ktu faculty of social sciences, arts and humanities 1922

48/2026
Research Journal
Studies about Languages
pp. 95-114
ISSN 1648-2824 (print)
ISSN 2029-7203 (online)
DOI 10.5755/j01.sal.1.48.44141

APPLIED LINGUISTICS / TAIKOMOJI KALBOTYRA

Requirements for student thesis abstract guidelines: A comparative perspective from Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian universities

Received 01/2026 | Accepted 07/2026

HOW TO CITE: Laiveniece, D., Helviga, A., Hint, H., Ruskan, A., Lel-Rozentāle, Dz., & Dubova, A. (2025). Requirements for student thesis abstract guidelines: A comparative perspective from Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian universities. *Studies about Languages / Kalbų studijos*, 48, 95–114. https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.sal.1.48.44141

Requirements for student thesis abstract guidelines: A comparative perspective from Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian universities

Studentų baigiamųjų darbų anotacijų rengimo gairių lyginamoji analizė Latvijos, Lietuvos ir Estijos universitetuose

DIĀNA LAIVENIECE, Liepaja Academy of Riga Technical University, Latvia

ANITA HELVIGA, Liepaja Academy of Riga Technical University, Latvia

HELEN HINT, University of Tartu, Estonia

ANNA RUSKAN, Vilnius University, Lithuania

DZINTRA LELE-ROZENTĀLE, Liepaja Academy of Riga Technical University, Latvia

AGNESE DUBOVA, Liepaja Academy of Riga Technical University, Latvia

Abstract

This article investigates the genre of the student thesis abstract as conceptualized within the methodological guidelines of higher education institutions (HEIs) in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Although in the materials of all three Baltic countries the abstract is defined as a concise overview of the thesis, the analysis reveals major inconsistencies in the conceptualization of this genre. Borrowed terms such as *anotācija* (LV) / *anotacija* (LT) / *annotatsioon* (EE) coexist with the local labels of *summary*, often used interchangeably without a clear distinction. These terminological divergences might hinder students' understanding of the abstract as a defined academic genre.

A detailed review of the guidelines from twenty-nine HEIs shows that structural, linguistic, and functional aspects of abstracts are only sporadically defined. In some institutions, the purpose and composition of the abstract are taken for granted rather than explicitly described, leading to uneven practices and

uncertainty among students. Drawing on this comparative analysis, the study proposes a set of ten core elements essential for a well-organized abstract and highlights the distinction between the core and supplementary (such as keywords) elements of the abstract.

Our findings demonstrate a need for greater standardisation and pedagogical clarity. We argue for the integration of explicit guidelines and genre-based instruction into academic writing curricula. Aligning local practices more closely with internationally established models would help students produce more consistent, effective abstracts. Moreover, fostering cross-regional dialogue around abstract conventions, extending beyond the Baltic context, could enrich academic writing standards and enhance scholarly communication.

KEYWORDS: student thesis abstract, methodological guidelines, academic writing, genre standardization, Baltic universities, terminology inconsistency.

Introduction

An abstract is generally understood as a concise and factual summary that provides an overview of a longer text (Bhatia, 1993, p. 78). Although it is commonly regarded as a secondary or associated text, its purpose and rhetorical construction differ from those of the main body of a work (Hyland, 2004, p. 64). Accordingly, the abstract can be classified as a secondary-text genre that recapitulates the content of a primary document (Kretzenbacher, 1990, p. 11). This definition of the abstract is consistent with the international standard ISO 214 (1976, p. 1), which describes an abstract as "an abbreviated, accurate representation of the contents of a document, without added interpretation or criticism".

Research has shown that abstracts vary systematically across academic genres. For instance, thesis abstracts differ from research article abstracts in their rhetorical structures and metadiscourse patterns (El-Dakhs, 2018). Moreover, disciplinary conventions significantly influence how writers deploy linguistic resources in abstracts, particularly metadiscoursal devices used to organize information, express stance, and engage readers (Hyland, 2004; Hyland & Tse, 2005). These disciplinary differences are reflected in the ways writers guide readers through the text, emphasize the significance of their findings, and construct an authorial presence. Overall, these findings suggest that abstract writing requires mastery of genre-specific rhetorical conventions, which should be explicitly addressed in academic writing instruction.

From a pedagogical perspective, abstracts are sometimes perceived by students as a formal requirement or a largely mechanical task, which may result in reduced attention to their communicative complexity. However, academic writing scholarship emphasizes that the abstract plays a crucial role in communicating the content and significance of a study to potential readers (Hyland, 2004). Similarly, Koopman (1997) notes that despite the fact that an abstract is quite brief, "it must do almost as much work as the multi-page paper that follows it" (p. 1).

Building on this general understanding of the abstract as a genre, a substantial body of research has examined language use in student abstracts written in English as an L2 across different academic levels, with a focus on (1) abstract structure, i.e., adherence to move models, and (2) the distribution of linguistic elements within this genre. However, "student produced abstracts [..] remain a much-occluded part-genre" (Mathew & McCallum, 2024, p. 70). This suggests that, despite growing scholarly attention to student abstracts, this subgenre is still relatively underexplored and not fully theorized within genre research.

While numerous studies have examined the linguistic and rhetorical features of student-produced abstracts, including move structures, metadiscourse, and disciplinary variation (Hyland, 2000, 2004; Ren & Li, 2011; Male, 2018; El-Dakhs, 2018), considerably less attention has been paid to how abstracts are defined and taught through institutional methodological guidelines. Research addressing institutional instructions for abstract writing remains comparatively limited. In her studies on the language of Latvian and English scientific articles, Kalnbērziņa (2015, 2016) has examined language-use recommendations found in methodological materials. This analysis revealed differences among Latvian universities in their recommendations concerning the use of the passive voice and the expression of authorship (Kalnbērziņa, 2015, p. 152; 2016, pp. 53,

57). However, no specific attention has been paid to language use in the abstracts of students' final theses.

To date, no study has systematically examined the norms governing the writing of student thesis abstracts in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia as articulated in institutional methodological guidelines. This study addresses this gap by developing a comparative analysis of regionally comparable institutional guidelines and the norms they establish for writing student thesis abstracts.

The aim of this study is to develop a best-practice model of the student thesis abstract as a genre in Baltic higher education, based on a comparative analysis of normative requirements and recommendations found in the methodological guidelines of higher education institutions in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. To achieve this aim, the following tasks were carried out, where Tasks 1–3 are preparatory steps for Task 4:

1. Material pertaining to requirements for student thesis abstracts was extracted from the methodological guidelines of 29 higher education institutions in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.
2. The extracted material was analyzed to identify the main categories of abstract-related requirements and their defining features.
3. These features were compared in order to identify shared and divergent normative expectations across the three national contexts.
4. On this basis, a best-practice model of the student thesis abstract in Baltic higher education was developed.

Methodology

The research material from Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian higher education institutions was collected during the first half of 2025. The selection was based on a single criterion: the methodological guidelines had to be publicly available online and applicable for supporting students in the preparation of their bachelor's and master's theses. In some cases, annually updated versions were available, whereas in others, guidelines originally developed and approved more than ten years ago remain in use. The number of methodological guidelines from each country varied, as the higher education systems in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia differ in size and institutional structure. Universities also adopt different practices in organizing methodological guidance: some provide separate guidelines for individual study programmes, while others develop unified documents at the level of a faculty or department.

In total, the research material comprises 169 methodological guidelines. The oldest guideline dates from 2005 and the most recent from 2025; however, some guidelines do not indicate a publication date. The Latvian material was obtained from 44 sources across 14 higher education institutions, with several instances of inter-university cooperation where a study programme is jointly offered by multiple institutions. The Lithuanian sample includes 55 sources from nine universities. In Estonia, researchers compiled 70 units sourced from the websites of six universities (see **Table 1)**. The higher number of documents reflects the fact that Estonian institutions tend to provide more fine-grained and programme-specific methodological guidance, whereas in Latvia and Lithuania such instructions are more often consolidated into fewer, more general documents at the faculty or institutional level. Overall, the analysis covers 29 higher education institutions (HEI in table) across the three Baltic countries.

Table 1 Research material

Country	Number of HEIs	Number of Guidelines	Word Count
Latvia	14	44	5778
Lithuania	9	55	4571
Estonia	6	70	3804
Total	29	169	14 153

The structure of methodological guidelines in Baltic higher education institutions typically comprises the following components: (1) an introduction indicating the level of study as well as the ethical and legal principles governing academic work; (2) a description of the thesis development process, including topic selection and cooperation with the supervisor; (3) the structure of the thesis itself, within which the abstract is identified as one of its components; (4) methodological instructions for formatting the thesis and for referencing; (5) a description of the defence and assessment procedures; and (6) appendices containing the title page and other required documents, including the structure of the abstract.

Methodological guidelines in Latvian higher education institutions tend to focus more on administrative and assessment-related aspects, whereas those in Estonia emphasize academic writing and text construction. Lithuanian guidelines, in turn, clearly differentiate between sections devoted to thesis structure, the thesis-writing process and research ethics. Differences are also observed in the structural organization of the final thesis, even within a single university, depending on the discipline, faculty and study programme. This variation is particularly characteristic of Estonian higher education institutions, where the number of methodological guidelines differs considerably from those in Latvia and Lithuania.

To provide an overview of the scope and comparability of the analyzed texts, it is necessary to indicate the word count devoted to instructions on writing a student thesis abstract within the methodological guidelines. In total, these sections comprise 14 153 words (excluding sample abstracts, which are usually provided in an appendix): Latvian sources – 5 778 words, Lithuanian sources – 4 571 words, and Estonian sources – 3 804 words. These numerical data are not further analyzed. However, it is evident that the volume of abstract descriptions, which form the material of this study, varies across higher education institutions, ranging from a few lines or a single paragraph to a full page. The layout of these descriptions also differs: they are most often presented either as continuous prose or as numbered paragraphs, while the features to be included in the abstract are sometimes listed as bullet points. In one Latvian higher education institution (RSU, 2020), the abstract requirements are provided in a table where an overview of qualitative and quantitative research should be given. In some cases, sample abstracts are appended alongside the description of the abstract-writing process, either in the national language (Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian) or in English.

Given this diversity in both volume and format, a systematic approach was necessary to analyze the material. To ensure a consistent and comprehensive examination, the following methodological steps were applied:

- collection, compilation, and extraction of relevant material;
- content analysis of the extracted linguistic material, namely the descriptions of student thesis abstract available in the methodological guidelines, and identification of the features of abstracts (i.e., language, style, length, keywords, function, content categories);
- comparative analysis of the research material across the three countries;
- generalisation and synthesis of the examined material;
- the descriptive method for presenting the study.

Results

General Characterization of the Research Material and Its Content

To facilitate an understanding of the similarities and differences in the descriptions of student thesis abstracts across the three countries, selected features from the extracted material were examined and compared. The analysis distinguishes between higher-order descriptors of the abstract genre (terminology, language, style requirements, abstract length, and keywords) and the more specific features that operationalize these categories in the methodological guidelines. Within this framework, the analysis focuses on terminology used to refer to the genre of an abstract in Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian institutional guidelines, the languages in which an abstract should be written, stylistic requirements, length specifications, and the treatment of keywords as a conventional supplement to the abstract. In addition, attention is given to whether the guidelines provide a definition of the abstract, outline its purpose, and clarify its function within the study.

Terminology

This section analyzes the terminological variation used in institutional methodological guidelines to refer to the text type under investigation. The analysis focuses on three aspects: (1) cross-linguistic variation in the terms used to denote the abstract, (2) functional distinctions between the abstract and related genres (e.g., the summary), and (3) competing or related terms. The analysis also considers the terminological variation used across institutional methodological guidelines to refer to the text type discussed in this study. The methodological guidelines of the higher education institutions examined reveal a marked inconsistency in the terminology used for the text type referred to in this article as an abstract. It should be noted that borrowed terms dominate. In Latvian higher education institutions, the term *kopsavilkums* 'summary' is frequently encountered, which refers to a broader genre than an abstract. According to ISO 214 (1976: 1), "a summary [...] is a brief restatement within the document (usually at the end) of its salient findings and conclusions, and is intended to complete the orientation of a reader who has studied the preceding text." This definition highlights a key functional distinction between a summary and an abstract, the latter being an independent, self-contained text rather than a concluding restatement of the document. The function of a summary, however, partly overlaps with that of an abstract, as both provide an overview of the main text. In Estonian and Lithuanian universities, the terms *kokkuvõte* (EE) and *santrauka* (LT), both meaning 'summary', are employed for abstracts. In Lithuanian methodological guidelines, however, the distinction between an *abstract* (*anotacija*) and a *summary* (*santrauka*) may be indicated. The former refers to a concise description of the essence of the thesis, while the latter denotes an extended summary. For this study, the terminology is analyzed as it is presented in the institutional guidelines, and no a priori equivalence between the terms is assumed. This distinction between a summary and an abstract is explicitly maintained in the methodological guidelines of the Faculties of Law and Philology at Vilnius University.

In Latvian guidelines, terminological blending is common, resulting in variation in the terms used to refer to different text types. For example, one of the sources states that "since English is commonly used in scientific communication, the abstract in Latvian is followed by a Summary in English" (DU HSZF, 2023, p. 5). In other words, the same text, identical in content, may be referred to by different terms depending on the language rather than on the functional distinctions of the text.

The most widespread term for the genre in a student thesis is a borrowing derived from the Latin *annotatio*, appearing as *anotācija* in Latvian, *anotacija* in Lithuanian and *annotatsioon* in Estonian. In this study, the term "student thesis" refers exclusively to bachelor's and master's theses, as reflected in the analyzed institutional methodological guidelines. Its consistent use across the languages of the Baltic countries may have been influenced by Russian, where *annotacija* (*аннотация*) is the standard term used for summaries accompanying student academic works. However, its English cognate *annotation*, occasionally used in Latvian guidelines (e.g., DU HSZF M 2025; RTU LA VSZC 2025), is a potential false friend. The Cambridge Dictionary defines *annotation* as:

1. a short explanation or note added to a text or image, or the act of adding such explanations or notes;
2. a description or piece of information added to data, for example, a label saying whether a word is a noun, verb, etc., or the act of adding this (Cambridge Dictionary, 2025b).

Neither definition fully corresponds to the purpose of a student thesis abstract when compared with the definition provided in ISO 214 (1976, p. 1) (see Introduction) and that proposed by Hahele (2005, p. 17), who argues that an abstract should serve as a guide for readers, enabling them to assess the relevance of the thesis. A semantically related term used in general lexicographic sources is *abstract*, which aligns with the operational definition adopted in this study. The Cambridge Dictionary defines it as "a short form of a speech, article, book, etc. giving only the most important facts or ideas" (Cambridge Dictionary, 2025a). This can be considered the most precise equivalent of *anotācija*. In Latvian, although the adjective *abstrakts* exists ('existing only in thought or as an idea'), the noun itself is not used. In Lithuanian and Estonian, however, the word is employed to denote an abstract – *abstraktas* (LT) and *abstrakt* (EE).

Another term encountered in some Lithuanian (*reziumė*) and Estonian (*resümee*) guidelines is *resume*, meaning 'summary'. In the Latvian material, this term is not used. In the analyzed data, it functions as a language-specific variant of summary-type labelling rather than as a distinct competing term for an abstract.

Estonian methodological guidelines deserve particular attention for the breadth of terminology employed to label the abstract genre. Alongside *kokkuvõte* ('summary'), several additional terms appear: *lühike kokkuvõte*/*lühikokkuvõte* ('short summary'), *sisukokkuvõte* ('content summary'), *lühiülevaade* ('short overview'). In some cases, notes explicitly indicate synonymy, for example: *annotatsioon* or *lühikokkuvõte*; *lühikokkuvõte* or *resümee*; *sisukokkuvõte* or *abstract*.

Overall, the analysis in this section demonstrates that the genre under examination is consistently referred to as *abstract*, which is used here as an umbrella term encompassing the synonymous or near-synonymous labels found in the methodological guidelines of all three Baltic countries, corresponding to *anotācija* (LV), *anotacija* (LT), and *annotatsioon* (EE).

Languages

The methodological guidelines consistently provide information on the languages in which the abstract should be written, which are usually at least two, and in some cases three, including the language of the thesis itself, especially when the work is written in a language other than English.

Latvian methodological guidelines emphasize that the abstract provided in two languages should be identical in both content and form. This suggests that the abstract is most commonly expected to be a translation closely aligned with the original text. This is evidenced, for example, by instructions such as "the translation must be of high quality and free of language errors" (EKA, 2014, p. 7) and other similar guidelines that stress direct and accurate translation from Latvian. Alternatively, the abstract may be written in parallel in two languages, typically in Latvian-English or English-Latvian, depending on whether the thesis is written in Latvian or English. This requirement is stated either explicitly or implicitly in the majority of the guidelines (approximately 70%). Another frequently mentioned option is to write the abstract in Latvian and one of the European Union (EU) languages, more specifically English, German, or French (approximately 15%).

Occasionally (in only two of the 44 cases examined), abstracts mal still be written in Russian, even though Russian is not an official language of the European Union. In these cases, the guidelines either explicitly refer to the possibility of writing an abstract in Russian or include a sample abstract in Russian. Given the current geopolitical situation and the foreign policy position of the Republic of Latvia, such permission for the use of Russian in university abstracts would no longer be appropriate, and the relevant methodological guidelines should therefore be revised. In rare cases, the methodological guidelines stipulate that the abstract must be written in three languages: Latvian and two foreign languages (if the thesis is written in Latvian), or in the thesis language (if it is not Latvian), Latvian as the state language, and one foreign language other than the thesis language.

It should be noted that only one Latvian guideline contains an indication that the choice of the foreign language in which the abstract is written should be linked to the language used in the study programme; therefore, this relationship cannot be meaningfully examined in greater detail. In one case, the choice of the foreign language is not specified and is thus left to the discretion of the author. In two further guidelines, no information is provided regarding the language to be used in the abstract, indicating that this issue has not been addressed at all. Overall, the number of such cases is too small to warrant more detailed analysis.

Lithuanian methodological guidelines show that, beyond the conventional Lithuanian-English or English-Lithuanian combinations, non-Lithuanian-speaking foreign students may sometimes be exempt from writing the abstract in Lithuanian (e.g., VU GMC, 2024; VU TSPMI, 2025). In several instances, it is stated that the abstract may be written in only one language, such as English, French, German, or another EU language. Individual methodological guidelines specify highly particular requirements. For example, if the thesis is written in English, an extended summary in Lithuanian may be required (VU FF, 2020); in some

cases, the Lithuanian abstract must be shorter than the English version (VU MIF, n. d.); when both an abstract and a summary are included, they are usually required to be written in two languages: Lithuanian and English (MRU, 2009). In many cases, like in Latvian and Estonian requirements, the abstract is expected to be content-identical in both languages. Unlike Latvian and Estonian guidelines, however, Lithuanian guidelines require abstracts to be written exclusively in EU languages.

Estonian methodological guidelines show that, although a student thesis may contain only one abstract, it is more common practice to require abstracts in both Estonian and English. In such cases, the second abstract is usually expected to be either a summary or an extended version of the first rather than an identical translation. Similarly to Latvia, it is still possible in Estonia to use Russian for the abstract (e.g., TLU UI, 2019; TLU UI, 2022; TT IT, 2020; TU, 2024; TU OK, 2020).

Style Requirements

In the Latvian methodological guidelines, unlike in the Lithuanian and Estonian materials, the linguistic features of an abstract are rarely specified; nevertheless, a few indications can be found. For instance, in the guidelines of Riga Stradiņš University, emphasis is mainly placed on using the indicative mood and "passive voice, for example: *was developed, was examined, has been calculated, has been concluded,* etc." (RSU, 2019). At the same time, it is noted that in qualitative research, the use of active voice, personal pronouns and the first-person singular is acceptable (e.g., *I developed, I investigated, I concluded*) (RSU, 2020). This latter recommendation does not fully correspond to the traditional scientific style of Latvian or the conventions of academic writing (see Torgāns, 2001; Baltiņš, 2003; Lokmane & Kalnača, 2006; Laiveniece, 2010, et al.).

In the methodological guidelines of Lithuanian higher education institutions, emphasis is primarily on conciseness, avoidance of long and complex sentences, and the appropriate use of specific terminology. An impersonal style is required, employing either impersonal constructions or verbs in the third person. Only a limited subset of the analyzed guidelines includes lists of recommended phrases in both English and Lithuanian to be used in abstracts. Furthermore, abstracts must not contain quotations, references, or empirical and numerical data. Students are advised not to rewrite the introduction but rather to describe the essence of the thesis briefly and objectively, presenting its main conclusions. The guidelines also specify that information not included in the thesis should not appear in the abstract; it should convey knowledge about the thesis without evaluating or analyzing it.

In Estonian guidelines, authors are instructed in their abstracts to use correct, grammatically precise language, employ the present tense and the indicative mood, and avoid evaluative statements concerning research results. Taken together, these requirements can be seen as forming an implicit set of criteria that characteriszes appropriate abstract-writing practice, including the use of clear language intended to make the abstract comprehensible to a wider readership.

Length

Across all explanations of the abstract as a textual genre, the adjective "short" (Latvian [LV]: *īss*; Lithuanian [LT]: *trumpas*; Estonian [EE]: *lühike*) recurs, indicating that the abstract is a concise text that, in some way, represents a larger text, potentially covering a variety of academic fields. The examined materials indicate that abstract length is expressed in various units, including the number of words, characters, sentences, or pages.

Word count is most explicitly indicated in Lithuanian guidelines, with intervals such as 130–180 or 150–200 words. However, the difference between the minimum (100 words) and the maximum (500 words) is considerable, implying that abstract length may vary up to fivefold. The Estonian materials show a similar range (100–500 words), although other units of measurement are more commonly applied. In Latvian higher education institutions, the recommended interval is narrower (200–350 words), aligning closely with Brown's (1994/1995) (275 words) suggested ideal length. However, more recent sources present a different view: "Abstract word counts typically range from 150–300 words depending on style guide and

publication. APA 7th Edition requires 150–250 words, Chicago allows up to 300 words, while scientific journals like Nature limit abstracts to 150 words and Science to 125 words" (Letter Counter, 2026).

Character count is sometimes specified instead of word count. Differences in character-based limits may reflect the linguistic structure of the respective languages: Latvian and Lithuanian are morphologically fusional, while Estonian is agglutinative, which may allow for longer words. In Latvian guidelines, the specified range is typically 850–1500 characters (with one instance of 700 characters), while in the Estonian materials it ranges from 1000 to 5000. These limits can be approximately translated into word counts, although the exact correspondence varies depending on word length and syntactic structure.

Lithuanian higher education institutions often specify very short abstracts (e.g., 400 characters including spaces) when these are supplemented by an extended summary (up to 5000 characters), depending on the discipline; for instance, in law, both a short abstract and a longer summary are required. On average, Lithuanian abstracts expressed in characters (2000–3000) are longer than those in Latvian, which may partly be explained by the inclusion of spaces in the count.

Sentence count is more commonly indicated in the Lithuanian materials, ranging from 5–6 sentences (approximately 100 words) (VU MA n.d.) to 10 sentences (MRU 2009). This unit is rarely applied in the Latvian context but occasionally appears in the Estonian materials. A notable example is provided by the Estonian University of Life Sciences (EMU, 2024), which specifies sentence-based requirements for different abstract components, such as 1–2 sentences for basic information, one sentence for the research objective, and so forth.

Page-based length requirements are less precise and may or may not correspond to word or character counts. Nonetheless, they are found in the data of all three countries. Latvian guidelines show that abstracts in each language should not exceed one page, though sometimes 3/4 or 2/3 of a page is mentioned. Lithuanian guidelines allow for half a page, or in some cases, up to two pages. In the Estonian materials, the minimum is generally half a page and the maximum three pages.

These differences reflect the varying purposes of abstracts. If an abstract is written in the same language as the thesis for archiving and contains up to 100 words, its length will not exceed half a page. Often, it is complemented by a more comprehensive summary in a secondary language, which may increase the length to three pages. Similar arrangements are found in Lithuanian guidelines, where a brief abstract in the primary language may coexist with a longer summary in a secondary language. In contrast, Latvian guidelines most frequently emphasize that abstracts must be identical in Latvian and English.

Requirements also differ regarding the placement of an abstract. Traditionally, the text of an abstract appears at the beginning of the thesis (after the title page); however, in nearly half of the examined cases in the Lithuanian materials, the abstract is placed at the end (after the reference list and/or appendices). This aspect is not considered further, as placement does not affect abstract content.

Keywords

Although keywords are considered an independent component accompanying a thesis rather than part of the abstract, in some methodological guidelines of all three countries, they are mentioned alongside instructions on abstract writing. Similarly, Afolaranmi considers that keywords are "not really part of the components of an abstract. However, they are required to be listed separately from the paragraph of the abstract" (Afolaranmi 2024, 22). In our data, more than 90 % of cases where keywords are discussed, the meaning of the term is explained, and the categories to be included are specified. In the Latvian materials, the formulations are consistent, typically encompassing about three categories in various combinations: the topic of the thesis, its results, methods used, main variables, essence of the study, and key ideas. In one instance, a more detailed explanation is provided: "Keywords, or the fundamental concepts of the study, are the variables included in the title of the bachelor's thesis and measured in the study. Other significant concepts examined in the study in close relation to the investigated concepts are also considered keywords" (LU PPMF, 2021).

References to keywords are found in fewer than half (in 20 sources) of the examined Lithuanian methodological guidelines, which may be explained by the fact that students upload their theses to the university information system, where entering keywords is also mandatory. In such cases, keywords are considered part of the thesis submission process rather than part of the abstract. When keywords are addressed, they are defined in various ways: as words or terms recurring in the thesis, as main or thematic words arranged by importance, as words characterizing the thesis, as central concepts reflecting its essence, or as words highlighting the research problem.

In Estonian guidelines, explanations regarding keywords are minimal, usually limited to short phrases such as "keywords characterizing the research" or "thematic keywords." Some guidelines, however, provide more detailed instructions, emphasizing the importance of keywords as search tools in repositories and advising students to select terms that best reflect different aspects of the study, including its subject, methodology, and main field.

Alongside definitions explaining the concept of keywords, the recommended or permissible number of keywords is typically indicated. In the Latvian materials, no consensus exists, with ranges varying considerably: 4–8, 3–7, 3–6, or 5–8. These differences may reflect the guideline authors' views on the appropriate number of keywords. In some cases, it is specified that keywords should be listed alphabetically and placed after the abstract.

In Lithuanian guidelines, the number of keywords also varies widely (from 2 to 10), with specific ranges such as 2–4, 3–5, 3–6, 4–6, 4–7, 5–7, and 5–10. The language of the keywords generally corresponds to the language of the abstract. Guidelines may specify that keywords should be placed in a separate paragraph or at the end of the abstract, arranged alphabetically, with punctuation applied consistently, and without repeating the thesis title. A minimum of two keywords is specified only in the Lithuanian guidelines, whereas the guidelines of the other two Baltic countries indicate higher minimum numbers.

In Estonian guidelines, the required number of keywords is specified in most cases, typically 3–5, or up to 5, though a broader range (5–15) is also observed (TLU UI, 2022). Unlike the Latvian and Lithuanian guidelines, the Estonian guidelines allow a maximum of 15 keywords. At the Estonian Academy of Music and Theatre, keywords must be incorporated into the main text of the thesis, including the title or chapter headings (EMTA, 2024).

Overall, the requirements in all three countries share common characteristics: there is no strict consistency regarding the number of keywords. While there is a broadly shared understanding of what constitutes keywords, approaches to keyword selection may differ significantly. For instance, Estonian guidelines require keywords to correspond to the thesis title and chapter headings, whereas Lithuanian guidelines adopt the opposite approach.

Definition, Function, and Purpose of the Student Thesis Abstract

In Latvian methodological guidelines, the abstract as a component of the student thesis is seldom defined explicitly. Only a few instances provide some indication of what constitutes an abstract, typically using synonymous terms such as *summary*, *description of the work*, or *content overview*. More commonly, a definition is replaced by an explanation of the function of an abstract or by statements concerning the information it should contain. The most common descriptions used in these cases include *general overview*, *logically organized account*, and *brief information*.

By contrast, Lithuanian methodological guidelines more consistently define the abstract. These definitions tend to be descriptive and encompass characterizations such as *concise/essential presentation of the work, summary, overview of the main results, generalization of key facts, outline of the work's prerequisites, and synthesis of the work.*

A similar pattern to Latvian is observed in Estonian university guidelines, where a clear-cut definition of the abstract is likewise often avoided. Instead, the abstract is described through narrative explanations that emphasize its function, outline its content, provide indicative categories, or offer procedural instructions on how the abstract should be prepared.

In some Latvian methodological guidelines (about 50 % of cases), the description of the abstract includes a list of content categories that must be represented, such as the main results and conclusions; keywords; objectives and tasks; content of the work; research problem; thesis topic; theoretical approach; and research methods.

Lithuanian methodological guidelines present a comparable but more systematized approach, specifying categories such as the relevance and novelty of the research; research question, problem, or hypothesis; research object; aims; tasks; methods; results; main conclusions; and an appropriate set of keywords.

A different approach emerges in the Estonian materials, where methodological guidelines often distinguish between abstracts written in the language of the thesis and those written in another language to ensure accessibility for readers unfamiliar with the original. Although the foreign-language abstract is frequently treated as a direct translation of the original (as is also common in Latvia), some guidelines clearly differentiate these versions. For example, the abstract written in a foreign language may be permitted to be up to twice as long as the Estonian abstract. This case was observed in only one set of guidelines (TU PRI 2018). Some guidelines explicitly warn that a foreign-language abstract should not be based solely on the thesis summary or on its conclusions: "An abstract written in a foreign language is not a translation of the summary written in Estonian. Rather, it provides a comprehensive overview of the entire thesis, allowing readers who do not understand Estonian to gain a full understanding of its content" (TU KI, 2024). Another source similarly states: "It is not a translation of the summary, but a concise overview of the entire thesis, reflecting its aims and results – a condensed model combining the introduction, theoretical and methodological framework, and conclusions" (TLU HI, 2020).

In several methodological guidelines, the authors consider it necessary to clarify the purpose of writing an abstract. In the Latvian materials, the formulations of the purpose of the abstract often incorporate the features mentioned earlier, but they also introduce an important nuance: the abstract is intended for the potential reader. It should enable the reader, through a quick review of its content, to decide whether engaging with the full thesis is necessary.

An analogous perspective is found in Lithuanian guidelines, which emphasize that the abstract is an essential structural component of the student thesis that must be informative, substantively grounded, and comprehensible. The role of the reader is highlighted: through the abstract, the reader should rapidly obtain an overview of the thesis, understand why the thesis is of interest, and be able to grasp its content even without specialized knowledge. The abstract should enable the reader to form an informed judgment regarding the scope of the thesis, the research conducted, and its results.

Viewed from this angle, the abstract as a genre acquires a significantly broader function: it becomes the *calling card* or *advertisement* of the thesis. Koopman (1997) emphasizes that an abstract performs a "selling" function. Although Koopman does not elaborate on this notion, the "selling" function suggests that the abstract serves as a means of attracting readers' attention to the thesis and encouraging them to read the entire text. Unfortunately, such genre-oriented considerations remain insufficiently integrated into most methodological guidelines. Typically, neither the definition, function, nor purpose of the abstract is articulated; instead, emphasis is placed solely on its obligatory character. Yet the definition, function, and purpose are crucial indicators of intent, helping students understand what is expected, why it is required, and what communicative role the abstract fulfils.

The Estonian materials show that the function or purpose of the abstract is explicitly stated only in 13 or about 5% guidelines, particularly those concerning foreign-language abstracts. In such cases, the primary goal is to provide information to readers who are unable to access the thesis in its original language. Additional, less frequently mentioned functions include informing readers who have not consulted the full thesis, facilitating dissemination in databases, and supporting archiving procedures. In some cases, the function must be inferred from contextual cues and modal constructions such as "to provide an overview," "to give an impression," "to be comprehensible," or "to allow."

The synthesis of definitions and descriptions related to the function of the abstract reveals the key characteristic terms that capture the essence of the abstract as a genre: *summary*, *description*, *short*, *general*, *specific*, *focused*, *overview*, *comprehensive*, *complete*, *informative*. It is noteworthy, however, that the terms *specific* and *general* are semantically opposed.

Discussion

As illustrated in the Results section above, the methodological guidelines of the Baltic higher education institutions formally require an abstract as a compulsory component of the final thesis, yet the description of this genre's communicative purpose and structural organisation remains strikingly vague. This lack of specificity is not a trivial omission: for most bachelor-level students, the abstract is often the first highly conventionalized academic genre they are required to produce. Expecting novice writers to produce a rhetorically effective abstract without a clear, operationalized genre model places an unnecessary cognitive burden on them and may weaken the pedagogical effectiveness of the guidelines. A more explicit, systematically structured genre description is therefore not merely desirable but essential.

Despite the extensive body of research on student abstracts, the field has largely overlooked a critical issue: the potential misalignment between institutional norms governing abstract writing and students' actual writing practices. Mathew and McCallum's (2024) study of Omani student abstracts expose this gap very clearly. Their findings show that students frequently introduce rhetorical moves not required by their faculties – either because "students do not always follow pedagogic advice from their faculties" or because "the Omani student writers actively include their own rhetorical moves to try and shape their construction of the abstract as a specific genre" (Mathew & McCallum, 2024, p. 78). This demonstrates that students are not passive recipients of institutional norms but active negotiators of genre conventions. The authors therefore identify "a possible disparity between student and faculty expectations around producing abstracts" (ibid., p. 80), a disparity that has significant implications for genre instruction.

There is no reason to assume that Baltic academic writing practices are immune to similar tensions. On the contrary, the lack of specificity in existing guidelines makes such discrepancies highly probable. Systematic investigation is therefore needed to determine how closely studentproduced abstracts align with institutional expectations and whether the guidelines themselves adequately reflect actual disciplinary writing practices. Such research would enable a more empirically grounded classification of abstract moves as *conventional* or *optional* (Mathew & McCallum, 2024, p. 80), rather than relying on broad, unspecific descriptions.

Moreover, applying Hüttner's (2010, p. 205) move representation typology, which distinguishes obligatory (90–100%), core (50–89%), ambiguous (30–49%), and optional (1–29%) moves, would allow for a more precise assessment of the communicative necessity of each component. This approach would not only clarify the internal structure of the abstract genre but also provide a robust foundation for revising methodological guidelines. In short, without such evidencebased refinement, current guidelines risk reinforcing ambiguity rather than supporting students in developing competent academic writing practices.

As the analysis above demonstrates, the abstract of a student thesis functions as an accompanying text whose primary purpose is to provide a sufficiently clear and concise overview of the research presented in the main body of the bachelor's or master's thesis. Its role is to enable a prospective reader to determine whether the full study is relevant to their interests and merits further reading. Consequently, when defining the abstract as a specific genre within methodological guidelines for students, it is essential to identify the core features that this accompanying text must contain.

Abstracts of undergraduate and master's theses are uploaded to the databases of higher education institutions, where this process involves the entry of metadata, the abstract text itself, and keywords, all of which are treated as an integrated whole. According to the abstract guidelines analyzed for this study, a structurally coherent abstract should begin with information on authorship, specifying (1) the author of the study (student's name, surname, higher education institution, and study programme) and (2) the academic supervisor (name, surname, academic degree, and position). Because abstracts may be published independently of the full thesis (e.g., on the higher education institution website), the next obligatory components are (3) the thesis title, (4) the type of thesis, and (5) the language of the thesis. Taken together, these first five elements comprise the metadata.

The abstract should also contain elements that provide the reader with an understanding of the relevance and scholarly contribution of the research conducted. These elements include (6) the research aim, (7) objectives, (8) the research question or hypothesis, and (9) a concise description of the methodology (e.g.,

methods used, research design, and, where applicable, information on the sample). The abstract should conclude with (10) a brief description of the main results and/or conclusions.

There are several ways to present these ten elements. One common approach, recommended also in the methodological guidelines of higher education institutions, is a descriptive, narrative-style text organized into paragraphs:

- First paragraph: metadata (1)–(5): the author of the study, the academic supervisor, the thesis title, the type of thesis, and the language of the thesis;
- Second paragraph: description of the research (6)–(9): the research aim, objectives, the research question or hypothesis, and a concise description of the methodology;
- Third paragraph: results and/or conclusions (10).

Afolaranmi's (2024) model, which contains nine "components of an ideal abstract," is in fact very similar to the model provided above: 1) title, 2) author's name and other details (e.g., author's institutional affiliation, email address, etc.), 3) introduction (background of the study, e.g., "lacuna or gap the study is filling", "description of the core word (or words) or phrase in the title", etc.), 4) aim, 5) methodology (or methods), 6) findings, 7) conclusion, 8) recommendations, and 9) alphabetically arranged keywords (Afolaranmi, 2024, pp. 21–23). A classical model of an abstract is also demonstrated in the study by Swales and Feak (2009, p. 5; see Table 2 below); however, an analysis of 60 student abstracts conducted by Qurat-ul-Aine et al. (2021) revealed that only 18.33% adhered to this five-move structure. An alternative layout is a tabular or column-based format in which the required categories are listed on the left side of the page, with corresponding information provided on the right. This format minimizes omissions, as any missing elements become immediately visible. Among the reviewed methodological guidelines, such a structure has been observed only in the example provided by the Liepāja Academy of Riga Technical University (RTU LA, 2025), where twelve categories (author of the paper; theme of the paper; type of the paper; study programme; consultant of the paper; volume of the paper; key words, aim of the research, content of the paper; methods of research; results of the research; applicability of the paper) appear as a left-hand column.

The inclusion of keywords within the abstract remains a subject of debate. Keywords represent a distinct feature of scholarly communication and fulfil a different function from the abstract: they support information retrieval and thematic indexing in databases. Although keywords are relevant in the context of student theses, they should not be considered an integral component of an abstract. Accordingly, methodological guidelines should allocate a separate section for keywords, accompanied by independent instructions, rather than merging them with guidance on abstract writing.

The methodological guidelines of Baltic universities rarely describe the rhetorical structure of abstracts, including various moves and steps, outlined in widely recognized models in the international literature on academic writing. Explicit instructions on the structure of an abstract would help students organize information more logically and coherently. Previous research also shows that abstracts of student theses vary considerably in how they apply established rhetorical models (see **Table 2**) (e.g., Luthfiyah, Alek & Fahriany, 2015; Aziz et al., 2021; Zuniga-Tonio, 2023). Evidence from Latvian bachelorthesis abstracts likewise point to heterogeneous move patterns (see Egle et al. 2025, pp. 102–104). As Juanda & Kurniawan (2020, p. 447) note: "By understanding the manifestation of moves and steps in each discipline, authors can write an abstract that is consistent with the customs and rules of their respective disciplines." These findings highlight the need to incorporate instruction on abstract writing into academic writing courses and to clarify expectations within higher education institutions methodological guidelines.

Classical models presented by Swales and Feak (2009, p. 5) and Hyland (2004, p. 67) (see **Table 2**) offer a clear thematic structure for abstracts, which is widely used in studies of student writing (e.g., Behnam & Golpour, 2014; Darabad, 2016). These models can be adapted for bachelor's and master's thesis abstracts in the Baltic context, with appropriate consideration of disciplinary and subdisciplinary conventions.

Table 2 Abstract Moves models

Moves (Swales & Feak, 2009, p. 5)	Hyland's Five-Move Model (Hyland, 2004, p. 67)
Background, introduction, situation	Introduction: establishes the context of the paper and motivates the research and discussion
Present research, purpose	Purpose: indicates purposes, thesis and hypothesis outlines the intention behind the paper
Methods, materials, subjects, procedures	Methods: provides information on design, procedures, assumptions, approach, data, etc.
Results, findings	Product: states main findings and results, the argument, or what was accomplished
Discussion, conclusion, implications, recommendations	Conclusion: interprets or extends results beyond scope of paper, draws inferences, points to applications or wider implications

The assessment of the quality of abstracts in student theses requires a clear and explicit understanding of the standards according to which these texts are evaluated. However, in many higher education institutions across the Baltic countries, the development of methodological guidelines is not subject to centralized or unified oversight. Consequently, individual faculties, departments, or academic units may produce their own guidelines, which vary considerably in length, structure, terminology, and theoretical foundation. Some guidelines rely on internationally recognized academic writing models, whereas others reflect local conventions, long-standing traditions, or individual assumptions shaped by limited experience in academic writing.

One of the most significant findings of this study concerns terminological inconsistency found in the examined methodological guidelines: different higher education institutions employ a range of terms to designate the abstract. The foreign terms *anotācija* (LV), *anotacija* (LT), and *anotatsioon* (EE) are most likely historically influenced by the Russian term *annotacija*, which denotes "a brief description of the content of a printed work or manuscript" (Multitran, 2025). This borrowing occurred in Latvian, Lithuanian and Estonian terminology without conceptual adaptation, which also explains the persistent mistranslation of this genre into English as *annotation* instead of *abstract*. This phenomenon reflects the broader impact of Russian as the historical contact language shaping terminology development in all three Baltic languages – a pattern observed not only for abstracts but also for other academic genres, such as *conference materials*.

Empirical research on requirements for student thesis abstracts reveals notable ambiguities that students encounter in practice. For instance, Egle et al. (2025) report that at one Latvian higher education institution, abstracts may appear in informative, descriptive, or mixed forms, which likely reflects disciplinary conventions or the adoption of existing templates. From the reader's perspective, this results in significant variation in the amount and type of information provided, thereby reducing the effectiveness of an abstract as a communicative tool. Similar issues have been examined by Šulovská in the context of writing abstracts in English as a foreign language, who emphasizes that "writing an abstract requires a lot of skill and practice" (Šulovská, 2022, p. 18) and argues that sufficient time and attention must be devoted to this task, with careful consideration of disciplinary norms.

Although research on abstract writing has predominantly focused on English as a foreign language, where additional challenges related to language proficiency are present (see Frydrychova Klimova, 2015), these insights are equally relevant for developing text production skills in the authors' native languages. Elements such as genre conventions, clarity, conciseness, and the use of scientific language are crucial regardless of the language of instruction. The substantial variety of abstract types documented in practice (Egle et al., 2025) underscores the need for methodological guidelines to be systematically integrated into academic writing instruction and for students to be trained explicitly in writing abstracts in both their native and foreign languages.

Conclusions and Prospects for Further Research

Taken together, the findings of this study point to the need for a more unified, theoretically grounded, and pedagogically informed approach to guiding students in the production of abstracts. Establishing clearer genre definitions, standardizing structural requirements, and integrating research-based writing instruction into academic curricula would enhance not only the consistency and quality of student theses but also students' broader academic literacy. Strengthening the alignment of methodological guidelines with international best practices may also facilitate students' participation in wider scholarly communication and contribute to raising academic writing standards across the Baltic region.

This study examined how student thesis abstracts are described in the methodological guidelines of higher education institutions in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, with the aim of developing a best-practice representation of the abstract as a regional academic genre. The findings reveal substantial institutional and national variation in prescribed abstract length, content, and presentation, indicating the absence of a shared and explicit understanding of the abstract within Baltic higher education.

The analysis further shows that abstracts are rarely defined as a genre in the guidelines, and their communicative function is only occasionally articulated. As a result, expectations regarding the role and significance of the abstract remain largely implicit, which may contribute to uncertainty among students and uneven abstract quality.

This lack of standardisation raises broader questions about the underlying principles guiding the development of methodological materials. Systematic national-level collection and analysis of such guidelines could help identify the dominant assumptions and expectations regarding the features of a high-quality abstract for a student thesis. This would, in turn, contribute to a clearer conceptualisation of the abstract as an academic genre and promote transparent, research-based practices in teaching and assessing academic writing. A comparative perspective, as demonstrated in the present study, reveals not only shared tendencies and divergences across the three Baltic countries but also provides opportunities to identify best practices. Future research could enrich these insights by extending the comparison to other geographic and cultural contexts, such as the Nordic region, where different academic writing traditions may offer further points of reference.

At the same time, the guidelines suggest that an effective abstract is expected to provide a coherent overview of the thesis through a limited number of systematically ordered descriptive elements. On this basis, the study proposes a best-practice representation of the student thesis abstract consisting of essential metadata and core research information that together enable a concise yet informative representation of the research.

Inconsistencies in the terminology used to refer to abstracts, including variation within national contexts, further complicate students' understanding of this genre. The analysis also confirms that keywords serve a distinct identifying function and should be treated as a supplementary element rather than as part of the abstract itself.

From a genretheoretical perspective, abstract writing reflects both textual conventions and contextual influences. Variation in students' move patterns indicates developing genre awareness. Future research should therefore examine how linguistic structures interact with external factors, such as students' experience with guidelines and other genre sources, to provide a clearer basis for refining institutional recommendations.

Overall, the findings underscore the need for clearer and more consistent institutional guidance on abstract writing in higher education. Future research could extend this work by comparing Baltic abstract conventions with those in other academic regions and by relating institutional prescriptions to students' actual abstract-writing practices.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

Declaration on the Use of AI

During the preparation of this chapter, the authors used generative AI tool ChatGPT (OpenAI) for English language proofreading. After using the tools, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

References

1 Afolaranmi, A. O. (2024). Towards an ideal abstract in academic writing: Some crucial components. Jozac Academic Voice (JAV), 4(1), 20-23. https://doi.org/10.57040/g9vvg721

2 Aziz, A., Mahmood, M. A., Ahmad, S., & Akbar, N. (2021). A corpus-based study of genre specific discourse: M.A. TEFL thesis abstracts. Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 17(Special Issue 2), 884-898. Retrieved November 24, 2025, from https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.904084

3 Baltiņš, M. (2003). Zinātniskā raksta struktūrelementi. Konferences "Zinātnes valoda" materiāli. Atb. red. M. Baltiņš, D. Markus. Valsts valodas komisija, 5-11.

4 Behnam, B., Golpour, F. (2014). A Genre Analysis of English and Iranian Research Articles Abstracts in Applied Linguistics and Mathematics. International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 3(5), 173-179. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.3n.5p.173

5 Bhatia, V. K. (1993). Analysing genre - Language use in professional settings. London: Longman.

6 Blinkena, A. (2009). Latviešu interpunkcija. Zvaigzne ABC.

7 Brown, R. (1995). Write right first time. Literati Newsline (Special Issue for Authors and Editors). MCB University Press. Retrieved July 22, 2026, from http://web.archive.org/web/19971014014626/http://www.mcb.co.uk/literati/write.htm

8 Cambridge Dictionary. (2025a). https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/abstract

9 Cambridge Dictionary. (2025b). https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/annotation

10 Darabad, A. M. (2016). Move Analysis of Research Article Abstracts: A Cross-Disciplinary Study. International Journal of Linguistics, 8(2), 125-140. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v8i2.9379

11 Egle, B., Lele-Rozentāle, Dz., Dubova, A., Jēkabsons, G. (2025). Building and Annotating a Bachelor Paper Abstract Corpus: First Findings about Latvian Student Abstracts. Kalbotyra, 78, 89-110. https://doi.org/10.15388/Kalbotyra.2025.78.4

12 El-Dakhs, D. A. S. (2018). Why are abstracts in PhD theses and research articles different? A genre-specific perspective. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 36, 48-60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.09.005

13 Frydrychova Klimova, B. (2013). Common mistakes in writing abstracts in English. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 93, 512-516. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.09.230

14 Frydrychova Klimova, B. (2015). Teaching English Abstract Writing Effectively. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 186, 908-912. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.113

15 Hahele, R. (2005). Skolēnu zinātniski pētnieciskā darbība. RaKa.

16 Hartley, J. & Betts, L. R. (2009). Common weaknesses in traditional abstracts in the social sciences. Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 60(10), 2010-2018. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21102

17 Hüttner, J. (2010). The potential of purpose-built corpora in the analysis of wstudent academic writing in English. Journal of Writing Research, 2(2), 197-218. Retrieved November, 22, 2025, from https://www.jowr.org/jowr/article/view/735/775 https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2010.02.02.6

18 Hyland, K. (2004). Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing. University of Michigan Press.

19 Hyland, K. & Tse, P. (2005). Hooking the reader: a corpus study of evaluative that in abstracts. English for Specific Purposes, 24(2), 123-139. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2004.02.002

20 ISO 214 1976 - International Organization for Standardization. (1976). ISO 214:1976 Documentation - Abstracts for publications and documentation. Geneva, Switzerland: ISO. Retrieved November 26, 2025, from https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/en/#iso:std:iso:214:ed-1:v1:en

21 Juanda, M. R. & Kurniawan, E. (2020). A Comparison of Rhetorical Moves in Students' Undergraduate Thesis Abstracts. Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 509. 4th International Conference on Language, Literature, Culture, and Education (ICOLLITE 2020), 443-448. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.201215.070

22 Kalnbērziņa, V. (2015). Ciešamā kārta latviešu un angļu zinātniskajā rakstu valodā. Valoda: nozīme un forma: Valodas sistēma un lietojums / Language: Meaning and Form: Language System and Language Use, 6, 147-154.

23 Kalnbērziņa, V. (2016). Ciešamās kārtas lietojuma biežums latviešu un angļu medicīnas zinātniskajos rakstos. Valoda: nozīme un forma: Gramatika un saziņa / Language: Meaning and Form: Grammar and Communication, 7, 50-58. https://doi.org/10.22364/VNF.7.5

24 Koopman, P. (1997). How to Write an Abstract. Carnegie Mellon University. Retrieved November 22, 2026, from https://www.clintconrad.no/classes_uh/GG610_F11/How_to_Write_an_Abstract.pdf

25 Kretzenbacher, H. L. (1990). Rekapitulation: Textstrategien der Zusammenfassung von wissenschaftlichen Fachtexten. Forum für Fachsprachen-Forschung, Bd. 11. Gunter Narr Verlag. https://doi.org/10.37307/j.2198-2430.1991.04.2

26 Laiveniece, D. (2010). Subjektīvā un objektīvā izteiksmes veidi zinātnes valodā. G. Smiltniece (atb. red.) Vārds un tā pētīšanas aspekti: rakstu krājums, 14(1). LiePA, 128-138.

27 Letter Counter. (2026). Abstract Word Count: Requirements by Field and Document Type. Retrieved June 30, 2026, from https://lettercounter.org/blog/abstract-word-count-requirements/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

28 Lokmane, I. & Kalnača A. (2006). Studentu pētnieciskie darbi un zinātniskais stils. A. Veisbergs (galv. red.). Valodas kvalitāte: Valsts valodas komisijas raksti, 2. Valsts valodas komisija, 69-76.

29 Luthfiyah, A., Alek, A. & Fahriany. (2015) An Investigation of Cohesion and Rhetorical Moves in Thesis Abstracts. Indonesian Journal of English Education, 2(2), 145-159. Retrieved November 24, 2025, from https://journal.uinjkt.ac.id/ijee/article/view/3086/pdf https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v2i2.3086

30 Male, H. (2018). A structural move analysis of abstracts in undergraduate theses: A case study at Universitas Kristen Indonesia. KnE Social Sciences, 3(9), 428-440. https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v3i9.2690

31 Mathew, P. & McCallum, L. (2024). A Corpus-based Analysis of Rhetorical Moves and P-frames in an Omani Learner Corpus of Research Project Abstracts. Journal of Language & Education 10(1), 68-82. https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2024.17364

32 Multitran. (2025). Multilingual Online Dictionary. https://www.multitran.com/

33 Murray, R. (2020). Writing for Academic Journals. 4th ed. McGraw Hill.

34 Qurat-ul-Ainea,Tahira, S. S. & Yaqub, S. (2021). Investigation of Rhetorical Move Structure of Theses Abstracts at Government College Women University, Faisalabad, Pakistan: A Genre Analysis. International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change, 15(7), 315-325. Retrieved November 23, 2025, from https://www.ijicc.net/images/Vol_15/Iss_7/15722_Tahira_2021_E1_R.pdf

35 Ren, H., & Li, Y. (2011). A comparison study on the rhetorical moves of abstracts in published research articles and master's foreign-language theses. English Language Teaching, 4(1), 162-166. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n1p162

36 Swales, J. M. & Feak C. B. (2009). Abstracts and the Writing of Abstract. Vol. 1 of the Revised and Expanded Edition of English in Today's Research World. The University of Michigan Press, 2009. Retrieved November 30, 2026, from https://dokumen.pub/abstracts-and-the-writing-of-abstracts-9780472033355-0472033352.html https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.309332

37 Šulovská, D. (2022). Teaching to write an abstract in the ESP/EAP classroom. Lingua Viva, XVIII(35). České Budejovice, 9-20. Retrieved November 24, 2025, from https://www.pf.jcu.cz/images/PF/veda-vyzkum/viva/LV35_2022.pdf

38 Torgāns, K. (2001). Juridiskā pētījuma rakstīšana: padomi zinātniskajam darbam. TNA.

39 Zuniga-Tonio, J. (2023). Move Structure and Lexico-Grammatical Features of Master's Thesis Abstracts in a State University. Journal of Education, Management and Development Studies, 3(4), 48-63. https://doi.org/10.52631/jemds.v3i4.203

Sources

1 DU HSZF 2023 - Daugavpils Universitāte, Humanitāro un sociālo zinātņu fakultāte, Izglītības un psiholoģijas katedra. (2023). Metodiskie norādījumi zinātniskā darba izstrādei psiholoģijā. Retrieved January 30, 2025, from https://du.lv/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Metodiskie-noradijumi-zin-darba-izstrade-PSIHOLOGIJA_2023.pdf

2 EKA 2014 - Ekonomikas un kultūras augstskola. (2014). Metodiskie norādījumi studiju darba, kvalifikācijas darba, bakalaura darba un maģistra darba izstrādāšanai un aizstāvēšanai. Retrieved January 30, 2025, from https://www.eka.edu.lv/upload/studentiem/metodiskie%20noradijumi/Metodiskie_noradijumi.pdf

3 EMTA 2024 - Eesti Muusika- ja Teatriakadeemia. (2024). Üliõpilaste kirjalike tööde nõuded ja vormistus. Retrieved June 12, 2025, from https://eamt.ee/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/Lisa_Eestikeelsete_kirjatoode_juhend.pdf

4 EMU 2024 - Eesti Maaülikool. (2024). Lõputöö vormistamise juhend. Retrieved June 12, 2025, from https://dspace.emu.ee/server/api/core/bitstreams/496bb9bf-4a08-4278-b80f-c47f16227aad/content

5 LU PPMF 2021 - Latvijas Universitāte, Pedagoģijas, psiholoģijas un mākslas fakultāte, Izglītības zinātņu un pedagoģisko inovāciju nodaļa. (2021). Prasības maģistra darba izstrādāšanai un aizstāvēšanai izglītības zinātnēs. Retrieved January 30, 2025, from https://www.ppmf.lu.lv/fileadmin/user_upload/lu_portal/projekti/ppmf/2021/Prasibas_magistra_darba_izstradei__gala.pdf

6 MRU 2009 - Mykolo Romerio Universitetas. (2009). J. S. Pečkaitis, I. Mačerinskienė. Bakalauro baigiamojo darbo rengimo tvarka. Retrieved August 14, 2025, from https://cris.mruni.eu/server/api/core/bitstreams/b9bedbac-b1aa-4cdc-ad59-2f5eb0bf8d32/content

7 RSU 2019 - Rīgas Stradiņa universitāte, Sarkanā Krusta medicīnas koledža (2019). Metodiskie norādījumi kvalifikācijas darba izstrādei un aizstāvēšanai. Retrieved January 30, 2025, from https://rcmc.lv/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/metodiskie-norādījumu-kval.d.izstrādei_2019_2020.pdf

8 RSU 2020 - Rīgas Stradiņa universitāte. (2020). K. Mārtinsone, K. Šneidere (red.). Metodiskie norādījumi maģistra darbu izstrādei RSU psiholoģijas, mākslu terapijas un supervīzijas studiju programmās. Retrieved January 30, 2025, from https://www.rsu.lv/sites/default/files/book_download/noradijumi_magistra_darbu_izstradei_2020.pdf

9 RTU LA HMZC 2025 - Rīgas Tehniskās universitāte, Liepājas akadēmija. (2025). Zinātnisko un radošo darbu izstrāde, rakstīšana un noformēšana: Metodiski norādījumi RTU Liepājas akadēmijas Humanitāro un mākslas zinātņu centra studentiem. Retrieved January 30, 2025, from https://www.rtu.lv/writable/public_files/RTU_utf_8hmzc_zinatnisko_darbu_rakstisanas_noradijumi_2025_.pdf

10 RTU LA VSZC 2025 - Rīgas Tehniskās universitāte, Liepājas akadēmija. (2025). Zinātnisko un radošo darbu izstrāde, rakstīšana un noformēšana: Metodiski norādījumi RTU Liepājas akadēmijas Vadības un sociālo zinātņu centra studentiem. Retrieved January 30, 2025, from https://www.rtu.lv/writable/public_files/RTU_la_studiju_darbu_vszc_rakstisanas_un_noformesanas_metodiskie_noradijumi_2_.pdf

11 TLU HI 2020 - Tallinna Ülikool, Humanitaarteaduste instituut. (2020). Kultuuriteaduste õppekava bakalaureuseeksami uurimistöö juhend. Retrieved June 12, 2025, from https://www.tlu.ee/sites/default/files/Kultuuriteaduse õppekava bakalaureuseeksami uurimistöö juhend.pdf

12 TLU UI 2019 - Tallinna Ülikool, Ühiskonnateaduste instituut, Sotsioloogia suund. (2019). Üliõpilastööde koostamise ja kaitsmise juhend. Retrieved June 12, 2025, from https://www.tlu.ee/sites/default/files/Instituudid/%C3%9CTI/Dokumendid/Üliõpilastööde koostamise ja kaitsmise juhend-õigus_0.pdf

13 TLU UI 2022 - Tallinna Ülikool, Ühiskonnateaduste instituut, Sotsioloogia suund. (2022). Üliõpilastööde koostamise ja kaitsmise juhend. Retrieved June 12, 2025, from https://www.tlu.ee/sites/default/files/Sotsioloogia-loputoode_juhend_okt2022.pdf

14 TT IT 2020 - Tallinna Tehnikaülikool, Infotehnoloogia teaduskond. (2020). Lõputöö koostamise ja vormindamise

juhend. Retrieved June 12, 2025, from https://taltech.ee/infotehnoloogia-teaduskond/lopetajale

15 TU 2024 - Tartu Ülikool. (2024). Magistritöö- ja magistriprojekti kirjutamise ja kaitsmise juhend Euroopa keelte ja kultuuride õppekaval klassikalise filoloogia erialal. Retrieved June 12, 2025, from https://maailmakeeled.ut.ee/sites/default/files/2024-12/Magistritöö- ja magistriprojekti kirjutamise ja kaitsmise juhend EKK õppekaval klassikalise filoloogia erialal_2024.pdf

16 TU KI 2024 - Tartu Ülikool, Kultuuritaduste instituut. (2024). Etnoloogia, folkloristika ja rakendusantropoloogia õppekava magistritöö juhend. Retrieved June 12, 2025, from https://kultuuriteadused.ut.ee/sites/default/files/2025-03/EFRA_magistritoo_juhend_kinnitamiseks_4_12_2024 .pdf

17 TU PRI 2018 - Tartu Ülikool, Peremeditsiini ja rahvatervishoiui nstituut (2018). Magistritöö koostamise ja vormistamise juhend rahvatervishoiu õppekaval. Retrieved June 12, 2025, from https://tervis.ut.ee/sites/default/files/2022-02/rt_magistritoo_vormistamise_juhend.pdf

18 TU OK 2020 - Tartu Ülikool, Õigusteaduskond. (2020). J. Sootak, H. Siimets-Gross (koostanud). Üliõpilastööde kirjutamine ja vormistamine: Juhend õigusteaduskonna üliõpilastele, 3., täiendatud ja parandatud väljaanne. Retrieved June 12, 2025, from https://oigus.ut.ee/sites/default/files/inline-files/oigusteaduskonna_uliopilastoode_nouded.pdf

19 VU FF 2020 - Vilniaus universitetas, Fizikos fakultetas. (2020). Baigiamasis darbas. Retrieved August 14, 2025, from https://www.ff.vu.lt/studentams/baigiamasis-darbas-12#baigiamojo-darbo-rengimas

20 VU GMC 2024 - Vilniaus universitetas, Gyvybės mokslų centras. (2024). Vilniaus universiteto Gyvybės mokslų centro studijų programų baigiamųjų darbų rengimo ir gynimo metodiniai nurodymai. Retrieved August 14, 2025, from https://www.gmc.vu.lt/images/studentams/dokumentai/metodiniu_nurodymu_aprasas.pdf

21 VU MA n. d. - Vilnius University, Faculty of Mathematics and Informatics, Institute of Computer Science, Department of Computational and Data Modeling. Retrieved August 14, 2025, from https://mif.vu.lt/lt3/dokumentai/Bakalauro_darbai_ju_rengimas_pristatymas_ir_vertinimas.pdf

22 VU MIF n. d. - Vilniaus universitetas, Matematikos ir informatikos fakultetas, Informatikos institutas, Kompiuterinio ir duomenų modeliavimo katedra. (n. d.). Bakalauro rašto darbai, jų rengimas, pristatymas ir vertinimas: Informacinių technologijų studijų programa. Retrieved August 14, 2025, from https://mif.vu.lt/lt3/dokumentai/Bakalauro_darbai_ju_rengimas_pristatymas_ir_vertinimas.pdf

23 VU TSPMI 2025 - Vilnius universitetas, Tarptautinių santykių ir politikos mokslų institutas. (2025). Rašto darbų metodiniai nurodymai. Retrieved August 14, 2025, from https://www.tspmi.vu.lt/rasto-darbu-metodiniai-nurodymai/

Santrauka

Diāna Laiveniece, Anita Helviga, Helen Hint, Anna Ruskan, Dzintra Lele-Rozentāle, Agnese Dubova.

Studentų baigiamųjų darbų anotacijų rengimo gairių lyginamoji analizė Latvijos, Lietuvos ir Estijos universitetuose

Šiame straipsnyje nagrinėjama studentų baigiamųjų darbų anotacijos žanro samprata, remiantis aukštųjų mokyklų Latvijoje, Lietuvoje ir Estijoje metodiniais nurodymais. Nors visų trijų Baltijos šalių metodinėje medžiagoje anotacija apibrėžiama kaip glausta baigiamojo darbo apžvalga, atlikta analizė atskleidžia reikšmingų anotacijos sąvokos ir terminų neatitikimų. Skoliniai kaip anotācija (LV) / anotacija (LT) / annotatsioon (EE) vartojami greta sinonimiškų terminų, reiškiančių santrauką, dažnai be aiškaus skirtumo. Tokie terminologiniai skirtumai apsunkina studentų supratimą apie anotaciją kaip aiškiai apibrėžtą akademinį žanrą.

Išsami 29 aukštųjų mokyklų metodinių nurodymų apžvalga rodo, kad anotacijų struktūriniai, lingvistiniai ir funkciniai aspektai apibrėžiami tik iš dalies. Kai kuriose institucijose anotacijos tikslas ir struktūra laikomi savaime suprantamais, o ne aiškiai apibrėžtais elementais, todėl formuojasi nevienoda praktika, o

studentams kyla neaiškumų. Remiantis šia lyginamąja analize, teigiama, kad nuosekli ir gerai struktūruota anotacija turėtų apimti dešimt būtinų elementų. Raktiniai žodžiai siūlomi traktuoti kaip nuo anotacijos atskira, savarankiška dalis.

Tyrimo rezultatai pabrėžia didesnio vientisumo ir aiškesnių pedagoginių gairių rengiant anotacijų reikalavimus. Į akademinio rašymo programas tikslinga integruoti aiškias anotacijos rengimo gaires ir žanro ypatumais grindžiamą mokymą. Glaudesnis vietinių praktikų derinimas su tarptautiniu mastu pripažintais modeliais padėtų studentams rengti nuoseklesnes ir tikslesnes anotacijas. Be to, svarbu aptarti anotacijų rašymo konvencijas platesniame, ne tik Baltijos regiono, kontekste, siekiant tobulinti akademinio rašymo standartus ir gerinti mokslinę komunikaciją.

About the Authors

DIĀNA LAIVENIECE
Professor, Centre for Humanities and Arts, Liepaja Academy of Riga Technical University, Latvia

Research interests
Scientific language, research methodology, Latvian language didactics, text linguistics

Address
Liepaja Academy of Riga Technical University, Liela str. 14, LV-3401 Liepaja, Latvia

E-mail
diana.laiveniece@rtu.lv

Orcid ID
0000-0002-3107-2109

HELEN HINT
Researcher, Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics, University of Tartu, Estonia

Research interests
Academic writing, academic literacy, rhetoric

Address
Tartu University, Faculty of Philology, Department of English Philology. Jakobi str. 2-446, 51914 Tartu, Estonia

E-mail
helen.hint@ut.ee

Orcid ID
0000-0002-5588-112X

ANITA HELVIGA
Associate Professor, Centre for Humanities and Arts, Liepaja Academy of Riga Technical University

Research interests
Lexicography, semantics, terminology, terminography, word-formation

Address
Liepaja Academy of Riga Technical University, Liela str. 14, LV-3401 Liepaja, Latvia

E-mail
anita.helviga@rtu.lv

Orcid ID
0000-0003-4534-5144

ANNA RUSKAN
Associate Professor, Department of English Philology, Vilnius University, Lithuania

Research interests
Evidentiality, epistemic modality, grammaticalization, corpus linguistics and contrastive linguistics

Address
Vilnius University, Faculty of Philology, Department of English Philology. Universiteto str. 5, LT-01513 Vilnius, Lithuania

E-mail
anna.ruskan@flf.vu.lt

Orcid ID
0000-0001-5547-0075

DZINTRA LELE-ROZENTĀLE

Senior researcher, Centre for Humanities and Arts, Liepaja Academy of Riga Technical University, Latvia

Research interests
Scientific language, academic writing, historical sociolinguistics of German, contrastive linguistics (German-Latvian)

Address
Liepaja Academy of Riga Technical University, Liela str. 14, LV-3401 Liepaja, Latvia

E-mail
dzintra.lele-rozentale@rtu.lv

ORCID iD
0000-0003-3181-6929

AGNESE DUBOVA

Assistant professor, Centre for Humanities and Arts, Liepaja Academy of Riga Technical University, Latvia

Research interests
Scientific language, academic writing, language contacts (German-Latvian), German language acquisition

Address
Liepaja Academy of Riga Technical University, Liela str. 14, LV-3401 Liepaja, Latvia

E-mail
agnese.dubova@rtu.lv

ORCID iD
0000-0002-7428-1824

This article is an Open Access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (CC BY 4.0) License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)