



University of Pannonia

Faculty of Humanities

Response to the review by Prof. Anat Stavans

By: Ahmad Awawdeh

Date: 27/05/2025

I am truly grateful for the time and attention **Prof. Stavans** devoted to assessing my dissertation. She described it as *“a high-quality, original, and methodologically sound investigation into the functions of CS among Maghreb Arabic–French–English trilingual speakers,”* noting that it *“contributes significantly to the field of multilingualism and CS research by addressing an underexplored linguistic combination.”* Her insightful remarks not only motivate me to uphold high standards in future research but also remind me to remain vigilant as a researcher—to approach each project with critical attention to detail.

In what follows, I would like to address and respond to the issues that were raised by the reviewer as ones that need correction, further elaboration, clarification, or acknowledgment. I have categorized these remarks into the following key areas.

Methodology:

The reviewer pointed out that *“there is no clear explanation of how various coefficients (e.g., for language history, proficiency, language switching, and attitudes) were calculated or what scales, formulas, or weighting methods were applied.”*

I sincerely appreciate this thoughtful observation regarding the calculation of various coefficients, such as those related to language history, proficiency, language switching, and attitudes coefficients. The reviewer is absolutely right that greater transparency in this area would strengthen the methodology.

While Section 3.4.2.1 (**Questionnaire**) includes detailed descriptions of the scoring procedures for each individual module, and also provides the weighting coefficients assigned to each module, it is indeed the case that the subsequent step of combining these scores into coefficients was not explicitly explained in the original draft. This oversight is acknowledged.

Another thoughtful point raised by the reviewer is that *“The Methodology chapter would be strengthened by including specific examples from the data to illustrate how individual or aggregated coefficient values are interpreted.”*

I completely agree that concrete examples would make the methodology more accessible and transparent. I could have, for example, conducted a comparative analysis of two participants with different proficiency coefficients, explaining how these differences manifest in their language use patterns, or offered examples demonstrating the relationship between coefficient values and observed CS behaviors. I believe that these additions would have provided readers with a clearer understanding of how the numerical data translates to meaningful insights about participants’ linguistic behaviors and attitudes. I appreciate this valuable suggestion by the reviewer to enhance the interpretability of the coefficient values.

In addition, the reviewer pointed out that *“the graphical representations in the methodology section are currently limited in their effectiveness due to unclear or missing x- and y-axis labels,”* suggesting that *“adding brief interpretive commentary alongside each figure would enhance their clarity and relevance.”*

I greatly appreciate the reviewer’s constructive feedback regarding the graphical representations. She has identified an important area for improvement that will enhance the clarity and interpretability of the visual data. I fully agree with the suggestion, especially in relation to the figures in Section 3.3 (**Participants and Sampling Procedures**), where the Y-axis label “Frequency” could be replaced with a more specific and informative label that better reflects the data being presented.

In future research, I will ensure that each figure is clearly and accurately labeled on both axes and is properly introduced within the text, accompanied by sufficient context and interpretive commentary. This will help to establish a more cohesive relationship between the visualizations and the narrative, allowing readers to more easily grasp the relevance and implications of the graphical data.

Finally, the reviewer pointed out that *“the actual procedures of quantitative analysis are not elaborated. The tools, techniques, and statistical summaries used to process the numerical data are not adequately described.”*

I sincerely thank the reviewer for highlighting this important gap in the methodology. I acknowledge that a more detailed explanation of the quantitative analysis procedures would significantly strengthen the dissertation.

I would like to clarify the procedures that were followed during the quantitative analysis. For the word count, each of the eight transcriptions was first segmented according to the topics discussed by the participants. The portions in each of the three languages were then extracted and imported into separate Microsoft Word documents. After that, the detailed procedures explained in Section 3.5.2 (**Quantitative Data Analysis**) were carefully applied during the analysis.

In addition to the word count, the percentage distribution of the four broader functional categories of CS was calculated manually across the entire dataset. The identified functions of CS were tallied and calculated to determine their relative proportions within the overall set of occurrences.

I appreciate the reviewer’s thoughtful remark, which has allowed me the opportunity to clarify these methodological procedures more explicitly.

Results and Discussion:

An insightful point raised by the reviewer is that the Results and Discussion chapter *“would benefit from deeper interpretation of the findings,”* with a suggestion to *“draw bolder implications from the data.”*

I sincerely appreciate the reviewer’s encouragement to develop deeper interpretations and bolder implications from the findings. I value the reviewer’s push toward more interpretive depth, as it

will help position this research more effectively within the scholarly conversation and highlight its unique contributions to the field.

Conclusion:

The reviewer pointed out that *“I miss your voice as an upcoming scholar with stronger concluding statements that position the findings as a foundation for further scholarly dialogue or conceptual development.”*

I thank the reviewer for this thoughtful comment about the need for a stronger scholarly voice in the conclusion. I appreciate the encouragement to be more confident and clear in presenting my ideas as an early-career researcher. I understand that a more focused and impactful conclusion can strengthen my argument and better show how the findings contribute to current research in the field. I am grateful for this helpful feedback as I continue to grow as a scholar.

Ahmad Awawdeh

Ph.D. Candidate

