

SAMPLE SCHOLARLY ADVISORY BRIEF

Qualitative Research Design Consultation

ILLUSTRATIVE EXCERPT · NOT A CLIENT DELIVERABLE · DOCTORAL ADVISORY

What this sample demonstrates

[This illustrative brief shows how a focused consultation can surface decisions that deserve attention before a doctoral researcher invests further in a qualitative study. It models developmental feedback, not a judgment. The emphasis is methodological coherence: whether purpose, questions, participants, collection, trustworthiness, and analysis tell one connected story. The situation is entirely fictional.]

Illustrative scholarly situation

[A doctoral researcher proposes a qualitative descriptive study of how first-generation doctoral students experience informal peer support during their first year in a hybrid program. The purpose is to understand forms of peer support students find useful and conditions shaping access. The researcher plans semi-structured video interviews with 10 to 12 volunteers recruited through a program newsletter. The plan names thematic analysis and a reflexive journal.]

[The topic is focused and the interview format could provide rich accounts. Several design choices, however, remain connected only in outline. The observations below identify questions for the scholar to work through with relevant academic guidance and local requirements.]

Diagnostic observations

Observation 1: Methodological label and purpose need a sharper connection.

Qualitative description may fit a practice-oriented aim to portray accounts in accessible terms. The scholar should explain why it, rather than phenomenology or case study, matches the understanding sought. That rationale prevents unexplained borrowing from another methodological tradition.

Observation 2: The sampling logic is underdeveloped.

A newsletter invitation may be feasible, yet it does not explain whose perspectives are needed. The scholar could specify eligibility around first-year status, first-generation identity, hybrid participation, and exposure to peer support. This matters because the sample should provide variation relevant to the question, not only convenient respondents.

Observation 3: The collection sequence needs decision rules.

One interview may be appropriate, but the guide should invite concrete accounts of access, usefulness, and barriers without presuming benefit. The scholar should decide how interview records, reflective notes, and procedural changes will be documented. This links what participants are asked to what the study can credibly illuminate.

Observation 4: Trustworthiness and analysis are parallel, not integrated.

A reflexive journal should connect to positionality, analytic memos, an audit trail, and a considered participant-feedback decision. The scholar also needs to explain how meaning units become candidate patterns and how interpretations are checked against the full accounts. These practices make the reasoning to findings transparent.

DISSERIQ / SCHOLAR-OWNED REVISION PATH

A disciplined next step, not a substitute for scholarship.

Revision pathway

Scholar-owned next step

1. **Clarify the design claim.** Decide what qualitative understanding the purpose requires, then link that choice to the question and interview method.
2. **Bound the participant logic.** Define eligibility, recruitment boundaries, and useful variation in accounts. Then consider whether the anticipated sample can inform the stated purpose.
3. **Align procedures before collection begins.** Map each question to prompts, documentation, trustworthiness actions, and a staged analytic process. Treat unresolved choices as focused topics for methodological or institutional discussion.

Questions for the scholar

- 01 What evidence would help you explain why qualitative description is the best fit for the understanding your question seeks?
- 02 Which participant characteristics are essential to the experience you want to understand, and which would unnecessarily narrow the perspective available to the study?
- 03 How will your documentation show the path from individual interview accounts to the patterns you ultimately interpret?

Academic-integrity boundary

This sample represents developmental, educational methodology consulting. The scholar remains the author and decision-maker for every research choice, written submission, and institutional interaction. The consultation provides feedback, methodological reasoning, and planning tools for independent work. It does not supply text for academic submission, create research evidence, conduct recruitment or collection activities, or make decisions on the scholar's behalf.

Engagement snapshot

Offer: Qualitative Research Design Consultation **Price:** \$ 295 **Timeline:** 3 business days after required materials are received and a mutually available consultation time is confirmed. Calendar availability may affect the meeting date.

Example deliverables appropriate to this consultation are:

1. A 60-minute online qualitative design consultation focused on the submitted study design.
2. A concise Design Coherence Brief identifying strengths, risks, and decision points.
3. An Annotated Alignment Map connecting the problem, purpose, questions, sample, data collection, trustworthiness, and planned analytic approach.
4. A Prioritized Next-Step Checklist for independent revision and future scholarly discussion.

READY FOR A FOCUSED, ETHICAL DOCTORAL ADVISORY CONVERSATION?

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