

Supplement to: “Rubric-based dynamic assessment and multimodal feedback: A transformative model for doctoral supervision”

Zahra Homayounzadeh , Mohammad Bavali and Fatemeh Behjat

Department of Foreign Language Studies, Shi.C., Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran

Email: zahra.homayounzadeh@iau.ac.ir, mo.bavali@iau.ac.ir, and fatemeh.behjat@iau.ac.ir

(Received 19 December, 2025. Published online 28 December, 2025.)

This document provides supplementary information to accompany the article, “Rubric-based dynamic assessment and multimodal feedback: A transformative model for doctoral supervision”, *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 19(2), 71-102. The purpose of this supplement is to clarify the relationship between this article and a companion publication arising from the same overarching research project, and to transparently distinguish the foci, data use, and analytical contributions of each paper.

1. Introduction

The broader research project examined innovative feedback practices in doctoral supervision, focusing on the integration of multimodal feedback (written, audio, video, and visual annotations) with rubric-based assessment frameworks. Using a longitudinal mixed-methods design, the project explored how structured and multimodal feedback can support doctoral learning, writing development, supervisory effectiveness, and engagement over time. The study generated a rich dataset that included rubric-based writing assessments, student and supervisor surveys, feedback logs, and semi-structured interviews. Given the scope and diversity of the data, the project addressed multiple research questions that were analytically and theoretically distinct.

In addition to the *Journal of Academic Language and Learning* (JALL) article (Homayounzadeh et al., 2025b), a companion paper based on the same research project has been published (Homayounzadeh et al., 2025a). Both papers draw on the same overarching intervention but are distinct in focus, analytical orientation, outcome variables, and intended readership. This supplement is provided to make these distinctions explicit for readers.

2. Differentiation of foci and rationale for the split

2.1. Focus of the JALL paper

The JALL article (Homayounzadeh et al., 2025b) adopts a learning-, assessment-, and writing-development perspective, with a primary focus on:

1. Rubric-based **dynamic assessment** grounded in Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development
2. The pedagogical role of **multimodal feedback** in scaffolding doctoral research writing
3. Changes in **dissertation quality**, feedback literacy, and self-regulated learning over time
4. Quantitative analysis of rubric scores using repeated-measures ANOVA and Bayesian methods, complemented by qualitative insights.

The central contribution of the JALL paper is a **theoretically grounded and empirically tested model of assessment-informed doctoral supervision**, aligned with the journal's focus on academic language, learning, and assessment.

2.2. Focus of the companion paper

The companion paper published in *Cogent Education* (Homayounzadeh et al., 2025a) adopts a **higher-education practice and implementation lens**, focusing on:

1. Doctoral students' cognitive, affective, and behavioural engagement with feedback
2. Supervisors' time efficiency, workload management, and perceived feedback quality
3. Practical challenges and benefits associated with implementing multimodal and rubric-based feedback
4. Analysis of engagement surveys, feedback logs, and time-on-task measures.

The primary contribution of this companion paper lies in highlighting the **practical, organizational, and policy-relevant implications** of multimodal and rubric-based feedback in doctoral supervision.

3. Rationale for the split

Although both papers originate from the same research project, they address different research questions and outcomes and are framed by distinct theoretical and analytical perspectives. Combining these strands into a single article would have resulted in excessive length and reduced conceptual clarity. The division into two papers allowed each paper to provide a focused and substantive contribution suited to the scope and audience of its respective journal. As such, any overlap between the two papers is limited to the contextual background and theoretical framing necessary to situate each study. No overlap occurs in the analysis, results, or interpretation of findings.

4. Differentiation of data use

While both publications draw from the same overall dataset, different subsets of data were foregrounded and analysed:

- The **JALL paper** emphasises:
 - Rubric-based assessments of dissertation drafts across multiple time points
 - Quantitative measures of writing quality and development
 - Qualitative data related to feedback literacy and learning processes.
- The **companion paper** emphasises:
 - Student engagement surveys (cognitive, affective, and behavioural dimensions)
 - Supervisor feedback logs and efficiency metrics
 - Qualitative reflections on feedback implementation and workload.

No dataset is analysed for the same research purpose or outcome in both papers.

5. Closing Statement

This supplement is provided to ensure clarity, transparency, and alignment with best practices in publication ethics. The authors appreciate the opportunity to clarify the relationship between the two publications and thank the editor for guidance and editorial support.

References

- Homayounzadeh, Z., Bavali, M., & Behjat, F. (2025a). Enhancing student engagement and supervisor efficiency in doctoral supervision: A study on multimodal and rubric-based feedback. *Cogent Education*, 12(1), Article 2590860. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2590860>
- Homayounzadeh, Z., Bavali, M., & Behjat, F. (2025b). Rubric-based dynamic assessment and multimodal feedback: A transformative model for doctoral supervision. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 19(2), 71–102. <https://journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/article/view/1021>