

OPINION
OF ACADMIC PAPER SUBMITTED FOR ACQUIRING
THE ACADEMIC DEGREE "DOCTOR"

By: Assoc. Prof. Christian Schnork Postadzhian, PhD, New Bulgarian University,
Professional Field 8.4. Theatre and Film Arts

Impact of 3D Technology on the Viewer's Perception of Audiovisual Forms

o

in Professional Field 8.4. Theatre and Film Arts

PhD Student: Despot Sebishki

Academic Advisor Assoc. Prof. Elizaveta Boeva, PhD

1. Significance of the Research Subject for the Academic and Applied Science Fields

The dissertation presented amounts to 138 pages of text, structured in an introduction, six chapters and a conclusion. Within the framework of the paper, the contributions and the sources of information used are presented separately. There are no Appendices. In terms of structure, the work of the doctoral student follows a logical and consistent order. The topic itself is undoubtedly up-to-date and significant in two aspects:

- In terms of academic research, the topic is not commonly studied and there is insufficient detailed academic research devoted to 3D technologies, especially in the cinema art context and their impact therein. In this respect, the topic deserves attention and is definitely a challenge for every researcher.
- In scientific and applied terms, the development of technologies in recent decades and the growing need for interactivity of audiovisual content render the work crucial in terms of applied science, insofar as even as early as in the title, the focus is placed on the viewer and their perception.

2. Precisely formulated goals and objectives of the dissertation

In the introduction to his paper, the doctoral student Despot Sebishki sets a very specific goal, although I must note that from a scientific point of view it should be presented in more detail - "how 3D film, Virtual Reality and 3D hologram affect the viewer". The tasks are relatively clearly formulated.

3. Degree of knowledge of the state of the problem and compliance with the literature used.

Despot Sebishki is a director and editor with extensive practical experience. This allows him to monitor many of the problems presented in the dissertation very closely. In his practice, he has used new technologies and I think this has allowed him to get a very clear idea of the challenges of the introduction of these technologies in cinema and television.

In terms of the literature used, I think the bibliography is extremely poor. It makes a particularly unpleasant impression that the most up-to-date literature is from 2015. I consider this a very serious problem, given the nature of the topic, the development of technology and the requirements for such type of scientific texts. I believe that the author of the text has relied much more on his own understanding, observation, professional culture and knowledge and has ignored the role of the detailed literary review in the process of creating a dissertation. This is especially evident in the second chapter "Theory of 3D Film and Holographic Film".

The films examined in the text are not presented in a separate filmography.

4. Consistency of the chosen research methodology and approaches with the stated purpose and tasks of the dissertation.

To perform the first two tasks of the study, the author mainly summarizes existing data. Undoubtedly, a third task is of interest, dedicated to the impact of the 3D film on the human brain – it is developed in the third chapter of the dissertation. Interesting facts and circumstances

are presented, but from the research point of view and given the formulation of the dissertation itself, the contribution would be significantly more significant, had the author shown his personal position; also, the paper would benefit from carrying out a study, from the research point of view, that draws clear conclusions and personal theses, presented in the context of the overall development of the dissertation.

There is also a similar expectation for chapter five, titled "Trends and Author Work". Arguments for and AGAINST the 3D films of prominent artists are presented, but Despot Sebishki's personal attitude, be it agreement or disagreement with them, is not provided. I believe that it is the personal attitude of the author and his own reading, as well as going into the details behind these arguments, that would make the text far more scientifically significant. In its current version, this text arouses curiosity, but the reader remains largely dissatisfied due to the lack of specificity and a clearly expressed author's position to give context to the text and develop a clear thesis of the dissertation.

5. Impacts of the dissertation on the external environment.

The submitted materials (dissertation, abstract, materials on digital medium) lack information about publications on the dissertation, but creative products are also presented, but these are deprived of a specific description of the objectives, listing of the applied techniques and the specific contributions as a result of their realization. It would be appropriate for each of these products to be presented and analyzed in the context of the dissertation itself; at the moment they are rather an addition to the description of the activities of the doctoral student, rather than an inextricably linked part of his work. What is more, some of the chapters and the headings refer to the author's work, suggesting that these links were made.

6. General impressions.

I do not know the author of the dissertation well enough, but I have vague impressions of his work, which I have acquired during the internal defense, as well as of other appearances within the Department of Cinema, Advertising and Show Business at NBU. The doctoral student leaves

the impression of a competent professional with sound knowledge of the technologies, who is excited by their development and impact on television and cinema. I consider this important because it also predetermines his interests in the development of academic work and the development of academic research. I believe that good practitioners with potential to develop and enrich science are needed for modern science to develop further. Of course, this requires a lot of effort and dedication.

In the previous points of the review, I have highlighted a number of notes to the doctoral student's work. I know the path he took in his dissertation, the efforts the doctoral student made in working with various scientific supervisors on circumstances beyond his control and in real life, and I have seen and appreciated the difficulties overcome in his work in a language that is not his mother tongue. These difficulties did not deter Despot Sebishki from developing a dissertation and overcoming all these challenges. I would have liked it, of course, if he had made more efforts to improve his dissertation in order to overcome these remarks.

I cannot ignore the need for a complete editorial reading of the thesis. The content even shows poor formatting and the lack of sufficient focus for such a type of work on the form of presentation of the text – for example, the numbering of pages in the content is completely misrepresented. Inside the text itself there are unfinished phrases. In many places, the terminological apparatus is used with insufficient precision.

I would be happy for the PhD student to answer the following questions during the defense:

- How is technology changing the film and television professions? What are in his view the future professions in cinema?
- Do 3D technology and augmented reality kill or develop fantasy?

In conclusion, I can summarize that I have a number of notes on the work of the doctoral student, described in detail and justified above. At the same time, I do not underestimate his efforts and the importance of such research, as well as the potential for its development. I vote "Yes" for the awarding the academic degree "Doctor".

8 September 2023

Assoc. Prof. Christian Postadzhian, PhD