International Journal of Academic Pedagogical Research (IJAPR)
ISSN: 2643-9123
Vol. 10 Issue 3 March - 2026, Pages: 106-113

Crafting a Winning Introduction: A Structural Framework for Empirical Research Articles

Arinaitwe Julius[1], Ariyo Gracious Kazaara[2]

1,2 Metropolitan International University

Abstract: Background: *The introduction section of an empirical research article is the primary rhetorical space through which authors establish the significance of their work, yet structural deficiencies in introductions remain pervasive across disciplines, contributing to poor communicative quality and high rates of manuscript rejection.* ***Objective:*** *This study aimed to develop and validate a structural framework for crafting effective introductions in empirical research articles, and to examine the relationships between specific structural components and the rhetorical coherence and perceived utility of the framework among early-career researchers.* ***Methods:*** *A sequential mixed-methods design was employed, involving systematic document analysis of 120 purposively sampled peer-reviewed articles across public health, education, and social sciences, supplemented by a structured questionnaire administered to 215 early-career researchers. Univariate, bivariate (Spearman's correlation, chi-square), and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analyses were conducted to address the study objectives.* ***Results:*** *Structural completeness was low to moderate across the sampled articles, with problem statements, specific objectives, and research questions being the most frequently absent or underdeveloped elements. Spearman's correlations confirmed significant positive associations between all structural components and expert-rated rhetorical coherence, with problem statement clarity demonstrating the strongest relationship ($\rho = 0.67$, $p < 0.001$). Significant disciplinary differences in structural completeness were observed ($\chi^2 = 9.84$, $p = 0.043$), with public health articles demonstrating superior completeness relative to education and social sciences. SEM results confirmed excellent model fit (CFI = 0.963, RMSEA = 0.048) and validated all seven hypothesized structural paths, with problem statement clarity ($\beta = 0.54$), objective alignment ($\beta = 0.46$), and gap identification ($\beta = 0.39$) emerging as the strongest predictors of rhetorical coherence.* ***Conclusion:*** *The study provided robust empirical validation for a structured introduction-writing framework anchored in five core components, and demonstrated that structural completeness particularly problem statement clarity and objective alignment significantly predict the rhetorical quality of empirical research introductions. The framework offers a practical, evidence-based scaffold for researchers, writing instructors, and journal editors seeking to improve the communicative quality of empirical scholarship.*

Keywords: empirical research writing, introduction structure, rhetorical coherence, CARS model, structural equation modeling, academic writing framework, research article genre

Introduction

The ability to construct a compelling and logically coherent introduction is one of the most critical yet frequently underestimated competencies in academic writing. Empirical research articles serve as the cornerstone of scientific knowledge production, and their introductory sections function as the gateway through which readers, reviewers, and editors assess the relevance, rigor, and contribution of the work presented (Chun Tie et al., 2019; Goji et al., 2020; Walker, 2012). Despite the centrality of this section, many researchers particularly early-career scholars struggle to navigate the structural and rhetorical demands of crafting an introduction that simultaneously contextualizes the study, identifies a knowledge gap, and convincingly argues for the necessity of the research. The result is often introductions that are either overly broad, poorly sequenced, or disconnected from the study's core objectives.

Across disciplines, scholars have proposed various frameworks to guide the writing of research introductions. Among the most influential is Swales' (1990) Create a Research Space (CARS) model, which identifies three rhetorical moves: establishing a research territory, identifying a niche, and occupying that niche (Rantala et al., 2022; Walkington, 2015). While this model has been widely adopted in applied linguistics and writing pedagogy, its application in empirical sciences — particularly in fields such as public health, social sciences, and education — remains inconsistent and poorly operationalized. Researchers frequently conflate background information with problem statements, omit clear articulations of their objectives, or fail to align their research questions with the gaps they purport to address (Kalpokaite & Radivojevic, 2019; Kennedy et al., 2023; Zimba & Gasparyan, 2021).

This study therefore examines the structural elements that constitute an effective introduction in empirical research articles, with particular attention to how these elements interact to produce a persuasive and coherent narrative. By investigating existing published articles and drawing on established writing frameworks, the study aims to provide a replicable structural framework that researchers can apply when crafting introductions to their empirical work.

Background of the Study

Academic writing instruction has long recognized the introduction as a pivotal section of any research article, yet formal, empirically grounded frameworks for teaching and evaluating introductory structures remain limited. The growing volume of scholarly publications across disciplines has intensified competition for journal space, placing greater pressure on authors to produce introductions that quickly and convincingly establish the value of their research. In this context, structural deficiencies in introductions are not merely stylistic concerns they directly affect manuscript acceptance rates, citation frequency, and the broader

impact of the research (Arthurs, 2019; Kazaara & Nancy, 2025; Singhania et al., 2024). Genre-based approaches to academic writing, pioneered by scholars such as Swales (1990) and Bhatia (1993), established that research articles follow recognizable rhetorical patterns shaped by disciplinary conventions and communicative purposes. The CARS model, in particular, framed the research introduction as a competitive rhetorical space in which authors must claim territory, identify a gap, and assert the significance of their contribution. Subsequent studies have refined and critiqued this model, noting that its application varies considerably across disciplines, research traditions, and journal expectations (Biomedical & 2022, 2022; Hayashi et al., 2019; O'Sullivan & Ring, 2021). In the social and health sciences, introductions are further complicated by the need to integrate theoretical frameworks, policy contexts, and empirical evidence within a relatively concise opening section. Researchers in these fields often lack explicit training in genre conventions, relying instead on informal apprenticeship or imitation of published work — a process that perpetuates structural inconsistencies rather than resolving them (Nababi & Nelson, 2025; Nolte et al., 2016; Toyon, 2021). There is therefore a compelling need for a clearly articulated, empirically validated structural framework that synthesizes existing models and offers actionable guidance for researchers across disciplines.

Problem Statement

Despite the extensive body of literature on academic writing and research communication, a significant gap persists between theoretical frameworks for introduction writing and their practical application by researchers. Many empirical research articles continue to exhibit structural weaknesses in their introductory sections, including poorly delineated problem statements, misalignment between stated objectives and research questions, and inadequate justification of the study's significance (Chen, 2022; Mehnaz & Yang, 2025; Ruiz-Real et al., 2021). These deficiencies are not confined to novice writers; they are observable even in manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals by experienced researchers (Branch et al., 2023; Rejeb et al., 2025; Vom Brocke et al., 2020).

Current writing guides and genre analysis studies, while informative, tend to be either overly prescriptive in ways that do not account for disciplinary variation, or too abstract to offer concrete structural guidance. There is a particular absence of frameworks that integrate the rhetorical, logical, and organizational dimensions of introduction writing into a single, coherent model applicable to empirical research across multiple disciplines (Bouter, 2020; Papaeti & Grant, 2023; Roje, Reyes Elizondo, et al., 2023). Without such a framework, researchers are left to navigate the complex demands of introduction writing largely without structured support, contributing to high rates of desk rejection and reviewer criticism centered on unclear problem articulation and poorly justified research objectives (Garba, 2023; Roje, Tomić, et al., 2023; Weerasinghe et al., 2022; Zwart & Ter Meulen, 2019). This study addresses that gap by developing and validating a structural framework specifically designed for empirical research article introductions.

Main Objective

The main objective of this study was to develop and validate a structural framework for crafting effective introductions in empirical research articles, and to assess the extent to which adherence to this framework is associated with the rhetorical quality and organizational coherence of published research introductions across selected disciplines.

Specific Objectives

1. To identify and analyze the key structural elements present in high-quality introductions of empirical research articles published in peer-reviewed journals across selected disciplines.
2. To examine the relationships between structural components of research introductions specifically the background, problem statement, objectives, and research questions and the overall rhetorical coherence as evaluated by expert reviewers.
3. To develop and validate a replicable structural framework for empirical research introductions and assess its applicability and usability among early-career researchers.

Research Questions

1. What structural elements characterize high-quality introductions in empirical research articles published in peer-reviewed journals across selected disciplines?
2. What is the relationship between the structural components of research introductions (background, problem statement, objectives, and research questions) and the rhetorical coherence scores assigned by expert reviewers?
3. To what extent is the proposed structural framework perceived as applicable and useful by early-career researchers in constructing introductions for empirical research articles?

Methodology

This study employed a sequential mixed-methods research design to investigate the structural elements of introductions in empirical research articles and to develop a validated framework for their construction. In the first phase, a systematic document analysis was conducted on a purposively selected sample of 120 published empirical research articles drawn from peer-reviewed journals across three disciplines public health, education, and social sciences with 40 articles selected per discipline based on journal impact factor and citation frequency. Each introduction was coded using a structured coding instrument derived from Swales' (1990) CARS model and supplemented by elements identified through a preliminary scoping review of academic writing literature, capturing the presence,

sequence, and completeness of structural components including the research territory, gap identification, problem statement, study objectives, and research questions. Inter-rater reliability was established through independent double-coding of 20% of the sample by two trained research assistants, yielding a Cohen's Kappa coefficient of 0.84, indicating strong agreement. In the second phase, a structured questionnaire was administered to a sample of 215 early-career researchers recruited from three universities through purposive sampling, measuring their perceptions of the usability and applicability of the proposed framework using a five-point Likert scale. Univariate analysis was performed to describe the distribution of structural elements across the sampled articles and to summarize respondents' demographic characteristics and Likert-scale responses through frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. Bivariate analysis, including Pearson's chi-square tests, independent samples t-tests, and Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficients, was employed to examine associations between the presence of specific structural components and rhetorical coherence scores assigned by a panel of five expert reviewers, as well as to assess differences in framework usability perceptions across disciplinary groups. Finally, Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) using AMOS 26.0 was employed to test a hypothesized structural model specifying the directional relationships between the completeness of introduction components (background adequacy, problem statement clarity, objective alignment, and research question specificity) and two latent outcome variables rhetorical coherence and perceived framework utility with model fit assessed using the Comparative Fit Index (CFI ≥ 0.95), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI ≥ 0.95), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA ≤ 0.06), and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR ≤ 0.08), and convergent and discriminant validity established through Average Variance Extracted (AVE) and composite reliability (CR) estimates. All quantitative analyses were conducted at a 95% confidence interval with a significance threshold set at $p < 0.05$, and ethical approval was obtained from the relevant institutional review board prior to data collection (Nelson et al., 2022, 2023).

RESULTS

Table 1: Univariate Analysis Distribution of Structural Elements Across Sampled Empirical Research Articles (n = 120)

Structural Element	Present n (%)	Absent n (%)	Complete & Well-developed n (%)	Partial n (%)
Research Territory/Background	118 (98.3%)	2 (1.7%)	89 (74.2%)	29 (24.2%)
Gap Identification	97 (80.8%)	23 (19.2%)	61 (50.8%)	36 (30.0%)
Problem Statement	84 (70.0%)	36 (30.0%)	47 (39.2%)	37 (30.8%)
Main Objective	101 (84.2%)	19 (15.8%)	78 (65.0%)	23 (19.2%)
Specific Objectives	76 (63.3%)	44 (36.7%)	44 (36.7%)	32 (26.7%)
Research Questions	71 (59.2%)	49 (40.8%)	38 (31.7%)	33 (27.5%)
Theoretical/Conceptual Framework	58 (48.3%)	62 (51.7%)	29 (24.2%)	29 (24.2%)
Justification/Significance	88 (73.3%)	32 (26.7%)	52 (43.3%)	36 (30.0%)

Mean Rhetorical Coherence Score (out of 10): 6.43 ± 1.87 Mean Structural Completeness Score (out of 8 elements): 4.79 ± 1.64

The univariate analysis revealed considerable variability in the presence and quality of structural elements across the 120 sampled empirical research articles. Research territory and background was the most consistently present element, appearing in 98.3% of articles, with 74.2% of these rated as complete and well-developed by expert reviewers. This finding suggests that most researchers are reasonably proficient at situating their work within a broader disciplinary context. However, a marked decline in structural completeness was observed for more precise components. The problem statement was entirely absent in 30.0% of articles and fully developed in only 39.2%, while specific objectives and research questions were absent in 36.7% and 40.8% of articles respectively — representing the weakest performing elements in the sample. The theoretical or conceptual framework was the least consistently included element, present in fewer than half of all articles (48.3%), underscoring a widespread tendency among empirical researchers to omit explicit theoretical grounding from their introductions. The mean structural completeness score of 4.79 out of a possible 8 elements further confirmed that the majority of articles satisfied fewer than five of the eight expected structural components.

These findings have significant implications for the quality of empirical research communication across disciplines. The low rates of complete and well-developed problem statements, specific objectives, and research questions suggest that many researchers conflate or inadequately distinguish these functionally distinct components, a pattern consistent with observations by Swales (1990) and subsequent genre analysts who noted the tendency of authors to substitute vague thematic descriptions for explicit gap articulations. The mean rhetorical coherence score of 6.43 out of 10, with a relatively wide standard deviation of 1.87, indicated substantial heterogeneity in the quality of introduction writing even within a sample drawn from peer-reviewed journals — implying that journal acceptance does not necessarily guarantee structural excellence. These results collectively justify the need for a structured, replicable framework that guides researchers in systematically incorporating all critical elements into their introductions, with particular emphasis on the frequently omitted and underdeveloped components of problem statements, specific objectives, research questions, and theoretical framing.

Table 2: Bivariate Analysis — Spearman's Correlation Between Structural Components and Expert-Rated Rhetorical Coherence Score

Structural Component	Spearman's rho (ρ)	p-value	Strength of Association
Research Territory/Background Adequacy	0.31	0.001**	Weak–Moderate
Gap Identification Clarity	0.58	<0.001**	Moderate
Problem Statement Clarity	0.67	<0.001**	Moderate–Strong
Main Objective Alignment	0.61	<0.001**	Moderate–Strong
Specific Objectives Completeness	0.54	<0.001**	Moderate
Research Questions Specificity	0.56	<0.001**	Moderate
Theoretical Framework Presence	0.42	<0.001**	Moderate
Justification/Significance Strength	0.49	<0.001**	Moderate

***p < 0.01; Rhetorical Coherence Score rated by panel of five expert reviewers on a scale of 1–10**

The Spearman's rank-order correlation analysis revealed statistically significant positive associations between all eight structural components and expert-rated rhetorical coherence scores, with p-values well below the 0.05 significance threshold for all variables. Problem statement clarity demonstrated the strongest correlation with rhetorical coherence ($\rho = 0.67$, $p < 0.001$), followed closely by main objective alignment ($\rho = 0.61$, $p < 0.001$) and gap identification clarity ($\rho = 0.58$, $p < 0.001$). These three components collectively formed a cluster of moderate-to-strong associations, suggesting that the logical connective tissue between identifying a problem, specifying a gap, and articulating what the study intends to accomplish is the primary determinant of whether expert reviewers perceive an introduction as rhetorically coherent. Research questions specificity ($\rho = 0.56$) and specific objectives completeness ($\rho = 0.54$) also showed meaningful moderate correlations, reinforcing the importance of precision and internal alignment across the objectives-to-questions hierarchy. By contrast, research territory and background adequacy showed the weakest correlation ($\rho = 0.31$), indicating that while background information is nearly universally present, its contribution to perceived coherence is relatively modest compared to more targeted structural elements.

These bivariate findings carry important practical and theoretical implications. The pattern of correlations strongly suggests that rhetorical coherence in empirical research introductions is not simply a function of the volume or quality of background information provided, but rather of how effectively the author constructs a logical argumentative trajectory from gap identification through to clearly stated objectives and research questions. This aligns with Bhatia's (1993) contention that genre competence involves not merely the inclusion of expected elements but the strategic deployment of those elements to achieve communicative purposes. The moderate correlation observed for theoretical framework presence ($\rho = 0.42$) is particularly noteworthy: it suggests that while theoretical grounding contributes meaningfully to coherence, many reviewers may weight methodological and problem-centered clarity more heavily than conceptual framing when assessing introduction quality. Taken together, these results provided an empirical basis for prioritizing problem statement clarity, objective alignment, and gap articulation as the core structural pillars around which the proposed framework was designed.

Table 3: Chi-Square Analysis — Association Between Structural Completeness Category and Disciplinary Field

Structural Completeness Category	Public Health n (%)	Education n (%)	Social Sciences n (%)	Total n (%)	χ^2	p-value
Low (0–2 elements complete)	4 (10.0%)	9 (22.5%)	11 (27.5%)	24 (20.0%)		
Moderate (3–5 elements complete)	18 (45.0%)	22 (55.0%)	24 (60.0%)	64 (53.3%)	9.84	0.043*
High (6–8 elements complete)	18 (45.0%)	9 (22.5%)	5 (12.5%)	32 (26.7%)		
Total	**40 (100%)**	**40 (100%)**	**40 (100%)**	**120 (100%)**		

***p < 0.05**

The Pearson's chi-square test revealed a statistically significant association between disciplinary field and the level of structural completeness of research article introductions ($\chi^2 = 9.84$, $p = 0.043$). Public health articles demonstrated notably stronger structural completeness, with 45.0% classified in the high completeness category (6–8 elements complete) compared to only 22.5% of education articles and a markedly lower 12.5% of social sciences articles. Conversely, the social sciences discipline recorded the highest proportion of low-completeness introductions (27.5%), followed by education (22.5%) and public health (10.0%). The moderate completeness category was the modal category across all three disciplines, with social sciences articles most heavily concentrated at this level (60.0%), suggesting a tendency toward partially structured introductions that include some but not all critical elements. These differences were statistically significant at the 5% level, indicating that disciplinary context is a meaningful determinant of how comprehensively researchers structure their empirical article introductions.

The disciplinary variation observed in this analysis likely reflects the differential influence of genre conventions, editorial standards, and training cultures across fields. Public health, as a discipline that has increasingly aligned with systematic methodological reporting standards — including those promoted by reporting guidelines such as STROBE and CONSORT — may cultivate greater

awareness of structured scientific communication among its researchers, thereby producing more complete introductions. In contrast, the social sciences, which encompass a broader range of epistemological traditions including interpretive and critical paradigms, may afford researchers greater latitude in how they frame their studies, potentially at the cost of structural completeness as operationalized in this study. These findings suggest that any framework for structuring empirical research introductions must be sensitive to disciplinary norms, and that its implementation may require discipline-specific adaptation rather than uniform application. The significant chi-square result also underscores the importance of including discipline as a covariate in subsequent structural modeling, a consideration that was incorporated into the SEM analysis reported in Table 4.

Table 4: Structural Equation Modeling — Standardized Path Coefficients for the Proposed Structural Framework Model

Hypothesized Path	Standardized β	S.E.	C.R. (z)	p-value	Decision
Problem Statement Clarity → Rhetorical Coherence	0.54	0.07	7.71	<0.001**	Supported
Gap Identification → Rhetorical Coherence	0.39	0.08	4.88	<0.001**	Supported
Objective Alignment → Rhetorical Coherence	0.46	0.07	6.57	<0.001**	Supported
Research Questions Specificity → Rhetorical Coherence	0.33	0.09	3.67	<0.001**	Supported
Theoretical Framework → Rhetorical Coherence	0.21	0.10	2.10	0.036*	Supported
Rhetorical Coherence → Perceived Framework Utility	0.62	0.06	10.33	<0.001**	Supported
Structural Completeness → Perceived Framework Utility	0.44	0.07	6.29	<0.001**	Supported

Model Fit Indices: CFI = 0.963, TLI = 0.951, RMSEA = 0.048 [90% CI: 0.031–0.065], SRMR = 0.052 AVE (Rhetorical Coherence) = 0.61; CR = 0.87 | AVE (Perceived Framework Utility) = 0.58; CR = 0.84

Interpretation of Table 4

The Structural Equation Model demonstrated excellent fit to the observed data, with all fit indices meeting or exceeding recommended thresholds (CFI = 0.963 ≥ 0.95; TLI = 0.951 ≥ 0.95; RMSEA = 0.048 ≤ 0.06; SRMR = 0.052 ≤ 0.08), providing strong support for the proposed structural framework model. All seven hypothesized paths were statistically significant. Problem statement clarity emerged as the strongest direct predictor of rhetorical coherence ($\beta = 0.54$, $p < 0.001$), followed by objective alignment ($\beta = 0.46$, $p < 0.001$) and gap identification ($\beta = 0.39$, $p < 0.001$). Research questions specificity ($\beta = 0.33$, $p < 0.001$) and theoretical framework presence ($\beta = 0.21$, $p = 0.036$) also demonstrated significant positive effects on rhetorical coherence, though with comparatively smaller effect sizes. Importantly, rhetorical coherence in turn exerted a strong positive effect on perceived framework utility ($\beta = 0.62$, $p < 0.001$), while overall structural completeness independently predicted perceived framework utility ($\beta = 0.44$, $p < 0.001$), together accounting for a substantial portion of the variance in early-career researchers' assessments of the framework's usefulness. Convergent validity was confirmed with AVE values of 0.61 and 0.58 for the two latent constructs, both exceeding the 0.50 threshold, and composite reliability values of 0.87 and 0.84, well above the 0.70 benchmark.

These SEM results provided robust empirical validation for the proposed structural framework and illuminated the causal mechanisms through which individual introduction components contribute to overall quality. The dominant role of problem statement clarity in predicting rhetorical coherence with the largest standardized beta coefficient in the model confirmed that the problem statement functions as the rhetorical engine of an empirical research introduction: when it is clear, specific, and logically connected to the identified gap, the entire introduction gains argumentative force and direction. The significant path from rhetorical coherence to perceived framework utility ($\beta = 0.62$) is also theoretically meaningful, suggesting that researchers' positive evaluations of the framework were not arbitrary but were mediated through their recognition of how structural coherence improves the communicative quality of introductions. The relatively modest but significant contribution of theoretical framework presence ($\beta = 0.21$) adds nuance to the model, indicating that while theoretical grounding enhances coherence, it functions as a supporting rather than a foundational structural element a distinction that has direct implications for how the framework should be taught and applied in research writing contexts.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study collectively provided compelling empirical support for the centrality of structured, sequentially organized introductions in determining the rhetorical quality of empirical research articles. The univariate and bivariate results converged on a consistent pattern: while nearly all sampled articles included background information, the more analytically demanding components specifically problem statements, specific objectives, research questions, and theoretical frameworks were frequently absent, incomplete, or inadequately developed. This pattern aligns with earlier observations by Swales (1990) and Lim (2012), who noted that researchers often demonstrate stronger competence in establishing research territory than in executing the more rhetorically sophisticated moves of gap identification and niche occupation. The mean structural completeness score of 4.79 out of 8, combined with a mean rhetorical coherence score of 6.43 out of 10, suggests that even articles accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals frequently fall short of optimal structural standards a finding that calls into question the extent to which the peer review process systematically evaluates introduction quality as a criterion for acceptance.

The bivariate and SEM results further revealed that the relationship between structural components and rhetorical coherence is not uniform across all elements: problem statement clarity, objective alignment, and gap identification consistently emerged as the most powerful predictors of perceived introduction quality. This hierarchy of structural importance has meaningful pedagogical implications. It suggests that writing instruction and framework development efforts should prioritize the cultivation of skills in problem articulation and objective formulation over the mere accumulation of background information a reorientation that challenges the common tendency in research writing courses to overemphasize literature reviewing at the expense of gap analysis and problem construction. The moderate but significant contribution of theoretical framework presence to rhetorical coherence further suggests that conceptual grounding, while not the primary driver of quality, plays a meaningful supporting role that warrants explicit instruction, particularly in disciplines such as social sciences where its inclusion was found to be most inconsistent. These findings collectively support the argument advanced by Bhatia (1993) that expert communicators in academic genres distinguish themselves not simply by knowing what to include, but by understanding why each element exists and how it functions within the broader argumentative structure of the text.

The significant disciplinary differences in structural completeness observed in Table 3 added an important layer of complexity to the study's findings, underscoring that introduction-writing practices are not discipline-neutral but are shaped by field-specific epistemological traditions, editorial norms, and reporting cultures. The relatively stronger structural completeness observed in public health articles may reflect the discipline's increasing alignment with standardized reporting frameworks and evidence-based communication norms, while the lower completeness scores in social sciences articles may reflect the field's broader tolerance for narrative and interpretive framing that does not always conform to the positivist structural template used in this study. These findings suggest that the proposed framework, while empirically validated, should not be applied as a rigid universal prescription but rather as a flexible, adaptable scaffold that researchers can calibrate to the conventions of their specific disciplinary context. Future research should therefore explore how the framework performs across a wider range of disciplines, including the natural sciences and humanities, and should investigate whether disciplinary gatekeepers' editors and reviewers differentially weight structural completeness when evaluating manuscripts for publication.

CONCLUSION

This study set out to develop and empirically validate a structural framework for crafting effective introductions in empirical research articles, and the evidence generated across univariate, bivariate, and structural equation modeling analyses consistently affirmed both the need for and the utility of such a framework. The findings demonstrated that structural completeness particularly with respect to problem statement clarity, gap identification, objective alignment, and research questions specificity is a significant and measurable determinant of rhetorical coherence in empirical research introductions, and that adherence to a structured framework was perceived as highly useful by early-career researchers across disciplines. Disciplinary variation in structural completeness further highlighted the importance of context-sensitive application of the framework. Collectively, these results make a strong empirical case for integrating structured introduction-writing frameworks into research training programs and academic writing curricula, with the aim of improving the quality, coherence, and communicative impact of empirical research across the scholarly community.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Integration into Research Training Curricula: Universities and research institutions should formally incorporate structured introduction-writing frameworks — anchored in the five core elements of background, gap identification, problem statement, objectives, and research questions into postgraduate research methodology courses, particularly for early-career researchers who demonstrated the greatest need for guided structural support.

Discipline-Specific Adaptation of the Framework: Journal editors, writing instructors, and academic departments should develop discipline-specific versions of the structural framework that respect epistemological and genre conventions within fields such as social sciences, while still promoting the inclusion of the core structural components found to most strongly predict rhetorical coherence.

Incorporation of Structural Criteria into Peer Review Guidelines: Journal editors should consider embedding explicit structural evaluation criteria for research article introductions into their reviewer guidelines and manuscript assessment rubrics, ensuring that the quality of the introduction including the clarity of the problem statement and alignment of objectives is systematically evaluated as part of the publication decision-making process.

References.

Arthurs, L. A. (2019). Undergraduate geoscience education research: Evolution of an emerging field of discipline-based education research. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *56*(2). https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21471

Biomedical, V. K.-A. J. of, & 2022, undefined. (2022). Research process, study variables, statistical validations, and sampling methods in public health related research: an update. *Article.Scibiomedicalresearch.Com*, *10*(1).

Bouter, L. (2020). What Research Institutions Can Do to Foster Research Integrity. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, *26*(4). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-020-00178-5

Branch, K., Brian, N., & Enock, Z. (2023). Corresponding: Author: research.miu.ac.ug/publications INTERNAL CONTROL SYSTEM AND ORGANISATIONAL PERFOMANCE, ACASE STUDY OF POST. In *METROPOLITAN JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS (MJBE* (Vol. 2, Number 7).

Chen, L. (2022). Economic development collaboration in public administration research: A systematic literature review. *Chinese Public Administration Review*, *13*(1–2). https://doi.org/10.1177/15396754221105315

Chun Tie, Y., Birks, M., & Francis, K. (2019). Grounded theory research: A design framework for novice researchers. *SAGE Open Medicine*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.1177/2050312118822927

Garba, T. (2023). Research Methodology : A Quantitative Approach Research Methodology : A Quantitative Approach. *12th August, 2023, Organised*, (August).

Goji, T., Hayashi, Y., & Sakata, I. (2020). Evaluating "startup readiness" for researchers: case studies of research-based startups with biopharmaceutical research topics. *Heliyon*, *6*(6). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e04160

Hayashi, P., Abib, G., & Hoppen, N. (2019). Validity in qualitative research: A processual approach. *Qualitative Report*, *24*(1). https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2019.3443

Kalpokaite, N., & Radivojevic, I. (2019). Demystifying qualitative data analysis for novice qualitative researchers. *Qualitative Report*, *24*(13). https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2019.4120

Kazaara, A. I., & Nancy, M. (2025). Effective Presentation Styles for Academic Defenses: A Typology and Analysis for Researchers and Students. In *International Journal of Academic and Applied Research* (Vol. 9). www.ijeais.org/ijaar

Kennedy, M. R., Deans, Z., Ampollini, I., Breit, E., Bucchi, M., Seppel, K., Vie, K. J., & Meulen, R. ter. (2023). "It is Very Difficult for us to Separate Ourselves from this System": Views of European Researchers, Research Managers, Administrators and Governance Advisors on Structural and Institutional Influences on Research Integrity. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *21*(3). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-022-09469-x

Mehnaz, L., & Yang, C. (2025). Women in accounting research: a review of gender diversity, equity and inclusion. In *Meditari Accountancy Research* (Vol. 33, Number 7). https://doi.org/10.1108/MEDAR-05-2024-2479

Nababi, N. L., & Nelson, K. (2025). Corresponding: Author: research@miu.ac.ug/publications Production Of Painting On The Effects Of Traditional Circumcision On Boys Academic Performance. A Case Study Of Mbale District. In *Metropolitan Journal Of Social And Educational Research* (Vol. 4).

Nelson, K., Christopher, F., & Milton, N. (2022). *Teach Yourself Spss and Stata*. *6*(7), 84–122.

Nelson, K., Kazaara, A. G., & Kazaara, A. I. (2023). *Teach Yourself E-Views*. *7*(3), 124–145.

Nolte, I., Jones, R., Taiyari, K., & Occhiali, G. (2016). Research note exploring survey data for historical and anthropological research: Muslim-christian relations in south-west nigeria. *African Affairs*, *115*(460). https://doi.org/10.1093/afraf/adw035

O'Sullivan, L., & Ring, E. (2021). A potpourri of philosophical and child development research-based perspectives as a way forward for early childhood curricula and pedagogy: reconcilable schism or irreconcilable severance? *Early Child Development and Care*, *191*(7–8). https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2020.1871334

Papaeti, A., & Grant, M. J. (2023). RESEARCH ETHICS. In *The Routledge Handbook of Music and Migration: Theories and Methodologies*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003309437-38

Rantala, E., Balatsas-Lekkas, A., Sozer, N., & Pennanen, K. (2022). Overview of objective measurement technologies for nutrition research, food-related consumer and marketing research. In *Trends in Food Science and Technology* (Vol. 125). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2022.05.006

Rejeb, A., Rejeb, K., Appolloni, A., Zailani, S., & Iranmanesh, M. (2025). Navigating the landscape of public–private partnership research: a novel review using latent Dirichlet allocation. In *International Journal of Public Sector Management* (Vol. 38, Number 2). https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-09-2023-0263

Roje, R., Reyes Elizondo, A., Kaltenbrunner, W., Buljan, I., & Marušić, A. (2023). Factors influencing the promotion and implementation of research integrity in research performing and research funding organizations: A scoping review. *Accountability in Research*, *30*(8). https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2022.2073819

Roje, R., Tomić, V., Buljan, I., & Marušić, A. (2023). Development and implementation of research integrity guidance documents: Explorative interviews with research integrity experts. *Accountability in Research*, *30*(6). https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2021.1989676

Ruiz-Real, J. L., Uribe-Toril, J., Torres, J. A., & Pablo, J. D. E. (2021). Artificial intelligence in business and economics research: Trends and future. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, *22*(1). https://doi.org/10.3846/jbem.2020.13641

Singhania, M., Chadha, G., & Prasad, R. (2024). Sustainable finance research: Review and agenda. *International Journal of Finance and Economics*, *29*(4). https://doi.org/10.1002/ijfe.2854

Toyon, M. A. S. (2021). Explanatory sequential design of mixed methods research: Phases and challenges. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147- 4478)*, *10*(5). https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v10i5.1262

Vom Brocke, J., Winter, R., Hevner, A., & Maedche, A. (2020). Special issue editorial – accumulation and evolution of design knowledge in design science research: A journey through time and space. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, *21*(3). https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00611

Walker, J. L. (2012). The use of saturation in qualitative research. *Canadian Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing = Journal Canadien En Soins Infirmiers Cardio-Vasculaires*, *22*(2).

Walkington, H. (2015). Students as researchers: Supporting undergraduate research in the disciplines in higher education. *The Higher Education Academy*.

Weerasinghe, W. P. S. W., Jayathilaka, K. D. M. I., Prasadi, W. V. C., Goonetilleke, M. D. K. M., De Silva, D. I., & Samarasekara, P. (2022). Research on Hotel Management System. *International Journal of Engineering and Management Research*, *12*(5). https://doi.org/10.31033/ijemr.12.5.27

Zimba, O., & Gasparyan, A. Y. (2021). Plagiarism detection and prevention: A primer for researchers. *Reumatologia*, *59*(3). https://doi.org/10.5114/reum.2021.105974

Zwart, H., & Ter Meulen, R. (2019). Addressing research integrity challenges: From penalising individual perpetrators to fostering research ecosystem quality care. In *Life Sciences, Society and Policy* (Vol. 15, Number 1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40504-019-0093-6