Review of: "Supervisory Relationships, Constructing Academic Identity, and Transition to the Researcher: An Interpretative Single-Case Study"

Ahmed Faisal Siddiqi[1]

1 University of Central Punjab

The write-up addresses a crucial aspect of the research. YES, It is suitable for publication, provided the points mentioned in the following paragraph are improved.

The popularity of doctoral courses is on the rise, with increasing student enrollments each year. Doctoral education goes beyond just a curriculum; it involves identity construction and knowledge movement. Academic identity is shaped through writing and publications, and collaboration with supervisors plays a crucial role in developing this identity. A strong supervisory relationship helps transform knowledge into a new researcher identity and is key to doctoral students' success. However, there is limited research on how close supervisor-supervisee relationships contribute to this identity construction. To explore this, a qualitative single-case study examined a recent Ph.D. graduate's experience, highlighting how an ideal supervisory relationship supported their transition to an independent researcher.

Here are a few things that need to be corrected:

1 - The problem statement in the introductory paragraph fails to establish the study's significance. While a strong supervisory relationship is crucial in shaping a new researcher identity and ensuring doctoral students' success, it also involves psychological, sociological, educational, and even economic dimensions. Which of these aspects is being addressed in this context?

2 - The literature review appears too generic and lacks a clear theoretical foundation. Relationships are typically grounded in socio-economic theories, so it's important to clarify which theory is being applied here. The subsequent literature should be analyzed and presented through the perspective of these theories.

3 - No theoretical framework for the research.

4 - What qualitative methodology was used to gather data for this case study? Is it discourse analysis, ethnography, or constructionism? Which one is it?

5 - What tool has been used: NVIVO, Altas-TI, or ?

6 - How the themes have been extracted/developed? Clustering? Factoring? Word-Cloud? or what?

7 - What if I say these themes are all wrong! How would you prove me wrong? I mean, what is the accuracy of these themes?

8 - The discussion is very good; If there is no GPT involved, it is wonderful.

9 - The study seems to be an extension of some previous work which was being conducted sometime in 2021! If it is the case, please mention the previous work! If it is not the case, then please take reference from some post-2020 researches.