# Thread ID: thread\_j5TZyf1cGrtZQVkXXRDSiYbP

Created at: 11 July 2025, 11:35:15

User (11:35:15):

Please provide feeback on the following paragraph:

Toms experience of employment was not typical in the 1930's. This is due to the high unemployment in some regions such as Monmouthshire peaking at 43% in 1933 compared to that of 14.4% in Buckinghamshire at the time. This shows the disparity in counties of the fact of unemployment. This also shows that the general mining towns were the most affected by the 1930sh whereas other areas were nowhere near as badly affected. Toms experience was very different to that of the working classes as he was a middle-class white male who owned his own business. Therefore meaning that his experience of employment would be very different to that of a working-class person. In summary Toms experience of the 1930s was very different to that of the working class due to his successful and long-lasting employment compared to that of an unemployed person living in Monmouthshire.

. Please format your response in markdown.

#### Assistant (11:35:17):

## Feedback on Paragraph Using CASE Rubric

## Claim

The paragraph presents a clear claim: Tom's experience of employment was not typical in the 1930s. This is a strong starting point as it establishes the focus of the discussion.

#### Argument

The argument attempts to explain why Tom's experience was atypical, emphasizing disparities in unemployment rates between regions and the differences in experiences between middle-class and working-class individuals. However, the argument lacks depth and coherence. While regional unemployment statistics are mentioned, the connection to Tom's specific circumstances is not well-developed. The paragraph also repeats the idea that Tom's middle-class status made his experience different, but it does not elaborate on how this impacted his employment or business ownership in the context of the 1930s economy.

#### Supporting Evidence

The paragraph includes some evidence, such as unemployment rates in Monmouthshire (43%) and Buckinghamshire (14.4%) in 1933, to highlight regional disparities. This is a good attempt at incorporating factual data. However, the evidence is not fully integrated into the argument. For instance, the link between mining towns being more affected and Tom's middle-class status is not explored. Additionally, there is no specific evidence about Tom's business or employment to substantiate the claim that his experience was atypical.

## **Strengths**

- The paragraph provides a clear claim and attempts to support it with statistical evidence.
- It acknowledges regional disparities and class differences, which are relevant to the topic.

## Areas for Improvement

- 1. Coherence and Depth of Argument: The argument should more clearly connect the evidence to Tom's specific experience. For example, how did owning a business shield him from the economic challenges faced by others in mining towns? Why was his middle-class status significant in the context of the 1930s economy?
- 2. **Integration of Evidence**: The statistics provided need to be more explicitly tied to the claim. How do the unemployment rates in Monmouthshire and Buckinghamshire directly relate to Tom's experience?
- 3. **Avoid Repetition**: The paragraph repeats the idea that Tom's experience was different due to his middle-class status without adding new insights. This space could be used to deepen the analysis.

### **Questions for Reflection**

- Can you provide specific examples or details about Tom's business or employment to strengthen the argument?
- How did the economic conditions of the 1930s impact middle-class business owners differently from working-class individuals in mining towns?

## Level Grading: Level 3

The paragraph demonstrates a basic understanding of the topic and includes some relevant evidence. However, it lacks depth in analysis and coherence in linking the claim, argument, and evidence effectively. Improvements in integration and elaboration would elevate it to Level 4 or higher.