

SAMPLE SCHOLARLY ADVISORY BRIEF

DisserIQ Dissertation Defense Preparation Intensive: Illustrative Sample Brief

ILLUSTRATIVE EXCERPT · NOT A CLIENT DELIVERABLE · DOCTORAL ADVISORY

What this sample demonstrates

[This fabricated example shows how a Defense Preparation Intensive turns defense materials into a disciplined preparation plan. It models argument architecture, question preparation, and scholar-owned practice. The goal is to make the study's reasoning visible: why the inquiry mattered, how the design addressed the question, what evidence supports, and where limits belong. Names and study details are invented for this advisory format.]

Illustrative scholarly situation

[An illustrative doctoral researcher in higher education is preparing for a 20-minute final defense of a bounded qualitative study of first-generation doctoral students' use of peer mentoring during the first year. The scholar has a slide deck and selected pages. The deck states a phenomenological approach and presents themes related to belonging, navigation of unwritten norms, and help-seeking. The preparation need is to explain, without overclaiming, how the study's purpose, participant accounts, interpretive claims, and practical implications connect.]

[Committee members may ask why phenomenology fits the purpose, how the participant group bounds the contribution, why the themes are distinct, and what practitioners can reasonably take from the study. Preparation is therefore an argument task as much as a presentation task.]

Diagnostic observations

Observation 1: Contribution precedes the evidentiary warrant.

The deck opens with institutional implications before establishing the phenomenon, participant perspective, and interpretive path. Methodological significance: a defense needs a traceable progression from purpose through evidence to interpretation. Reordering the oral explanation helps show why each implication is proportionate to the inquiry.

Observation 2: The question-to-claim chain is compressed.

One slide moves from a question about lived experience to a broad claim about doctoral persistence. Methodological significance: phenomenological findings illuminate how participants describe a phenomenon, while the study boundary sets the scale and kind of claim that can be defended. The scholar needs a concise bridge between participant meaning and wider institutional effect.

Observation 3: Design rationale is present but not rehearsed under scrutiny.

The deck names phenomenology and semi-structured interviews, yet does not anticipate why this combination was preferable to a case study or survey. Methodological significance: defense questions test fit, not only terminology. Explaining the relationship among purpose, phenomenon, participant accounts, and interpretive approach demonstrates methodological coherence.

Observation 4: Limitations appear as a closing caveat rather than an interpretive boundary.

The current language lists constraints without linking them to transferability and implications. Methodological significance: woven into the argument, limits clarify the conditions under which the contribution should be understood. This signals scholarly restraint rather than weakness.

DISSERIQ / SCHOLAR-OWNED REVISION PATH

A disciplined next step, not a substitute for scholarship.

Revision pathway

Scholar-owned next step

1. **Map the defense through-line.** The scholar identifies a one-sentence core claim, then traces the sequence from problem and purpose to question, design, evidence, interpretation, and bounded implication. Each slide must advance that sequence.
2. **Make three defense decisions in advance.** The scholar decides how to explain methodological fit, distinguish findings from broader claims, and state limits before implications. These become personal speaking cues, not supplied presentation language.
3. **Practice responsive reasoning.** The scholar rehearses concise answers to high-risk questions, listens for places where a response loses the study boundary, and adjusts the evidence cue or explanation independently. A mock session tests clarity, precision, and composure under follow-up.

Questions for the scholar

- 01 What exact interpretive claim can you support from the participant accounts, and what broader claim must remain outside the study boundary?
- 02 How would you explain the fit between your purpose, phenomenological approach, and interview method to a committee member who asks why another design was not chosen?
- 03 Where in your defense can you name a limitation early enough to shape how listeners understand the implications?

Academic-integrity boundary

This illustrative brief models developmental coaching based on materials the scholar has authored. The scholar remains the author and decision-maker for every claim, presentation choice, and scholarly judgment. DisserIQ provides diagnostic feedback, preparation cues, and practice structure; it does not create dissertation or presentation text, speak for the scholar, invent evidence, or determine institutional requirements. Preparation support cannot determine a defense result.

Engagement snapshot

Offer: Dissertation Defense Preparation Intensive, \$ 395, delivered within 5 business days after complete materials are received. The live practice session is scheduled during that period, subject to mutual availability. Example deliverables are: (1) a **Defense Argument Architecture Map**; (2) **Defense Deck Narrative Notes**; (3) a **High-Risk Committee Question Practice Bank** with 12 to 15 tailored questions and preparation cues; and (4) one **60-Minute Mock Defense Practice Session and Action Memo**. The scholar supplies a current deck, up to 25 selected defense-relevant pages, and defense details.

READY FOR A FOCUSED, ETHICAL DOCTORAL ADVISORY CONVERSATION?

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