

ETHICAL ACADEMIC WRITING: A GUIDED REVISION WALKTHROUGH

CASE STUDY 1: RESPECTFUL LANGUAGE & ACADEMIC CAUTION

ORIGINAL WEAK EXTRACT

Students with dyslexia are usually **poor readers** and often cannot keep up with **normal** classroom learning because they **learn slower** than other students.

GUIDED DIAGNOSIS

- Deficit-oriented language
- Inappropriate terminology (normal vs abnormal)
- Overgeneralisations (ignores individual variation)

IMPROVED REVISION

Some students with dyslexia may require **differentiated literacy support** to participate effectively in mainstream classroom learning contexts.

WHY THE REVISION IS STRONGER

- Replaces deficit-focused descriptions with support-oriented language
- Uses cautious academic phrasing
- Acknowledges that learning experiences vary by context

CASE STUDY 2: SOURCE INTEGRATION & EVIDENCE-BASED CLAIMS

ORIGINAL WEAK EXTRACT

Research **proves** that **inclusive education creates major problems** for teachers. According to Hassan (2022), inclusion increases teacher stress.

GUIDED DIAGNOSIS

- Overstated claims ("proves")
- Unbalanced negative bias
- Weak source integration (mechanical insertion)

IMPROVED REVISION

Some studies reported that teachers **may experience challenges when implementing inclusive education**. For example, Hassan (2022) found that limited institutional support may contribute to stress.

WHY THE REVISION IS STRONGER

- Employs cautious wording
- Presents a balanced perspective on complex issues
- Integrates citations smoothly into academic flow

ETHICAL WRITING CHECKLIST

CHECKLIST ITEM	PROFESSIONAL STANDARD	✓
1) Respectful Representation	Avoids stereotypes; uses person-first/strengths-based language.	✓
2) Balanced Evidence	Avoids "proof"; acknowledges challenges and strengths fairly.	✓
3) Integrity & Tone	Properly cites all sources; maintains an objective, balanced tone.	✓