HOW TO WRITE A RESEARCH PAPER: A COMPREHENSIVE GUIDE FOR STUDENTS

Arshad Syed Karim*
Mahnoor Shaikh**

Abstract

Writing a research paper is among the most demanding tasks in academic education and yet it is among the least systematically taught. Although resources such as the APA Publication Manual, Creswell and Creswell's research design texts, and Saunders, Lewis handbook each address aspects of the research process authoritatively, but no single resource integrates structural guidance, methodological reasoning, and the practical logic of academic research within one accessible framework. This guide fills that gap by drawing on current academic writing literature and research methods pedagogy, providing a comprehensive, component-by-component framework for writing an original empirical research paper, a case study, and a review article or book review. This paper will equip students to approach each section with a clear understanding of its purpose, frameworks, and methodological reasoning, enabling them to produce work that meets the standards of peer-reviewed publication. The guide serves as a primary teaching and self-study resource for instructors and students across the social sciences, education, and allied health disciplines.

Keywords: academic writing, research methodology, mixed methods research, literature review, APA style, research design, case study, book review

How to Write a Research Paper: A Comprehensive Guide for Students

Among all the tasks that academic life requires, a research paper is probably the one that students despise the most and institutions underperform. The difference between having an idea of what a research paper should include and producing one that is coherent, credible and complete can be a very wide gap. This paper tries to bridge that gap.

This work is Licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial 4.0 International License.
*Arshad Syed Karim Former Fulbright Distinguish Professor, New York State University, Stonybrook, LI, NY, USA.

** Mahnoor Shaikh MPhil in Education Institute of Business Management Karachi, Pakistan.

A research paper is a logical, evidence-based argument that is intended to add original knowledge to a discipline. Research is published in professional journals as the discipline must know something it did not know before, whether it is a new empirical finding, a new theoretical framework, or a new use of existing knowledge. For students, the intent is similar: a research paper is an exercise that shows that you can construct a significant question, identify and assess the evidence, develop or conduct a study, analyse and interpret what you have discovered and present it all in a manner that the academic community recognizes as the rigorous.

The guide discusses each of the major structural parts of a standard research paper sequentially starting with the title and abstract up to the reference list, explaining what each part requires, why it matters, and where students make the most errors. Three areas are given specific coverage: keywords and field-specific controlled vocabulary databases, the entire logic of hypothesis construction, and research methodology including qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods and the Research Onion framework. A dedicated section on limitations and future research is also included, since it's a structural requirement is mostly absent from student writing samples. Each part concludes with a practical tip to help students begin correctly and check their work against a concrete standard. The guide follows the conventions of the APA seventh edition. In addition to the standard empirical research paper, the guide includes dedicated sections on two further paper types that students are frequently required to produce: the case study, with its distinct requirements for case selection, multiple-source evidence, and analytical generalizability; and the review article or book review, which calls for critical evaluation rather than summary and demands a balanced, scholarly tone throughout.

> ***Tip for Students:*** *Before you read further, write down answers to three questions: What is your research question? Why does it matter? What kind of evidence would count as a genuine answer? If you cannot answer all three clearly, you are not yet ready to write. Return to them after reading the Introduction and Choosing a Research Topic sections. A paper that cannot be summarised in three answers does not yet have a clear enough focus.*

Choosing a Research Topic

Every research paper begins with a topic. Choosing the right topic is arguably the most important step, because everything else, including your methods, analysis, and conclusions, flows from it. A good topic should be focused enough to be manageable but significant enough to be worth investigating. Before committing, ask yourself four questions: Is this research new and interesting? Is it intellectually challenging? Does it relate to a current and important issue in the discipline? And will it give solutions or insights that other people would find helpful?

Students tend to select either too wide or narrow topics. A well-scoped topic lies between these two extremes, answering a particular question that can be addressed using the

available data and methods within the given timeframe. One of the strongest justifications to have a research project is to identify what is already known and what gaps to address, which you can do by reading some recent journal articles in your field beforehand (LaPlaca et al., 2018; Annersten and Wredling, 2006).

> ***Tip for Students:*** *Try to put your research topic as one clear question. For example, rather than stating that your subject is 'social media and teenagers', write: What is the impact of the use of social media on the self-esteem of teenagers aged between 13 and 17? Every other decision that you will make in your paper will be guided by a focused question.*

The Title

The title of a research paper is what a reader sees first and forms the first impression. A good title should be specific enough to describe the contents of the paper while also being engaging enough to draw a reader's attention. It must state the primary problem, differentiate the paper subject with other similar topics, and avoid unnecessary words, ambiguous phrases, and unfamiliar abbreviations (LaPlaca et al., 2018).

A practical way is to think of the title as a summary of your core argument or finding. In some cases, a title based on the outcome of the study is more effective than a title that merely identifies the topic. For example, "Social Media Use Reduces Academic Performance in University Students" is more informative and engaging than "Social Media and Students". The title should tell the reader exactly what the paper is about without requiring them to read the abstract first.

In APA 7th edition format, the title appears on its own title page, centered and in bold. It should not exceed 12 words where possible, and it should not contain words that add no meaning, such as "a study of" or "an investigation into." The title is best finalized after the paper has been written.

> ***Tip for Students:*** *Write three to five possible titles for your paper before choosing: One. Then ask a classmate to read each title and describe what they think the paper is about. If their description matches your actual paper, the title is working well. If it does not, revise it for clarity and specificity.*

The Abstract

The abstract is a concise summary of the entire research paper. It appears at the beginning of the paper, directly after the title page, but it should be written last, after all other sections have been completed. This is because the abstract must accurately reflect the content of the finished paper, and it is impossible to summarize a paper you have not yet

written.

A well-written abstract serves as an advertisement for the paper. Many readers decide whether to read a full article based solely on its abstract. LaPlaca et al. (2018) emphasize that the abstract has to mention the research question, the framework of the research, methodology used, and, most importantly, the key findings. Many students explain what they intended to do without stating what they actually discovered, which is a major flaw.

There are three main types of abstracts. The *indicative abstract* outlines the topics covered in a paper so that the reader can decide whether to read it. The *informative abstract* summarizes the paper according to the standard structure of introduction, methods, results, and discussion. The *structured abstract* follows specific headings required by certain journals, such as purpose, methodology, findings, and implications. For most student papers, an informative abstract is the appropriate choice (LaPlaca et al., 2018).

In APA 7th edition format, the abstract should be between 150 and 250 words, written as a single paragraph without indentation, and placed on its own page with the label "Abstract" centered and in bold at the top. No references should be cited in the abstract, and technical jargon should be avoided wherever possible.

> ***Tip for Students:*** *Write your abstract by answering five questions in sequence: (1) what is the research question? (2) Why does this question matter? (3) How did you study it (method)? (4) What did you find? (5) What does this mean? If your abstract answers all five questions clearly and within 200 words, it is likely a strong abstract.*

Keywords

Picture two researchers working on almost identical studies, both published in the same year, both equally rigorous. One paper accumulates hundreds of citations over the next decade. The other is barely noticed. In many cases, the difference comes down to something deceptively simple: keywords. Keywords are three to five words or short phrases that are located under your abstract and inform academic databases of what your paper is all about. They are not decorative. They are functional infrastructure. When a scholar in any corner of the world enters a search term in PubMed, Scopus, or Google Scholar, the database will compare the search term with the keywords of millions of articles indexed in the database. Provided that your keywords are properly selected, then your paper will appear in the results. If they are poorly chosen, then your work will be hidden in the archive no matter how good it is (LaPlaca et al., 2018). The majority of large databases combine two overlapping methods of retrieval: *free-text searching*, where titles, abstracts, and author key words are searched against exact words, and *controlled vocabulary searching*, where a standardised list of terms, maintained by experts, is used to index all articles, irrespective of how each author worded their work.

Different disciplines have developed their own controlled vocabularies. In the

biomedical and life sciences, the authoritative resource is Medical Subject Headings, universally known as MeSH. Developed by the United States National Library of Medicine, MeSH is a hierarchically organised thesaurus of approximately 30,000 standardised terms used to index every article in PubMed and MEDLINE. MeSH can be browsed at ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh, and the NLM's MeSH on Demand tool will suggest appropriate terms when you paste you're abstract into it.

Students working in other disciplines have equivalent resources. Those in psychology and the behavioral sciences should consult the APA Thesaurus of Psychological Index Terms, the controlled vocabulary used by APA PsycInfo. Nursing and allied health researchers should use CINAHL Subject Headings, the controlled vocabulary of the CINAHL database, which covers nursing, midwifery, and all allied health professions. Education researchers have the ERIC Thesaurus, maintained by the United States Department of Education, which standardizes terminology across the fields of teaching, learning, curriculum, and educational policy. Researchers in sociology and social work can turn to the Thesaurus of Sociological Indexing Terms used by Sociological Abstracts. Business and management scholars will find that databases such as Business Source Complete and Scopus.

Best practice is to align author-supplied keywords as closely as possible with the controlled vocabulary of the relevant database, which maximises discoverability and signals indexing awareness to editors and reviewers. In APA 7th edition format, keywords appear on the abstract page on a new indented line following the label Keywords in italics and a colon. Keywords are written in lowercase, separated by commas unless they include a proper noun, and most journals request three to five terms of no more than four words each. Complete sentences, vague terms, and non-standard abbreviations should all be avoided.

> ***Tip for Students:*** *Before finalizing your keywords, open the controlled: Vocabulary database for your field and search for each of your proposed terms. If your proposed keyword appears as an official term, use the exact phrasing the database uses, not your own variation. If your term does not appear, find the closest official term and use that instead. This single step can significantly increase the number of researchers who find and cite your work.*

The Introduction

Introduction is the first part of the main body of the paper and it plays critical role because it helps establishing the background and importance of the study. A good introduction serves the four primary purposes: it focuses the reader on the research question or purpose, it sets the appropriate frame of reference, it shows a gap in the current

knowledge that the research will fill, and it persuades the reader that the research is worth undertaken (LaPlaca et al., 2018).The introduction usually starts with a general overview of the topic, with background information on the topic, and then narrows progressively toward the research questions or hypothesis.

Such a structure is referred as the 'funnel' approach: begin with the broad picture and narrow down. In the process, the writer ought to provide a summary of the literature that is already available to demonstrate what is already known and in what ways the current study fits into the body of knowledge. One of the most important components of the introduction is to determine the research gap. A gap refers to a question that has not been answered, a population that has not been researched, or a conflict between the findings of earlier research that is yet to be resolved. The identification of the gap by the writer justifies why the current study is required. This answers the fundamental question every reviewer and reader has: "So what?" Why does this research matter, and what new understanding will it provide (LaPlaca et al., 2018)?

The introduction should end with a clear statement of the research purpose or question. This statement acts as a bridge between the background information and the methodology section that follows. In APA format, the introduction does not require a heading, as it is understood to be the introductory section. The heading "Introduction" is not used in APA 7th edition papers.

> ***Tip for Students:*** *A common mistake students make is writing an introduction that: is simply a list of facts about a broad topic. Instead, structure your introduction as a logical argument. Every sentence should build toward the conclusion that your specific research question needs to be asked and answered. If a sentence does not contribute to that argument, consider removing it.*

The Literature Review

The literature review is one of the most intellectually demanding sections of any research paper, and it is also one of the most commonly misunderstood. Many students treat it as a shopping list of summaries: here is what Smith found, here is what Jones found, here is what Williams found. This approach produces a literature review that reads like an annotated bibliography rather than a scholarly argument. A genuine literature review does something far more ambitious. It synthesizes what is already known, reveals where the gaps lie, and builds the case for why your specific study is the logical and necessary next step (LaPlaca et al., 2018; Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

The first challenge in writing a literature review is deciding which sources to include. Not all published work is equally credible or relevant. Students should prioritize peer-reviewed journal articles over textbooks, websites, or general-audience publications. Within the peer-reviewed literature, sources should be evaluated on several dimensions. How recent is the study? In fast- moving fields such as medicine, nursing, or technology, a study more than five to ten years old may have been superseded by newer findings. In the humanities and certain social sciences, older foundational works retain their

importance, but they should generally be supplemented with more recent literature. A useful rule of thumb is that 70 to 80 per cent of your cited sources should be from the last ten years, with older sources included only when they are genuinely seminal works whose influence on the field is still felt and acknowledged (Scribbr, 2025). Seminal works, identifiable by high citation counts and sustained influence, belong in the review regardless of publication date.

Beyond recency, students should evaluate each source for methodological quality. A study with a large, representative sample provides stronger evidence than one based on a small convenience sample. A peer-reviewed article published in a reputable journal has passed external review; a conference paper or preprint has not. When two studies reach conflicting conclusions, the one with the stronger methodology deserves greater weight, and the conflict itself should be noted and discussed in your review rather than ignored. Critical engagement distinguishes a literature review from a summary (Purdue OWL, 2024).

The structure of a literature review should be thematic rather than chronological or author-by-author. Organise the literature around the key concepts, debates, or dimensions of your research question, discussing within each theme what has been established, where evidence is strong or contested, and where gaps remain. The final theme should build directly toward your own research question, showing how your study fills an identified gap or resolves an unresolved debate.

Students should be careful to draw on primary sources, which are the original research articles themselves, rather than relying on secondary accounts in textbooks or review articles. Citing a textbook's description rather than the original study introduces secondhand error and signals that you have not engaged directly with the literature; primary sources should form the backbone of the review. In APA 7th edition format, all sources are cited using the author-date system within the text, for example (Smith, 2020), and every in-text citation must correspond to a full reference entry at the end of the paper. Direct quotations additionally require a page number, for example (Smith, 2020, p. 45).

> ***Tip for Students:*** *Before you write a single sentence of your literature review build a synthesis matrix. Draw a table with your key themes or research questions along the top as column headers and each of your sources listed down the left side as row labels. Then fill in each cell with a brief note about what that source says about that theme. When you sit down to write, you will not be summarizing sources one by one; you will be describing patterns across sources column by column. This single technique will transform a list of summaries into a genuine synthesis.*

The Research Hypothesis

If the introduction is the story of why your research question matters, then the hypothesis is the moment you put your money where your mouth is. A research hypothesis is a precise, testable prediction about the relationship between two or more variables. It takes the theoretical argument you have built in the literature review and converts it into a specific, falsifiable statement that your data can either support or contradict. By having a hypothesis, one is committing oneself even before looking at the findings, and that commitment is what provides the research intellectual honesty and scientific credibility (LaPlaca et al., 2018).

It is worth understanding what a hypothesis is not. A hypothesis is not a question (that is the research question). It is not a guess or a wish. And it is not at all a statement so obviously true that nobody would deny it. This is one of the most frequent criticism that reviewers have of student research. When a hypothesis merely paraphrases the common knowledge in scientific language, it adds nothing to the field. A hypothesis must be worth testing: genuinely uncertain, grounded in theory, and informative regardless of which direction the result goes.

Research hypotheses generally come in two paired forms: the null hypothesis and the alternative hypothesis. The *null hypothesis*, written as H0, asserts that there is no significant effect, relationship, or difference between the variables being studied. It is the default assumption, the position that says nothing interesting is happening in the data. The *alternative hypothesis*, written as H1 or Ha, proposes the opposite: that an effect, relationship, or difference does exist. In most research, the goal is to gather enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis, thereby lending statistical support to the alternative. Researchers never prove a hypothesis; they either reject the null or fail to reject it. The word prove has no place in this vocabulary. Researchers must also choose between directional and non-directional predictions. A *directional hypothesis* specifies both that a relationship exists and the direction it takes: students who sleep fewer than six hours will score significantly lower on assessments than those who sleep eight or more. A *non-directional hypothesis* simply predicts that a difference or relationship exists, without specifying direction. Directional hypotheses are more desirable when previous theory supports a certain prediction, because they generate more accurate interpretations (LaPlaca et al., 2018).

All studies that rely on hypotheses have to deal with two kinds of error. *Type I error* happens when the null hypothesis is rejected when it is true, i.e. a false effect is found. A *Type II error* is the opposite: not rejecting the null when the alternative is true, and thus missing a real effect.

Type II error is directly proportional to the size of the sample, as small samples decrease

statistical power. An underpowered sample cannot test a well-stated hypothesis, which is wasted theoretical work (LaPlaca et al., 2018).

A formal hypothesis is not necessary in all research papers. Hypothesis belongs to the quantitative and some mixed methods studies whereby a prediction is made prior to data collection and is tested statistically. Qualitative research is directed by open research questions that start with how, what, why and allow trends to be discovered within the data, as opposed to testing pre- determined predictions. Mixed methods research can include both (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2018).Students should explain at the beginning that what kind of inquiry their research is and align their guiding statements accordingly.

> ***Tip for Students:*** *Write a hypothesis following a simple formula If [independent variable changes in a certain way], then [dependent variable will respond in a specific direction], because [brief theoretical reason].' For example: If university students start to exercise more (30 minutes daily), their self-reported stress levels will decrease significantly, since exercise is known to lower cortisol secretion.' This structure compels one to be specific about variables, prediction, and theoretical justification, which are the three things every strong hypothesis needs.*

The Methods Section

The methods section explains exactly how the research was conducted. Its two primary functions are to demonstrate that the study was conducted in compliance with the scientific standards and to present sufficient information that would allow another researcher to replicate the study (LaPlaca et al., 2018). When a reader cannot comprehend how a study was conducted, the reader cannot assess how much to trust its results.

A thorough methods section discusses four components: the research design, which may be descriptive, cross-sectional, longitudinal, or experimental; the sample, including who was included, how many, and how they were selected, quantitative studies should statistically justify sample size by a power analysis (Annersten and Wredling, 2006). Any known limitations of the chosen method should be acknowledged here and developed further in the discussion section.

The choice of method must always be justified in relation to the research question. Choosing a method simply because it is fashionable or because it was used in a similar study is not sufficient justification. Every methodological decision should be driven by what is most appropriate for answering the specific question at hand
(LaPlaca et al., 2018).

> ***Tip for Students:*** *A simple way to test whether your methods section is complete is to give it to someone who was not involved in your study. Ask them whether they*

could repeat the study based on what you wrote. If they say no, or if they have questions about how you did something, those are the areas you need toclarify.

Qualitative Research, Quantitative Research, and Methodological Pluralism

The choice of how you gather and process information is among the most basic decisions in research design, and it is determined by the nature of your research question. Qualitative and quantitative approaches are not opposing philosophies, but rather they are two distinct tools to be used in different intellectual tasks, and selecting the appropriate one is an indicator of a thoughtful researcher.

Quantitative research involves working with numbers and quantifying and testing the relationships between variables by using statistical analysis. Quantitative methods are the right methods to consider in order to know the strength of a relationship, whether groups differ significantly, or whether one variable predicts another. Research in this tradition utilises large samples, structured surveys, or experiments, and their power is in precision, replication, and the ability to generalise the results to other groups outside the study sample (LaPlaca et al., 2018).

Qualitative research uses words, images and meaning, trying to comprehend how people experience the world, and why phenomena happen as they do. When a research question starts with why or how instead of how much or how many qualitative methods will probably be the more suitable option. Some of the common designs are in-depth interviews, focus groups, ethnographic observation and textual analysis. Sample sizes are also small since the aim is depth rather than representativeness and results are in the form of themes and interpretations, not coefficients. Qualitative methods particularly prove useful in exploratory research, where the field lacks a theory.

Methodological pluralism refers to the understanding that no single approach can be used to describe all aspects of a complex phenomenon. The most commonly used form of it is mixed methods research, which combines both qualitative and quantitative data in one study to answer both confirmatory and exploratory questions at the same time (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2018; LaPlaca et al., 2018). The paradigm wars of the previous decades, that the two traditions were philosophically incompatible, have been much replaced by a pragmatic insight: what is important is whether the method is appropriate to the question.

In practice, there are three common designs of mixed methods studies. *An exploratory sequential design* starts with a qualitative data collection, then designs a quantitative survey based on the themes identified, and tests the generalizability of those themes. *An explanatory sequential design* works in reverse, providing qualitative data to explain patterns identified quantitatively. *A convergent design* gathers the two types at the same time and makes comparisons.

Tip for Students: *A simple rule of thumb for choosing your method if you can express your research question as a number, go quantitative. If the most honest and complete answer to your question requires a human story, go qualitative. If your question has both a measurable dimension and a lived dimension,*

consider mixed methods. The method should always serve the question, not the other way around. Choosing a method because it feels easier, or because your supervisor prefers it, or because it is fashionable in your field, is one of the most common methodological mistakes in student research.

The Research Onion: A Framework for Designing Your Methodology

Most students approach methodology by asking: which method should I use to collect data? This is a reasonable starting point, but it skips several prior questions whose answers shape and constrain every methodological choice that follows. A conceptual framework created by Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill provides a systematic means of conceptualizing the relationships between these levels of decision-making (Saunders et al., 2019). The metaphor is actually intentional and precise: you cannot peel an onion inside out, and you cannot construct a coherent methodology starting with the data collection stage. You must start from the outside in, addressing each layer in order.

The Research Onion Framework

Note. Adapted from *Research Methods for Business Students* (8th ed.), by Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill (2019), Pearson.

The outermost layer is research philosophy: the assumptions a researcher has regarding the nature of reality, knowledge, and the place of values in research. These are categorized as ontology (what reality is), epistemology (what counts as valid knowledge) and axiology (how the values of the researcher influence the process). According to Saunders et al. (2019), there are five philosophical stances, including positivism, critical realism, interpretivism, postmodernism, and pragmatism. A positivist believes that there is objectivity and measurability of reality. An interpretivist believes that human meaning constructs social reality and thus it is contextual. A pragmatist adopts any philosophical position that can answer the research question in the best way possible, and that is why most mixed methods work relies on pragmatism.

The second layer is the theory development strategy. A deductive method begins with a prior theory or hypothesis and compares it to data, which is the dominant logic of quantitative research. Inductive approach begins with data, recognizes patterns and constructs new theory starting with the bottom up. An abductive method switches between theory and data and builds the most optimal explanation of an observed phenomenon. The methodology selected not only explains what method is suitable but also what type of contribution the study is justified to make (Saunders et al., 2019).

The third layer is methodological choice, which refers to the overall design logic guiding

how data will be collected and analyzed. Saunders et al. (2019) distinguish between mono-method, multi-method, and mixed-methods designs. A mono-method study uses a single data collection technique and corresponding analysis procedure, such as a survey analyzed statistically or interviews analyzed thematically. A multi-method design employs multiple techniques within the same methodological tradition, for example, combining questionnaires and experiments within quantitative research. A mixed-methods design integrates both qualitative and quantitative approaches within a single study, either sequentially or concurrently, to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the research problem. The choice at this layer must align with the research philosophy and theoretical approach, as it shapes how evidence is generated, interpreted, and integrated to answer the research question.

The fourth layer is research strategy: the plan of the procedure of data collection, which can be a survey, experiment, case study, ethnography, grounded theory, or action research. The fifth layer is the time horizon which questions whether data will be gathered at one point in time (cross-sectional) or over a long duration (longitudinal). Cross-sectional research is effective in taking snapshots; longitudinal designs are costly but necessary to monitor change over time (Saunders et al., 2019).

Techniques and procedures is the most central part of the Research Onion, and this is where most students start, and where the Methods section of this article is mainly located. The methods of data collection involve interviews, questionnaires, observation, focus groups and analysis of the documentary among other methods. Data analysis methods include statistical tests and regression models in quantitative data and thematic analysis, content analysis, and discourse analysis in qualitative data. The Research Onion's contribution is to remind the researcher that every technical choice expresses the deeper decisions made in the outer layers.

> ***Tip for Students:*** *When writing your methodology chapter, start from the outside: Of the Research Onion and work inward. Begin with one paragraph that states your research philosophy and briefly explains why it is appropriate for your question. For example: this study adopts a pragmatist philosophical stance, as the research question requires both quantitative measurement and qualitative contextual understanding. Then specify how you are going to develop the theory: this paper employs a deductive methodology, because the hypotheses are based on the existing theory and are tested with the help of empirical data. Then explain your methodological decision, your plan, your time frame and lastly your data collection and analysis approaches. Every decision must be visibly related to the previous one. Such a methodology written in this manner will be much more likely to appease a supervisor or reviewer than a methodology that merely enumerates methods without providing the rationale behind them.*

The Results Section

The findings section, also known as the results section, is a section that reveals what was

found in the research. It is a descriptive part that describes the data in a way that is as objective as possible without interpretation and commentary. The discussion section is where interpretation should be found. The most frequent error that student make is to place results and discussion in the same section, which tends to confuse and weaken both sections of the argument (LaPlaca et al., 2018).

In the case of quantitative studies, statistical findings are normally presented in a logical sequence that reflects the research questions or hypotheses that were mentioned in the previous parts of the paper. The first reported statistics are descriptive statistics (means, medians, and standard deviations) and the second ones are inferential statistics (t-tests, correlations, or regression results).For qualitative studies, thematic syntheses or narrative descriptions of interviews, observations or documents are presented in the results section. Illustrative quotations may be included as evidence but should not be presented as conclusions.

A note on APA 7th edition table and figure formatting is essential here because students frequently lose marks on presentation errors that are entirely avoidable. Every table must have a number (Table 1, Table 2, in bold) placed above the table, followed by a title in italicized title case on the next line (for example, Table 1 and then on the next line in italics: Descriptive Statistics for Academic Performance by Study Hours). A general note may appear below the table if the reader needs additional context to interpret it, preceded by the word Note in italics and a full stop. Figures follow the same pattern in reverse: the figure number and title appear below the figure, not above it.

> ***Tip for Students:*** *Before writing your results section, list all your research: Questions or hypotheses. Then write the results in the same order as the questions. This parallel structure makes it easy for readers to follow your findings and for you to ensure that you have addressed everything you set out to investigate. After you finish writing the section, go through every table and figure and ask: does this visual add information the reader cannot find in the text? If the answer is no, delete it. If yes, check that it has a properly formatted APA 7 number, title, and note.*

The Discussion Section

The discussion section is where the researcher gives an explanation of what the results imply. It is the intellectual core of the paper, where results are discussed in terms of the research questions, the literature that exists and the theoretical framework that was set in the introduction. A well-written discussion does not re-present the findings only, it justifies their importance, how they connect with what was already known, and what conclusions they have on theory, practice, or future research.

A properly organized discussion starts by going back to the research question and stating whether the findings justify or refute the hypothesis or expectation that was initially set. It then compares the results with those of other studies, pointing out where results are in agreement with the existing knowledge and where they differ. In case of divergence, the author should provide a reasonable argument as to why this could be so, based on the nature of the sample, the methodology or the study setting.

Tip for Students: *When you are writing your discussion, imagine that you are talking to the authors of the studies you mentioned in your literature review. Where do you agree with them? Where do your findings tell a different story? What are the unanswered questions raised by your study? Writing in this light will assist you to create a discussion that is truly analytical and not just descriptive.*

Limitations and Future Research Directions

No matter how well designed and well conducted, every research paper has its limitations. This is not a flaw, but a sincere aspect of empirical enquiry. No one study has the ability to cover all potential participants, to measure all the potential variables, to control all the potential confounding variables, and to apply its results to all populations and settings. A research that openly acknowledges its limitations is more reliable, since it shows that the researcher is knowledgeable about their methodology to the extent that they are aware of where they can and cannot take it.

Limitation is generally discussed in a research paper at the end of the discussion section, either at the beginning of the discussion section to put the interpretation of the findings into context or at the conclusion to indicate the way forward in future research. Students should focus on the limitations that can be directly related to the research question and which may possibly have influenced the results.

The limitations are categorised into three broad groups, i.e. methodological (a cross-sectional design is incapable of establishing causality; a convenience sample cannot be generalised outside of its context), empirical (the sample size might have been too small or the setting too narrow), and analytical (the statistical or interpretive method might have been limiting what can be discovered). Regarding every limitation, use a three-part format, namely, name the limitation, describe how it might have influenced the findings, and suggest how future studies can overcome it. This framework turns limitations from a list of weaknesses into a productive research agenda.

Future research directions ought to be a continuation of the limitations discussed above. In case this study employed a small sample, a future study ought to replicate the results with a larger and diverse population. Had the study been cross-sectional then the longitudinal design would have enabled future researchers to analyze change with time. These recommendations are not a mere formality; they lead the next researcher to fruitful questions and conclude the study with integrity and open the gateway to the future.

> ***Tip for Students:*** *When you write your limitations section, use a three step format when describing each limitation you have identified. First, name it clearly and specifically. Do not write 'the sample was small.' Write 'the sample consisted of 45 undergraduate students at a single urban university, which limits the generalizability of the findings to other populations and educational contexts.' Second, describe how this limitation could have influenced your results. Third, Suggest how it can be handled by future research.*

The Conclusion

The last part of the main body of the paper is the conclusion. It concludes the whole paper by summarizing the most significant findings and reiterating the value the research makes to the field. A proper conclusion is not a repetition of all that has been stated; instead, it summarizes the main points and justifies why the research is important in a bigger perspective.

The conclusion must respond to the so what question one final time. What do you think the reader should learn after all the analysis and discussion? What has been acquired which was previously unknown? What can be done with this knowledge in practice or as a guide to future research? These are the questions that the conclusion must answer, and it must be in a confident and clear way.

There are several things the conclusion should not do. It should not introduce new arguments, evidence, or citations that were not discussed in the body of the paper. It should not summarize every section in detail, as that is the function of the abstract. It should also avoid vague or overly cautious language such as "maybe" or "possibly" when describing findings that are well- supported. At the same time, it should not overstate the generalizability of results beyond what the data can support.

If the research has practical implications, for example, for educators, health professionals, or policymakers, these should be stated clearly in the conclusion. Implications show that the research has value beyond the academic context and that it can contribute to real-world decisions or improvements.

> ***Tip for Students:*** *A useful exercise before writing your conclusion is to imagine explaining your paper to a friend who has not read it. What would you say is the most important thing you found? Why does it matter? How would you answer? their question, 'So why did you study this?' Your answer to that imagined conversation is the core of your conclusion.*

The Reference List

The reference list appears at the end of the paper and provides complete bibliographic information for every source cited in the text. In APA 7th edition, the reference list begins on a new page with the heading "References" centered and in bold. All entries are listed alphabetically by the last name of the first author and formatted with a hanging indent, meaning that the first line of each entry is flush with the left margin while subsequent lines are indented by approximately half an inch.

APA 7th edition uses a specific format for different types of sources. For a journal article with a digital object identifier (DOI), the format is: Author, A. A., & Author, B. B. (Year). Title of article. Title of Journal, Volume (Issue), page-page. https://doi.org/xxxxx. For a book, the format is: Author, A. A. (Year). Title of work: Capital letter also for subtitle. Publisher. Students should consult the APA Publication Manual (7th edition) or Purdue OWL for guidance on edited books, book chapters, conference papers, and websites.

It is strongly recommended that students use a reference management tool such as Zotero, Mendeley, or EndNote. These tools allow you to store sources, generate citations automatically, and format reference lists according to different citation styles. Using such tools reduces errors and saves significant time, especially in longer research papers.

> ***Tip for Students:*** *One of the most common errors in student papers is the mismatch between in-text citations and the reference list. After completing your* paper, *go through every in-text citation and check that it appears in the reference list. Then check that every reference in the list has been cited somewhere in the text. This cross-check should become a standard part of your proofreading process.*

Ethical Considerations in Research

Ethical considerations should be addressed in any research that uses human subjects. Ethical behavior in research implies safeguarding the dignity, privacy and wellbeing of those involved at any given time. In case a study implies gathering data of individuals, be it in the form of surveys, interviews, or observations, the researcher should make sure that the participation is voluntary and that informed consent was obtained (Annersten and Wredling, 2006).

Informed consent implies that the participants are provided with all the correct information concerning the purpose of the study, their data, and any risks involved, agree willingly, and informed that they can pull out any time. In the majority of institutional contexts, research that involves human subjects should be endorsed by an

institutional review board or ethics committee prior to data collection.

Ethical behavior is also applied in the processing and disclosure of data. Researchers should not create, distort or report data in a selective manner to defend a desirable conclusion. They should be able to recognize the weaknesses of their research and reference the sources properly and they should not plagiarize in any way. Academic honesty is not merely a policy as dictated by the institutions; it is the basis on which the validity of research lies.

> ***Tip for Students:*** *If your research involves human participants, write a brief ethical considerations section in your methods.*

Writing a Case Study

A case study is a research strategy designed for in-depth investigation of a specific instance, event, organization, or situation. Unlike a standard empirical research paper, which tests hypotheses across a sample, a case study focuses intensively on a single unit of analysis in order to understand a complex phenomenon within its real-world context. The case study has become widely used in business and management, social sciences, education, and healthcare, particularly when the researcher is asking "why" and "how" questions rather than "how many" or "how much." It is especially appropriate when the boundary between the phenomenon and its context is not clearly defined, and when existing theory cannot adequately explain the situation being examined. A case study generally requires original data collected by the researcher. One of the first design decisions a researcher must make is whether to conduct a single-case study, which allows for deep, intensive analysis of one instance, or a multiple-case study, which examines several cases to identify patterns across them and strengthen the basis for analytical conclusions. Both are legitimate, but the choice must be justified in the introduction in relation to the research question.

The structure of a case study largely mirrors that of a standard research paper, but with several important differences. The title and introduction serve the same purposes, orienting the reader to the subject and establishing why the case is significant. However, the introduction must additionally justify why this particular case was selected. Is it a critical case that directly tests an established theory? Is it an extreme or unusual case that illuminates a process rarely observable elsewhere? Is it a representative or typical case whose findings can inform broader understanding stating the rationale for case selection is a requirement that distinguishes a case study from a general descriptive report?

The methods section of a case study must specify the data sources used. Case studies typically draw on multiple forms of evidence, including interviews, documents, archival records, direct observations, and physical artifacts. This use of multiple data sources, known as triangulation, is one of the strengths of the case study method because it allows the researcher to corroborate findings across different types of evidence, strengthening the credibility of the conclusions. The methods section should also describe how data were collected, how they were analyzed (commonly through thematic analysis or pattern matching against theoretical propositions), and how the researcher ensured rigor, for example through member checking, peer review of interpretations, or maintaining a case study database.

The results or findings section of a case study is where the evidence is presented, organized around the key themes or propositions that guided the inquiry. Unlike quantitative results sections, which report statistics, case study findings are typically narrative: they describe what the data revealed, supported by direct quotations from interviews, excerpts from documents, or descriptions of observed events. The researcher should present evidence systematically and transparently, allowing the reader to see the basis for the interpretations that follow in the discussion. Each piece of evidence should be tied explicitly to the research question it addresses, and the researcher should resist interpreting or arguing in this section, reserving that work for the discussion.

The discussion section of a case study has an additional obligation beyond interpreting findings: it must explicitly address the question of analytical generalizability. Unlike statistical generalization, which projects findings from a sample to a broader population, analytical generalization argues that the findings of the case extend or refine an existing theory. The researcher must connect the specific observations from the case back to theoretical propositions and explain what the case reveals about those theories. A case study that remains entirely descriptive, without engaging with theory, misses the primary scholarly contribution the method is capable of making. Citation and bibliography requirements are the same as for any research paper, and APA 7th edition format applies throughout.

> ***Tip for Students:*** *Before writing your case study, write down the answer to one question: what theoretical proposition is this case designed to examine or extend? If you cannot answer that question clearly, you are not yet ready to write. A case study without a theoretical anchor is a story, not a contribution to knowledge. Return to the literature, identify the gap or the theoretical debate your case speaks to, and let that anchor guide every section of your paper.*

Writing a Review Article or Book Review

A review article or book review is a distinct form of academic writing that evaluates a published work rather than reporting original empirical research. Its purpose is not simply to describe what an article or book contains, but to assess the quality, significance, and contribution of that work to its field. A well-executed review is an act of critical scholarship: it situates the work in the relevant literature, evaluates the author's

argument and methodology, identifies both strengths and weaknesses, describes the key findings or conclusions the author draws, and draws out the implications for research and practice. The review is typically around 1,000 words in length, or roughly three to four double-spaced pages, and should be written with enough concision that a reader can gain a comprehensive evaluation from a single brief reading.

The most important distinction between a review and a summary is this: a summary tells the reader what the work says, while a review tells the reader what the work is worth. The objective is to situate the historical and intellectual merit of the work and to evaluate critically the author's purpose, central thesis, key contentions, and methods of analysis. Students who write reviews that merely paraphrase the content of the article or book, chapter by chapter, have misunderstood the task. The evaluative voice of the reviewer must be present throughout.

A word on tone is essential, because students frequently err in one of two directions. Some write reviews that are purely celebratory, cataloguing the work's strengths while avoiding any critical engagement. Others adopt a dismissive tone that focuses disproportionately on weaknesses without acknowledging genuine contributions. Neither is acceptable in scholarly writing. The appropriate tone is analytical and balanced: a strong review acknowledges what the work accomplishes well and where it falls short, and it does both with specific evidence and reasoned argument rather than unsupported assertion. Even a work with significant limitations may have made a valuable contribution to its field, and a thorough review recognizes this.

The structure of a review article typically follows four stages. First, a brief introduction identifies the work being reviewed and establishes its relevance: what field does it address, what problem does it claim to solve, and who is its intended audience? Second, a concise overview of the work's central argument, organization, and main conclusions gives the reader enough context to follow the evaluation that follows. This summary should be kept brief, occupying no more than one quarter of the total length, and should never reproduce the structure of the work section by section. Third, and most substantially, the critical evaluation addresses the work's strengths and limitations. This includes assessing whether the thesis is clearly stated and adequately supported, whether the methodology is appropriate and rigorously applied, whether the evidence is sufficient and credibly interpreted, and whether the conclusions follow logically from the analysis. Fourth, a conclusion states the overall judgment: what is the significance of the work, to whom would it be most useful, and what does it contribute to or leave unresolved within the field?

Because the review is short, every sentence must do real evaluative work. Direct quotations from the reviewed work should be used sparingly and should rarely exceed a single sentence; their purpose is to illustrate a point, not to fill space. Where you refer to specific

passages, paraphrase concisely and integrate your evaluation in the same sentence. The challenge is to give the reader sufficient evidence from the text to understand your judgments while never allowing those references to crowd out the critical argument itself. All sources cited in the review, including the work under review, follow APA 7th edition format.

> ***Tip for Students:*** *After reading the work you are reviewing, write down three things before you begin drafting: (1) the author's central claim in one sentence, (2) the strongest thing about the work, and (3) the most significant limitation or gap. These three points should anchor your review. If your draft does not clearly address all three, it is not yet a genuine critical review. Write concisely: the goal is not to write more, but to communicate a comprehensive, independent evaluation in as few words as possible.*

General Writing Tips for a Strong Research Paper

Beyond structure, there are two principles that are applicable to the entire research paper. To begin with, there must be coherence and logical flow that cannot be compromised. Every paragraph must build on one thought, have a topic sentence at the start of the paragraph, and a transitional sentence at the end of the paragraph linking to the next paragraph. One of the most frequent causes of revisions demanded by reviewers is abrupt changes of logic. Second, simplicity is better than complexity. The most esteemed authors convey challenging thoughts in straightforward and exact language.

Revision is not optional. Every strong research paper goes through multiple drafts. Set a completed draft aside for at least a day before reviewing it, read it aloud to catch awkward phrasing, and ask a peer to review it before submission. A carefully revised paper is almost always substantially stronger than one submitted in its first draft form.

> ***Tip for Students:*** *Before submitting any research paper, run through this final checklist: Does your title accurately reflect your paper? Does your abstract include the research question, methodology, and key findings? Does your introduction end with a clear statement of purpose? Does your methods section contain enough detail for replication? Does your results section avoid interpretation? Does your discussion link back to the introduction? Does your conclusion answer the 'so what?' question? Is every citation in the text listed in your reference list?*

Conclusion

Writing a research paper is a skill that develops with practice. All sections have a unique and non-equivalent purpose: the title draws the attention of the reader, the abstract presents the overview of the argument, the introduction sets the context and gap, the methods section describes the way the study has been carried out, the results

present the findings, the discussion includes the meaning interpretation, and the references section includes a clear scholarly record.Learning these conventions takes investment, but students who make it will find that academic writing becomes progressively more natural and that the process of writing itself sharpens their thinking.

Finally, students are encouraged to read widely in their chosen field. Familiarity with well- written research articles is one of the most effective ways to develop an intuitive feel for the conventions, tone, and standards the discipline expects. Every paper read is a model to learn from, and every paper written is an opportunity to grow.

> ***Tip for Students:*** *Before you submit any research paper, read your conclusion one more time and ask yourself three questions. First, have I clearly stated what I found and why it matters? Second, does this conclusion close the circle by connecting back to the research question I raised in the introduction? Third, is there any new information here that I never discussed in the body of the paper? If the answer to the third question is yes, either move that information to the appropriate section or remove it. A conclusion that introduces new ideas at the last moment confuses the reader and undermines the coherence of the entire paper.*

References

American Psychological Association. (2020). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (7th ed.). https://doi.org/10.1037/0000165-000

Annersten, M., & Wredling, R. (2006). How to write a research proposal. *European Diabetes Nursing, 3*(2), 102–105. https://doi.org/10.1002/edn.21Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

LaPlaca, P., Lindgreen, A., & Vanhamme, J. (2018). How to write really good articles for premier academic journals. *Industrial Marketing Management, 68*, 202–209. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2017.11.014

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). *Research methods for business*

students (8th ed.). Pearson.

McCombes, S. (2025). *How to write a literature review: Guide, examples, and templates.*
Scribbr. https://www.scribbr.com/dissertation/literature-review/

Purdue Online Writing Lab. (2024). *Writing a literature review.* Purdue University. https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/conducting_research/writing_a_literature_revi ew.html