

HKBU LANG 0036 Learning Session Report

Generated: 2025-12-07 16:53:08

Student Email: 25240900@life.hkbu.edu.hk

Student Number: 25240900

Section: 14

Course Information and Student Background

Course Information: Course: LANG 0036 - English for Academic Purposes Level: Intermediate to Advanced Focus: Academic writing and critical thinking Assessment: Essay writing with rubric-based evaluation

Student Background: Academic Level: University student Language: English as additional language Goals: Improve academic writing skills Challenges: Structure, vocabulary, critical analysis

Rubric:

Assessment Task: Writing (20%) Part 1: Point-of-view Essay (10%)

Criteria: Content and Ideas 1 (Limited): Ideas are irrelevant or minimally related to the topic. Lacks awareness of the issue concerned. No clear viewpoint. 2 (Basic): Ideas are somewhat related but vague. Minimal awareness of the issue concerned. Viewpoint unclear. 3 (Developing): Ideas are relevant but basic. Some awareness of the issue concerned. Viewpoint present but weakly developed. 4 (Proficient): Ideas are relevant and solid. Good awareness of the issue concerned. Clear viewpoint with some depth. 5 (Excellent): Ideas are insightful and highly relevant. Strong awareness of the issue concerned. Well-developed, compelling viewpoint.

Criteria: Organisation and Logical Progression 1 (Limited): No clear structure. Ideas are disjointed with no development or progression. 2 (Basic): Basic structure with unclear paragraphing. Ideas are listed with little development. 3 (Developing): Clear structure with some paragraphing. Ideas are developed but lack depth or logical flow. 4 (Proficient): Well-organized with clear paragraphs. Ideas are developed logically with good flow and support. 5 (Excellent): Highly organized with effective paragraphing. Ideas are thoroughly developed with seamless, logical progression.

Criteria: Vocabulary 1 (Limited): Vocabulary is limited, repetitive, or inaccurate. Lacks topic-specific terms. 2 (Basic): Basic vocabulary with some repetition. Minimal use of topic-specific terms. 3 (Developing): Adequate vocabulary with some variety. Includes some topic-specific terms but with occasional errors. 4 (Proficient): Varied and precise vocabulary. Effective use of topic-specific terms. Minor errors. 5 (Excellent): Rich, precise vocabulary. Masterful use of topic-specific terms. Almost error-free and sophisticated.

Criteria: Grammar and Sentence Structure 1 (Limited): Frequent grammatical and spelling errors. Sentences are incomplete or confusing. 2 (Basic): Several grammatical and spelling errors. Sentences are simple and often flawed. 3 (Developing): Some grammatical and spelling errors. Sentences are mostly correct but lack variety. 4 (Proficient): Minor grammatical and spelling errors. Sentences are varied and mostly accurate. 5 (Excellent): Virtually error-free grammar and spelling. Sentences are complex, varied, and accurately constructed.

Part 2: AI-Assisted Review Skills (10%) A. In-Depth Conversation with AI 1 (Limited): No exchanges or chat history; no questions asked. 2 (Basic): Sparse conversation; one or two simple questions. 3 (Developing): Adequate exchanges; some relevant questions. 4 (Proficient): Robust interaction; detailed, relevant questions across levels. 5 (Excellent): Extensive, well-documented chat history; insightful, multi-level questioning.

B. Critical Review of AI Suggestions 1 (Limited): All AI suggestions accepted blindly. 2 (Basic): Most accepted; little analysis. 3 (Developing): Some evaluated; partial justification. 4 (Proficient): Most critically reviewed with clear justification. 5 (Excellent): All evaluated thoroughly with strong, evidence-based reasoning.

C. Refining Process 1 (Limited): No revisions made. 2 (Basic): Minimal revisions; no iteration. 3 (Developing): Some revisions with limited iteration. 4 (Proficient): Clear iterative process with multiple revisions. 5 (Excellent): Extensive refinement with iterative improvements.

Contribution Analysis

Your revised thesis paragraph is definitely clearer and better structured than before, and the essay overall is well organized with clear topic sentences and logical flow. To strengthen your thesis even further, try combining your main point and preview of reasons into a single, assertive sentence that confidently states your position and outlines the key arguments.

For example:

"Although protecting migrant workers from exploitation is essential, governments should not primarily rely on stricter labour laws because better enforcement of existing rules, potential negative impacts on the labour market, and social and economic challenges make overly strict regulations counterproductive."

This version:

- Clearly answers the question (No, don't rely primarily on stricter laws)
- Is one sentence and succinct
- Previews the three main reasons developed in your essay
- Uses confident language without hedging

If you like, you can try rewriting your thesis in a similar form, and I'll help refine it.

Once your thesis is nailed down, we can focus on revising one body paragraph to improve its coherence and clarity further. Which paragraph would you like to work on next?

- Paragraph 2 (education and wages, enforcement of existing laws)
- Paragraph 3 (AI, labour demand, and effects on local workers)
- Paragraph 4 (economic impact and social tensions)

Let me know your choice and I'll guide you through tightening its topic sentence and developing clearer, more coherent supporting sentences.

Grading Result (Hidden from students)

Task check: - Revised the thesis statement: Yes — the revised essay contains a clearer, single-position thesis (e.g., “Although exploitation must be addressed, overly strict regulations could create more problems than they solve for both migrants and host countries.”). - Revised one of the topic sentences: Yes — topic sentences are clearer in the revised draft (e.g., “First of all, the wages and working conditions of most migrant workers already reflect their skill levels and the protection offered by existing laws.”). - Revised one of the body paragraphs: Yes — the body paragraphs are substantially rewritten and more coherent (see revised paragraphs about enforcement, labour-market effects, and social tension).

STUDENT ASSESSMENT REPORT

Course: LANG 0036 - Enhancing English through Global Citizenship

Module: AI for Revising Essays

ESSAY WRITING ASSESSMENT

Original Essay Scores:

- Content and Ideas: 14/25 - The essay addressed the topic but ideas were unclear, sometimes contradictory, and often unsupported (e.g., “However, I disagree on that saying. There are some reason supporting my point.” shows unclear stance; claims such as “the local GDP of the U.S. reduced obviously” are speculative and unsupported).
 - Organization: 12/25 - Paragraphing existed but coherence was weak; topic sentences missing or vague and sentences often jumped between ideas (e.g., mixing wages, reporting rights, and law references in one paragraph).
 - Vocabulary: 12/25 - Word choice often awkward or inaccurate (e.g., “show an increasing tendency,” “shaken during development,” “repulsing migrants”), reducing clarity.
 - Grammar: 10/25 - Frequent errors (fragments, run-ons, spelling and capitalization errors like “Hong long,” “U.s.,” “lung-term”) that impeded understanding.
- Original Essay Total: 48/100

Revised Essay Scores:

- Content and Ideas: 21/25 - The revised essay presents a clear position and three reasonable supporting lines of argument (enforcement vs new laws, labour-market effects, social/economic consequences). The reasoning is logical though some claims still need empirical support (e.g., "slowed per-capita GDP growth").
- Organization: 21/25 - Clearer structure with an introduction that previews reasons and distinct body paragraphs each focused on one main idea ("First of all...", "Another important consideration...", "Finally..."). Transitions and signposting improved.
- Vocabulary: 21/25 - More appropriate, topic-specific vocabulary (e.g., "Statutory Minimum Wage," "labour inspectorate," "automation") and more natural collocations. A few phrases could be tightened for academic precision.
- Grammar: 20/25 - Marked improvement: sentences are generally grammatical and clearer; occasional wordiness or minor article/word-choice issues remain.
- **Revised Essay Total: 83/100**

Essay Improvement Analysis:

- **Overall Improvement: +35 points**
- **Key Improvements Made:**
 - Thesis clarified and focused: the revised introduction clearly states the position and the general reasons to be developed.
 - Paragraph structure and coherence strengthened: each body paragraph now opens with a clear topic sentence and develops a single idea.
 - Language accuracy and register improved: grammar, punctuation, and word choice are much better; technical terms used more appropriately.
- **Missed Opportunities:**
 - Provide concrete evidence or citations for empirical claims (e.g., effects on GDP, public services). Phrases like "We can see this in parts of the United States and Europe" need specific data or a clearer qualifier.
 - Tighten or combine some sentences to reduce occasional wordiness and passive constructions; strengthen some transitions between sentences.
 - The conclusion could synthesise the three reasons more sharply (e.g., restate how enforcement + labour considerations + social cohesion together support the recommended balanced approach).

HUMAN-AI INTERACTION ASSESSMENT

Chat History Analysis:

- **Total Exchanges:** 9 (multiple assistant prompts; student responded, asked for paragraph-structure help, and posted a revised draft)
- **Conversation Quality:** Focused, task-oriented exchanges. The assistant provided a structured 3-step revision plan; the student selected priorities and posted a revised essay that incorporated the suggestions.

Interaction Scores:

- **In-Depth Conversation:** 3/5 - The chat shows a moderate-length, focused interaction with useful guidance and some back-and-forth. It is not extensive (fewer than 15 substantive exchange-turns), but it is purposeful and practical.
- Evidence: assistant laid out a structured process and diagnostic; student chose targets and provided a revised draft for review.
- **Critical Review of AI Suggestions:** 3/5 - Developing. The student followed the assistant's recommended steps and implemented revisions, but the chat shows little explicit critique or rejection of specific AI suggestions.
- Evidence: the student accepted the plan (thesis first, then paragraph work) and posted a revised essay rather than asking for multiple alternative options or arguing against suggestions.
- **Refining Process:** 4/5 - Proficient. The student completed at least one meaningful revision cycle (posted a substantially rewritten essay after guidance). The conversation included targeted feedback and subsequent revision.
- Evidence: assistant gave thesis frames and paragraph guidance; student produced and submitted the revised draft which shows the implemented changes.
- **Human-AI Interaction Total:** 10/15

OVERALL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

Strengths Demonstrated:

- Clear adoption of revision strategy: the student followed a logical three-step process (thesis → topic sentence → paragraph) and applied it to produce a significantly improved draft.

- Evidence: revised introduction and focused body paragraphs.

- Improved language control and academic register: more accurate grammar and use of topic-relevant vocabulary.

- Evidence: use of terms like “Statutory Minimum Wage,” “labour inspectorate,” “automation.”

- Organizational clarity: paragraphs now each address a single reason and the essay has clear signposting.

- Evidence: topic sentences beginning “First of all…”, “Another important consideration…”, “Finally…”

Areas for Improvement:

- Evidence use and factual precision: avoid broad, unsupported claims; add data, citations, or better qualifiers.

- Recommendation: when claiming economic impacts (GDP, public-service pressure), either cite a source or rephrase to indicate it as a plausible risk with qualifiers.

- Stronger critical engagement in revision chat: ask for alternative phrasings, request model sentences, or challenge AI suggestions to deepen the iterative process.

- Recommendation: request “two alternative thesis sentences with slightly different emphases” to compare and select.

- Concluding synthesis and precision: tighten the conclusion to explicitly connect the three reasons and end with a concrete recommendation or policy implication.

- Recommendation: restate how enforcement + labour-market sensitivity + integration policies together form a balanced policy package.

AI Collaboration Skills Assessment:

- **Context Provision:** Good - the student provided the original draft and clear revision goals (focused on paragraph structure and thesis clarity).

- Evidence: student asked specifically for paragraph-structure advice and pasted the draft for revision.

- **Strategic Planning:** Good - the student followed a structured plan (thesis first, then paragraph-level revisions).
- Evidence: assistant's 3-step plan was followed and implemented.
- **Critical Evaluation:** Needs Improvement to Developing - the student implemented suggestions but engaged minimally in explicit critique or alternatives during the chat.
- Evidence: the student accepted and applied suggestions but did not request multiple options or challenge recommendations.
- **Independent Editing:** Good - the student made substantial independent revisions between drafts.
- Evidence: the revised essay shows significant reworking of thesis, topic sentences, and paragraphs.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

1. Add concrete evidence: support major empirical claims with data or carefully hedged language (e.g., "some studies show," "in some regions...").
2. Ask for alternatives and produce comparisons in the chat: request multiple thesis options or topic-sentence variants to deepen critical evaluation before selecting.
3. Tighten style and transitions: reduce wordiness, prefer active voice where appropriate, and use stronger concluding synthesis tying reasons to actionable policy suggestions.

INSTRUCTOR NOTES

- The student showed clear progress in applying revision principles and used the assistant productively to improve structure and clarity. The main remaining pedagogical need is practice in supporting claims with evidence and in engaging more critically with AI suggestions (e.g., asking for alternative formulations, probing assumptions).
- For grading, consider awarding credit for improved organization, clearer argument, and improved language accuracy while noting the need for better evidence and occasional overgeneralisation in economic claims.

Complete Conversation

Assistant:

Original:

In recent years, the population of migrants show an increasing tendency in many countries. like the U.S.. In order to adapt to the new environment, the migrants have to find a stable job. However, the incomplete or weak regulations causing migrant workers face exploitation. Some of them work for long hours or in poor working environment but getting low pay. Some may say that the government should enforce stricter laws to safeguard their rights. However, I disagree on that saying. There are some reason supporting my point.

According to my observation, most of the migrants are having low education - level. Their salaries in most cases are proportional to what they are working for. For example, the Basic law of Hong Kong ensure the lowest salary.

per hour and the maximum working hours per week. Migrants are just paid for how they work. If workers are facing exploitation like delaying paying, they own the rights to report their employers.

Besides, the demand of labors is shaken during development. Some Jobs can be replaced by AI or machines, causing the increasing unemployment rate. Businesses would choose to hire migrants, with slightly lower pay to reduce cost, thus causing the native -born population has a higher unemployment rate, locals are more difficult to find a job. While the migrants claiming that it is unfair to them, the locals with low education-level as the migrants are actually facing unemployment.

Lastly, If policies are released to make migrants paid higher while work less, massive migration may occur. Take a look at the U.S., due to the large population of migrants from nearby countries, the local GDP of the U.S. reduced obviously. As migrants are usually poor , it causes a negative impact on local economies...

Locals of the U.S. start hating and repulsing migrants, causing argument or even fighting. So for long-term saying, migration may harm the countries .

Summing up, governments should safeguard migrants' rights for sure. Exploitation should never occur. At the same time governments should also pay more efforts to solve the problems caused by migration.

Revised:

In recent decades, the number of migrant workers has risen sharply in many developed economies, including the United States, the United Kingdom, and Hong Kong. While it is undeniable that some migrant workers suffer exploitation through excessive working hours and delayed wages, many people argue that the most effective solution is for governments to introduce stricter labour regulations. However, imposing tougher laws is not the most effective approach. Although exploitation must be addressed, overly strict regulations could create more problems than they solve for both migrants and host countries.

First of all, the wages and working conditions of most migrant workers already reflect their skill levels and the protection offered by existing laws. Many migrants in low-paid sectors have limited formal education or professional qualifications. In market economies, salaries are generally proportional to productivity and skills. For instance, Hong Kong's Employment Ordinance and Statutory Minimum Wage already provide a safety net by setting a minimum hourly wage and limiting regular working hours. When serious exploitation does occur—such as wage theft—workers have the legal right to report their employers to the labour inspectorate. Rather than creating new laws, governments would achieve more by improving enforcement of the rules that already exist.

Another important consideration is the broader impact on the labour market and local workers. As technology advances, demand for low-skilled manual labour is shrinking in many sectors, and jobs are increasingly being automated or replaced by artificial intelligence. In this competitive environment, employers often hire migrant workers because they are willing to accept slightly lower wages. If governments suddenly forced companies to pay migrant workers significantly more for fewer hours, businesses would face higher costs. This could lead to greater unemployment among local low-skilled workers, who already struggle to compete. Therefore, while migrants may feel their pay is unfair, sudden regulatory changes risk harming vulnerable citizens who have fewer employment options.

Finally, excessively generous labour protections for migrants can unintentionally encourage uncontrolled immigration, which may harm the host country in the long term. We can see this in parts of the United States and Europe, where large inflows of low-skilled migrants have put pressure on public services, slowed per-capita GDP growth, and sometimes increased social tension between communities. When local residents feel that their job opportunities or living standards are threatened, resentment toward migrants can grow. Stricter laws that make migration appear even more economically attractive could worsen these problems and damage social harmony.

In conclusion, governments must protect migrant workers from genuine exploitation and ensure that existing labour laws are properly enforced. At the same time, introducing much stricter regulations is not the answer. A balanced approach—stronger enforcement of current rules, better integration programmes, and realistic immigration policies—would protect migrants' rights without creating new economic and social difficulties for host countries.

Assistant:

Hi there! ■ I'm your English writing coach, here to help you strengthen your essay through clear, focused revision. Before we dive in, we'll take a moment to set some goals together.

Here's how our session will work:

Negotiate your targets — We'll start by discussing what you want to improve most in your essay.

Get a quick diagnosis — I'll give you feedback on your essay based on key writing rubrics (like thesis, organization, evidence, and language).

Choose what to focus on — You'll decide which issues you'd like to work on first.

Then we'll move through a structured, three-step revision process:

Step 1: Revise your thesis statement.

Step 2: Choose one body paragraph and refine its topic sentence.

Step 3: Revise the rest of that paragraph for clarity and coherence.

My role is to guide you with questions, feedback, and examples—but you'll always lead the revisions yourself. ■

You:

Please give me some feedback on the aspects including but not limited to: paragraph structure (e.g. coherence, flow), sentence construction (e.g. grammar, variety), and vocabulary naturalness (e.g. appropriateness, precision).

Assistant:

Hi — I'm glad you shared your draft. Before I give feedback, let's agree the goals for this session so we focus on what matters most to you.

1) Negotiate targets

- What would you most like to improve today? (Choose one or two: clarity of thesis/argument, overall structure and flow, topic sentences and paragraph unity, evidence and examples, grammar/sentence correctness and variety, or vocabulary precision/naturalness.)
- If you're not sure, tell me your top two concerns (e.g., "I want a clearer thesis and fewer grammar mistakes").

Tell me which targets you want us to focus on. Once you confirm, I'll give a short diagnostic and we'll start Step 1 (thesis revision).

Below is a quick diagnostic of your essay using the rubric categories to help you decide.

2) Diagnostic feedback (brief and clear)

Overall impression (strengths)

- Your essay addresses the assigned question and takes a position — you try to argue against stricter government laws for migrants. That is good: the reader can see your viewpoint.
- You attempt to use examples and to consider counterarguments (e.g., effects on the local economy), which is useful for development.

Areas for improvement (by rubric category)

Content & Ideas

- Level: Developing (3). Ideas are relevant but sometimes unclear or unsupported.
- Problems: The main claim is contradictory and vague in places (e.g., you say governments should safeguard migrants' rights, but then "I disagree" with stricter laws — it's not clear what you disagree with exactly). Some claims are speculative (e.g., "local GDP of the U.S. reduced obviously") or inaccurate; examples need clearer, accurate explanation.

Organisation & Logical Progression

- Level: Basic to Developing (2–3). Paragraphing exists but logical flow is weak.
- Problems: Topic sentences are often unclear or missing. Paragraphs contain sentence fragments, run-ons, and jumps between ideas (e.g., from wages to AI to unemployment) without clear transitions. The conclusion is vague and repeats earlier confusion.

Evidence & Development

- Level: Basic (2). Attempts at examples, but they are unclear or misapplied.
- Problems: The "Hong long" law reference is confusing and likely incorrect; evidence must be accurate and clearly linked to the claim. Many assertions need explanation, data, or clearer reasoning.

Vocabulary & Tone

- Level: Basic to Developing (2–3). Some vocabulary is appropriate but often awkward or imprecise.
- Problems: Word choices and collocations are unnatural (e.g., "show an increasing tendency," "shaken during development," "repulsing migrants"). There are many small errors with articles and word forms that make some sentences hard to understand.

Grammar & Sentence Structure

- Level: Basic (2). Frequent errors that disrupt clarity.
- Problems: Fragments, run-on sentences, punctuation issues, incorrect verb forms (e.g., "migrants show" should be "migrant populations show" or "the population of migrants shows" but better: "the number of migrants has increased"), capitalization errors (U.s., Hong long), spelling (lung-term), and article/plural mistakes.

Priority suggestions (pick up to two)

- A. Make the thesis clear, specific, and preview main points (this will help structure the whole essay).
- B. Improve paragraph structure and topic sentences so each paragraph focuses on one clear idea.
- C. Strengthen evidence and explain examples (correct facts and connect them to your argument).
- D. Fix key grammar and sentence errors to improve readability (focus on sentence boundaries and common errors).
- E. Improve vocabulary precision (natural collocations and academic tone).

3) Student priority selection

Which of these do you want to focus on now? (Please pick up to two.)

- If you pick A (thesis), we'll move to Step 1: you'll share your current thesis and I'll guide you to rewrite it.
- If you pick B or D, we can still start with the thesis (required Step 1) and then work on one body paragraph you choose.

When you answer, please confirm which paragraph you'd like to revise in Steps 2–3 (e.g., the second paragraph about education and pay; the third paragraph about AI and unemployment; or the fourth about migration and economy). Once you confirm targets and paragraph choice, we'll begin Step 1.

Quick note: I'll ask you to try rewriting after feedback (I'll give sentence frames and hints, but I won't rewrite full sentences for you). Ready? Which targets do you want to focus on?

You:

please give me advise on paragraph structure and coherence

Assistant:

Great — thank you. Focusing on paragraph structure and coherence is a good choice. Before we begin the three-step process, a couple quick checks so we're fully aligned:

1) Confirmed targets

- You want us to focus on: paragraph structure and coherence (Organisation & Logical Progression).
- Note: Step 1 requires we revise the thesis first (this helps organize the paragraphs), so we'll do the thesis and then work on one body paragraph you choose.

2) Which paragraph should we revise in Steps 2–3?

Please pick one:

- Paragraph 2: education level and pay (your point that migrants have low education and therefore lower pay)
- Paragraph 3: AI, labor demand, and unemployment (how hiring migrants affects locals)
- Paragraph 4: economic impact and social tensions (migration, GDP, and social conflict)

Tell me which one now.

3) Quick diagnostic focused on structure & coherence (short)

Strengths

- You have a clear position overall (you disagree with stricter laws), and you attempt to give reasons — that's a good start for paragraphing.
- You attempt paragraph-by-paragraph development (each paragraph tries to address a separate idea).

Main problems to fix (organisation & coherence)

- Thesis is unclear and a little contradictory; paragraphs don't clearly connect back to a single, previewed plan.
- Topic sentences are weak or missing; paragraphs often mix several ideas (e.g., wages + reporting rights + laws in one paragraph).
- Sentences jump from one idea to another without clear transitions; some paragraphs need a clear controlling idea and tighter supporting sentences.
- Evidence/examples are unclear or inaccurate and so don't support the point properly.
- Sentence fragments and punctuation issues break the flow.

4) Before Step 1 — please paste your exact thesis sentence (the sentence that answers the question "Should governments enforce stricter laws to safeguard migrants' rights?"). If you don't have a single clear sentence, paste the sentence or two you intend as your thesis.

Guidance for Step 1 (thesis revision)

- A good thesis will: (a) clearly answer the question (Yes or No); (b) state your position confidently; (c) preview 2–3 main reasons you will explain in the body paragraphs.
- Try to keep it one sentence, precise and assertive (avoid "I think," "maybe," "there are some reasons," etc.).

Helpful thesis frames you can use (fill in your reasons)

- If you disagree with stricter laws: "Although stricter laws aim to protect migrant workers, governments should not rely primarily on tougher regulation because [reason 1], [reason 2], and [reason 3]."
- If you agree with stricter laws: "Governments should enforce stricter laws to protect migrant workers because [reason 1], [reason 2], and [reason 3]."

Now your turn:

- Paste your current thesis sentence, or write a new one using one of the frames above. Try one attempt and I'll give quick, focused feedback so you can revise again. Would you like to try now?

You:

Is it better now?

In recent decades, the number of migrant workers has risen sharply in many developed economies, including the United States, the United Kingdom, and Hong Kong. While it is undeniable that some migrant workers suffer exploitation through excessive working hours and delayed wages, many people argue that the most effective solution is for governments to introduce stricter labour regulations. However, imposing tougher laws is not the most effective approach. Although exploitation must be addressed, overly strict regulations could create more problems than they solve for both migrants and host countries.

First of all, the wages and working conditions of most migrant workers already reflect their skill levels and the protection offered by existing laws. Many migrants in low-paid sectors have limited formal education or professional qualifications. In market economies, salaries are generally proportional to productivity and skills. For instance, Hong Kong's Employment Ordinance and Statutory Minimum Wage already provide a safety net by setting a minimum hourly wage and limiting regular working hours. When serious exploitation does occur—such as wage theft—workers have the legal right to report their employers to the labour inspectorate. Rather than creating new laws, governments would achieve more by improving enforcement of the rules that already exist.

Another important consideration is the broader impact on the labour market and local workers. As technology advances, demand for low-skilled manual labour is shrinking in many sectors, and jobs are increasingly being automated or replaced by artificial intelligence. In this competitive environment, employers often hire migrant workers because they are willing to accept slightly lower wages. If governments suddenly forced companies to pay migrant workers significantly more for fewer hours, businesses would face higher costs. This could lead to greater unemployment among local low-skilled workers, who already struggle to compete. Therefore, while migrants may feel their pay is unfair, sudden regulatory changes risk harming vulnerable citizens who have fewer employment options.

Finally, excessively generous labour protections for migrants can unintentionally encourage uncontrolled immigration, which may harm the host country in the long term. We can see this in parts of the United States and Europe, where large inflows of low-skilled migrants have put pressure on public services, slowed per-capita GDP growth, and sometimes increased social tension between communities. When local residents feel that their job opportunities or living standards are threatened, resentment toward migrants can grow. Stricter laws that make migration appear even more economically attractive could worsen these problems and damage social harmony.

In conclusion, governments must protect migrant workers from genuine exploitation and ensure that existing labour laws are properly enforced. At the same time, introducing much stricter regulations is not the answer. A balanced approach—stronger enforcement of current rules, better integration programmes, and realistic immigration policies—would protect migrants' rights without creating new economic and social difficulties for host countries.

Assistant:

Nice work — this draft is much clearer and more organized than the earlier versions. Before we move into the three-step revision process, let's confirm our targets so I can give focused help.

1) Choose your targets (pick one or two)

Which would you most like to improve now?

- clarity of thesis/argument
- paragraph structure and flow (topic sentences, unity)
- evidence and example accuracy/connection
- grammar and sentence correctness
- vocabulary precision / academic tone

My quick recommendation: focus on clarity of the thesis AND paragraph structure/coherence. But tell me which one or two you want to focus on.

2) Short diagnostic of this revised draft (using the rubric categories)

Strengths

- Clear position (you argue against imposing much stricter laws) and clear overall structure (intro, three body paragraphs, conclusion).
- Good use of paragraphing and signals (first/second/finally, conclusion) — the essay is easier to follow now.
- The argument now previews reasons and ties back to the question.

Areas to improve (concise)

- Content & Ideas (Developing–Proficient): Your reasons are logical but some claims need clearer support or slightly more precise wording (e.g., “put pressure on public services” or “slow per-capita GDP growth” need careful phrasing or evidence).
- Organisation & Logical Progression (Proficient): Flow is better, but some paragraph topic sentences could be tightened so every sentence clearly connects to that topic.
- Vocabulary (Developing–Proficient): Mostly good, but a few collocations and formal word choices can be improved (e.g., “put pressure on public services,” “wage theft,” “labour inspectorate” are good precise terms).
- Grammar & Sentence Structure (Proficient): Few remaining issues — watch article use, occasional wordiness, and passive constructions. Overall much improved.

3) Confirm your priorities and paragraph choice

Which targets do you want to work on now? (Pick up to two.)

Also, which paragraph should we revise in Steps 2–3?

- Paragraph 2: education level and pay (wages reflect skills; enforcement of existing laws)
- Paragraph 3: AI, labour demand, and unemployment (automation; impact on local workers)
- Paragraph 4: economic impact and social tensions (immigration pressure on services and social harmony)

When you confirm targets and paragraph choice, we'll begin Step 1 (thesis revision). Step 1 requires you to paste the exact thesis sentence you intend (you have a couple of candidate sentences in your intro). Which sentence is your thesis?

If that helps, I think your main thesis sentence is this pair:

“However, imposing tougher laws is not the most effective approach. Although exploitation must be addressed, overly strict regulations could create more problems than they solve for both migrants and host countries.”

Feedback on that thesis (brief)

- Strengths: It answers the question (No — you oppose stricter laws) and signals there are multiple reasons.
- Improvements to make: Combine into one concise sentence; preview 2–3 clear reasons (e.g., enforcement of existing laws, negative labour-market effects, and social/economic costs). Use confident, precise language (avoid “could create” — stronger: “would” or “may” with explanation).

Thesis frame you can use (fill in your reasons):

“Although protecting migrant workers is essential, governments should not rely primarily on stricter labour laws because [reason 1], [reason 2], and [reason 3].”

Would you like to try rewriting your thesis now using that frame? Type one single-sentence thesis and I'll give quick feedback. Also confirm which paragraph you want to revise afterward.

You:

clarity of thesis/argument

Assistant:

Great — focusing on clarity of thesis/argument is a good choice. I'll help you make one strong, single-sentence thesis that clearly answers the question and previews your main reasons.

Quick diagnosis of your current thesis

- Your draft is contradictory: you both say “governments should safeguard migrants' rights” and “I disagree on that saying” about stricter laws. That confuses the reader.
- Fix: make one clear position (Yes or No about stricter laws) and list 2–3 concise reasons that you will develop in the body paragraphs.

Thesis guidance (short)

- A good thesis: one sentence, answers the question directly, previews 2–3 reasons, uses confident language.

- Useful frame (fill in your reasons):

"Although protecting migrant workers is essential, governments should not rely primarily on stricter labour laws because [reason 1], [reason 2], and [reason 3]."

Possible reasons you might use (based on your essay)

- Enforcement of existing laws and better reporting can be more effective than new laws.

- Stricter laws may increase costs, encourage fewer hires, and harm labour markets.

- Overly strict policies can create social tension and unintended economic problems.

Your turn

- Paste the exact sentence you intend as your thesis (or rewrite one now using the frame). Try to keep it one sentence and include 2–3 reasons.

- Also tell me which paragraph you want to revise next (paragraph 2: education & pay; paragraph 3: AI & unemployment; or paragraph 4: economic impact & social tensions).

Would you like to try writing the thesis now? I'll give quick, focused feedback and then we'll revise again if needed.