

SAMPLE SCHOLARLY ADVISORY BRIEF

Dissertation Proposal Readiness Review

ILLUSTRATIVE EXCERPT · NOT A CLIENT DELIVERABLE · DOCTORAL ADVISORY

What this sample demonstrates

[This fabricated scenario shows the developmental, cross-chapter feedback a doctoral researcher might receive through DisserIQ's Dissertation Proposal Readiness Review. It illustrates examination of a proposal as one research argument, rather than three separate chapters. The focus is on connections among the problem, purpose, research questions, framework, literature, and proposed methods, with attention to risks that could make a submission difficult to follow or defend. This is an instructional example, not a client case or a template for academic text.]

Illustrative scholarly situation

[A fictional doctoral researcher is preparing Chapters 1 through 3 for a study of how first-generation community-college students experience academic advising during their first year. Chapter 1 identifies uneven use of advising as the problem and poses two qualitative questions about barriers to seeking advising and helpful interactions.]

[Chapter 2 introduces sense of belonging as the conceptual frame and identifies limited attention to first-year, first-generation students at rural community colleges. Chapter 3 proposes a qualitative descriptive design, criterion-based recruitment of students who used advising, semi-structured interviews, and thematic analysis.]

[The proposal has a promising and timely focus. Its central issue is not the importance of advising. It is whether every chapter advances the same, sufficiently bounded inquiry.]

Diagnostic observations

Observation 1: The problem-to-purpose bridge needs a clearer knowledge need.

The problem emphasizes uneven service use, while the purpose centers on experiences among students who used advising. This distinction matters because the participant group may illuminate helpful interactions but cannot fully address barriers among students who never engaged. The scholar should decide whether the inquiry concerns use, nonuse, or users' experiences, then align the problem and purpose around that decision.

Observation 2: The framework has an uncertain analytic role.

Sense of belonging appears in the literature discussion, yet the proposal does not explain whether it will guide interview topics, interpretation, or only contextual framing. A conceptual frame should have a visible job. Otherwise, readers may not see how it informs study boundaries and links the literature to the inquiry.

Observation 3: The gap claim is broader than the planned setting.

The literature points to a general need for research on first-generation students, whereas the study is delimited to rural community colleges and first-year advising encounters. A credible scholarly gap identifies the specific underexamined population, context, relationship, or phenomenon that the design can speak to. Narrowing the claim will make the contribution more defensible.

Observation 4: The interview and analytic logic need a shared decision rule.

The questions ask about barriers and helpful interactions, but the plan does not indicate how interview domains and thematic analysis will distinguish those constructs. This is a methodological issue, not a wording issue. A transparent link among question focus, interview domains, and planned interpretation strengthens coherence and reduces the risk of material that cannot be connected back to the inquiry.

DISSERIQ / SCHOLAR-OWNED REVISION PATH

A disciplined next step, not a substitute for scholarship.

Revision pathway

Scholar-owned next step

1. **Choose the study's focal experience.** Decide whether the proposal examines advising use, nonuse, or users' experiences, and test whether the problem, purpose, and questions name the same phenomenon.
2. **Assign the framework a specific function.** Determine how sense of belonging will shape the study's boundaries, interview focus, or interpretation, then verify that Chapter 2 establishes that role.
3. **Trace each question into the method.** Map every question to the participant criterion, interview domains, and planned thematic interpretation; identify decisions for discussion with the scholar's chair or methodologist.

Questions for the scholar

- 01 What evidence supports defining the knowledge need around students who have used advising rather than students who have not?
- 02 In what precise way will sense of belonging guide the inquiry beyond providing background context?
- 03 Which interview domains would allow a reader to see how each research question will be addressed?

Academic-integrity boundary

DisserIQ offers developmental feedback, methodological reasoning, and planning tools for the scholar's independent work. The scholar remains the author and decision-maker for every research choice, revision, claim, and submission. This review identifies issues and prompts decisions; it does not supply text for submission, conduct research activities, or act on the scholar's behalf.

Engagement snapshot

Dissertation Proposal Readiness Review is a fixed-price \$ 895 engagement delivered within 7 **business days** after agreed materials are received. Example deliverables are: **annotated Chapters 1 through 3** with developmental comments tied to passages; a **cross-chapter alignment matrix** linking the problem, purpose, questions, framework, literature, design, data sources, and analysis plan; a **submission-risk report** ranking issues and explaining their methodological significance; and a **practical next-step action plan** for the scholar's own revision process, including one focused clarification round.

READY FOR A FOCUSED, ETHICAL DOCTORAL ADVISORY CONVERSATION?

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