

SAMPLE SCHOLARLY ADVISORY BRIEF

Chapter 3 Methodology Review

ILLUSTRATIVE EXCERPT · NOT A CLIENT DELIVERABLE · DOCTORAL ADVISORY

What this sample demonstrates

[This fabricated scenario models decision-focused feedback for a doctoral researcher using DisserIQ’s Chapter 3 Methodology Review. It is not a client engagement. It shows how an external review can trace proposed-study logic, identify questions a careful reader may raise, and prepare a scholar for a focused conversation with a chair, methodologist, or committee.]

[The review centers on coherence. Design should answer the questions; sampling should make intended evidence feasible; instrumentation should fit constructs or phenomenon; ethical procedures should be considered early; and the analysis approach should follow design. This helps the scholar make well-supported choices.]

Illustrative scholarly situation

[A doctoral scholar is preparing a Chapter 3 draft for a quantitative study of first-year community college students’ use of campus tutoring services and reported academic belonging. The draft proposes a cross-sectional survey, convenience sampling through two tutoring centers, a short locally assembled belonging scale, and a regression-based plan. The purpose is to examine a relationship, yet one research question asks whether tutoring use *causes* a change in belonging.]

[The scholar has received general feedback to “tighten the methods” and wants a place to begin. The review does not select a design or make decisions for the scholar. It organizes methodological issues, explains why each matters, and separates foundational choices from later refinements.]

Diagnostic observations

Observation 1: Design and question language are not yet matched.

A cross-sectional survey can examine an association at one point in time, but it does not itself establish temporal order or rule out competing explanations. The causal wording makes a stronger claim than the proposed design appears positioned to support. This matters because the question, purpose, design rationale, and interpretation boundaries should reflect the same level of inference.

Observation 2: The sampling frame is narrower than the stated population.

Recruiting only from tutoring centers may capture students already inclined or able to seek support. If the intended population is all first-year students, the scholar needs to explain how the accessible group relates to it. This is significant for feasibility, the reach of claims, and transparent limitations.

Observation 3: Instrumentation needs a construct-to-item check.

A locally assembled scale may suit exploratory work, but the draft needs to show how items represent academic belonging, how response options will be interpreted, and what supports consistent measurement. Unclear operationalization weakens the link from the research question to the intended evidence.

Observation 4: The proposed analysis approach lacks decision rules.

The draft names regression but does not connect each question to outcome and predictor variables, potential covariates, missing-response handling, or assumptions to examine. A stronger plan specifies what evidence will address each question and what conditions may affect interpretation.

DISSERIQ / SCHOLAR-OWNED REVISION PATH

A disciplined next step, not a substitute for scholarship.

Revision pathway

Step 1: Reconcile purpose, questions, and design.

The scholar decides whether the study examines association, prediction, or another form of inquiry, then aligns the methodology’s language with that decision.

Step 2: Build an evidence-path map.

For each research question, the scholar maps the target population, accessible sample, eligibility criteria, recruitment route, construct or variable, instrument, and proposed procedure. This makes gaps and dependencies easier to see.

Step 3: Record feasibility and ethics decisions.

The scholar documents how voluntary participation, privacy, data handling, access constraints, and foreseeable risks will be addressed under applicable institutional guidance. The record also identifies questions for the appropriate local resource.

Questions for the scholar

- 01 What claim can this design reasonably support, and where should the study’s language reflect that boundary?
- 02 How does the accessible sample relate to the population named in the purpose statement, and what limitation follows from that relationship?
- 03 What must be specified about each measure and proposed procedure for another reader to understand how the research questions will be addressed?

Academic-integrity boundary

This is developmental methodology feedback and planning support. **The scholar remains the author and decision-maker** for every research choice, revision, claim, and submission. The sample identifies reasoning tasks and discussion points; it does not replace the scholar’s judgment or institution-specific oversight.

Engagement snapshot

Chapter 3 Methodology Review · \$ 695 · Delivery in 5 business days

Example deliverables include: (1) a **Methodology Alignment Memo** identifying strengths, decision points, and methodological gaps; (2) a **Chapter 3 Review Matrix** spanning alignment, design, sampling, instrumentation, ethics, and analysis; (3) a **Prioritized Revision Roadmap** for the scholar’s own next decisions; and (4) a focused **30-Minute Methodology Debrief** to clarify findings and revision priorities.

READY FOR A FOCUSED, ETHICAL DOCTORAL ADVISORY CONVERSATION?

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