

SAMPLE SCHOLARLY ADVISORY BRIEF

Chapter 1 Research Development Review

ILLUSTRATIVE EXCERPT · NOT A CLIENT DELIVERABLE · DOCTORAL ADVISORY

What this sample demonstrates

[This fabricated sample illustrates the developmental, methodology-informed feedback in DisserIQ's Chapter 1 Research Development Review. It tests the logic among the research problem, purpose, questions, significance, scope, and theoretical or conceptual framing. The scenario and observations are invented solely for demonstration.]

[Rather than supply answers, the review helps a scholar locate strengths, identify risks, and prepare grounded decisions for a future advisor or committee conversation.]

Illustrative scholarly situation

[A fictional EdD scholar is preparing Chapter 1 about peer mentoring for first-generation students in an online graduate program. The draft identifies uneven persistence as a concern and proposes to explore students' first-year mentoring experiences. Its purpose statement, however, also suggests mentoring improves persistence. The questions ask how participants describe mentoring and whether it causes them to remain enrolled.]

[The chapter names communities of practice but does not explain how that frame will guide attention or interpretation. Significance promises improved retention across online graduate education. Scope shifts among all first-generation graduate students, one private university, and one mentoring initiative. These ingredients need a clearer relationship.]

Diagnostic observations

Observation 1: The stated problem blends a practical concern with a researchable knowledge need.

Uneven persistence provides context, but the draft does not specify what is unknown about mentoring experiences in this setting. The distinction matters: the problem should establish a knowledge need the study can address, not simply a condition an institution hopes to change.

Observation 2: The purpose and questions signal different forms of inquiry.

Exploring experience invites an interpretive focus, whereas determining whether mentoring improves persistence entails a different claim. Research questions organize the inquiry and should remain consistent with the stated purpose and anticipated approach.

Observation 3: The framework is named but not yet operationally connected to the study.

Communities of practice may focus attention on participation, belonging, and movement toward fuller membership. Stating that role prevents the framework from becoming a label and offers a principled basis for defining key concepts.

Observation 4: Scope and significance exceed the immediate study boundary.

The draft moves among a broad population, one institution, and one initiative without settling the unit of attention. Boundaries determine which claims are warranted; a bounded study can still carry scholarly, practical, and stakeholder relevance.

DISSERIQ / SCHOLAR-OWNED REVISION PATH

A disciplined next step, not a substitute for scholarship.

Revision pathway

Step 1: Define the knowledge need.

The scholar identifies what remains insufficiently understood about peer mentoring in the named program and distinguishes it from the larger persistence concern.

Step 2: Select one coherent inquiry claim.

The scholar chooses a carefully justified focus, then checks the purpose and each question for consistent language, focus, and answerability.

Step 3: Set interpretive and study boundaries.

The scholar specifies the framework's role, identifies the initiative and participant group in scope, and calibrates significance to the study's plausible contribution.

Questions for the scholar

- 01** What specific understanding about participants' mentoring experiences is presently absent from the setting you intend to study?
- 02** Which inquiry claim can your purpose and research questions support without moving beyond the evidence your study is designed to consider?
- 03** How will the selected framework shape the concepts you foreground while keeping the setting, participant group, and significance claim appropriately bounded?

Academic-integrity boundary

This illustrative review offers developmental observations, reasoning prompts, and a decision pathway for the scholar's own work. It does not provide text for academic submission or make institutional determinations. The scholar remains the author and decision-maker, responsible for every scholarly choice, revision, claim, and submission.

Engagement snapshot

Chapter 1 Research Development Review is a fixed-price \$ 495 engagement with delivery in **5 business days**. For an eligible Chapter 1 draft, prospectus, or relevant proposal excerpt, four example deliverables are:

1. **Annotated Chapter 1 Review:** Targeted comments and questions focused on research logic, clarity, and alignment.
2. **Problem-to-Question Alignment Map:** A concise visual or tabular trace connecting the problem, purpose, questions, significance, scope, and framework.
3. **Framework and Boundary Assessment:** Written observations on the framing role alongside scope and delimitation considerations.
4. **Prioritized Revision Action Plan:** A sequenced set of high-, medium-, and lower-priority development tasks for independent revision and scholarly discussion.

READY FOR A FOCUSED, ETHICAL DOCTORAL ADVISORY CONVERSATION?

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