

HKBU LANG 0036 Learning Session Report

Generated: 2025-12-05 20:54:44

Student Email: 25286927@life.hkbu.edu.hk

Student Number: 25286927

Section: 24

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

Thanks for sharing your conclusion! Here's a focused review with suggestions for revision:

What works well:

- It clearly restates your overall position that benefits outweigh drawbacks.
- It closes with a clear recommendation for government action, which helps signal an essay ending.

Areas for improvement:

- The two sentences repeat much the same idea; the conclusion could be more concise.
- It doesn't summarize your specific supporting reasons (e.g., preventing exploitation, reducing inequality, economic benefits).
- It misses an opportunity to mention a balanced policy approach that acknowledges the service pressure concern or suggests practical next steps.
- Phrasing like "take steps to implement" is wordy; simpler phrasing improves impact.

Revised conclusion options you can adapt or mix:

Summarizing main reasons:

"Despite potential challenges, governments should enact stricter laws to protect migrants because these laws prevent exploitation, reduce inequality, and promote social and economic well-being."

Balanced policy recommendation:

"Governments should adopt stricter protections for migrants while implementing phased rollouts and targeted funding to manage pressures on public services."

Concise wrap-up:

"Overall, the long-term benefits of protecting migrants' rights outweigh the costs, and governments should therefore strengthen labour protections."

If you like, try revising your conclusion now using one of these models or your own words, then paste it here. I'll give you focused, encouraging feedback to polish it!

Grading Result (Hidden from students)

Tasks check: - Revised the thesis statement: completed. - Revised one of the topic sentences: completed. - Revised one of the body paragraphs: completed.

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: 18/25 - The original draft had a clear stance but underdeveloped reasons and general claims (e.g., "In my perspective, my answer is yes."). Ideas were relevant but lacked specificity and supporting detail.
 - Organization: 18/25 - Basic essay structure (intro/body/conclusion) existed, but the thesis did not preview the main reasons, causing paragraphs to feel disconnected.
 - Vocabulary: 15/25 - Repetitive and somewhat imprecise word choice (e.g., repeated "unfair," "inequality," "chaos"); limited use of topic-specific terms.
 - Grammar and Sentence Structure: 17/25 - Generally understandable sentences but several awkward phrasings and informal constructions that reduced formality and clarity.
- Original Essay Total: 68/100

Revised Essay Scores:

- Content and Ideas: 22/25 - The revised thesis clearly states a position and previews reasons: "I agree that governments should enact stricter laws to protect migrants' rights because such laws prevent exploitation and reduce social inequality while promoting social harmony and economic productivity; however, policymakers must also consider the potential pressures increased migration may place on public services." The body paragraph was developed with clearer cause→effect links. More specifics (e.g., "wage theft," "systemic discrimination") strengthen

the argument, though empirical evidence or concrete citations are still missing.

- Organization: 21/25 - The thesis now previews the essay's main lines of reasoning and the revised paragraph follows a clearer microstructure (topic sentence → causal explanation → effects → wrap-up). The counterargument paragraph is present but would benefit from a clearer concession + rebuttal structure.
- Vocabulary: 21/25 - Improved use of precise terms ("systemic discrimination," "wage theft," "informal employment," "productivity"); some repetition remains but overall vocabulary is more academic and topic-appropriate.
- Grammar and Sentence Structure: 21/25 - Sentence clarity and formality improved; causal chains read more smoothly. A few minor phrasing issues and redundant lines remain (e.g., two sentences that repeat the same claim before the paragraph was tightened).
- **Revised Essay Total: 85/100**

Essay Improvement Analysis:

- **Overall Improvement: +17 points**
- **Key Improvements Made:**
 - The thesis was revised from a vague personal statement to a focused, previewing thesis that balances benefits and a caveat.
 - At least one topic sentence was reworked to link directly to the thesis and preview claims (e.g., "First, stricter legal protections for migrant workers reduce exploitation by preventing long hours and wage theft.").
 - One body paragraph was substantially revised to show clear cause→effect relationships and use more precise vocabulary (e.g., "weak regulation can entrench systemic discrimination and widen both gender and racial disparities").
- **Missed Opportunities:**
 - Counterargument paragraph still needs a stronger concession + rebuttal structure and clearer policy-oriented mitigation strategies (the paragraph notes "chaos" and "drawbacks" but lacks a concrete rebuttal).
 - The essay would be stronger with at least one concrete example, statistic, or citation to support claims (e.g., ILO, UNHCR, national case studies).
 - The conclusion repeats the main claim without summarizing the specific reasons or proposing practical next steps (e.g., phased implementation, targeted funding).

HUMAN-AI INTERACTION ASSESSMENT

Chat History Analysis:

- **Total Exchanges: 25** (extensive, stepwise conversation from goal negotiation through thesis, topic sentence, and paragraph revision; the assistant guided a 3-step process and the student iteratively revised and pasted drafts).
- **Conversation Quality:** High — the chat shows explicit goal-setting, targeted diagnostic feedback, iterative student revisions, request for examples, and focused micro-edits. The student both followed suggestions and made their own revisions.

Interaction Scores:

- **In-Depth Conversation:** 5/5 - Evidence: 25 exchanges covering goal negotiation, rubric diagnosis, stepwise thesis revision, topic sentence work, paragraph revision, requests for examples, and review of the conclusion. The student and assistant conducted a multi-stage, sustained revision process.
- **Critical Review of AI Suggestions:** 4/5 - The student evaluated and adapted AI suggestions rather than passively accepting all changes. Evidence: the student produced their own thesis revision ("I strongly agree that governments should enact stricter laws..."), asked whether topic sentences needed revision, chose which paragraph to revise, and requested specific example types. Some AI suggestions were accepted directly (the assistant's tightened thesis was inserted), while the student also made original rewrites.
- **Refining Process:** 5/5 - Multiple meaningful revision cycles are visible: initial thesis attempt → assistant feedback → assistant model thesis → student topic sentence revision → paragraph draft → assistant micro-edits → student rewrite of paragraph → discussion of counterargument and conclusion. This shows an iterative, reflective process.
- **Human-AI Interaction Total: 14/15**

OVERALL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

Strengths Demonstrated:

- Clear improvement in formal academic tone and vocabulary (evidence: use of "systemic discrimination," "wage theft," "informal employment" in revised essay).
- Effective iterative collaboration with the AI: student followed a stepwise plan and implemented revisions to thesis, topic sentence, and paragraph content.

- Improved logical clarity: revised paragraph shows explicit causal links (weak regulation → exploitation → reduced morale/productivity → social/economic harm).

Areas for Improvement:

- Provide concrete evidence or examples (statistics, case studies, or brief hypothetical examples) to strengthen claims and increase credibility.
- Strengthen the counterargument paragraph by naming specific pressures, offering a brief example, and adding a clear rebuttal or mitigation strategy (e.g., phased implementation, targeted funding, partnerships with NGOs).
- Tighten the conclusion to summarize reasons briefly and recommend actionable policy steps rather than restating the claim.

AI Collaboration Skills Assessment:

- **Context Provision:** Good - Student provided the essay text and stated revision goals (thesis clarity, topic sentence, vocabulary). Evidence: early messages clarifying priorities.
- **Strategic Planning:** Good - Student followed the assistant's three-step plan and selected a paragraph to revise; the process was structured and goal-oriented.
- **Critical Evaluation:** Good - Student questioned whether topic sentences needed revision, asked for examples, and iteratively chose among suggested phrasings.
- **Independent Editing:** Good - Student produced multiple independent rewrites (thesis and paragraph) rather than only accepting assistant outputs.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

1. Add at least one concrete example or citation (a short statistic, a news case, or reference to ILO/UN/World Bank findings) to support central claims about exploitation and economic effects.
2. Revise the counterargument paragraph into a clear concession + rebuttal: name the specific drawback, give one brief example, then show how policy design can mitigate it (phased rollout, funding, NGO partnerships).
3. Tighten the conclusion to summarize the two or three principal reasons and end with a concise policy recommendation (e.g., "Governments should adopt stricter labour protections alongside phased implementation and targeted funding to manage service pressures.").

INSTRUCTOR NOTES

- The student successfully completed the assigned revision tasks (thesis, one topic sentence, and one body paragraph) and demonstrated productive human-AI collaboration. The interaction log shows active engagement and iterative improvement, which is exactly the intended learning process for the module.
- For grading, note the improved essay score (68 → 85). Encourage the student to add evidence and a stronger rebuttal in the counterargument paragraph to reach an “excellent” level.
- The chat transcript is a good example of guided AI-assisted revision; consider highlighting the student’s iterative approach as a model for peers.

If you would like, I can:
- Provide a tightened version of the counterargument paragraph that includes a concise rebuttal and one policy mitigation,
or
- Insert one short, evidence-style example (with a suggested citation) into the revised paragraph to illustrate how to add support.

■■■ Student Feedback ■ Rating: 5/5 ■ Comment: Good for my learning.

Current Mode:assessment

Complete Conversation

Assistant:

Original:

In the current world, the process of globalization continues to advance, leading to increased migration in many countries. Governments are expected to consider whether stricter laws should be enforced to safeguard migrants' rights. In my perspective, my answer is yes.

First, I totally agree with the idea that governments should enact appropriate laws to address the issue of migrants enduring long hours and unfair pay due to weak regulations. The unequal treatment they suffer violates their rights, and such an atmosphere of inequality may expand, potentially causing further biases and disparities in gender or race. This unfair treatment can increase negative emotions among migrants, leading to lower work efficiency and higher risks of law violations. Both outcomes prevent society from becoming more harmonious and prosperous. Therefore, I support the idea that governments should implement relevant laws to improve migrants' working conditions.

However, I believe this approach also has drawbacks, especially for countries with large numbers of migrants. When migration significantly impacts society, it may not be reasonable to enforce laws that could attract even more migrants, as this might bring chaos. Thus, I partially disagree with the idea.

In conclusion, the benefits of enforcing laws to improve migrants' working conditions outweigh the drawbacks. In most countries, governments should take steps to implement stricter regulations to safeguard migrants' rights.

Revised:

In the current world, globalization continues to advance, leading to increased migration across many countries. Governments are expected to consider whether stricter laws should be enforced to safeguard migrants' rights. I agree that governments should enact stricter laws to protect migrants' rights because such laws prevent exploitation and reduce social inequality while promoting social harmony and economic productivity; however, policymakers must also consider the potential pressures increased migration may place on public services.

First, stricter legal protections for migrant workers reduce exploitation by preventing long hours and wage theft. Stricter legal protections for migrant workers reduce systemic discrimination and exploitation while increasing worker productivity and migrants' economic contribution. The unequal treatment they suffer violates their rights, and weak regulation can entrench systemic discrimination and widen both gender and racial disparities. Such exploitation undermines migrants' morale and mental health, reduces productivity, and increases the risk of informal employment and social instability. Together, reduced productivity and increased informal employment harm social cohesion and economic efficiency. Therefore, stronger labour protections are necessary to protect migrants and support social and economic well-being.

However, a potential drawback of stricter protections for migrants is that they can increase pressure on public services, such as education, healthcare, and housing, particularly in areas with large migrant inflows. When migration significantly impacts society, it may not be reasonable to enforce laws that could attract even more migrants, as this might bring chaos. Local clinics and schools may face overcrowding, creating short-term capacity problems. What's more, an influx of migrants can increase demand for affordable housing, straining municipal budgets. Moreover, Implementing and enforcing new protections requires administrative resources and public spending. Thus, I partially disagree with the idea.

Overall, the long-term benefits of protecting migrants' rights outweigh the costs, so governments should adopt stricter labour protections.

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:

Let us revise the thesis statement.

Assistant:

Great — let's do this. Before we jump into the thesis, a quick check so I can tailor feedback well.

1) Learning targets (pick or add more)

- Do you want to focus on: clarity of argument (thesis & topic sentences), overall structure/coherence, development/evidence in paragraphs, vocabulary/word choice, or grammar/sentence accuracy? Or two of these? Which are your top 1–2 priorities for this session?

2) Short diagnostic feedback (based on your draft and the rubric)

- Content & Ideas: You have a clear overall position (you agree that governments should act), and relevant ideas about rights, working conditions, and social impact. However the viewpoint is thinly developed — reasons need to be more specific and tied to evidence or concrete examples.
- Organisation & Logical Progression: The essay has a basic structure (intro, body, conclusion), but the thesis does not preview the main reasons, so paragraphs feel a bit disconnected. The counterargument paragraph is useful but not fully integrated.
- Vocabulary: Vocabulary is adequate but somewhat repetitive (e.g., “unfair,” “inequality,” “chaos”). More precise academic language and topic-specific terms would strengthen the essay.
- Grammar & Sentence Structure: Sentences are generally understandable but some phrasing is awkward (e.g., “my perspective, my answer is yes”; “may expand”). Work on clearer, more formal phrasing and varied sentence structures.

3) Which of these diagnosed issues do you want to focus on now?

- (a) Make the thesis clearer and preview the essay's reasons
- (b) Strengthen topic sentences so each paragraph links to the thesis
- (c) Improve paragraph development and clarity (evidence/explanation)
- (d) Language (vocabulary and formal phrasing)

Please choose one or two targets. Once you confirm, we'll revise the thesis.

Now, about the current thesis: you wrote “In my perspective, my answer is yes.” That states a position but is too short and vague — it doesn’t answer the question fully or preview your main points. A strong thesis should:

- Clearly state your position (agree/disagree/partly)
- Preview 2–3 main reasons you will develop
- Use confident, precise academic language (no “I think/maybe”)

To help you, try one of these sentence stems (fill in your reasons):

- “I strongly agree that governments should enact stricter laws to protect migrants’ rights because and, although ...”
- “**While stricter government regulation may have drawbacks, I agree that governments should implement such laws primarily to ... and**”
- “**Governments should adopt stricter protections for migrants’ working conditions, since ... and ...; at the same time, policymakers must consider**”

Would you like to try rewriting your thesis now using one of these stems? Type your revision and I’ll give focused feedback on clarity, strength, and previewing of points.

You:

I want to make the thesis clearer and preview the essay’s reasons and improve language (vocabulary and formal phrasing).

Assistant:

Great — those are helpful priorities. I confirm we’ll focus on:

- Making the thesis clearer and previewing your reasons, and
- Improving language (more formal vocabulary and phrasing).

Quick diagnostic recap (very short)

- Content & Ideas: You have a clear overall position but the reasons are general and need more specificity.
- Organisation: Thesis doesn’t preview main points, so paragraphs feel disconnected.
- Language: Some informal/awkward phrasing (“In my perspective, my answer is yes”). Use more formal, precise language.

Step 1 — Thesis revision

Your current thesis line: “In my perspective, my answer is yes.” That states a position but is too short and vague. A strong thesis should:

- Clearly state your stance (agree/partly agree/disagree),
- Preview 2–3 main reasons you will develop,

- Use confident, formal language (avoid "my perspective," "I think").

Please try rewriting your thesis now — 1 or 2 sentences that state your position and preview two reasons (for example: protection of rights; social/economic benefits; need for regulation to prevent exploitation). Use one of these stems if helpful:

- "I strongly agree that governments should enact stricter laws to protect migrants' rights because _ and _."
- "While stricter government regulation may have drawbacks, I agree that governments should implement such laws primarily to _ and _."

Would you like to try writing a revision now? Type your new thesis and I'll give focused feedback on clarity, strength, and previewing of points.

(If you prefer a quick example to edit, tell me and I'll provide one — but I'd like to see your version first.)

You:

I strongly agree that governments should enact stricter laws to protect migrants' rights because the unequal treatment they suffer violates their rights, and such an atmosphere of inequality may expand, potentially causing further biases and disparities in gender or race and This unfair treatment can increase negative emotions among migrants, leading to lower work efficiency and higher risks of law violation.

Assistant:

Nice attempt — thank you for trying to rewrite the thesis. Quick praise: you clearly tried to bring in the reasons from your paragraph into the thesis, which is exactly the right move.

Focused feedback on your version:

- It's too long and repetitive: it repeats the same ideas ("unequal treatment... unfair treatment") and becomes a run-on sentence.
- Language issues: "law violation" is awkward; use "legal violations" or "criminal activity" if you mean that. Also watch mid-sentence capitalization ("This").
- A strong thesis is shorter, clearer, and previews 2–3 concise reasons (and can acknowledge a drawback if you want a balanced stance).

Here's a tighter thesis that keeps your ideas but is clearer and more formal:

I agree that governments should enact stricter laws to protect migrants' rights because such laws prevent exploitation and reduce social inequality while promoting social harmony and economic productivity; however, policymakers must also consider the potential pressures increased migration may place on public services.

I've inserted that thesis into your essay below (only the thesis sentence was changed). Please read it and tell me whether you're happy with it or want another option (more forceful, more balanced, or shorter).

Full revised essay with the new thesis:

In the current world, the process of globalization continues to advance, leading to increased migration in many countries. Governments are expected to consider whether stricter laws should be enforced to safeguard migrants' rights. I agree that governments should enact stricter laws to protect migrants' rights because such laws prevent exploitation and reduce social inequality while promoting social harmony and economic productivity; however, policymakers must also consider the potential pressures increased migration may place on public services.

First, I totally agree with the idea that governments should enact appropriate laws to address the issue of migrants enduring long hours and unfair pay due to weak regulations. The unequal treatment they suffer violates their rights, and such an atmosphere of inequality may expand, potentially causing further biases and disparities in gender or race. This unfair treatment can increase negative emotions among migrants, leading to lower work efficiency and higher risks of law violations. Both outcomes prevent society from becoming more harmonious and prosperous. Therefore, I support the idea that governments should implement relevant laws to improve migrants' working conditions.

However, I believe this approach also has drawbacks, especially for countries with large numbers of migrants. When migration significantly impacts society, it may not be reasonable to enforce laws that could attract even more migrants, as this might bring chaos. Thus, I partially disagree with the

idea.

In conclusion, the benefits of enforcing laws to improve migrants' working conditions outweigh the drawbacks. In most countries, governments should take steps to implement stricter regulations to safeguard migrants' rights.

Next step — choose a paragraph to work on:

Which body paragraph would you like to revise next (I suggest the first body paragraph)? If you pick it, please share the current topic sentence you want to improve (or try rewriting it now) and we'll work on making it connect clearly to the new thesis and improving the language. Would you like to try revising the topic sentence now?

You:

Do I need to revise my topic sentences?

Assistant:

Short answer: yes — revise them. Good topic sentences make your essay clearer and show how each paragraph supports your thesis.

Why revise?

- They should connect directly to your revised thesis (showing how the paragraph supports your main reasons).
- They should preview the paragraph's main idea, not just state your opinion.
- Use formal, specific language (avoid "I totally agree," "this approach," or vague words like "drawbacks").

Quick diagnosis of your two current topic sentences

- Paragraph 1: "First, I totally agree with the idea that governments should enact appropriate laws to address the issue of migrants enduring long hours and unfair pay due to weak regulations."
- What's good: It signals support for the thesis and mentions exploitation/working conditions.
- What to fix: Too personal ("I totally agree"), long and unfocused, and it doesn't clearly preview the paragraph's main claim (e.g., how laws help and what consequences follow).

Paragraph 2: "However, I believe this approach also has drawbacks, especially for countries with large numbers of migrants."

What's good: Introduces a counterargument.

What to fix: Vague ("drawbacks," "chaos" in the paragraph). It should name the specific drawback you will explain (pressure on services, social tension, etc.) and tie back to the thesis balance.

How to revise (try one of these short stems)

- For a supporting paragraph (paragraph 1), try a stem that states a clear claim and previews the reason(s):
- "Stricter laws are necessary to protect migrants from exploitation by ensuring __ and __."
- "One key reason governments should strengthen migrant-protection laws is that such regulation reduces __ **and improves** __."
- For the counterargument paragraph (paragraph 2), use a stem that names the specific concern and signals it's a qualified objection:
- "A potential drawback of tighter migration laws is that they can increase pressure on public services, such as __, **which may** __."
- "Critics argue that stricter protections might lead to __; **while this is a valid concern**, __."

Would you like to try revising the topic sentence for paragraph 1 now (I recommend starting there)? Write one or two versions using a stem above and I'll give focused feedback on clarity and connection to your thesis.

You:

One key reason governments should strengthen migrant-protection laws is that such regulation reduces further biases and disparities and improves work efficiency.

Assistant:

Nice work — this topic sentence already connects to your thesis (you mention reducing bias and improving work outcomes), which is exactly what we want.

Focused feedback:

- Strengths: It signals a clear reason (laws reduce bias/inequality and help work outcomes), so it links the paragraph to your thesis.
- What to improve: Be more specific and use formal academic phrasing. Phrases like "reduces further biases and disparities" are vague; try "reduces systemic discrimination and economic inequality." "Improves work efficiency" is informal and unclear — "increases worker productivity" or "improves migrants' well-being and economic contribution" are clearer. Also tighten the structure so the sentence is more direct.

Would you like to try revising it now? If you'd like a quick model to edit, here are two concise options you can choose from or modify:

Stricter legal protections for migrant workers reduce systemic discrimination and exploitation while increasing worker productivity and economic contribution.

Strengthening labour protections for migrants prevents exploitation (such as long hours and unfair pay), reduces social inequality, and improves overall workforce productivity.

Which version do you prefer — or would you like to try another revision yourself? Once you're happy with the topic sentence, we'll move on to revise the supporting sentences in that paragraph.

You:

OK, let us move on to revise the supporting sentences in that paragraph.

Assistant:

Good — nice momentum. Quick praise: your topic sentence now links the paragraph to the thesis, which makes the paragraph's purpose much clearer. Now we'll focus on tightening the supporting sentences so they are unified, clear, and more academic.

Before you try a revision, please read these focused tips and micro-suggestions. I won't write full replacement sentences for you, but I will give precise guidance and phrase options to use.

1) Check unity: does every supporting sentence clearly relate to the topic sentence?

- Keep only details that explain how laws reduce exploitation, reduce inequality, or improve productivity/economic contribution.
- Remove or combine repetitive ideas (you repeat "unfair treatment" and "unequal treatment" in two nearby sentences).

2) Strengthen logic and causation: show clear cause → effect links.

- Make the causal chain explicit: weak regulations → exploitation (long hours, low pay) → negative consequences (reduced productivity, social tension) → benefits of laws.
- Add linking words: Consequently, As a result, Therefore, Moreover.

3) Make language more precise (replace vague or informal phrases):

- "Negative emotions" → lower morale, poorer mental health, or reduced job satisfaction.
- "Lower work efficiency" → reduced productivity; "higher risks of law violations" → greater likelihood of engaging in informal/illegal labour or

increased social instability.

- "May expand" → may lead to wider systemic discrimination or increased social inequality.

4) Add at least one concrete detail or mini-example (even hypothetical) or suggest a source to strengthen development:

- For example, mention a specific exploitative practice (e.g., unpaid overtime, wage theft) or a hypothetical: "When migrants work 12-hour shifts for below-minimum wage..."

- Or suggest referencing a study or statistic if you have one.

5) Improve cohesion and sentence variety:

- Vary sentence openings (Start one sentence with "Consequently" or "Moreover").
- Avoid repeated "Therefore, I support..." — make the paragraph end with a clear link back to the topic sentence (e.g., "For these reasons, governments should strengthen labour protections.")

Micro-edits and phrase swaps you can use

- Replace "enduring long hours and unfair pay" with: "facing long hours and wage theft / below-minimum pay."
- Replace "unequal treatment... may expand, potentially causing further biases and disparities in gender or race" with: "systemic discrimination that can widen gender and racial disparities."
- Replace "increase negative emotions among migrants" with: "undermine migrants' mental health and job satisfaction."
- Replace "higher risks of law violations" with: "increase the likelihood that vulnerable workers enter informal or illegal employment."

Checklist for your revision

- Does each sentence support the topic sentence?
- Does each cause → effect relationship read clearly?
- Have you removed repetition and tightened wording?
- Did you add one concrete detail or example?
- Are transitions used to link ideas?

Now your turn

- Try revising one supporting sentence first (for example the sentence that begins "The unequal treatment they suffer..."), or paste your full revised paragraph when you're ready.
- I'll give focused feedback on clarity, unity, and language and then we can polish further.

Would you like to revise one sentence now or paste a full draft of the paragraph?

You:

plz paste a full draft of the paragraph.

Assistant:

Great — thanks for asking. I won't write a fully new paragraph for you, but I'll paste your current paragraph and give tight, sentence-level edits, phrase swaps, and a short suggested structure you can use to produce the revised paragraph. Try revising using these notes, then paste your version and I'll give targeted feedback.

Your current paragraph (with sentence numbers for reference)

- 1) First, I totally agree with the idea that governments should enact appropriate laws to address the issue of migrants enduring long hours and unfair pay due to weak regulations.
- 2) Stricter legal protections for migrant workers reduce systemic discrimination and exploitation while increasing worker productivity and economic contribution.
- 3) The unequal treatment they suffer violates their rights, and such an atmosphere of inequality may expand, potentially causing further biases and disparities in gender or race.
- 4) This unfair treatment can increase negative emotions among migrants, leading to lower work efficiency and higher risks of law violations.

- 5) Both outcomes prevent society from becoming more harmonious and prosperous.
- 6) Therefore, I support the idea that governments should implement relevant laws to improve migrants' working conditions.

Sentence 1 level feedback and specific edits (use these to revise each sentence)

- Sentence 1 (topic sentence)
- Problem: personal phrasing ("I totally agree"), long and unfocused.
- Use: a concise, formal topic sentence that links to thesis and previews the paragraph's main claim.
- Phrase swaps: replace "I totally agree with the idea that governments should enact appropriate laws to address the issue of migrants enduring long hours and unfair pay due to weak regulations" with a topic sentence like one of these stems you can adapt:
- "Stricter legal protections for migrant workers reduce exploitation by preventing long hours and wage theft."
- "Strengthening labour protections for migrants prevents exploitation (for example, unpaid overtime and wage theft) and improves economic outcomes."
- (Don't paste a full replacement here — choose one of the stems and adapt.)

Sentence 2 (claim/support)

Good: this sentence is useful but it's close to a topic sentence; keep it as evidence/explanation.

Tighten language: "increase worker productivity and economic contribution" → "increase worker productivity and migrants' economic contribution."

Add transition: start with "For example," or "Consequently," if you follow a cause→effect line.

Sentence 3 (explain social harms)

Problem: repetitive ("unequal treatment" / "atmosphere of inequality").

Swap: replace "such an atmosphere of inequality may expand, potentially causing further biases and disparities in gender or race" with more precise phrasing: "weak regulation can entrench systemic discrimination and widen gender and racial disparities."

Keep it short and direct.

Sentence 4 (psychological/economic effects)

Problem: vague "negative emotions" and awkward "higher risks of law violations."

Phrase swaps: "negative emotions" → "lower morale" or "poorer mental health"; "law violations" → "informal or illegal employment" or "social instability."

Example phrasing to adapt: "Exploitation undermines migrants' morale and productivity and may push vulnerable workers into informal or illegal employment."

Sentence 5 (link to social outcomes)

Problem: abstract.

Make the causal link explicit: "Together, reduced productivity and increased informal employment harm social cohesion and economic efficiency."

Sentence 6 (concluding link)

Problem: repetitive with topic sentence.

Make it a short wrap-up that links back to thesis: "For these reasons, governments should strengthen labour protections for migrants." (Use this as a closing sentence, not a repeat of the whole thesis.)

Suggestion: a clear microstructure for the paragraph (3–5 sentences total)

- Topic sentence (1): state the specific claim linking to thesis (laws prevent exploitation and improve productivity). — Use one of the stems above.
- Explain the problem and causal chain (1–2): show how weak regulation → exploitation (specific examples like unpaid overtime, wage theft) → effects on migrants (lower morale, poorer mental health) → effects on society (lower productivity, informal/illegal work).
- Brief illustrative example (1): a short hypothetical or general example (e.g., "For example, when migrants work 12-hour shifts for below-minimum wage...").
- Concluding sentence (1): tie back to the thesis ("Therefore, governments should strengthen labour protections...").

Two short phrase banks you can paste into your revision

- Replace "enduring long hours and unfair pay" with: "facing long hours and wage theft / below-minimum wages / unpaid overtime."
- Replace "negative emotions" with: "lower morale, poorer mental health, and reduced job satisfaction."
- Replace "higher risks of law violations" with: "a greater likelihood of entering informal or illegal employment" or "increased social instability."

Next step

- Please paste your revised paragraph using these notes (you can keep it 3–5 sentences). I'll give focused feedback on clarity, unity, and language and suggest final micro-edits. Would you like me to also show how one short example sentence could look, or would you prefer to try it yourself first?

You:

First, stricter legal protections for migrant workers reduce exploitation by preventing long hours and wage theft. Stricter legal protections for migrant workers reduce systemic discrimination and exploitation while increasing worker productivity and migrants' economic contribution. The unequal treatment they suffer violates their rights, and weak regulation can entrench systemic discrimination and widen both gender and racial disparities. This unfair treatment can lead to lower morale, poorer mental health, and reduced job satisfaction among migrants, leading to lower work efficiency and higher risks of social instability. Together, reduced productivity and increased informal employment harm social cohesion and economic efficiency. For these reasons, governments should strengthen labour protections for migrants.

Assistant:

Nice work — this paragraph is much clearer and much closer to academic style. You've made the topic sentence direct, added causal links, and improved vocabulary. Below I include the full essay with your revised paragraph inserted, then short, focused feedback and specific micro-edits you can apply. Would you like to try another revision now?

Full essay with your paragraph inserted

In the current world, globalisation continues to advance, leading to increased migration across many countries. Governments are expected to consider whether stricter laws should be enforced to safeguard migrants' rights. I agree that governments should enact stricter laws to protect migrants' rights because such laws prevent exploitation and reduce social inequality while promoting social harmony and economic productivity; however, policymakers must also consider the potential pressures increased migration may place on public services.

First, stricter legal protections for migrant workers reduce exploitation by preventing long hours and wage theft. Stricter legal protections for migrant workers reduce systemic discrimination and exploitation while increasing worker productivity and migrants' economic contribution. The unequal treatment they suffer violates their rights, and weak regulation can entrench systemic discrimination and widen both gender and racial disparities. This unfair treatment can lead to lower morale, poorer mental health, and reduced job satisfaction among migrants, leading to lower work efficiency and higher risks of social instability. Together, reduced productivity and increased informal employment harm social cohesion and economic efficiency. For these reasons, governments should strengthen labour protections for migrants.

However, I believe this approach also has drawbacks, especially for countries with large numbers of migrants. When migration significantly impacts society, it may not be reasonable to enforce laws that could attract even more migrants, as this might bring chaos. Thus, I partially disagree with the idea.

In conclusion, the benefits of enforcing laws to improve migrants' working conditions outweigh the drawbacks. In most countries, governments should implement stricter regulations to safeguard migrants' rights.

Focused feedback and small revisions to try

What's working

- Clear topic and link to thesis: the paragraph supports the thesis and explains how laws reduce exploitation.
- Improved vocabulary and more formal tone (e.g., "systemic discrimination," "economic contribution").
- Logical cause→effect chain is present (weak regulation → exploitation → social/economic harm).

What to tighten (specific, fixable items)

- 1) Avoid repetition: sentences 1 and 2 repeat the same claim ("Stricter legal protections..."). Combine them so the paragraph is more concise and energetic.
- 2) Reduce redundancy and tighten causal phrasing:
 - Change "leading to lower work efficiency and higher risks of social instability" to "reducing productivity and increasing the risk of social instability" (more concise + parallel structure).
- 3) Phrase choices:
 - Replace "worker productivity and migrants' economic contribution" → choose one phrase or combine cleanly ("migrants' productivity and economic contribution").
 - Replace "higher risks of social instability" → "increased risk of social instability."
 - Replace "work efficiency" with "productivity" (more academic).
- 4) Add one brief concrete example or hypothetical to strengthen development (even a short phrase): "For example, when migrants work 12-hour shifts for below-minimum wages..."
- 5) Tighten the closing sentence so it doesn't repeat the thesis word-for-word — make it a brief wrap-up.

Micro-edits and a model sentence you can adapt

- Combine S1+S2 into one stronger sentence (model you can copy/edit):
- Stricter legal protections for migrant workers reduce exploitation (for example, long hours and wage theft), curb systemic discrimination, and increase migrants' productivity and economic contribution.
- Replace this phrase:
 - "This unfair treatment can lead to lower morale, poorer mental health, and reduced job satisfaction among migrants, leading to lower work efficiency and higher risks of social instability."
 - Suggested edit (you can adapt): "Such exploitation undermines migrants' morale and mental health, reduces productivity, and increases the risk of informal employment and social instability."
- Replace final sentence:
 - Instead of "For these reasons, governments should strengthen labour protections for migrants," consider a concise wrap-up: "Therefore, stronger labour protections are necessary to protect migrants and support social and economic wellbeing."

Next step — your turn

Would you like to:

- (A) Try revising the paragraph now using the micro-edits above and paste your version for one more check? (I recommend this — I'll give focused final edits.)
- (B) Or would you like me to apply those small edits and return the full essay with the paragraph tightened?

Either choice is fine — tell me which you prefer and I'll help you finish.

You:

However, I believe this approach also has drawbacks, especially for countries with large numbers of migrants. When migration significantly impacts society, it may not be reasonable to enforce laws that could attract even more migrants, as this might bring chaos. Thus, I partially disagree with the idea.

What about this paragraph's statement/topic sentences?

Assistant:

Thanks — this is a useful question. Before I give focused feedback, a very quick check so we stay focused:

1) Which 1–2 priorities do you want to work on right now?

- Clarity of argument (thesis & topic sentences)
- Paragraph development / evidence and explanation
- Language (vocabulary and formal phrasing)

(You can pick one or two. If you're not sure, say "help me choose.")

Brief diagnostic (2–3 sentences) about the counterargument paragraph you posted

- Strengths: You correctly include a counterargument, which makes your essay balanced. The paragraph signals disagreement and attempts to qualify your main claim.
- Weaknesses: The topic sentence is vague (uses "drawbacks" and "chaos" without naming the specific problem), and the paragraph does not clearly explain the causal chain or offer a brief rebuttal. It needs a clearer claim, more specific reasons, and smoother links back to your thesis.

Confirming scope

- Do you want to focus on (A) improving the topic sentence for the counterargument paragraph, or (B) improving that paragraph's topic sentence plus its supporting sentences (concession + rebuttal)? Confirm before I give step-by-step help.

If you choose topic sentence only — quick feedback and next step

- Problem with current topic sentence: "However, I believe this approach also has drawbacks, especially for countries with large numbers of migrants. When migration significantly impacts society, it may not be reasonable to enforce laws that could attract even more migrants, as this might bring chaos."
- Too vague: "drawbacks," "chaos."
- Not specific: It doesn't name what the "drawbacks" are (pressure on services, social tensions, economic costs).
- Weak link to thesis: it doesn't clearly show how this limits or qualifies your main claim (that laws are still overall desirable).
- How to fix it: make the counterargument specific, concise, and clearly labelled as a qualified concession that you will later rebut or limit.

Try one of these stems to write a clear topic sentence (pick one and fill in the bracket):

- "A legitimate concern is that stricter migrant protection laws could increase pressure on public services, such as [healthcare/housing/education], especially in countries with large migrant populations."
- "Opponents argue that stronger protections for migrants may impose economic and administrative burdens on host countries—for example, by increasing demand for [public services/welfare]—which is a valid, but manageable, concern."
- "While stricter labour protections reduce exploitation, they may also create short-term pressures on local services and budgets in areas with high migration."

Which of those stems fits what you mean? Try editing one now into a full topic sentence in your own words and paste it here — I'll give focused feedback and small wording suggestions.

If you choose to revise the whole counterargument paragraph — quick roadmap and guiding questions

- Structure I recommend (3–4 sentences):
 - 1) Topic sentence: name the specific drawback and whom it affects.
 - 2) Brief explanation: show how the drawback happens (cause → effect).
 - 3) Concession or brief example: a short concrete detail or hypothetical (e.g., "For example, an influx of migrants can strain local housing and clinic capacity.").
 - 4) Rebuttal/qualification: explain why the drawback does not outweigh the benefits (e.g., policy solutions, phased implementation, international aid, enforcement that balances rights and capacity).
- Guiding questions to revise each sentence:
 - Does this sentence name a clear, specific drawback?
 - Do I explain the causal link (how the law could lead to that drawback)?
 - Do I give a short example or consequence to make the claim concrete?
 - Do I end by limiting the counterargument (showing it is manageable or less important than the benefits)?

- Language tips:
- Replace vague words ("chaos," "drawbacks") with precise terms: pressure on public services, increased short-term costs, administrative burden, social tension.
- Use transition words: "However," "Nevertheless," "While this is a valid concern," "Yet," "To address this concern,".
- Keep sentences concise and academic: avoid personal phrases like "I believe" in topic sentences.

Quick micro-example (use only as a model to adapt — don't copy blindly)

- Model plan in three short lines:
- Topic sentence stem: "A potential drawback of stricter protections is that they can increase pressure on public services, such as..."
- Example/explanation: "When municipalities receive many new migrants, demand for housing and healthcare can temporarily exceed supply."
- Rebuttal: "However, careful policy design (e.g., phased implementation, targeted funding) can mitigate these pressures without abandoning migrant rights."

Your turn

- Would you like to:
 - A) Try rewriting the topic sentence now (paste your version) so I can give micro-edits; or
 - B) Try rewriting the full counterargument paragraph (3–4 sentences) so I can give focused feedback on unity and language?

Tell me which option you prefer and paste your sentence/paragraph when you're ready. I'll respond with short, actionable edits and encouragement.

You:

I want to focus on (B) improving that paragraph's topic sentence plus its supporting sentences (concession + rebuttal) and Language (vocabulary and formal phrasing). I will try rewriting the topic sentence now (paste your version) so you can give micro-edits. A potential drawback of stricter protections is that they can increase pressure on public services, such as education, healthcare and housing.

Assistant:

Nice work — this is a clear, focused start. A few quick micro-edits to make the sentence more precise and formal, then some short stems you can adapt before you write the full paragraph.

Micro-edits (copyable fixes)

- Spelling/spacing: "education, healthcare" → "education, healthcare"
- Be specific about what "stricter protections" refers to: say "stricter protections for migrants" or "stricter migrant-protection laws."
- Consider qualifying the timing: do you mean short-term pressures or long-term costs? If short-term, add "short-term."

A corrected, minimal version you can edit:

- A potential drawback of stricter protections for migrants is that they can increase pressure on public services, such as education, healthcare, and housing.

If you'd like options to choose from or adapt, here are three concise stems with slightly different tones — pick one and tweak it to match what you want to argue:

1) Neutral concession (simple, clear)

- "A potential drawback of stricter protections for migrants is that they can increase pressure on public services, such as education, healthcare, and housing, particularly in areas with large migrant inflows."

2) Concession with short-term qualifier (good if you plan to rebut by saying it's manageable)

- "While stronger migrant-protection laws reduce exploitation, they may create short-term pressures on local public services (for example, housing and healthcare) in regions receiving many newcomers."

3) Concession that sets up a policy rebuttal (good if you want to propose solutions)

- "Opponents argue that stricter protections could impose administrative and financial burdens on public services — a valid concern that can be mitigated through phased implementation and targeted funding."

Next step — write the full concession + rebuttal paragraph (3–4 sentences)

Use this mini-plan:

- Sentence 1 (topic sentence): pick/adapt one of the stems above.
- Sentence 2 (explain cause → effect): briefly show how the law could lead to greater demand or costs (e.g., increased arrivals, higher service use).
- Sentence 3 (short example or consequence): one concrete detail or hypothetical (e.g., "For example, an influx of migrants can raise demand for affordable housing, straining local budgets.").
- Sentence 4 (rebuttal/qualification): show why this concern is manageable or less important than the benefits (e.g., "However, phased implementation, targeted funding, and international cooperation can reduce these pressures while protecting migrants' rights.")

Would you like to try writing that 3–4 sentence paragraph now? Paste it here and I'll give tight, focused edits on language and logic.

You:

Maybe you can give me some specific examples?

Assistant:

Good question — thanks for asking. Do you want real-world, evidence-based examples (studies, country policies), brief hypothetical examples you can use in an essay, or both? Tell me which and I'll tailor the examples.

Below are several short, usable examples divided by purpose. Each example includes a one-line idea of how to use it and a short model clause or phrase you can adapt when you insert it into your paragraph.

A. Concrete exploitation examples (use in paragraph 1 to show what "exploitation" looks like)

- Unpaid overtime / wage theft
- How to use: show a specific exploitative practice that laws would prevent.
- Model phrase to adapt: "for example, unpaid overtime and wage theft (such as workers paid below the minimum wage)"
- Withholding identity documents or passports
- How to use: show how employers control workers and prevent them from asserting rights.
- Model phrase to adapt: "employers sometimes withhold passports, preventing migrants from changing jobs or reporting abuse"
- Dangerous working conditions without safety protections
- How to use: link weak regulation to physical risk and higher costs.
- Model phrase to adapt: "unsafe workplaces (for instance, construction sites without proper safety gear)"

B. Consequence examples (show the effects on migrants and society)

- Reduced productivity and mental health
- How to use: explain why exploitation harms the economy and social cohesion.
- Model phrase to adapt: "such exploitation undermines morale and mental health, reducing workers' productivity"
- Growth of informal/illegal employment
- How to use: show a social-stability consequence laws would reduce.
- Model phrase to adapt: "vulnerable workers may turn to informal or illegal employment, which erodes tax revenue and social cohesion"

C. Counterargument / pressure-on-services examples (use in the concession paragraph)

- Strain on local housing
- How to use: give a concrete public-service example critics cite.
- Model phrase to adapt: "an influx of migrants can increase demand for affordable housing, straining municipal budgets"
- Increased demand on clinics and schools
- How to use: show short-term public-service pressure.
- Model phrase to adapt: "local clinics and schools may face overcrowding, creating short-term capacity problems"

- Administrative and fiscal costs of implementation
- How to use: show the economic burden opponents worry about.
- Model phrase to adapt: "implementing and enforcing new protections requires administrative resources and public spending"

D. Policy solutions / rebuttal examples (use to limit the counterargument and show manageability)

- Phased implementation and targeted funding
- How to use: show a practical way to reduce pressure while protecting rights.
- Model phrase to adapt: "phased implementation and targeted funding can reduce short-term pressures on services"
- Work permits tied to social services contributions
- How to use: show a policy that balances rights and capacity.
- Model phrase to adapt: "linking work permits to taxation and social contributions helps fund services"
- Partnerships with NGOs / international aid
- How to use: show off-budget or external supports.
- Model phrase to adapt: "partnerships with NGOs and international agencies can provide immediate support for housing and healthcare"

E. Where to find evidence (quick sources if you want to cite)

- ILO reports on migrant worker rights and exploitation
- UNHCR reports (migration pressures, refugees)
- Human Rights Watch / Amnesty International country reports (examples of abuse)
- OECD or World Bank migration statistics (for numbers on inflows and economic impact)
- National news cases (search "wage theft migrant workers [country]")

How to integrate an example in one short move

- Structure: Topic sentence → example phrase (one clause) → short explanation of effect → link back to thesis.
- Tiny model structure to adapt (not a full paragraph):
- "[Topic claim]. For example, [example phrase], which [effect/explanation]; therefore, [link to thesis]."

Your turn

- Which type of example do you want to use in your paragraph (A, B, C, or D)? Or do you want one real-world citation from the sources above?
- Pick one example and paste the sentence of your paragraph where you want it inserted. I'll give a tight micro-edit showing exactly how to add it (I'll avoid rewriting the whole paragraph for you).

You:

In conclusion, the benefits of enforcing laws to improve migrants' working conditions outweigh the drawbacks. In most countries, governments should take steps to implement stricter regulations to safeguard migrants' rights.

Do you think this paragraph needs any revisions?

Assistant:

Quick check before I answer: which 1–2 priorities should I focus on when I give feedback on this conclusion?

- clarity of argument (thesis & topic links)
- structure/coherence (summary + closing)
- language (formal phrasing, concision)

Pick one or two (or say "just give quick feedback") and I'll tailor the reply.

Brief, targeted diagnostic of your closing paragraph

- Strengths: It clearly restates your position (benefits outweigh drawbacks) and gives a recommendation (governments should implement stricter regulations). That helps signal closure.
- Areas to improve:
 - Repetition / lack of precision: the two sentences repeat the same idea without summarising the specific reasons you developed earlier (exploitation prevention, reduced inequality, economic/social benefits, and the service-pressure caveat).
 - Weak closing: the final sentence restates the recommendation but doesn't add a final insight, nuance, or action (e.g., mention of policy measures that manage service pressures).

- Tone and concision: tighten wording to avoid redundancy (e.g., “take steps to implement stricter regulations” → more direct phrasing).

Suggestions you can try (fill these stems — try one and paste it back for feedback)

1) Summarise your reasons and close decisively:

- “Despite potential drawbacks, governments should implement stricter laws to protect migrants because they and .”

2) Recommend a balanced policy action (good if you want to acknowledge the caveat):

- “Governments should enact stricter protections for migrants while also to manage short term pressures on public services.”

3) Strong, concise wrap up (if you prefer a short ending):

- “Overall, the long term benefits of protecting migrants’ rights outweigh the costs, so governments should adopt stricter labour protections.”

A few micro edits you can apply right away

- Remove redundancy: keep only one clear recommendation phrase instead of “take steps to implement stricter regulations.”

- Be specific: mention one or two reasons (e.g., “prevent exploitation” or “improve social cohesion”) if you want to summarise the essay.

- If you want balance, add a short clause about mitigation (phased implementation, targeted funding, or partnership with NGOs).

Would you like to:

- (A) Try one of the stems now and paste your revised conclusion for quick edits, or

- (B) Move on to revising the thesis or a body paragraph next?

Your choice — I’ll give focused, encouraging feedback the moment you paste your revision.