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1. ***Information concerning the PhD thesis, PhD student’s development, PhD Summary and publications.***

|  |
| --- |
| Kaloyan Angelov’s education and career are a magnificent example of consistent and continuing development. After graduation in The National School for Ancient Languages and Cultures “St. Constantine-Cyril the Philosopher”, Angelov defends a bachelor’s degree in the Faculty of History and a Master’s degree in English philology in Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”. The Ph.D. student is qualified teacher both in History and English. Till the end of 2014 onwards he teaches history and/or English in different Sofia schools. Moreover, he participates in educational scientific projects. His education and practice of the Ph.D. student Angelov determine his scientific field. Angelov starts his Ph.D. in the department of Ethnology of Sofia University in 2019.  The Ph.D. thesis is discussed and directed for a defence from the department of Ethnology of the Faculty of History of Sofia university “St. Kliment Ohridski”, 27.04.2022. During the development and the realization of the whole procedure no violations are committed and all requirements are met. Based on the presented documents with a full certainty can be concluded that the procedure of the development of the Ph.D. student and him being directed towards a Ph.D. defence is done in full accordance of the Law for Development of the Academic Staff of Republic of Bulgaria, the Regulations for its appliance, as well as the Inside Regulations for Conditions and Steps for Acquiring Scientific Degrees and Filling Academic Positions in Sofia University. Continuing the procedure further in completely in order with the mentioned normative documents.  The Ph.D. thesis consists of introduction, four chapters, results and conclusion. The Ph.D. student has presented the required documentation, concerning the procedure of Ph.D. defence. He has deposited a Ph.D. thesis of 310 pages, from which 19 pages are appendices. Bibliography consists of 106 units, 79 in Cyrillic alphabet and 27 in Latin alphabet. The appendices consists of unfilled survey for school specialists, unfilled survey for the concerned parties, list of respondents and four excel files, with a total size of 2.60 MB, which represent the quantity results from the survey. The Ph. D. dissertation contains 24 figures.  In accordance with the established academic tradition in the **Introduction** is made a general overview of the ethnopsychological research with correctly outlined the importance of the researched issues. The topic of discrimination and equal access to quality education is a current issue, which is presented through the existing normative documentation in Bulgaria, as well as in international aspect, considering these international documents, which have been ratified by Bulgaria. The Ph.D. student demonstrates outstanding skills in systematization and analyzation of demographic data, outlining processes and tendencies, which ever so rarer among the ethnological researches. Furthermore, he comments upon the data (e.g. the child death rate among the Roma communities) in the context of the existing law in Bulgaria. The demographic picture (both in quantity and depth) overlaps the educational results and outlines as a result the potential for positive change among the Roma communities in Bulgaria.  The goals of the ethnopsychological research are clearly defined. The time period is correctly outlined. A working hypothesis is formulated. The content of the four chapters is presented.  The **First chapter** is entitled Models and Practices of Coordination-educational Policy in Bulgaria (1989-2019) (ethnopsychological ground for educational interaction). In it are presented models and practices in coordination-educational policies in Bulgaria for the time period 1989-2019. The Ph.D. student has chosen to present in the beginning of each chapter a detailed and critical overview of important concepts and terms used within the chapter text. This determines the clear and unambiguous usage of terms like politics/policies etc. in contemporary language. The in-depth research (enhanced by his practice) of the educational system is easy to see in the following subparagraph 1.1.2. within 1.2., where the Ph.D. student includes the ethnopsychology science and critically presents the issues that may occur while researching ethnic identity, followed by the reflective approach, which is the foundation of his scientific research. In paragraph 1.3. are presented different ethnopsychological practices of coordination policies in the field of educational integration of students from the Roma communities in Bulgaria. In the end of first Chapter there is a discussion, which prepares for a transition towards the next chapter.  The **second chapter** is entitled Coordination-educational Analysis of the Policies in Bulgaria (1989-2019) (ethnopsychological ground for educational interaction with Roma students). Within it a SWOT analysis is conducted for European and Bulgarian documents, concerning the educational integration of students of Roma communities in chronological order. The Ph.D. student critically comments in detail a wide range of legislation and documents, which over 20 years are not applied in reality and do not achieve the declarated within them goals. Interest provokes the part, which is devoted to the new tendencies in museum work and development of educational programs, in context of the desegregation and integration of children of Roma communities in cities and villages alike. The normative documentation is critically commented, which concern the unequal access to education. The Ph.D. student’s approach towards the State Regulations deserves admiration. Here, the Ph.D. students, being a teacher, has the advantage of having an insight perspective of the researched area.  **Chapter three** is entitled Cultural Specifics of the Roma Ethnic Community in Bulgaria (ethnopsychological ground for educational interaction). In it, the author demonstrates a perfect understanding of the achievements of the Bulgarian gypsology. His argumentative critique towards some debatable points demonstrates in-depth knowledge. Without having a special focus, I would have added the historical episode of the “enlightenment processes”, which is a specific historic period in modern Bulgarian history, where the state has a policy of assimilating the Muslim Bulgarians and the Roma communities in Bulgaria in the beginning of the 1960s and 1970s, including a forceful renaming of the population in 1984 (around p. 114). The Ph.D. student has presented the issues, concerning the Roma education from a historical perspective. A serious effort has been made for include different aspects of Roma’s everyday life and celebration practices, which are somehow related to the educational system.  **Chapter four** is entitled Empirical Research: Ethnopsychological model of Coordination-Educational Policy for Educational Integration of Roma Students. I find the three different approaches for gathering information to be a contribution to the field – participant observation, questionnaires and interviews, including not only a Roma community, but also representatives from different institutions, connected somehow to the integration educational processes, which includes representatives from the Ministry of Education and Science and different non-government organizations. The specifics of the research have defined the distance between some of the state expects and staff. A fact, which deserves more research in future studies.  It is important to highlight the contribution of the commentary concerning the specifics and the dynamic of intercultural communication, developed in the introduction of Chapter Four.  Valuable is the description of the issues during a research on “contaminated terrain”, which is an issue that many researchers face in different communities in Bulgaria. The researched terrain is fairly interesting having two Roma communities, which define and distance themselves more on social than cultural characteristics. The Ph.D. student has displayed a fine scientific sensitivity towards the declared differences and those in reality, which are typical for defining the (Roma) intercommunity dynamics. The current issue about secondary segregation in educational institutions is presented correctly. Valuable are the materials of the existing distance between the pedagogical specialists and the students’ parents on verbal level and in real practice. The questionnaire is presented correctly and in high detail, with valuable insights about the distance between the researcher and the interviewees, who are holding posts in different educational institutions (e.g. kindergartens, schools, Regional Educational Managements, Ministry of Education and Science).  On the basis of the research an ethnopsychological theoretic-empiric project of coordination-educational policy is suggested. This model aims to enhance the educational integration of the Roma students in Bulgaria. During the development, the Ph.D. student has defined the formal and the content limitations upon the possible appliance of the model, as well as the risk factors and the possible opportunities if executed correctly.  In the **Conclusion** is presented the result grounded in the goals, placed in the Introduction. The text reveals that the goals are completed and a new knowledge is acquired in the process.  The presented study is yet another proof for the productivity of the ethno-pedagogical school, developed in Bulgaria by prof. Irina Koleva, for which both the supervisor and the Ph.D. student reserve my most sincere admirations.  The Ph.D. summary consists of 37 pages. In it the content of the Ph.D. thesis is presented in tight and precise fashion, presenting the scientific contributions and including a summary in English.  The Ph.D. student presents 3 publications in Bulgarian and one as co-author in English. Thus, the Ph.D. student fulfills the requirements of the Law for Development of the Academic Staff of Republic of Bulgaria, the Regulations for its appliance, , as well as the Inside Regulations for Conditions and Steps for Acquiring Scientific Degrees and Filling Academic Positions in Sofia University. |

1. ***Scientific Contributions***

In accordance with the established school of ethnopsychological researches, the Ph.D. student has defined the contributions in two major directions: theoretic-scientific and empirical. I fully believe that the research goals of the ethnologists should include both in order to present their results and recommend models to the community and to target institutions.

The developed ethnopsychological theoretic-empiric project of a model of coordination-educational policies for educational integration of Roma students in Bulgaria is especially valuable. The outlined conclusions following Chapter Four are a firm foundation for initiating a dialog on level Ministry. Thus I recommend the study to be published and presented to these departments in the Ministry of Education and Science which are interested in the research.

I fully accept the presented by the Ph.D. student contributions.

1. ***Recommendations:***

The Ph.D. student uses multiple times the term “tendentious” in its meaning: something that contains or exhibits tendency or something done with tendency (as in Bulgarian interpretative dictionary). However, in Bulgarian public speech the word “tendentious” is used more often as “biased”, “partial”, and “prejudiced”. I would recommend the word “tendentious” to be replaced with “exhibits tendency” or “a tendency can be observed”.

In classical ethnological researches the methods (for gathering empiric material) and methodologies (the theoretical methods which help analyze the gathered empiric material) are presented. However, on page 10 in the Introduction a subtitle is entitled “Methodology of the ethnopsychological research”, after which there is a short and combined description of the methods and methodology of the study. The paper will benefit greatly if a differentiation between these two terms is made as it is done in every following chapter.

It will be beneficial for the text to undergo a correction, to avoid some spelling and purely technical mistakes.

1. ***Conclision.***

Based on objective requirements, required for Ph.D. thesis for conferring an educational and scientific degree “Doctor”, and taking under consideration the achievements of Bulgarian Ethnology, I express a positive notion and recommend to the members of the scientific jury to confer to Kaloyan Valeriev Angelov educational and scientific degree “Doctor” in Ethnology in scientific field 3. Social, economic and law sciences, professional field: 3.1 Sociology, anthropology and culture sciences for the study **entitled** Ethnophychological model of Coordination-educational Policies in Bulgaria (1989-2019)
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