



## **Response by Ali Can Yalçinkaya, PhD Candidate, to the Final Dissertation Review**

Dear Assoc. Prof. Dr. İpek Pınar Uzun,

Thank you sincerely for your thorough review of my doctoral thesis and for your positive evaluation of the work. I am deeply grateful for your encouraging words about its contribution to the field, as well as your thoughtful suggestions for improvement. It is reassuring to know that the layout and the theoretical and methodological approaches were clear and well-received. I especially appreciate your recognition of the study's uniqueness in this overexplored area of research. I believe that research on Turkic material in the Hungarian language, and the relationship between the two languages, has reached a plateau. My aim, therefore, was to introduce a new perspective by exploring loanword adaptations in this longstanding issue through a quantitative statistical approach.

Regarding your suggestion to separate the Introduction into two distinct sections — Previous Literature and Research Design — I completely agree. This restructuring would indeed enhance the clarity and accessibility of the thesis, and I will implement this change.

I also appreciate your recommendation to expand the research using experimental methods from a psycholinguistic perspective. Thank you for highlighting the recent work of Sharon Peperkamp and her colleagues, which represents a valuable body of research that could further strengthen the theoretical framework of my study. I will certainly look into these studies for future research, as incorporating psycholinguistic experiments could add new dimensions to the findings and broaden the scope of analysis.

Your suggestion to provide more detailed explanations of the statistical analysis is well-received. I agree that clearer descriptions of the models used and the treatment of variables would improve both transparency and clarity. The challenge, however, lies in the vast number of comparisons in big data and the extensive phonemic matches, which would require a substantial amount of space to describe fully. That said, I have provided detailed examples (table 4-9) to illustrate the process of calculating operational costs rather than applying the explanations to each comparison individually. To summarize the process that leads to calculating the total assimilation rate:

- Step One: Calculate the LD% for each phonemic match. This is done by assigning specific operation costs based on the distinctive features of each phoneme within the Turco-Hungarian matrix.
- Step Two: Determine the LD% for each word-pair. The formula used is  $LD\% = (\text{total operation cost}/\text{number of alignments}) * 100$ , which essentially measures the percentage of modifications within a given word-pair.
- Step Three: Compute the total assimilation rate by averaging the LD results of all 377 word-pairs.

Example:

cheap		
H. <i>olcsó</i>	[ o l tʃ o: - ]	
O.H. <i>ucsag</i>	[ u - tʃ a y ]	
Cost 2.83	N-align 5	LD% 56.6

Breakdown:

Phonemic alignments: 5

/u/ → /o/ = 0.33

Insertion = 1

/a/ → /o:/ = 1

Deletion of transitional sounds or semivowels = 0.5

Total cost: 2.83

2.83 out of 5 is 56.6%.

Despite being done manually rather than automated, the calculations have been repeatedly revised throughout the research process, with input from my supervisors, referees, and juries. As a result, the likelihood of errors is now very low. While it is impractical to provide a complete breakdown of all operational costs and calculations due to concerns about readability and space, the unshared features of phonemic matches can be seen in the distinctive feature matrix found in the dissertation. I plan to revisit this aspect and improve its presentation in future versions or related publications.

I also note your observation on the term “phonetic distance calculation,” and I will ensure that key terms like this are explained more clearly throughout the text, aligning them with the research questions and broader discussions.

I understand your idea of expanding cross-linguistic comparisons in the Discussion. Expanding this section would provide valuable insights into the universality or specificity of loanword adaptation processes. (Stachowski, 2014 p. 221) also brings up this issue as I mentioned in my dissertation, and suggests a comparison of phonetic adaptation processes of Turkic loanwords in Hungarian with those of Pannonian Slavonic. In future research, I will work to draw parallels between the phonological and phonetic adaptations of other languages to strengthen the linguistic argumentation.

Once again, thank you for your constructive feedback and for recommending my thesis for the PhD degree. Your insightful comments will not only help me refine this work but will also guide me in future research. I am sincerely grateful for your appreciation and for taking the time to engage so thoughtfully with my thesis.

Sincerely,

Ali Can Yalçınkaya

PhD Candidate  
Multilingualism Doctoral School  
University of Pannonia

Lecturer  
School of Foreign Languages  
Beykent University

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of stylized, cursive letters that appear to be 'A.C.Y.' followed by a period.