

OPINION

On dissertation work of Tsvetelinka Tosheva Draganova on the topic "Literature Education in the Second Gymnasium Stage of Secondary School" for acquisition of educational and scientific degree "Doctor" in doctoral program "Methodology of Teaching Literature", professional field: 1.3. Pedagogy of Teaching in..., field of higher education: 1. Pedagogical Sciences

Scientific supervisor: Prof. Dr. Temenuga Teneva

I have been appointed as the author of an opinion on dissertation work of Tsvetelinka Tosheva Draganova with order No. RD 16-113 from 15.07.2026 of Rector of University of Shumen "Bishop Konstantin Preslavski". All procedures for the doctoral program and the dissertation work have been complied with.

Tsvetanka Draganova graduated Bulgarian Philology in 1995 with a second degree in Cultural Studies at Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski". She has been a long-time lecturer in Bulgarian language and literature at the "Antoine de Saint-Exupéry" Faculty of Literature in Plovdiv. Although she notes that she wrote her dissertation in the last four years, she stated the issue as early as 2010 with the interesting article "Bai Ganyo by Aleko Konstantinov and the Language on the Stage of History", which highlights her non-standard approach to teaching literature. In her study "History in the Texts from the National Literary Canon: Ways of Use", she demonstrates her ability to conceptually highlight phenomena in a remarkable symbiosis of theory and practice. Her enduring interest in the interrelationship of history and literature leads her from the specifics to the systematic approach, which is fully used in her dissertation. Tsvetelinka Draganova has significant pedagogical experience, which is significant in terms of years and activities. She has developed her own style, through which she

provokes the regulation of the pedagogical process with artistry and a good sense of humor and Oscar Wilde wit. When asked "What are books to you?" she answers: "An irresistible hijacker of my time. A temptation, a job, an attempt for solace. A reason to carry huge handbags and scold children. A way to fill awkward silences." This is not just an answer, but a smile in which there is goodwill, warmth and light.

Tsvetelinka Draganova's dissertation consists of three chapters, well-arranged with a view to balancing theory and practice, with a rich bibliography that contains studies, collections, articles and electronic publications. The materials that she used in her experimental practice are included in the appendix, as well as the survey "The Voice of the Literature Teacher". The questions in this survey are very well structured and deserve special attention. The total volume of the work is 237 pages. The goals, methods and scientific hypothesis are clearly stated. According to its specificity, the study has an interdisciplinary and intertextual character, which again raises the question of the essence of the methodology of teaching literature, in which different approaches to art intersect - the culturological, sociological and historical. And this synthesis of methods, views and concepts is completely justified, since it is about the problem-thematic presentation of the educational content in the 11th and 12th grades.

In the first chapter, "Contexts of Literary Educational Discourse," an analytical and systematic review of the theories related to the radical change in contemporary cultural situation on a global scale is made. We are no longer writing about traditions, but about transformations, since the change in reading as a "basic cultural practice" affects literature education to the point of transformation. Particularly successful is the way in which Draganova introduces the individual theories in the field of cultural studies, philosophy, literary studies and the methodology of literary education. She groups them according to

individual trends and directions, then chooses a key study or concept that she highlights in order to present the civilizational changes that have occurred through it. This is what happened with the theory of "liquid modernity" by Zygmund Bauman. The graduate student pays special attention to the global crisis of the humanities and arts, subordinated to economic needs, and refers to the research of Natalia Hristova, but in this whole series of correlations, which naturally lead to the problem of reading and perception, pedagogy is somehow omitted. Did technologies not make it meaningless, since they, coming from outside school, cannot be managed. Pedagogy once created a miracle at the beginning of the 20th century during the accelerated industrialization of society through a phenomenon that Ortega-y-Gasset called the "economy of education" - it made the vast information from individual sciences functional for education. Today, however, the speed of technologies has given birth to the delight of fragmentation, at the expense of the system. Pedagogy has ceased to be the strict mother of the sciences in order to raise children through them. Even the methods now have the agility of technology, but not the deep contradictions generated by dialogicity. This is exactly what the graduate student was able to see and realize in her scientific quest, in order to bring to the forefront the deficiencies in literature education. The building of education has been taken over by the economy. "The unifying narratives," notes Draganova, "on which the inspiring power of authorities has so far relied, are falling apart, displaced by demonstration and imitation, by the principle "Stop telling – show us!". The era of irony has passed, canceled by the era of fascination, in which visibility is elevated to the rank of only reality" (p.11). In times of global change and crisis, questions become answers. The graduate student also took advantage of this opportunity, since she has sufficient pedagogical experience to see what is big in "two" and what is small in "two hundred". "These questions can hardly be answered now, but to reflect on them and look for paths, inevitably narrow, is certainly exciting. In this we see one of the tasks of literature education at school, in which the trinity of ethos, pathos and

its logos is revealed" (p.23). In the second chapter "Towards some systemic deficiencies of the curricula and the teaching content in literature" a functional analysis of the curricula and textbooks for the 11th and 12th grades is carried out. While I highly appreciate the work done and welcome the critical approach in clarifying the essence and structure of the textbooks, as well as the skillful comparative analysis, I am personally attracted by "Historical as a concept and context in high school literature curricula". This part of the second chapter reveals the inner nature of the graduate and her clear attitude to feel what she knows. History and literature are the two children of mother time and Draganova's ability to bring them together opens up a rich range of possibilities, especially in the 11th and 12th grades. It is in this connection that she raises the question of the deficits, one of which, according to her, is "in the knowledge of the period 1944-1989, which, if not compensated for, doom the work with works such as "Balkan Syndrome" and "Honorable Cross", for example, to failure" (p. 82). I agree with this view of Draganova, but I think that this deficit is related to the other – the deficit of humor, especially in the 12th grade. Without humor, no era can know itself, and this also applies to man. The author's decision to connect Georgi Markov's "Zadochni reportaji" with fragments of the comedy "Balkan Syndrome" by Stanislav Stratiev (p.86 see also p.101) is interesting. The final reflections in this part are a real manifesto for the presence of historical, which "must enter through the door into the Bulgarian school with the clear awareness that the complex should not be spoken of simply" (p.87). I also think that, given the knowledge and opportunities at her disposal, Draganova should open her own research door wider to the problems of history and literature.

The third chapter "Literary Educational Discourse and the Building of Competencies – Theoretical and Applied Aspects" is literary, as it concerns the problem of genre and methodological in its practical applicability. Draganova is undoubtedly right in noting that the problem-thematic principle of organizing the educational content opens up new perspectives in working with the nature of the

studied texts" and of course with their genre characteristics. In this sense, she believes that "The formation of a reading culture is impossible without knowledge of the genre paradigm" (p.109). In her practical work, however, the author does not miss the context when understanding the genre, because in significant texts, genres are an entity that is often created beyond itself. Such are, for example, the odes from Ivan Vazov's "Epopoeia na zabravenite". It is precisely this ability of Draganova to give her concepts methodological working dimensions that makes her solutions functional for teaching. She knows how to bend the rule in such a way as to find the student with his individual attitude. The choice of the ode "Paisiy" by Ivan Vazov is quite apt, since it is one of the few works (the other is "Levski") in which we do not hesitate about the genre. The students have realized that "the work fully corresponds to the genre characteristics of the ode" (p.112). However, her approach to Aleko Konstantinov's "Bai Ganyo Journalist" is different, because the feuilleton is one of the most open genres - its doors never close. That is why the author has found the right solution by achieving "the ability to problematize the choice of genre, the relationship between different conventions and the artistic model of the world" (p. 113). I highly appreciate the teaching tasks for comparative interpretation, which are essentially intertextuality in action. It is no coincidence that the author is a fan of Nikola Georgiev. The great advantage of comparative interpretation Draganova finds in the opportunity "the teacher himself, in parallel with the normatively set teaching content, to select and offer texts, to outline associative fields and to compose diverse tasks." Moreover, she believes that "This freedom is a unique opportunity that literature education has not known until now." At this stage, I am slightly skeptical as to how much the teacher will take advantage of it.

Draganova knows how to find the neuralgic moments in literature teaching and to look for models for overcoming them. Particularly useful in clarifying the peculiarities of the essay is the idea and, accordingly, the learning tasks for "integrating literary competencies into student essays";. The results are quite

encouraging. However, I do not accept that through "Bai Ganyo" by Aleko Konstantinov, a "civic educational potential" is created in students. Satirists are one-sided, although, as Somerset Maugham notes, in their one-sidedness they can be brilliant. Of course, the author has provided the necessary arguments and important interpretations for her thesis (p. 164). But we must finally respect Aleko's wish after the publication of the book in 1895 to be different. Today, students do not laugh at Bai Ganyo, and we teach him as if we were crying.

The survey with teachers is very well prepared and conducted. Its analysis provokes a lot of reflection, especially the shared opinions that the literature curriculum is not functional for different types of schools (p. 193, 196). An old problem, the solution to which the author sees in the freedom of the teacher to use different texts.

The contributions of the dissertation are correctly stated at the end of the work and I accept them as accurately reflecting the essence and functionality of the dissertation for the teaching of literature.

Considering what Tsvetelinka Tosheva Draganova has achieved in her dissertation, I propose and will vote to award her the educational and scientific degree of "Doctor" in the doctoral program "Methodology of Teaching Literature", professional field: 1.3. Pedagogy of Teaching in..., field of higher education: 1. Pedagogical Sciences.

Prof. Dr. Radosław Radev

Prof. Dr. Radosław Radev