinarity), the working objective is formulated: to investigate to what extent and in what manner the literary text, as a translator of a specific type of experience (ideas, understandings, perceptions, relationships, and evaluations), serves as an element of the "inner speech" (following L. Vygotsky) of the essay writers, and whether and how the generic conventions of the essay alter the reading approach to the works studied. It examines how students talk in their essays about texts that have been the object of literary analysis and interpretation, and which the interpretative essay explores in accordance with specific requirements tied to more or less specialized knowledge. Furthermore, it questions whether, by incorporating literary examples into their argumentation, students deploy a specific literary competence (knowledge of literary-historical processes, the artistic construction of texts, their generic specificity, etc.).

Answers to these questions were sought within a specific sample of student texts produced in April 2024 at Plovdiv English Language School. For the purposes of this analysis, the typology of information developed by the Russian linguist Ilya Galperin was utilized, which allows for an evaluation of the functioning of the literary example and the degree of reflection upon it for the sake of argumentation in student essays. Distinguishing three levels of informativeness in any text (content-factual, content-conceptual, and content-subtextual

information), Galperin points out that the content-conceptual level is key to decoding a literary text, including its content-subtextual level.¹⁵

The study provides numerous examples indicating that students are capable of working with the content-conceptual level of literary texts—they extract the semantic core from the chosen literary example and present it within the course of their argumentation. Across all essays, reflection is oriented toward the stated problem, regardless of the semantic logic determining the place of the works within the curriculum. Various aspects of working with the student-selected literary examples are discussed in the study. Strengths and weaknesses delineating deficits and opportunities are highlighted and illustrated with examples.

The presented observations and analysis justify the claim that tasks integrating literary competencies into student essays possess rich educational potential. The utilization of literary examples and their corresponding interpretation, alongside the alignment of artistic insights/messages with personal experience, expand the students' competencies to express and defend their own position on a given problem. On the other hand, the diverse semantic bridges and connections that the essay presupposes enrich the dialogue with the aesthetic and foster an awareness of reading as a significant instrument for self-knowledge, self-construction, and self-expression. The essayistic context opens a different "entry point" and outlines alternative interpretative routes toward the compulsory works—through the lens of the personal. It liberates writers from the tutelage of metatexts, granting free access to diverse, often contradictory and confronting, and therefore particularly meaningful, versions of the world and value models that represent the diversity and complexity of being human among others. Consequently, the consistent implementation of a system of methodological steps, solutions, and

¹⁵ Galperin, I. *Text as an Object of Linguistic Research [Tekst kak obyekт lingvisticheskogo issledovaniya]*. Moscow: KomKniga, 2007, pp. 26–29.

practices aimed at encouraging reading experience as an integrative part of essay-writing skills is well-founded, even urgent. Within this context, certain types of tasks are presented that have the potential to enrich the literary foundation and to develop skills for connecting literary competencies with the extra-literary experience of students.

The final, **fourth section of Chapter Three** focuses on the civic education potential of literature education in the upper secondary stage. The constant problematization of the link between literary and civic education is necessitated by the shifting nexus points it contains, which stem from the contradiction between the actual core needs that the school is by definition expected to meet and the current situation illustrating that these needs remain unresolved, often appearing irresolvable. On the one hand, civic competence is clearly defined at the level of regulatory documents—it encompasses the knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes required of an active citizen, and stands as one of the eight key competencies demanded by education and training for personal fulfillment, active citizenship, social cohesion, and employment in a knowledge society.

On the other hand, the results of the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS), in whose three iterations (in 2009, 2016, and 2022) Bulgaria has participated, unequivocally indicate serious problems directly affecting (literature) education. Concrete data are cited emphasizing the urgent need not simply for well-packaged declarations and good intentions, but for institutional will and functioning mechanisms to transform the philosophy, environment, and educational practices within domestic secondary education. The study also draws upon analyses of literature curricula from a civic perspective, which conclude that the curriculum exhibits civic indifference and a façade-like presence of the civic component, which remains at the level of externally claimed integrity but is devoid of support in practice. As O. Georgieva-Teneva summarizes, "There is a sign of change, but its actual denotatum is missing," and "encountering

images of recent and present (non)citizenship, or of social and political life in school, is virtually unthinkable."¹⁶

On this basis, the study attempts to outline certain significant semantic lines that intersect the individual thematic and problem-oriented areas, to focus on a set of issues which—while not explicitly stated in the course content and curricula—is relevant to the goals and tasks of literature education within the examined context, and to highlight directions of work that enable a productive "addendum to" the missing civic education project without losing sight of the goals and expected outcomes directly mandated by the institutional norm at the level of literary and language competencies. The main thematic and problem-oriented areas around which the curriculum is constructed are traced; furthermore, methodological ideas and concrete examples of learning tasks aimed at the optimal utilization of the civic education potential of literary-educational discourse are presented. Special attention is dedicated to the possibilities for problematizing "Bai Ganyo the Journalist," the "uses" of history, the historical clichés and myths referenced by the works studied, the ideologized variant readings of the short story "Andreshko," and the necessity to reflect upon the role of religion as a contemporary integrative factor, among others. Fragments from Georgi Markov's essays, which are particularly suited for reflecting upon key aspects of the totalitarian era such as mentality and behavioral models, are pointed out as an opportunity for work directed toward developing students' skills in producing essayistic texts.

Another major theme of high social significance, which still remains unfocused and unarticulated within the curricula, is the theme of the place and voice of women. The study draws attention both to the compulsory works that offer an opportunity for reflection on this matter, and to the necessity of enriching and expanding this scope with

¹⁶ Georgieva-Teneva, O. *Literature Education in a Civic Perspective (Grades 8–12)*. [Literaturnoto obrazovanie v grazhdanska perspektiva (VIII – XII klas)] Sofia: New Bulgarian University, 2020, pp. 43–50.

appropriate supplementary information regarding the historical aspects of the issue in Bulgaria. The lack of specific software designed for the construction of knowledge in the humanities is highlighted, an element of which could be a digital library containing useful and necessary textual and audiovisual resources. Given the current relevance of civic issues, which unfold dynamically, the need for such resources is more than urgent.

The appendix includes excerpts from specific current texts, primarily media texts, upon which productive learning tasks can be constructed to develop sensitivity toward societal events. Capturing and actively utilizing such case studies from the public agenda is a matter of professional reflex, because it is precisely within this agenda that ingrained (prejudiced) perceptions become visible, and it is toward its transformation, however utopian, that efforts in the field of civic and literature education should be aimed.

Undoubtedly, literature education ought to be conceived as an element of an entire complex of discursive practices that co-participate in the continuous processes of constructing social reality—understood as a discursive symbolic universe and a communicative environment of a performative nature, which is constructed with every act of public speech (or silence). Therefore, the question of what and how is reflected upon, and what and how is discussed in literature classes, is, among other things, a question of cultivating social perspective and imagination—a cultivation linked to examining specific social facts, presenting viewpoints and explanatory frameworks, articulating messages, and legitimizing behavioral models. In this manner, conversations about literature and within the field of literature emerge as agents of social action and interaction, of control and resistance against control, thereby supporting the building of the individual's horizon of values and the moral integrity of society.

In a distinct, separate section at the end of the dissertation, **the results of a survey titled "The Voice of the Literature Teacher"** are presented—an empirical study of the professional attitudes and

evaluation of individual practice-defining components among active teachers of Bulgarian Language and Literature regarding the curricula currently implemented in Grades 11 and 12.

The primary objective is to diagnose the functionality of the current model through the prism of direct pedagogical experience, by identifying systemic deficits, resource availability, and the correlation between the educational process and the State Matriculation Examination (SME). Addressed to teachers from various types of schools, the survey was also conceived as an accessible opportunity to overcome, at least to some extent, the inevitable limitations of the research perspective in the present study. The method of a direct standardized survey conducted in a digital environment was employed, utilizing a mixed-type questionnaire that combined closed-ended questions to determine the demographic and professional profile of the respondents; multiple-choice questions to identify complex deficits; Likert-type rating scales to evaluate specific issues and the level of institutional and resource support; and an open-ended question for qualitative research and the collection of expert recommendations from the respondents. During the stages of survey construction and the primary mathematical and structural processing of the collected dataset, technical and methodological support was provided by an AI-based language model (Gemini). The author bears full responsibility for the validity of the conclusions and the conceptual interpretation of the results.

The focus group includes 38 teachers of Bulgarian Language and Literature teaching in Grades 11 and 12 during the current educational cycle, differentiated by school type, geographical region, and professional experience. Due to its limited scope, the study makes no claim to full statistical representativeness; instead, it relies on geographical and institutional diversity, which allows for the capturing of stable trends, systemic deficits, and correlations valid for the educational system as a whole. The sample encompasses the three main types of educational institutions in the country—specialized secondary

schools (47.4%), vocational high schools (34.2%), and general secondary schools (18.4%), located both in large administrative centers (Sofia, Plovdiv, Ruse, Stara Zagora, Lovech, Dobrich) and in smaller towns and villages (Madan, Karnobat, Klisura, Parvomay, Asenovgrad, Samokov, Ihtiman, the village of Osoitsa). The study was conducted between April and May 2026. The questionnaires were anonymous and completed voluntarily and independently. Quantitative results are presented numerically, including percentages. The qualitative analysis is organized around three primary focal points.

The first focus pertains to the results of the multiple-choice questions, which outline the primary deficits and challenges within the specific educational practices of individual teachers. Although significantly more than half of the respondents express general satisfaction with the curriculum as a whole and with the selection of authors and works, this satisfaction is "conditional." While they approve of the goals and the modern outlook of the curriculum, they experience serious difficulties in utilizing it efficiently. Teachers are constrained not so much by the number of texts, but rather by the inability to teach them comprehensively due to a lack of contextual knowledge and a language barrier. Even though the curriculum is overall evaluated as conceptually sound, the specific practice poses severe challenges, insofar as the comparison of authors and eras confuses and demotivates upper secondary students.

The data concerning the time deficit unequivocally indicate that it reflects most severely upon the two fundamental axes of literature education: direct contact with the artistic text and the generation of the student's own written discourse. The time required for reading and gathering profound knowledge of the studied texts emerges as a key deficit. The format of the State Matriculation Examination (SME) requires graduates to produce various types of written texts, yet more than two-thirds of the surveyed teachers lack sufficient instructional time to develop their students' written competencies in class. Nearly half of the respondents note that they are forced to neglect working with

texts outside the compulsory list. This encapsulates instruction solely within its boundaries and blocks the opportunities for developing functional literacy through unfamiliar texts—a skill posited as a primary goal in the curricula. The ongoing classroom discussion is also suppressed in favor of a lecture-based delivery of information. The active framework of the curriculum in Grades 11–12 suffers from a structural deficit—it is oriented toward serious academic goals, yet deprives the educational process of the temporal resources necessary for their realization.

The analysis of the data outlines a highly important trend: while the educational system has succeeded in providing teachers with traditional didactic materials and administrative guidelines, it lags seriously behind in the area of dynamic support—namely, the ongoing qualification and technological adaptation of staff. Qualification programs and the effectiveness of training sessions and seminars are recognized as the most severe deficits in practice.

The second focus concerns the tracking of responses across the three school profiles (specialized secondary schools, vocational high schools, and general secondary schools), which reveals three distinct pedagogical realities existing simultaneously within the Bulgarian educational system. Teachers in specialized secondary schools demonstrate the most pronounced conceptual objections—they are teaching students with potential for high achievement, yet perceive the new framework as methodologically restrictive. Their level of satisfaction can be described as moderate. The data provide grounds to assume that vocational high schools—especially those located in smaller towns—are the primary beneficiaries of the new curriculum. For vocational education, where literature classes are heavily limited, thematic grouping serves as a viable alternative. A large portion of teachers in vocational high schools evaluate the format of the State Matriculation Examination (SME) positively, and the presence of "templates" and structured exam components most likely helps graduates in these schools meet the baseline requirements for a

successful diploma. General secondary schools (especially those in small towns) emerge as the most pressured part of the system. Their overall satisfaction is low, and their skepticism is most strongly pronounced. Teachers acutely feel the misalignment between high state criteria and the actual capabilities of the students. Teaching for them turns into a "race against time," as they lack specialized hours to compensate for the established deficits.

The third focus of the qualitative analysis addresses one of the systemic deficits in Bulgarian secondary education in Bulgarian Language and Literature—namely, the correlation between the curriculum, the educational content, and the format of the State Matriculation Examination (SME). The data here are unequivocal: according to 76.3% of the respondents, the exam primarily tests reproduction and ready-made clichés. The critical majority signals a lack of coherence between the system's "input" and "output," a conceptual misalignment between the philosophy of the curriculum and the type of exam, as well as a functional substitution of goals. The established rift compromises the reliability of the SME as an objective measure of the quality of the educational process—the exam possesses high administrative validity but low substantive and functional validity. Consequently, its results cannot serve as a genuine basis for correct remedial educational actions. This evaluation also illustrates another paradox: the system requires the literature teacher to foster critically thinking individuals, yet controls and evaluates the teacher through an instrument that requires students to be efficient executors of algorithms.

The analysis of the qualitative survey data yields several key directions for future corrections in educational policy regarding Bulgarian Language and Literature. The SME ought to be transformed from an exam testing memorized analyses of a specific list of works into an exam that assesses competencies and transferable skills—such as the ability to interpret an unfamiliar artistic text and to construct an independent civic and creative stance. On the other hand, the data reveal a severe dichotomy within the educational system, insofar as the current

literature curriculum imposes identical requirements (at the output via the SME) upon subjects with fundamentally different resource and temporal endowments.

The crisis in the professional self-determination of literature teachers, signaled by the study, is linked to a deeper problem of a fundamental nature. It concerns that "inter-power" entanglement, the value-based ambivalence "between enlightenment, humanity, and public or private violence," and the "dual-value institution called school"—a tension long established by Nikola Georgiev in his book *A Literature Teacher? I Am Not One of Them*. "This dual-value," the author concludes with unconcealed professional empathy, "fuels the disbelief in the so-called vocation of the teacher, both in their own eyes and in the eyes of others"¹⁷. We have no choice but to agree.

¹⁷ Georgiev, N. *A Literature Teacher? I Am Not One of Them* [*Uchitel po literatura li? Ne sam ot tyah*]. Prosveta Publishing, Sofia, 2010, p. 62.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion of the dissertation presents the findings arrived at through the research. In summary, they are as follows:

The overall shift in the concept of literature education during the upper secondary stage of Bulgarian schooling is a logical consequence of global processes and trends, and aligns with key European documents. Concurrently, however, a tension is identified between the philosophy of this transformation, its definition within regulatory documents, and the actual functioning of the system. The ambitiously proclaimed opening up and transition toward the competence-based approach encounters constraints of various natures, most of which are interconnected or derive from one another.

Within the curricula, competencies are described in overly broad terms without concrete, meaningful focal points, which creates prerequisites for varying interpretations and practices—further exacerbated by the lack of public consensus regarding the meaning and goals of literature education. This deficiency is particularly pronounced concerning civic education objectives.

The transition from a literary-historical to a thematic-problem-oriented approach is a step that can be evaluated positively. Studying literary works within a network of diverse intertextual correlations corresponds to the cognitive profile of contemporary students and the challenges they face in the modern world. Compared to previous curricula, the volume of educational content has been significantly reduced, providing better opportunities to utilize the core thematic-problem nodes.

At the same time, various content-related and systemic deficits undermine educational efforts. Literature teachers must contend with the severely limited or entirely absent contextual knowledge of modern students. The anticipated literary-historical background knowledge expected to be accumulated by students by the end of the lower

secondary stage is non-existent; in this sense, the curriculum in the subsequent stage rests on "feet of clay."

The curriculum remains a hostage to the compulsory text list, despite the theoretical possibility of its expansion and enrichment. Studying literature through the construction of a broader textual field is extremely restricted. Structured around approximately thirty compulsory texts and utilized as a ranking tool, the State Matriculation Examination (SME) severely narrows, and even substitutes, the goals of literature-education discourse. This leads to a pragmatization of efforts for the sake of measurable indicators that fail to provide clear information regarding the level of acquired competencies. Consequently, this raises the question of the (in)ability of literature classes to address educational inequalities and the needs of students from different regions and varying types of schools.

Despite the current availability of a considerable number of official reports, studies, and analyses that pinpoint the problematic areas of the educational reality and propose potential solutions, an impression of a lack of genuine debate and constructive dialogue between academic knowledge, expert voices, and the institutions responsible for policymaking in the field of literature education remains.

Bulgarian literature teachers identify a shortage of adequate qualification support in their work with the new model. The curriculum offers sound opportunities for implementing and testing diverse methodological scenarios; however, the freedom and imagination of teachers are heavily constrained, not least by instructional time. Experiencing these deficits firsthand, they seek various ways of coping with them to the extent necessary, primarily to ensure successful performance on the SME.

While European documents provide the rationale for the reform, specific European practices in the field of literature instruction remain unfamiliar. In this regard, the Bulgarian educational reality generally remains insular and subject to inertia and inherited models. We perceive

the most critical tasks facing it to lie within the complex nexus between the dynamic processes of sustaining humanitarian values in a digital reality and the arduous liberation from these inertias and models.

The path traversed by this study appears complete only because it is, by definition, constrained by time. The number of questions increases, thereby opening up new directions and enticing research perspectives that hold the potential to generate further texts. The meaning lies in the continuous renewal of inquiry and the diligence of the search, without ever losing sight of the "power nestled within every word" (R. Barthes).

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE DISSERTATION

1. The study represents one of the first comprehensive attempts to reflect upon the discourse of literature education within the context of the current concept and the active curricula designed to implement it in the upper secondary stage.
2. The research draws upon a rich corpus of texts that analyze current trends related to literature education and point out significant deficits in the active curricula, the identification of which constitutes the first step toward remedial actions
3. The study presents and analyzes data from a survey examining the attitudes and evaluations of literature teachers across various regions and school types, capturing key characteristics of the active curricula.
4. The research offers a reflection on the author's own pedagogical experience and provides descriptions of specific methodological solutions that have proven their practical and applied value.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS ON THE TOPIC OF THE DISSERTATION

Draganova, Ts. (2022) Comparative Interpretation as an Educational Task in Literature Classes During the Upper Secondary Stage [Sappostavitelnata interpretatsiya kato uchebna zadacha v chasovete po literatura vav vtori gimnazialen etap]. // *Annual of Konstantin Preslavski University of Shumen, Faculty of Humanities. Proceedings of the Jubilee International Scientific Conference "Humanities – Traditions and Challenges"* [Godishnik na Shumenskiya universitet "Episkop Konstantin Preslavski", Fakultet po humanitarni nauki. Materiali ot yubileyната mezhdunarodna nauchna konferentsiya "Humanitaristikata – traditsii i predizvikatelstva"], VOL. XXXIII A/1. Shumen: Bishop Konstantin Preslavski University Press, 2022, pp. 381–388, ISSN 2603-512X.

Draganova, Ts. (2023) The New Literature Curricula and the Rewriting of the Canon [Novite uchebni programi po literatura i prenapishvaneto na kanona]. // *International Philological Colloquium. Word and Society [Mezhdunaroden filologicheski kolegium. Slovo i obshtestvo]*, Vol. III. Shumen: Bishop Konstantin Preslavski University Press, 2023, pp. 206–215, ISSN 2738-8581.

Draganova, Ts. (2024) The Historical as a Concept and Context in Secondary School Literature Curricula [Istoricheskoto kato kontsept i kontekst v gimnazialnite uchebni programi po literatura]. // *Paisii Readings. Scientific Papers [Paisievi cheteniya. Nauchni trudove]*, Vol. 62, Book 1, Part B. Plovdiv: Plovdiv University "Paisii Hilendarski" Press, 2024, pp. 53–66, ISSN 0861-0029.

Draganova, Ts. (2025) On Certain Features of the Essay as a Student Argumentative Text [Za nyakoi osobenosti na eseto kato uchenicheski argumentativen tekst]. // *International Philological Colloquium. Word and Society [Mezhdunaroden filologicheski kolegium. Slovo i obshtestvo]*, Vol. IV. Shumen: Bishop Konstantin Preslavski University Press, 2025, pp. 190–208, ISSN 2738-8581.

REFERENCES

Atanasov 2018: Atanasov, V. Toward a Critical Methodology [Za edna kriticheska metodika]. // *Bulgarian Language and Literature [Balgarski ezik i literatura]*, 2018, No. 5.

Gadamer 2009: Gadamer, H.-G. *The Legacy of Europe [Nasledstvoto na Evropa]*, Sofia: Kritika i humanizam, 2009.

Galperin 2007: Galperin, I. *Text as an Object of Linguistic Research [Tekst kak obyekt lingvisticheskogo issledovaniya]*, Moscow: KomKniga, 2007.

Georgiev 2017: Georgiev, N. The Silent Dialogues in Literature [Malchalivite dialozi v literaturata]. // *Literary Theory. Vol. I [Literaturna teoriya. T. I]*. Sofia: Iztok-Zapad, 2017.

Georgiev 1999: Georgiev, N. *Abysses and Bridges of Intertextuality [Propasti i mostove na mezhdutekstovostta]*. Plovdiv: Plovdiv University "P. Hilendarski" Press, 1999.

Georgiev 2010: Georgiev, N. *A Literature Teacher? I Am Not One of Them [Uchitel po literatura li? Ne sam ot tyah]*. Prosveta Publishing, Sofia, 2010.

Georgieva-Teneva 2020: Georgieva-Teneva, O. *Literature Education from a Civic Perspective (Grades 8 – 12) [Literaturnoto obrazovanie v grazhdanska perspektiva (VIII – XII klas)]*. Sofia: New Bulgarian University Press, 2020.

Dobrev, Teneva 1992: Dobrev, D., T. Teneva. *Literaturno obrazovanie i interpretatsiya na hudozhestven tekst v uchilishte [Literature Education and the Interpretation of Literary Texts at School]*. Sofia: Glauks, 1992.

Yoveva 2002: Yoveva, R. *Methodology of Literature Education [Metodika na literaturnoto obrazovanie]*. Shumen: Bishop Konstantin Preslavski University Press, 2002.

Krumov 2015: Krumov, K. *The New Conformism [Noviyat konformizam]*. Sofia: Agata-A, 2015.

Petrov 2000: Petrov, A. The Problems of Discourse and Students' Discourse Competence in the Theory and Practice of Bulgarian Language Instruction [Problemite za diskursa i diskursnata kompetentnost na uchenitsite v teoriyata i praktikata na obuchenieto po balgarski ezik]. // *LiterNet E-Journal*.
<https://litternet.bg/publish/apetrov/discourse.htm>

Protohristova 2010: Protohristova, K. Thematic Studies on the Offensive. Methodological Prerequisites and Methodological Utilizations [Tematologiyata v nastaplenie. Metodologicheski predposostavki i metodicheski opolzootvoryavaniya]. // *The Great Inscription, or What Does Comparative Literature Compare [Golyamoto vpisvane, ili kakvo sravnyava sravnitelnoto literaturoznanie]*. Sofia: Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski" Press, 2010.

Radev 2020: Radev, R. The Thematic Principle and the Structuring of Educational Content in Literature. Present and Perspectives [Tematichniyat printsip i strukturirane na uchebnoto sadarzhane po literatura. Nastoyashte i perspektivi]. // *Education and Media. Collection in Honor of Prof. Dr. Vladimir Atanasov [Obrazovanie i medii. Sbornik v chest na prof. d-r Vladimir Atanasov]*. Sofia: Prosveta, 2020.

Teneva 2020: Teneva, T. *Foundations and Practices of the Lesson "Performance" in Literature Classes (Grades 5 – 12) [Osnovaniya i praktiki na urochnoto "predstavlenie" v chasovete po literatura (5.– 12. klas)]*. Shumen: Bishop Konstantin Preslavski University Press, 2020.

Bauman 2000: Bauman, Z. *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000.