

# HKBU LANG 0036 Learning Session Report

Generated: 2025-12-02 10:34:06

Student Email: 25226177@life.hkbu.edu.hk

Student Number: 25226177

Section: 46

## 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

Thank you for sharing your full essay and the chat history for context. Your essay demonstrates clear, logical arguments and a strong command of academic English. Below is a comprehensive evaluation based on your current work and interaction with the AI:

### Evaluation of Your Final Essay

#### Content and Ideas:

- Your essay effectively presents a clear stance supporting stricter labour laws for migrant workers.
- Each paragraph addresses a distinct and relevant point: preventing exploitation, maintaining fair market competition, and addressing counterarguments.
- Usage of specific mechanisms like minimum wage legislation, workplace safety standards, legal recourse, and government incentives enhances the argument.
- To strengthen further, consider adding one or two concise, concrete pieces of evidence—e.g., a statistic on wage theft or a brief reference to ILO labour standards—to give more weight and specificity to your claims.

#### Organization and Coherence:

- The essay flows logically from introduction, through body paragraphs, to a persuasive conclusion.
- Topic sentences mostly connect well to the thesis, though a few could more explicitly echo the thesis language or end with clear transitions to the next idea.
- Adding a brief framing sentence or two before your thesis in the introduction paragraph could help set context for readers unfamiliar with the issue.

#### Vocabulary and Language Use:

- You employ precise academic and topic-specific terms effectively (e.g., “statutory minimum wage,” “level playing field,” “anti-retaliation protections”).
- To avoid repetition, vary frequently used nouns like “workers,” “laws,” and “employers” with synonyms (e.g., “employees,” “regulations,” “businesses”) when natural.
- Introducing additional labor-related terms such as “labor inspectorate,” “grievance mechanisms,” or “worksit audits” could enrich the vocabulary further.

#### Grammar and Style:

- Your grammar is generally solid with varied sentence structures contributing to a professional tone.
- Some sentences could be tightened for concision—for example, omitting the opening “Therefore” in your thesis strengthens impact.
- Replacing “this vulnerable workforce” with “migrant workers” enhances clarity and directness.

## Summary of Human-AI Interaction Analysis

- The record shows a limited number of exchanges (6) and minimal iterative revision within the conversation.
- The AI provided a clear workflow and actionable suggestions, including thesis strengthening and paragraph revision strategies.
- However, the student did not engage in back-and-forth refinement or critically evaluate AI suggestions in the chat, instead submitting a final essay for evaluation.
- Despite limited interaction, the final essay reflects strong independent revision and editing skills.

---

## Recommendations for Continued Development

### **Evidence Integration:**

Add concise examples or data points supporting your claims (e.g., a brief ILO reference, wage theft statistics). This will elevate the essay from strong to outstanding.

### **Thesis Precision:**

Refine your thesis to omit filler such as "Therefore" and be specific, e.g.:

"Governments must enact and enforce stricter labour regulations because these measures prevent exploitation, ensure fair market competition, and protect the fundamental rights of migrant workers."

### **Vocabulary Diversification:**

Introduce synonyms and additional labor law terminology naturally throughout the essay to add lexical richness.

### **Structural Polishing:**

Consider adding a framing context sentence before the thesis to set up the issue and ensure each paragraph closes with a sentence that reinforces its connection to the thesis.

### **AI Collaboration Strategy:**

In future interactions, actively engage with the AI by:

6. Providing clear goals and context upfront.

7. Iteratively revising text in smaller sections.

8. Critically evaluating and discussing AI's suggestions.

This will maximize the benefits of AI as a writing partner.

---

If you'd like, I can assist you now with one targeted revision—such as refining the thesis or improving the first body paragraph for clarity and adding a concrete example. Just let me know your preference!

## Grading Result (Hidden from students)

# 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: 15/25 - The central claim (governments should protect migrant workers through stricter laws) is present but underdeveloped and unclear. While a counterpoint is hinted ("Each coin have two side"), ideas are vague and not explained with mechanisms or examples.
  - Organization: 14/25 - Paragraphing and logical flow are unclear. Topic sentences do not signal main ideas, and transitions are weak or confusing. The sequence of points is difficult to follow.
  - Vocabulary: 12/25 - Frequent inaccurate or non-standard word choices ("comen," "realities working envolvent," "cowHR," "heedes") hinder meaning. Limited academic terminology relevant to labour rights.
  - Grammar: 10/25 - Major errors in grammar and sentence structure ("In one word, governments effective and comen is necessary"; "Stricters always means less free") significantly impede understanding.
- Original Essay Total: 51/100

### **Revised Essay Scores:**

- Content and Ideas: 23/25 - Clear, relevant, and well-developed ideas. Strong awareness of migrant worker exploitation issues and a clear viewpoint. Mechanisms are explained (minimum wage, safety standards, enforcement, anti-retaliation) and a counterargument is addressed.
- Organization: 23/25 - Clear structure: introduction with a thesis; body paragraphs on exploitation prevention, fair competition, and counterargument + rebuttal; conclusion reinforces the thesis. Topic sentences generally align with the thesis ("Firstly, by enacting and enforcing stringent laws..."; "Beyond protecting migrants..."; "Critics legitimately argue...").
- Vocabulary: 22/25 - Precise academic terms and topic-specific language ("statutory minimum wage," "workplace safety standards," "level playing field," "race to the bottom," "compliance procedures"). Minor opportunities to diversify repeated nouns.
- Grammar: 22/25 - Generally accurate with varied sentence structures. Minor tightening possible (e.g., opening "Therefore," and occasional long sentences).
- **Revised Essay Total: 90/100**

### **Essay Improvement Analysis:**

- **Overall Improvement: +39 points**
- **Key Improvements Made:**
  - Clear, assertive thesis that previews three reasons ("prevent exploitation," "ensure a level playing field," "protect fundamental rights").
  - Stronger topic sentences and coherent paragraph development with mechanisms (minimum wage, safety standards, enforcement, legal recourse).
  - Inclusion of a counterargument ("overly stringent regulations might deter employment") and practical rebuttal (streamlined compliance, tax incentives, awareness campaigns).
- **Missed Opportunities:**
  - Add concise, concrete evidence (e.g., ILO standards, brief statistics on wage theft or injuries, a short case example) to increase persuasiveness.
  - Minor precision edits (remove "Therefore" at thesis opening; specify "migrant workers" instead of "this vulnerable workforce") and occasional variation in diction ("workers," "employers," "laws").

## HUMAN-AI INTERACTION ASSESSMENT

### Chat History Analysis:

- **Total Exchanges:** 6
- **Conversation Quality:** Minimal, guided by the assistant. The assistant proposed a structured three-step process (thesis, topic sentence, paragraph revision) and provided model language. The student requested completion of the first paragraph and then posted a final essay for evaluation without engaging in iterative question–answer refinement.

### Interaction Scores:

- **In-Depth Conversation:** 2/5 - Limited back-and-forth (6 messages total). The assistant asked targeted planning questions (goals, priorities, position/scope), but the student did not respond to those prompts with detailed information or multiple queries.
- **Critical Review of AI Suggestions:** 1/5 - No evidence of the student evaluating or justifying acceptance/rejection of suggestions. For instance, the assistant proposed removing “Therefore” and adjusting “this vulnerable workforce” to “migrant workers,” but the student did not comment on or assess these suggestions in the chat.
- **Refining Process:** 2/5 - The assistant outlined a multi-step refinement strategy and offered a draft introduction. The student asked for completion of the first paragraph and later submitted a final essay; however, the provided chat shows no iterative cycles (e.g., revising a topic sentence and then reworking the rest of that paragraph) within the history.
- **Human-AI Interaction Total:** 5/15

## OVERALL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

### Strengths Demonstrated:

- Clear argumentative stance and structured reasoning: The thesis and body paragraphs align well, moving from protecting migrants to benefits for locals and then addressing counterarguments.
- Effective use of mechanisms: References to “statutory minimum wage,” “workplace safety standards,” “legal recourse,” and “anti-retaliation protections” demonstrate topic awareness and explain how laws operate.

- Academic tone and coherence: The essay uses precise language ("level playing field," "race to the bottom") and cohesive transitions ("Consequently," "However," "In conclusion").

#### Areas for Improvement:

- Evidence depth: Incorporate one or two brief, concrete examples or data points (e.g., an ILO guideline, a statistic on wage theft, a short case of safety violations) to substantiate claims.
- Precision and concision in the thesis: Drop the initial "Therefore" and name "migrant workers" explicitly instead of "this vulnerable workforce."
- Lexical variety: Vary repeated terms ("workers," "employers," "laws") with suitable synonyms and add domain-specific terms where natural (e.g., "labour inspectorate," "grievance mechanisms," "worksit audits").

#### AI Collaboration Skills Assessment:

- **Context Provision:** Needs Improvement - The student did not provide detailed goals or course-specific context when prompted; they referenced "more than thirty rounds," but the provided chat lacks that history.
- **Strategic Planning:** Needs Improvement - The assistant proposed a plan (thesis → topic sentence → paragraph), but the student did not confirm targets or select paragraphs to work on.
- **Critical Evaluation:** Needs Improvement - No evidence of evaluating suggestions or requesting alternatives; suggestions were neither discussed nor justified.
- **Independent Editing:** Good - The student produced a significantly improved essay independently, indicating strong self-editing ability even without iterative chat-based refinement.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

1. Essay writing skills: Integrate concise, credible evidence (ILO conventions, brief statistics, or a named case) to substantiate claims and elevate the essay to "Excellent." Tighten the thesis opening and add a sentence linking each body paragraph's conclusion back to the thesis.
2. AI collaboration skills: Engage in the proposed revision workflow—state two clear priorities, answer scoping questions, and iterate on one topic sentence and body paragraph. Ask the AI for contrasting options and explain your acceptance or rejection with reasons.

3. Overall improvement: Build a habit of precision edits (eliminate filler like "Therefore" in thesis openings), vary diction, and maintain parallel structure in reason lists. Consider adding a brief framing sentence before the thesis to set context.

## INSTRUCTOR NOTES

- The student reports "more than thirty rounds of discussion," but the submitted chat history shows only six exchanges and no iterative revisions. If comprehensive interaction assessment is required, please ensure the student submits the complete chat log. The essay demonstrates substantial improvement; however, the limited chat history constrains evaluation of human-AI collaboration skills. ```

■■■■ Student Feedback ■ Rating: 5/5 ■ Comment: No additional comment provided.

Current Mode:assessment

## Complete Conversation

### Assistant:

Original:

In one word, governments effective and comen is necessary and very important parts to protect those migrant workers from enduring long hours and unfair payment.

First of all, government, which is an important parts in laws systems, making and enforce stricter laws is one of the easiest way to protect. In social systems, because of different cultural background, stress flow environment and usually less-free financial those workers' right is hard to safeguard. To change themselves is not an easy thing but it's government to stricter laws, is much easy - At least to give them that should they get in laws. On the other hand, this will also be useful in protect local realities working envolvent. And The migrant workers are not the only one can get benefits from a stricter laws. This will helps to impart more technology and economic project to go into a reason.

Each coin have two side. Stricter always means less free, and it might effective some normal employment happens. To avoid be publish, cowHR will not to allow those workers enter their compiling. But this should not be a reason to stop from protect them, people on another way people should. Governants should think more carefully and do some research in the worker heedes. Stricter need a right, clear directions. Laws without research will harm the

**Revised:**

Therefore, governments must enact and enforce stricter labour regulations because this is the most effective way to prevent exploitation, to ensure a level playing field in the job market, and to protect the fundamental rights of this vulnerable workforce.

Firstly, by enacting and enforcing stringent laws, such as minimum wage legislation and workplace safety standards, governments can directly shield migrant workers from exploitation. Migrant workers are often particularly vulnerable due to language barriers, a lack of knowledge regarding local rights, and pressing economic needs, making them easy targets for unscrupulous employers. A statutory minimum wage directly tackles the issue of unfair pay by ensuring a legally mandated income floor, while safety regulations prevent them from being forced to work in dangerous conditions. Furthermore, these laws provide workers with legal recourse, empowering them to report abuses without fear of immediate reprisal.

Beyond protecting migrants, robust labour laws also benefit local workers by removing the incentive for employers to undercut wages and exploit a vulnerable workforce to gain an unfair competitive advantage. When all employers are compelled to pay a fair minimum wage and provide decent working conditions regardless of a worker's origin, they can no longer slash labour costs by hiring exploitable migrants. Consequently, this prevents a "race to the bottom" in employment standards, ensuring that the wages and rights of local workers are not undermined. In this way, protecting the most vulnerable elevates standards for everyone and fosters a healthier, more equitable economy for the entire society.

Critics legitimately argue that overly stringent regulations might deter the employment of migrant workers by increasing perceived costs and complexities for businesses. However, this challenge can be proactively addressed through thoughtful government action. Instead of diluting essential protections, authorities can implement supportive measures for employers, such as streamlining compliance procedures, offering tax incentives for providing fair wages, and running awareness campaigns about the long-term benefits of a stable, fairly-treated workforce. This approach balances the need for protection with economic practicality, ensuring that the fundamental rights of migrants are not sacrificed due to unsubstantiated fears of economic harm.

In conclusion, the moral and economic imperative for governments to enact and enforce stricter labour laws is clear. Such legislation is the most direct mechanism to shield migrant workers from exploitation and, by establishing a level playing field, simultaneously protects the standards of all workers. While careful implementation is required to avoid discouraging lawful employment, this challenge can be met with complementary policies that support businesses in doing the right thing. Ultimately, upholding the fundamental rights of this vulnerable group is not merely a regulatory issue, but a cornerstone of a just and sustainable society.

**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:**

change the topic:

Migrant workers face exploitation due to weak regulations, enduring long hours and unfair pay. Should governments enforce stricter laws to safeguard their rights?

Write no fewer than 250 words. You should use around 40 minutes for this task.

**Assistant:**

Thanks for sharing your draft and the new prompt. I'm excited to help you strengthen it step by step.

Preliminary Stage — Negotiating Targets and Diagnosing the Essay

1) Your goals

- What would you most like to improve today? Choose up to two:
  - a) Thesis clarity and strength
  - b) Organization and logical flow (paragraphing, topic sentences)
  - c) Evidence and explanation (specific examples, reasons)
  - d) Vocabulary (more precise academic words)
  - e) Grammar and sentence clarity

2) Brief diagnostic feedback on your current draft (based on your new topic)

- Content and Ideas: You clearly want governments to protect migrant workers, and you hint at a counterargument (stricter laws can limit freedom). That's a good start. However, the reasons are vague and not fully explained. To reach a higher band, you'll need specific, relevant reasons (e.g., wage theft, unsafe conditions, retaliation) and clear explanation of how stricter laws plus enforcement can address these issues.
- Organisation and Logical Progression: The structure is unclear. Topic sentences don't consistently signal the main idea. Some sentences repeat or contradict each other, and transitions are weak. You'll benefit from a clear thesis, strong topic sentences, and one main idea per paragraph supported by evidence or examples.
- Vocabulary: Many words are inaccurate or unclear (e.g., "comen," "realities working envolvent," "cowHR," "heedes"). Aim for precise academic terms: enact/enforce labor laws; safeguard rights; inspection/regulatory oversight; wage theft; minimum wage; overtime; safety standards; complaint/grievance mechanisms; anti-retaliation protections; penalties.
- Grammar and Sentence Structure: Frequent errors in subject–verb agreement, articles, plurals, word form, and punctuation make meaning hard to follow. Keep sentences short and clear (Subject–Verb–Object), then add variety later.

Estimated rubric levels right now (for awareness):

- Content and Ideas: 2–3 (Basic–Developing)
- Organisation and Logical Progression: 2 (Basic)
- Vocabulary: 2 (Basic)
- Grammar and Sentence Structure: 1–2 (Limited–Basic)

3) Student priority selection

- Which two areas do you want us to focus on first? I recommend:
- Thesis clarity and strength (this guides the whole essay), and
- Organization + sentence-level clarity within one body paragraph.
- Please confirm your two targets so we can begin Step 1.

Before Step 1, two quick choices to guide your thesis:

- Position: Do you agree that governments should enforce stricter laws to protect migrant workers? Strongly agree / agree with some reservations / partially agree / disagree?
- Scope: Do you want to emphasize particular protections (e.g., minimum wage, overtime, safety standards, inspections, penalties, complaint systems), or keep it general?

When you reply:

- Tell me your two target areas (from a–e).
- State your position (agree/disagree/partial) and any key protections you want to emphasize.
- Then write your current thesis in 1–2 sentences answering the question directly.

Tips for the thesis:

- Clearly answer "Should governments enforce stricter laws?"
- Preview your main reasons (2–3 reasons you'll develop).

- Use confident language (avoid "I think," "maybe").

After you share your thesis, we'll do:

- Step 1 — strengthen your thesis,
- Step 2 — revise one topic sentence from a body paragraph you choose, and
- Step 3 — revise the rest of that paragraph for clarity and support.

Ready when you are!

**You:**

Complete the first paragraph of the revision■Therefore, governments must enact and enforce stricter labour regulations because this is the most effective way to prevent exploitation, to ensure a level playing field in the job market, and to protect the fundamental rights of this vulnerable workforce.

**Assistant:**

Thanks for sharing your draft and the sentence you'd like to build on. I'm happy to help—let's set clear targets and then work through the thesis and one paragraph together.

Preliminary Stage — Negotiating Targets and Diagnosing the Essay

1) Your goals

- Which two areas would you most like to improve today? Choose up to two:
  - a) Thesis clarity and strength
  - b) Organization and logical flow (paragraphing, topic sentences)
  - c) Evidence and explanation (specific examples, reasons)
  - d) Vocabulary (precise academic words)
  - e) Grammar and sentence clarity

2) Quick diagnostic on your current draft (migrant workers topic)

- Thesis & Argument: You have a clear viewpoint: governments should protect migrant workers through stricter laws. Good. It will be stronger if you preview the main reasons and use precise, confident language.
- Organization: Paragraph structure is unclear; topic sentences don't consistently signal the main idea. We should build clear topic sentences and keep one main idea per paragraph.
- Evidence & Development: Reasons are general and need specific examples (e.g., wage theft, unpaid overtime, unsafe worksites, limited complaint mechanisms, retaliation). We should add concrete details and simple cause–effect explanations.
- Language Use: Many words are inaccurate or unclear and grammar makes some sentences hard to follow. We'll aim for short, clear sentences and precise terms (enact, enforce, inspections, penalties, grievance systems, anti-retaliation).

Estimated rubric levels now:

- Content and Ideas: 2–3 (Basic–Developing)
- Organisation and Logical Progression: 2 (Basic)
- Vocabulary: 2 (Basic)
- Grammar and Sentence Structure: 1–2 (Limited–Basic)

3) Confirm priorities and prompt

- Please confirm the two areas you want to focus on today. I suggest:
  - a) Thesis clarity and strength
  - b) Organization + sentence-level clarity in one body paragraph
- Also, just to confirm, we're working on the migrant workers/labour regulations topic (not the climate change prompt). Is that correct?

## Main Workflow: Three-Step Revision

### Step 1 — Thesis Statement Revision

You shared this sentence:

"Therefore, governments must enact and enforce stricter labour regulations because this is the most effective way to prevent exploitation, to ensure a level playing field in the job market, and to protect the fundamental rights of this vulnerable workforce."

Feedback:

- Strengths: Clear stance ("governments must"), three reasons previewed (prevent exploitation, fair competition, protect rights). Confident and focused.
- Small improvements: Remove "Therefore" (it's stronger without it as a thesis), and consider "migrant workers" instead of "this vulnerable workforce" for precision.

Two polished options (choose one or edit them):

- Option A: Governments must enact and enforce stricter labour regulations to prevent exploitation, ensure a level playing field in the job market, and protect the fundamental rights of migrant workers.
- Option B: Voluntary corporate policies are not enough; only robust labour laws and consistent enforcement can prevent exploitation, create fair competition, and safeguard the rights of migrant workers.

Would you like to keep your original sentence, or choose/adjust one of these options? If you're satisfied, we'll lock the thesis and continue.

### Step 2 — Topic Sentence Revision (choose one body paragraph)

Let's focus the first body paragraph on "prevent exploitation." A strong topic sentence should clearly link to the thesis. Here's a model you can adapt:

- Topic sentence draft: Stronger labour laws are essential to prevent common forms of exploitation faced by migrant workers, including wage theft, unpaid overtime, and unsafe working conditions.

Would you like to try revising that topic sentence now? Aim for one clear sentence that names the specific types of exploitation.

### Step 3 — Revising the Rest of the Chosen Paragraph

Guiding questions:

- Do the supporting details clearly relate to preventing exploitation?
- Do you specify how laws plus enforcement stop abuses (inspections, penalties, complaint systems, anti-retaliation)?
- Are sentences short and clear?

Because you asked to "complete the first paragraph of the revision" starting with your thesis sentence, here is a suggested introduction paragraph that you can review and edit. If you accept any changes, I'll include the updated text in full as we go.

Updated revised text (introduction paragraph draft):

Governments must enact and enforce stricter labour regulations to prevent exploitation, ensure a level playing field in the job market, and protect the fundamental rights of migrant workers. While some employers adopt voluntary codes of conduct, evidence shows that wage theft, unpaid overtime, and unsafe worksites persist where rules are vague and enforcement is weak. Clear legal standards, regular inspections, meaningful penalties, and accessible complaint mechanisms—paired with strong anti-retaliation protections—turn rights from theory into reality. This essay explains how robust laws and consistent enforcement reduce exploitation, promote fair competition, and safeguard the dignity and rights of migrant workers.

Next step:

- Please confirm your two target areas (a–e).
- Confirm your preferred thesis (your original or Option A/B or your edited version).
- Share your revised topic sentence for the first body paragraph (about preventing exploitation), or tell me you'd like to use the draft above.
- Then I'll help you refine the supporting sentences for that body paragraph with clear, specific details.

Would you like to try revising that topic sentence now?

**You:**

This is my revised paper, which has been revised through more than thirty rounds of discussion, and now look at the final version and evaluate it. Therefore, governments must enact and enforce stricter labour regulations because this is the most effective way to prevent exploitation, to ensure a level playing field in the job market, and to protect the fundamental rights of this vulnerable workforce.

Firstly, by enacting and enforcing stringent laws, such as minimum wage legislation and workplace safety standards, governments can directly shield migrant workers from exploitation. Migrant workers are often particularly vulnerable due to language barriers, a lack of knowledge regarding local rights, and pressing economic needs, making them easy targets for unscrupulous employers. A statutory minimum wage directly tackles the issue of unfair pay by ensuring a legally mandated income floor, while safety regulations prevent them from being forced to work in dangerous conditions. Furthermore, these laws provide workers with legal recourse, empowering them to report abuses without fear of immediate reprisal.

Beyond protecting migrants, robust labour laws also benefit local workers by removing the incentive for employers to undercut wages and exploit a vulnerable workforce to gain an unfair competitive advantage. When all employers are compelled to pay a fair minimum wage and provide decent working conditions regardless of a worker's origin, they can no longer slash labour costs by hiring exploitable migrants. Consequently, this prevents a "race to the bottom" in employment standards, ensuring that the wages and rights of local workers are not undermined. In this way, protecting the most vulnerable elevates standards for everyone and fosters a healthier, more equitable economy for the entire society.

Critics legitimately argue that overly stringent regulations might deter the employment of migrant workers by increasing perceived costs and complexities for businesses. However, this challenge can be proactively addressed through thoughtful government action. Instead of diluting essential protections, authorities can implement supportive measures for employers, such as streamlining compliance procedures, offering tax incentives for providing fair wages, and running awareness campaigns about the long-term benefits of a stable, fairly-treated workforce. This approach balances the need for protection with economic practicality, ensuring that the fundamental rights of migrants are not sacrificed due to unsubstantiated fears of economic harm.

In conclusion, the moral and economic imperative for governments to enact and enforce stricter labour laws is clear. Such legislation is the most direct mechanism to shield migrant workers from exploitation and, by establishing a level playing field, simultaneously protects the standards of all workers. While careful implementation is required to avoid discouraging lawful employment, this challenge can be met with complementary policies that support businesses in doing the right thing. Ultimately, upholding the fundamental rights of this vulnerable group is not merely a regulatory issue, but a cornerstone of a just and sustainable society.

**Assistant:**

Thank you for sharing your final version. It's clear, thoughtful, and well-structured. I'm happy to evaluate it and then—if you'd like—guide you through a focused, interactive revision of the thesis and one paragraph.

Preliminary Stage — Negotiating Targets and Diagnosing the Essay

1) Quick evaluation using the course rubric

- Content and Ideas: 4 (Proficient)

Strengths: Clear viewpoint; three solid reasons; a balanced counterargument and rebuttal. You explain mechanisms (minimum wage, safety standards, enforcement) and show the wider impact on local workers.

To improve toward 5: Add one or two concise, concrete examples (e.g., a brief case, data, or reference to ILO standards) to make your points more compelling and specific.

Organisation and Logical Progression: 4 (Proficient)

Strengths: Logical paragraph sequence: protection → fair competition → counterargument + rebuttal → conclusion. Transitions are smooth.

To improve toward 5: Sharpen topic sentences so each directly echoes the thesis language, and ensure each paragraph closes with a sentence that explicitly links back to the thesis. Consider a slightly fuller introduction (one or two sentences before the thesis) to frame the issue.

Vocabulary: 4 (Proficient)

Strengths: Precise academic terms ("statutory minimum wage," "level playing field," "race to the bottom," "anti-retaliation," "compliance procedures").

To improve toward 5: Vary repeated nouns ("workers," "employers," "laws") with synonyms where natural; add a few topic-specific terms (e.g., "labour inspectorate," "grievance redressal," "workplace audits").

Grammar and Sentence Structure: 4 (Proficient)

Strengths: Mostly accurate, varied sentences; cohesive and readable.

To improve toward 5: Tighten a few long sentences, and consider removing "Therefore" at the start of the thesis and replacing "this vulnerable workforce" with the specific noun ("migrant workers") for precision.

Overall: This is a strong point-of-view essay with clear reasoning, effective organization, and confident academic tone. With minor precision edits and one or two concrete examples, it could reach "Excellent."

## 2) Your targets

Please choose up to two areas to focus on in our short interactive revision:

- a) Thesis clarity and strength
- b) Organization and logical flow (topic sentences)
- c) Evidence and explanation (specific examples)
- d) Vocabulary (more precise academic words)
- e) Grammar and sentence clarity

My recommendations, based on your evaluation:

- a) Thesis clarity and strength (minor precision and concision)
- b) Organization and logical flow (tighten one body paragraph's topic sentence)

## 3) Confirm priorities

Which two would you like to work on now? Once you confirm, we'll start the three-step process.

Main Workflow: Three-Step Revision Process (to begin after you confirm targets)

### Step 1 — Thesis Statement Revision

Your current thesis:

"Therefore, governments must enact and enforce stricter labour regulations because this is the most effective way to prevent exploitation, to ensure a level playing field in the job market, and to protect the fundamental rights of this vulnerable workforce."

Feedback:

- Strengths: Clear claim ("must enact and enforce"), previews three reasons (prevent exploitation, fair competition, protect rights), confident tone.
- Edits to consider: Remove "Therefore" for a stronger opening; replace "this vulnerable workforce" with "migrant workers" for clarity; keep parallel structure and tighten wording slightly.

Prompt for you:

- Try revising the thesis in 1–2 sentences using this frame:

"[Governments must enact and enforce stricter labour regulations] because [Reason 1], [Reason 2], and [Reason 3]."

- Keep the reasons parallel and precise. Would you like to try that now?

### Step 2 — Topic Sentence Revision

Choose one body paragraph to focus on (the first, second, or third). Paste its current topic sentence.

Feedback approach:

- We'll ensure it clearly echoes the thesis language (e.g., "prevent exploitation," "level playing field," "protect rights").

- We'll make the claim specific (name the type of exploitation or the mechanism).

Prompt for you:

- Select the paragraph and share the topic sentence.
- Aim for one clear sentence that directly links to the thesis and names the focus of that paragraph.

### Step 3 — Revising the Rest of the Chosen Paragraph

We'll polish the supporting sentences for unity and coherence.

Guiding questions:

- Do all supporting details clearly relate to the topic sentence?
- Is there one specific example (brief statistic, case, or mechanism) that makes the point concrete?
- Are cause–effect links explicit (e.g., “Because X, Y happens; as a result, Z”)?
- Are transitions clear (“for example,” “specifically,” “consequently,” “therefore”)?

Prompt for you:

- After revising the topic sentence, paste the paragraph.
- I'll help you refine sentences for clarity, add one precise example, and ensure a strong concluding link back to the thesis.

Would you like to confirm your two target areas now and try revising the thesis first?