

Reactions to the review written by Prof. Kata Csizér

Dear Prof. Csizér,

I am very grateful for the reviews. The comments are encouraging, and you share my judgement that these studies and their results are important and should be published after a careful revision. I sincerely appreciate the valuable comments and suggestions. The thorough review helped immensely in knowing what to edit and clarify in case of further publications. Your previous suggestions and comments have been closely followed and revisions have been made accordingly, however, I understand that the work can still be improved. The following are the questions extracted from the comments along with the responses.

Comment 1:

This dissertation investigates an important and current issue in an innovative and creative way. I was really interested in reading the final version of the dissertation as the one submitted for the in-house review was already a fairly professional piece of work. As my previous concerns mostly related to the write-up of the project, I briefly repeat my previous opinion here that this is a well-designed study, which has been executed carefully.

Response 1:

Thank you for your continued support. I take reviews seriously to improve the quality of my manuscript.

Comment 2:

Abstract:

I am happy to see that the candidate has decided to rewrite the abstract. In its current form, this short summary does real justice to the dissertation as the reader is able to obtain a clear idea about the main points of the investigation.

Response 2:

The abstract has been revised to effectively present the research from general to specific and the findings of both studies. Prof. Verspoor kindly offered to help edit the abstract. I learned from her academic writing expertise while going through the abstract and dissertation over a Zoom call.

Comment 3:

Content:

As for the review of the literature, I think more care should have been paid to reflect on my previous comments. I still think that the focus of the literature review is not justified, and the structure of the review is not explained explicitly. In addition, although there are few critical remarks (e.g., in Chapter 2.9), a critical and personal voice is not woven into the present literature review. In addition, some ideas are presented in an overly simplified way (e.g., in Chapter 2.12), there are some unnecessary repetitions, occasional overreliance of a single source and short paragraphs. The candidate needs to understand that an academic literature review is not a mere summary of ideas, but a critical synthesis linked to the given empirical study. I miss this in the dissertation.

Response 3:

Thank you for pointing out the importance of a critical literature review. I tried to be critical by describing the different viewpoints and approaches, but I understand that in some chapters this should be more pronounced and my personal voice should be louder. L2/FL motivation is one of the most rapidly growing field in Applied Linguistics and it is quite challenging to find one's own voice but I hope I am on the right track.

Comment 4:

The methods section is written in a fairly good way. I was trying to establish how the candidate addressed my previous comments. I did not find any explanation of the present context and what other environments the results can be generalised/transferred to. (Cf. my previous report: "The

candidate writes on page 34 that “This research study takes place in a foreign language learning context.” Can you explain this statement?”) As for the sampling procedure, I could not find how participants were selected from the population to the sample and what the rationale of selecting this population was. Why is this population important to investigate in terms of the theoretical contributions of the study to the field?

Response 4:

The studies aim to study the phenomena of language learning -LOTE- motivation, anxiety, and attitudes in study abroad (SA) context. The sample is relevant to the aims and objectives and the criterion of inclusion is any international student studying Hungarian at a Hungarian university. The learners' characteristics are neither too homogeneous nor too heterogeneous. While students are not native Hungarian speakers and are all enrolled in Hungarian language courses, there was still room for academic level, proficiency level and study program differences.

In the mock exam, the committee members and supervisors discussed the status of Hungarian for international students, and they all agreed that Hungarian is not a “foreign language” in this context and can be L3 or even L4 for most participants. On the safe side, I had the option to remove it or replace it with Ln.

Comment 5:

The results and discussion chapters are convincing and well-written, I am happy to see that the candidate explicitly answered the research questions in the final version of the dissertation. Some of the statistical steps are still unjustified, please be prepared to discuss those at the defense.

Response 5:

I found your first reviews very helpful and applied your suggestions to this version. I am ready to provide any additional information you may require regarding the statistical analysis.

Comment 6:

Form and language:

There are still some minor language related issues in the text but the dissertation is presented

in a professional and reader-friendly way. I still think that the use of “we” is outdated in academic English.

Response 6:

Your comments on the previous version helped me in prioritizing the form to present my dissertation in a reader-friendly way. As I agree that there are some minor language related issues, my goal in the next couple of weeks is to practice academic writing to improve the quality of my manuscript.

My only intention with using “we” in methodology was to give credits when credits are due. I was being grateful to my supervisors for their time and efforts. I understand that in my dissertation I should be only using “I”.

Comment 7:

Summary:

On the basis of the above considerations, I can conclude that this dissertation presents an original piece of research on a timely and important topic in an under-researched context, therefore, I think that the dissertation fully meets the requirements of a PhD degree. I am looking forward to discussing the study with the candidate at the public defense.

Response 7:

Thank you for your time and generous support. Your comments in the mock exam pointed out aspects of the dissertation that were carefully revised. I will try to integrate these points in case of future publication(s).