

COACHED WRITING AND CROWD WRITING PRODUCTS IN THE TEACHING OF EFL WRITING

Bambang Yudi Cahyono
Universitas Negeri Malang
bambang.yudi.fs@um.ac.id

Abstract: Writing as one of the four language skills is a very important skill for communication, especially in a written form. In universities in Indonesia, writing in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) is taught to the students of the English departments. Through the teaching of EFL writing, the students will be able to learn to write according to the academic conventions. The process of writing through systematic teaching is called 'coached writing.' In this digitization era, however, students also become users of social media. Social media have so many users that they are referred to as 'crowd.' The crowd in social media communicate and they might be willing to be involved in some activities initiated by some users. These particular users try to attract the crowd in activities such as *crowd funding, crowd sourcing, crowd translating, and crowd writing*. This article reports the result of a study which investigated the differences between the products of coached writing and those of crowd writing. It also discusses some implications of crowd writing practices so that EFL teachers will be aware of the phenomenon and its effects on ethical and academic issues.

INTRODUCTION

Writing is a language skill which is important for written communication. In order to be successful in learning a language, a learner needs to learn to write in addition to the need to learn the other language skills, which are listening, speaking, and reading. Miller (1998: 341) states that for the learner, "writing is an important skill in supporting other learning experiences." In a more elaborate way, Raimes (1987) argues that when a language learner tries to write for learning, he or she can encompass other purposes in learning to write, which are writing for reinforcement, training, imitation, communication, and fluency. Due to the importance of writing, in the context of teaching English as a foreign language (EFL), writing is one of the language skills taught in English departments, trained in English language centers, and offered in English training courses.

Apart from its importance, writing is a skill which is difficult to master. That is why authors of textbooks believe that good writing ability can only be achieved through a gradual process of learning. For example, Grenville (2001) proposes six steps in writing which are getting ideas, choosing, outlining, drafting, revising, and editing. Dollahite and Haun (2003) recommends writers to follow five steps which are exploring, focusing, organizing, creating, and refining. Other authors believe that writing can be mastered well by learning from the shorter to the longer discourses. For example, in order to write good paragraphs, learners are guided to write good topic sentences (Sullivan, 1976; Arnaudett & Barrett, 1981) and to write good essays, learners need to be trained to write good paragraphs (Zemach & Rumisek, 2003). Many other authors (Oshima & Hogue, 2006; Smalley, Ruetten & Kozyrev, 2001) believe that before producing an argumentative essay, the learners need to learn to develop various types of paragraphs and write expository essays of different types of development (e.g., exemplification, comparative and contrast, classification, process analysis, and cause and effect analysis).

English departments in Indonesian universities (e.g., *Universitas Brawijaya* and *Universitas Negeri Malang*) offer writing courses which have been graded from the lowest level to the most complex level (Cahyono, 2007; Catalogue of the Department of English, 2017). For example, in the Department of English of Universitas Negeri Malang, writing is offered in a series of three courses: Paragraph Writing, Essay Writing, and Argumentative Writing. As the course names suggest, the Paragraph Writing course aims to "provide students with the ability to write various types of paragraphs" (p. 41). The Essay Writing course "develops students' ability to write expository essays using different methods of development" (p. 42), while the Argumentative Writing course "develops students' ability to present

logical reasoning ... in the form of subject-related argumentative essays” (p. 42). Similarly, in the English Department of Universitas Brawijaya, writing is taught in a series of four courses: Writing I, Writing II, Writing III, and Writing IV (Cahyono, 2007). The examination of the curricular contents of writing courses in the two universities shows that writing is taught in a few consecutive courses; the less complex level becomes the prerequisite of the more complex level. The gradual process of teaching writing in the English departments in Indonesian universities reflects the beliefs of the writing book authors (e.g., Zemach & Rumisek, 2003; Oshima & Hogue, 2006; Smalley, et al., 2001).

It is apparent that the EFL students in the English departments undergo the gradual process of teaching writing so that they can develop their writing ability optimally. The process of writing through systematic teaching in the English departments is called ‘coached writing.’ Through coached writing the EFL students can write graded forms of texts (i.e., topic sentences, paragraphs, and essays) and various types of texts (i.e., narrative and descriptive paragraphs as well as expository and argumentative essays). In this digitization era, however, students also become users of social media such as *Facebook*, *Instagram*, and *Twitter*. Social media have so many users (i.e., *friends* or *followers*) that they are referred to as ‘crowd.’ The crowd in social media communicate and interact. For example, they might be willing to be involved in a business initiated by some users. These particular users try to attract the crowd in a business with a system of *crowd funding* which is also called *crowd financing* or *crowd fund sourcing*. Crowdfunding is defined as “... a method of raising capital in small amounts from a large group of people using the Internet and social media” (“Crowd funding,” 2016). For example, an author markets his or her book to the community in the social media so that he or she can get financial benefits for the book sale. Similarly, an Internet user may also involve the crowd to help him or her in translating a text (called *crowd translating*) and in preparing a writing product (*crowd writing*).

Due to the trend in the involvement of the crowd to contribute to an activity initiated by individual users of social media, EFL students might be tempted to initiate crowd writing to fulfil a writing course assignment. Crowd writing can be defined as “a method of composing a writing product from pieces of texts contributed by people (friends or followers) using the Internet and social media” (my definition). Crowd writing is different from *The Write Crowd* and *Crowd Content*. *The Write Crowd* is a book offering “practical tips and examples of how writers of all genres and experience levels contribute to the sustainability of the literary community, the success of others, and to their own well-rounded writing life” (May, 2014). *Crowd Content* is an Internet site which solicits contributions of articles of various themes from the crowd as writers. Writers who contribute their articles to *Crowd Content* are paid depending on the number of visits or strikes to the page showing the contributed articles. Unlike the *Write Crowd* and *Crowd Content* which are more profit oriented, crowd writing is run on a voluntary basis. The crowd simply contribute their written texts to individual users who request contribution for the composition. Thus, the individual users get advantages in terms of content contributed by the crowd.

Crowd writing can be very practical for the completion of a written product. However, the practice in crowd content brings ethical and academic issues due to the arguable sources of ideas. Ethically, code writing obscures the concept of authorship. Authorship is concerned with originality of a piece of writing (Robinson & Davidson, 2002). Whilst it has been recognized that new ideas are commonly based on previous ones (Noah & Eckstein, 2001, p. 109), a writer is required to present the ideas in a way that shows his or her own creative process of writing (Stearns, 1999, p. 7). To use or to refer to other people’s ideas or words, one is supposed to acknowledge the ideas or words to the original author. Acknowledgment of sources is seen as a measure of morality needed to “uphold the scholarly consensus necessary for the production of knowledge” (Myers, 1998, p. 2) and to recognize the work of an author (Pedersen, 2001). Thus, authorship or ownership of ideas may be established, in part, by attribution.

Academically, crowd writing ignores the process of learning which is aimed to help students in producing coached writing products. For example, when the students are assigned to write an essay, they are expected to write an essay according the academic conventions. An essay should be good in terms of five components: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics (Hartfiel, Jacobs, Zinkgraft et al., 1985; Weigle, 2002). In terms of content and organization, the students should be knowledgeable about the topic and how it can be developed into the paragraphs: the introductory paragraph, the development paragraphs, and the concluding paragraph (Oshima & Hogue, 2006; Smalley, et al., 2001). According to Smalley et al. (2001, pp. 108-109), a good introductory paragraph of an essay should:

- (1) introduce the topic.
- (2) indicate generally how the topic is going to be developed.
- (3) contain the thesis statement.
- (4) be inviting; that is, it should be interesting enough to make the reader want to continue reading.

In order to develop the body of an essay, a writer should use the introductory paragraph as a basis. With regard to the good characteristics of developmental paragraphs, Smalley et al. (2001, pp. 112-113) stated that:

- (1) each developmental paragraph discusses one aspect of the main topic.
- (2) the controlling idea in the developmental paragraph should echo the central idea in the thesis statement.
- (3) the developmental paragraphs should have coherence and unity.

In addition, Smalley et al. (2001, p. 121) stated that the concluding paragraph:

- (1) can restate the main points (subtopics) discussed.
- (2) restate the thesis.
- (3) should not ... bring up a new topic.

In terms of vocabulary and language use, the essay should contain relevant and various dictions and should be written with accurate and appropriate uses of grammar. In addition, students should be able to write an essay by considering the mechanical aspects such as spelling, capitalization and punctuation. In light of the systematic process of helping EFL students produce coached writing products, it is then arguable that the contributors of crowd writing are aware of the academic conventions in writing a text required by the social media users requesting contribution for crowd writing.

Unfortunately, the phenomenon of crowd writing in the context of English language teaching and learning has not been examined. In light of this research gap, this article aimed to examine the differences between the writing products of coached writing and those of crowd writing. By comparing the two types of writing products, this article aims to provide evidence that coached writing products are better than crowd writing products. It also discusses the ethical and academic issues behind the phenomenon of crowd writing.

METHOD

This study describes the results of comparing two writing products: one is the product of coached writing and the other is the product of crowd writing. The coached writing product was an essay written by a student of the English department who was taking the Essay Writing course. The essay was a comparative and contrast essay which was written for the mid-term examination of the course. In the mid-term examination, two topics were offered to the students: (1) Indonesian Food versus American Food and (2) Traditional Classes versus Online Classes. Among 25 students who attended the examination, 14 students wrote essays on the first topic and 11 students wrote essays on the second topic. The fact that more students chose the first topic indicated that the first topic was more preferable. Therefore, one of the essays on the first topic was used in this research. The chosen essay was entitled "Differences of Indonesian Food and American Food" which was written by SNS and it is shown in Appendix 1. The essay consists of five paragraphs: 1 introductory paragraph, 3 developmental paragraphs, and 1 concluding paragraph.

The crowd writing product consists of texts contributed by the researcher's friends in Facebook, social media application used in this study. In order to get the contributions from the crowd in the social media, several steps were followed:

1. An introductory paragraph was posted in the note section of the researcher's Facebook account. In order to have a comparable essay, the introductory paragraph written by SNS was used as the posted introductory paragraph. The title and the wordings of the paragraph were modified for grammatical accuracy.
2. The introductory paragraph was introduced to the crowd with a greeting and a request. Briefly stated, friends in Facebook were invited to contribute their paragraphs based on the introductory paragraph. The contributors were given the freedom to choose any paragraph from the blank paragraphs, namely Developmental Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, or the concluding paragraph. However, a contributor should write only one paragraph. The pre-uploaded version of the posting for crowd writing looks like the one shown in Figure 1.

Hello ...would you like to contribute ..?

The following is an introductory paragraph of a five-paragraph essay on "The Differences between Indonesian Food and American Food". The other four paragraphs (3 developmental paragraphs and 1 concluding paragraph) are still blank. Please contribute your ideas by writing ONE paragraph. Every contributor may choose to write a

developmental paragraph (either Developmental Paragraph 1, 2 or 3) or the concluding paragraph.

The number of contributors is not limited. However, each contributor is advised to indicate the part of paragraph being written in the comment bar, for example, DP 1 for Developmental Paragraph 1, DP 2 for Developmental Paragraph 2, DP 3 for Developmental Paragraph 3, and CP for the Concluding Paragraph. The contribution can be given NOT in a particular order. Thank you very muchand happy contributing.

THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN INDONESIAN FOOD AND AMERICAN FOOD

Indonesia and America are two countries which have most colorful and vibrant dishes. This happens because people from different ethnics, religions, and cultures blend in each of the countries. However, these two countries have differences in their dishes. The dishes differ in terms of the people's favorite food, citizen's staple food, and the tools used to eat the food.

DP 1 blank

DP 2 blank

DP 3 blank

CP blank

Note: Please do not copy and paste the introductory paragraph into the comment bar. Thank you very much.

Figure 1. Request Contributions of Texts from the Researcher's Facebook Friends

3. A time was needed to wait for responses from the crowd. When the responses are already available, a crowd writing can be made by compiling and reconstructing the responses from the contributing friends.

The product of the crowd writing was based on the contributions from the Facebook friends. The products of the coached writing and crowd writing were then analyzed to investigate which of the two products was better than the other. The two writing products were analyzed by using the criteria of good introductory, developmental, and concluding paragraphs stated by Smalley et al. (2001).

RESULTS

The results of the study are presented by focusing on the product of coached writing and then the product of crowd writing. To begin with, the introductory paragraph of the coached writing is quoted below:

Indonesia and America are two countries which have most colorful and vibrant dishes. This is happened because people from different ethnics, religions, and cultures blend in one place. *These two countries also have differences in some aspects although they have similar history of their dishes, which are about people's favorite food, citizens' staple food, and the tools are used to eat the food.*

(Introductory paragraph of the product of coached writing written by SNS)

The introductory paragraph of the product of coached writing has fulfilled the four criteria of a good introductory paragraph as outlined by Smalley et al. (2001: 108-109), regardless of the grammatical errors (the underlined words). It was written with a funnel system by which the topic is introduced in a general statement, leading to the presentation of the thesis statement (*the italicized sentence*). The thesis statement indicates how the topic is going to be developed into subtopics. In addition, it is inviting as well because it presents the three aspects of the differences explicitly. This way, it attracts the reader to read about the subtopics to be compared in the developmental paragraphs, namely (1) people's favorite food, (2) citizens' staple food, and (3) the tools used to eat the food.

The three subtopics in the introductory paragraph of the product of coached writing are used as bases to develop the body of the essay which consists of three developmental paragraphs. This is evident from the ideas stated in all of the first sentences, which are the topic sentences, of the three developmental paragraphs:

First, in Indonesia, most people enjoy to have *rendang* and *nasi goreng* as their dishes.

(The first sentence of the first developmental paragraph)

Second difference is about people's staple food.

(The first sentence of the second developmental paragraph)

The third is about the tools people used when they enjoyed their dishes.

(The first sentence of the third developmental paragraph)

Each of the topic sentences introduces the subtopic to be discussed in each of the developmental paragraphs of the product of coached writing. Thus, each of them leads the reader to know the content of the supporting sentences, which are about the comparison between Indonesian food and American food as seen from each subtopic. For example, with regard to the *people's favorite food* (Developmental Paragraph 1), the complete developmental paragraph can be shown as follows:

First, in Indonesia, most people enjoy to have *rendang* and *nasi goreng* as their dishes. Besides, they also have *sate* as one of the most popular food. These three dishes are cooked by many kinds of seasoning, and the dishes can also have different tastes depending on the place they are made. Different from Indonesia, in America, people like to enjoy hamburger and cheeseburger, fries, apple pie, hotdogs and fried chicken. These foods that American chose are simple dishes with not many kind of seasoning. American likes to eat food originates from bread, while Indonesian likes to enjoy rice, chicken and also beef meat. For the beverage, ice tea and orange juice are the most common drinks to get in the foodstalls, while in America most people go for ice cream ... This proves that Indonesian and American have different taste of food.

(The first developmental paragraph of coached writing product)

The other two developmental paragraphs (Developmental Paragraphs 2 & 3), also discuss the contents stipulated in the topic sentences, namely about *citizens' staple food* and *the tools used to eat the food*, respectively. It is apparent that the supporting sentences, which are about the comparison between Indonesian food and American food as seen from the *citizens' staple food* and the *tools used to eat the food*, conform to the ideas stated in the topic sentences of the two developmental paragraphs, respectively. Therefore, it can be inferred that the developmental paragraphs of the coached writing product are good developmental paragraphs.

The concluding paragraph of the coached writing product is shown in the following:

All people in the world, including American and Indonesian people need to eat to grow and to do their activities. These people have their own taste of food, and it affects their favorite food, the country's staple food, and also the tools used to eat the food. These makes American and Indonesian dishes unique and special.

Based on Smalley et al.'s (2001: 121) criteria of a good concluding paragraph, the concluding paragraph of the coached writing product restates "the main points (subtopics) discussed" and does not "bring up a new topic." Accordingly, it can be concluded that the essay produced through coached writing represents a good essay as the introductory, developmental, and concluding paragraphs have been written by considering the criteria.

In the remaining part of this section, the crowd writing product is presented. The introductory paragraph adapted from the one written by SNS was used to elicit the contributions from the crowd (Facebook friends). The introductory paragraph with a title is shown below:

THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN INDONESIAN FOOD AND AMERICAN FOOD.

Indonesia and America are two countries which have most colorful and vibrant dishes. This happens because people from different ethnics, religions, and cultures blend in each of the countries. However, these two countries have differences in their dishes. The dishes differ in terms of the people's favorite food, citizen's staple food, and the tools used to eat the food.

(Introductory paragraph adapted from the coached writing product written by SNS which is used to elicit crowd writing)

The thesis statement of the introductory paragraph contains three subtopics which may be developed into Developmental Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3, namely: "The dishes differ in terms of (1) the people's favorite food, (2) citizen's staple food, and (3) the tools used to eat the food." However, contributions from Facebook friends do not necessarily follow the hints given in the thesis statement. This is evident in one of the contributed texts as shown below:

Text 1

The people bring the ways to cook the dishes from their origin country to America. Some dishes from different countries have their own characteristic, sweet salty or even hot. (Contributed by AS)

While the subtopic in the posted text contributed by AS is still related to dishes, the text emphasized an issue which is not in the listed subtopics which is "the ways to cook the dishes." Thus, the contribution does not conform to the directions given in the introductory paragraph. The second contributed text is presented in the following:

Text 2

Another difference is about citizen's staple food. Indonesian people eat the same food everyday. That is rice which became main menu for Indonesians' breakfast, lunch, and dinner as well without feeling bored. The rice is served with *lauk pauk* (food produced from animal like fish, egg, or chicken) and *sayur mayur* (vegetables). On the other hand, American people eat a variety of foods each day. A bread mixed fresh vegetables and bread is rather strange for Indonesian tongue. In particular, they eat pizza, sandwiches, pasta or noodles, and sometimes meat for dining. (Contributed by AS)

The text contributed by AS is meant to be Developmental Paragraph 2 as it deals with citizens' staple food. It deals with the differences between food in the main dishes consumed by Indonesian and American people. Thus, this paragraph fits the requirement to be used as the second developmental paragraph because it presents the second subtopic, *the citizens' staple food*. The third text contributed by one of Facebook friends is shown below:

Text 3

DP 1: Contrasting between the flavor's stepped down from American and Indonesian cuisine provide you with a varied answer. A common item in Indonesian food is rice, due to their rice fields. Indonesian dishes commonly are described as a platter, it is designed with different segments of food, for example *Nasi Goreng*. Otherwise known as "Fried Rice," *Nasi Goreng* contains the bright and obvious, stir rice fried in cooking oil or margarine. Also accompanied by *kecap*, (Soy sauce) shallot, garlic, ground shrimp paste, tamarind, chilly, and typically added egg, chicken, or prawns. The aroma is earthy and holds an smoky appeal. The dish is high on detail, while on the other half of the argument concludes of more of a signature meal. American dishes are savory, and juicy, with a taste designed to rest on your taste buds. Most of their meals may be considered an item, while it doesn't need to be plated unless you aren't immune to messes. The Hamburger perhaps, is made of patties, tucked between bread rolls. Often served with cheese, onion, bacon, tomato, lettuce, and pickles, and condiments such as ketchup, it makes its way into fast-food restaurants. It's simple to collate the style ranges, while one food is high to tradition, and the other is one to keep the mind engaged. As you can see, the image, taste, and originating of the foods are very divergent. (Written by Robyn Nemeth and contributed by SSAN)

As shown in the posted text, the text contributed by SSAN was written by Robyn Nemeth. The text was meant to be Developmental Paragraph 1 (DP 1). Although it did not explicitly indicate the intended word as the subtopic, which is *the people's favorite food*, the topic sentence suggests so with the use of the phrase *the flavor's stepped down from American and Indonesian cuisine provide you with a varied answer*. Thus, this text fits the expectation stated in the thesis statement regarding the first subtopic to be developed in the body of the essay. The fourth text, which is the last crowd writing product, was contributed by NP and it is quoted below:

Text 4

Firstly I'd like to discuss people's food preference. Indonesians prefer food with strong taste of spices. It can be seen from several food bloggers and vloggers who have reviewed Indonesian street food, started from *pecel*, *rendang*, fried rice, to curry, and *lodeh*. Meanwhile, Americans prefer food which contains cheese and meat. Spices are only used to strengthen the taste of the food. (Contributed by NP)

The text was contributed to be the first developmental paragraph as indicated by the use of the phrase *people's food preference* in the topic sentence to substitute the term *the people's favorite food*. Totally there were four texts contributed by Facebook friends for the crowd writing. However,

after examination of each text, only two texts were considered suitable with the introductory paragraph. Text 1 was not used because it was irrelevant with the topic, while Text 3 was written in a different style. The final version of crowd writing product is presented in Appendix 2. It consists of only 3 paragraphs: The introductory paragraph, Developmental Paragraph 1 (Text 4), and Developmental Paragraph 2 (Text 2).

DISCUSSION

The results of the study show that the crowd writing product is different from the coached writing product in two major aspects: quality and originality. In terms of quality, the coached writing product is better than the crowd writing product. The different number of paragraphs (5 for the coached writing and 3 for the crowd writing) affected the aspects of content, organization and vocabulary of the two writing products. In terms of content, the coached writing has presented all of the subtopics (*people's favorite food*, *citizen's staple food*, and *the tools used to eat the food*) in the three developmental paragraphs, whereas the crowd writing presents only two of the three subtopics (*people's favorite food* and *citizen's staple food*). In terms of organization, the coached writing shows a complete component of an essay (i.e., introductory, developmental, and concluding paragraphs), while the crowd writing does not have a concluding paragraph. The content and organization aspects, in turn, affect the use of vocabulary in the produced essays.

It is important to note that the quality is not the issue to be compared. This is because the initiator of the crowd writing might complete the number of the paragraphs in the crowd writing. In the present digitization era, however, a more important issue is the originality of the ideas. As discussed earlier, originality deals with the notion of authorship. In the coached writing product, the authorship can be attributed to the student (SNS). She was able to write the essay well within the allocated time in the mid-term examination. This was made possible as she has passed the Paragraph Writing course, which was the prerequisite of the Essay Writing course. The essay reflected the thorough process of learning to write by following the criteria of good introductory, developmental, and concluding paragraphs as outlined by Smalley et al. (2001). The student writer has been successful in presenting "ideas in a way that shows his or her own creative process of writing" (Stearns, 1999: 7). Through the coached writing process, the student was able to use the process of writing as "a means of personal discovery, of creativity, and of self-expression" (Miller, 1998: 341).

In the crowd writing product, the writer's authorship was not clear as the essay was written by a number of people: the initiator and two contributors. The initiator gets the advantages of getting the contributed texts to make up his or her essay for free and in a quick manner. Accordingly, he or she can use the crowd writing for his or her own benefits such as publishing it in his or her personal profile or submitting it for a course grade. In contrast, each of the text contributors may not lose financially, as he or she had the fun by contributing a text and might keep the copy of the text. However, his or her creative work fails to be acknowledged. This is because the acknowledgment has a moral value to maintain the tradition in the development and dissemination of knowledge (Pedersen, 2001), in this case, in an essay form. Thus, a written work should not be a compilation of texts taken from other people's work or contributed by other writers, although it is based on a voluntary basis.

CONCLUSIONS

In the present digitization era, it is not difficult to collect ideas or even a complete text by using the Internet or social media. However, the ease in completing a written product should not be considered as an option if the written product fails to show the authorship of the writer. This article has reported the results of comparison of two writing products: one is the product of coached writing and the other is the product of crowd writing. While the crowd writing product is not as good as the coached writing product, the essential issue is not in the quality of the written product, but how it can show the creative process of the writer. Therefore, students who are learning to write are suggested to practice more in writing by following the process of teaching and learning so that they are able to present a genuine product of coached writing. They are not recommended to practice collecting texts through crowd writing as it fails to show morality in the creative process. In addition, teachers of writing are recommended to emphasize the importance of writing through the process in understanding the characteristics of good product of writing as well as the recursive process of writing. Thus, regardless of the temptation in easy and quick writing nowadays, coached writing should be valued more than crowd writing.

REFERENCES

Arnaudett, M. L., & Barrett, M. E. (1981). *Paragraph development: A guide for students of English as a second language*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Cahyono, B. Y. (2007). *Pembelajaran writing di program studi S1 sastra Inggris, Universitas Brawijaya: Sebuah tinjauan kurikuler* [The teaching of writing in the undergraduate program of English literature at Universitas Brawijaya: A curricular perspective]. Paper presented in a workshop on "EFL writing syllabus design" at Universitas Brawijaya, 4 August 2007.
- Catlogue of the Department of English. (2015). Malang: Faculty of Letters, Universitas Negeri Malang.
- Crowd content. (2016). *Get paid to write articles for crowd content*. Retrieved October 14, 2016, from <http://realwaystoearnmoneyonline.com/writing-from-home-for-crowd-content/>
- Crowd funding*. (2016). Retrieved October 14, 2016, from <https://writeitsideways.com/crowdfunding-for-authors-is-it-right-and-is-it-right-for-you/>
- Dollahite, N. E., & Haun, J. (2003). *Sourcework: Academic writing from sources*. Boston, MA: Heinle.
- Grenville, K. (2001). *Writing from start to finish: A six-step guide*. Crows Nest, NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Hartfiel, V. F., Jacobs, H. L., Zinkgraft, S.A., Wormuth, D. R., & Hughey, J. B. (1985). *Learning ESL composition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- May, L. A. (2014). *The write crowd*. Retrieved October 14, 2016, from <http://www.bloomsbury.com/us/the-write-crowd-9781628923094/>
- Miller, K. S. (1998). Teaching speaking. In K. Johnson & H. Johnson (Eds.), *Encyclopedic dictionary of applied linguistics* (pp. 335-341). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Myers, S. (1998). Questioning author(ity): ESL/EFL, science, and teaching about plagiarism. *TESL-EJ*, 3(2). Retrieved October 21, 2016, from <http://www-writing.Berkeley.edu/TESL-EJ/ej10/a2.html>
- Noah, H. J., & Eckstein, M. A. (2001). *Fraud and education: The worm in the apple*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2006). *Writing academic English*. White Plains, NY: Pearson.
- Pedersen, T. (2001). *A plagiarism case study*. Retrieved February 21, 2003, from <http://www.d.umn.edu/~tpederse/Pubs/plag.pdf>
- Raimes, A. (1983). Why write? From purpose to pedagogy. *English Teaching Forum*, 25(4): 36-41.
- Robinson, M., & Davidson, G. (Eds.). (2002). *Chambers 21st century dictionary*. Edinburgh, UK: Chambers.
- Smalley, R. L., Ruetten, M. K., & Kozyrev, J. R. (2001). *Refining composition skills*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Stearns, L. (1999). Copy wrong: Plagiarism, process, property, and the law. In L. Buranen & A. M. Roy (Eds.), *Perspectives on plagiarism and intellectual property in a postmodern world* (pp. 5-17). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Sullivan, K. E. (1976). *Paragraph practice: Text and exercises in the topic sentence, the paragraph, and the short composition*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zemach, D. E., & Rumisek, L. A. (2003). *Academic writing: From paragraph to essay*. Oxford: Macmillan Publishing Company.

APPENDIX 1. THE ESSAY PRODUCED THROUGH COACHED WRITING

Differences of Indonesian Food and American Food

Indonesia and America are two countries which have most colorful and vibrant dishes. This is happened because people from different ethnics, religions, and cultures blend in one place. These two countries also have differences in some aspects although they have similar history of their dishes, which are about people's favorite food, citizens' staple food, and the tools are used to eat the food.

First, in Indonesia, most people enjoy to have *rendang* and *nasi goreng* as their dishes. Besides, they also have *sate* as one of the most popular food. These three dishes are cooked by many kinds of seasoning, and the dishes can also have different tastes depending on the place they are made. Different from Indonesia, in America, people like to enjoy hamburger and cheeseburger, fries, apple pie, hotdogs and fried chicken. These foods that American chose are simple dishes with not many kind of seasoning. American likes to eat food originates from bread, while Indonesian likes to enjoy rice, chicken and also beef meat. For the beverage, ice tea and orange juice are the most common drinks to get in the foodstalls, while in America, most people go for ice cream ... This proves that Indonesian and American have different taste of food.

Second difference is about people's staple food. In Indonesia people have steamed rice as the staple food, The rice is eaten by any kind of side dishes. Sometimes people enjoy *rendang* with steamed rice. Some of them also eat noodle with rice. Many people also form new food from rice, for example, there are *nasi goreng* and *nasi goreng* which are very popular in Java. Meanwhile in America, people mostly have bread for their dishes, whether in their breakfast, their lunch or dinner. They also have cereal and milk to eat in their breakfast, and it is so common to see this in US. US citizens don't need rice to accompany their meals, like when they eat beef, they just enjoyed it with salad but not rice.

The third is about the tools people used when they enjoyed their dishes. It is common for Indonesia people to have spoon on their right hand and fork in their left. This is because most of the ingredients such as vegetables and meat are already cut into bite-size prior of cooking. In some traditional foodstalls, people eat their food with bare hands. First, they wash their hands in a bowl of water called *kobokan*, then started to enjoy their dishes. Indonesian people are also enjoyed to eat using chopsticks, even though this tool is rarely used. In America, a person use a knife and hold it with his right hand; and had a fork in his left hand. They need to cut their dishes first, so people can put it into their mouth. This is commonly seen in restaurant, but also applied in people daily life.

All people in the world, including American and Indonesian people need to eat to grow and to do their activities. These people have their own taste of food, and it affects their favorite food, the country's staple food, and also the tools used to eat the food. These makes American and Indonesian dishes unique and special.

(An essay by SNS, a third semester student)

APPENDIX 2. THE ESSAY PRODUCED THROUGH CROWD WRITING

The Differences between Indonesian Food and American Food

Indonesia and America are two countries which have most colorful and vibrant dishes. This happens because people from different ethnics, religions, and cultures blend in each of the countries. However, these two countries have differences in their dishes. The dishes differ in terms of the people's favorite food, citizen's staple food, and the tools used to eat the food. (Taken from SNS's essay with some modifications)

Firstly I'd like to discuss people's food preference. Indonesians prefer food with strong taste of spices. It can be seen from several food bloggers and vloggers who have reviewed Indonesian street food, started from *pecah*, *rendang*, fried rice, to curry, and *lodeh*. Meanwhile, Americans prefer food which contains cheese and meat. Spices are only used to strengthen the taste of the food. (Contributed by NP)

Another difference is about citizen's staple food. Indonesian people eat the same food everyday. That is rice which became main menu for Indonesians' breakfast, lunch, and dinner as well without feeling bored. The rice is served with *lauk pauk* (food that produced from animal like fish, egg, or chicken) and *sayur mayur* (vegetables). On the other hand, American people eat a variety of foods each day. A bread mixed fresh vegetables and bread is rather strange for Indonesian tongue. In particular, they eat pizza, sandwiches, pasta or noodles, and sometimes meat for dining. (Contributed by AS)