

SAMPLE SCHOLARLY ADVISORY BRIEF

Dissertation Research Alignment Review

ILLUSTRATIVE EXCERPT · NOT A CLIENT DELIVERABLE · DOCTORAL ADVISORY

What this sample demonstrates

[A research alignment review makes a study's logic visible. It examines whether the problem identifies a focused knowledge need, the purpose responds, the questions make the purpose investigable, the framework has a clear role, and the approach can produce relevant evidence. It identifies coherent elements, drifting terms or boundaries, and decisions that deserve attention first.]

[This review is useful when a prospectus, proposal, or early draft includes expected components but their connections remain difficult to explain. Feedback supports independent revision and more productive scholarly discussion.]

Illustrative scholarly situation

[In this fabricated scenario, Jordan is an EdD researcher considering a qualitative study of first-year community-college nursing students moving from classroom learning into hybrid clinical instruction. Jordan's problem describes uneven persistence in a regional program, while the purpose is to explore students' experiences of academic belonging during that transition. Two open-ended questions ask about belonging and helpful supports.]

[Jordan names Schlossberg's transition theory as the conceptual framework and proposes individual interviews with students who completed their first clinical term. The context, population, and approach are specific. Yet the materials use persistence, engagement, confidence, and belonging almost interchangeably. The framework is presented as central, but its connection to the questions and interview focus is uncertain.]

Diagnostic observations

Observation 1: Problem-to-purpose boundary.

The problem begins with persistence, whereas the purpose turns to belonging. The scholar needs to state the knowledge need that connects them. This matters because an inquiry into experiences cannot, by itself, explain persistence patterns. A bounded problem prevents the purpose from carrying a broader institutional claim than the inquiry can address.

Observation 2: Construct discipline across the questions.

Belonging is the stated focus, but confidence and engagement appear as parallel outcomes in explanatory notes. The scholar should decide whether these are contextual ideas, dimensions of belonging, or separate concepts outside the study. This choice matters because each question should direct attention to one coherent phenomenon rather than quietly expanding the inquiry.

Observation 3: Framework operating role.

Transition theory appears in the background, but the draft does not specify whether it will orient question development, guide interpretation, or provide contextual language. Clarifying that role creates consistency among the rationale, key terms, and intended evidence without pre-termining participant accounts.

Observation 4: Evidence route and participant fit.

Interviews after the first clinical term may fit the exploratory purpose if the draft explains why these participants can speak to the transition. The questions should remain answerable through reflective accounts rather than ask what intervention would improve retention. This alignment matters because the approach, participant group, and intended evidence must support the same bounded inquiry.

DISSERIQ / SCHOLAR-OWNED REVISION PATH

A disciplined next step, not a substitute for scholarship.

Revision pathway

Scholar-owned next step

1. **Set the central knowledge need.** Decide whether the inquiry concerns the lived transition into hybrid clinical instruction or a broader persistence concern. Bound the problem, purpose, and key terms around that choice.
2. **Choose the framework's job.** Specify how transition theory will inform the inquiry and which terms must remain distinct from belonging.
3. **Test each question against the evidence route.** Check that every question can be addressed through the proposed participants' accounts and that the questions collectively answer the stated purpose.

Questions for the scholar

- 01 What knowledge would remain missing if the study described belonging during the transition but made no claim about persistence?
- 02 How will transition theory inform the inquiry without predetermining participants' accounts?
- 03 Which terms must be defined or removed so every question addresses the same bounded phenomenon?

Academic-integrity boundary

The scholar remains the author and decision-maker. This review offers diagnostic observations, alignment tools, and questions that support independent scholarly judgment. The scholar determines the final research decisions, revisions, claims, and submission materials.

Engagement snapshot

Dissertation Research Alignment Review is a fixed-price \$ 149 engagement delivered within 3 business days after all required materials are received. For a consolidated draft of up to 25 double-spaced pages and relevant supporting materials, the four example deliverables are:

- **Written Research Alignment Review:** a concise, section-referenced diagnostic of strengths, risks, and questions.
- **Alignment Matrix:** a component-by-component map of the problem, purpose, questions, framework, and basic methodological choices.
- **Prioritized Revision Roadmap:** a sequenced set of decision-focused next steps for the scholar's independent work.
- **Methodology Discussion Prompts:** targeted prompts for a discussion with a chair, methodologist, or committee member.

READY FOR A FOCUSED, ETHICAL DOCTORAL ADVISORY CONVERSATION?

Visit praxisiqgroup.com/disseriq to take the research readiness assessment or schedule a consultation.