JURNAL PENDIDIKAN KARAKTER
Volume 14 Nomor 2 Tahun 2023
Halaman. 187-198
DOI: *10.21831/jpka.v14i2.62480*
p-ISSN: 2089-5003
e-ISSN: 2527-7014
Submitted: 13-06-2023 | Revised: 09-08-2023 | Accepted: 02-10-2023 | Published: 30-10-2023

Think pair share as an effort to foster students' literacy awareness and individual accountability character

Nita Maghfiratul Jannah*
* Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia
nitamaghfiratuljannah@uny.ac.id

Fitriani
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia
fitriani22fbs.2021@student.uny.ac.id

Neneng Herbyanti
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia
nenengo038fbs.2021@student.uny.ac.id

Adam Indrawan
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia
adamindrawan.2022@student.uny.ac.id

Dwiyani Pratiwi
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia
dwiyani_pratiwi@uny.ac.id

Jamilah
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia
jamilah@uny.ac.id

Sri Handayani
SMPN 1 Yogyakarta, Indonesia
srihandayani083@guru.smp.belajar.id

*Corresponding Author

Abstract: *Social skill is considered one of the important factors in the failure or success of individual in a society. Formal learning not only aims to improve cognitive abilities but also social skills. Improving students' character in learning is very important to create a smart and virtuous generation. This study was aimed at improving students' literacy awareness and individual accountability and at the same time improving English writing ability. There were 31 students of grade seventh junior high school participated in this study. The sample was chosen using random sampling technique. The themes taught in the lesson are recount text, English writing skills. The study was carried out in 2 cycles within 1 month. Interviews, surveys, tests, and documentation were conducted in gathering the data. The data gained then were analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. The findings show that think-pair-share significantly improves English writing ability. Although the results show unexpressive increase in student literacy awareness and individual accountability, the atmospheric of the learning process change. There is an improvement in the effectiveness of smartphone usage during the learning process. Students no longer use cellphones for learning diversion purposes but rather as learning support.*

Keywords: character education, teachers' role, classroom atmosphere, responsibility

Introduction

In general, education today prioritizes cognitive intelligence, this is seen from schools that have students with high score graduates but not a few who have high scores actually do not have intelligent behavior, and lack good mental personality, as academic scores achieved in school and see from the graduation of students determined by the results of the National Final Examination. The objectives

of character education in Indonesia are developing the potential of the mind/conscience/affect students as humans and citizens who have national character values develop habits and behaviors of learners that are commendable and in line with the universal values and cultural traditions of the religious nation instilling the spirit of leadership and responsibility of students as the next generation of the nation develop the ability of students to become independent, creative, national-minded human beings; and developing the school life environment (Fitriasari & Masyitoh, 2020; Kusmawati, Ghojaji, Eramansyah, Putri, Istianah, Asbari, & Purwanto, 2022). The case of the lack of instillation of good character values in students can be seen in several cases of the implementation of the National Examination which is more concerned with the intellectual aspect than the honesty aspect. The level of honesty of the National Exam is only 20% because there are still students who cheat in various ways in doing the National Exam. Education today has not provided instinctive education for morality and superior personality. The problem of lack of character values is that the government has taken various policies where one of them is the National Policy for National Character Building in 2005-2025. This means that every development effort is always directed to have a positive impact on character development. The character that will be developed in students is used as a guide and practiced in social life, meaning that in students there is a process starting from hearing, seeing, understanding, realizing and making decisions to do so. Character is basically acquired through interaction with parents, teachers, friends, and the environment. Character is obtained from the results of direct learning or observation of others.

Character education in Indonesia contains 18 important values in the 2013 curriculum, of the 18 values are as follows: religious values, honesty, tolerance, discipline, hard work, creative, independent, democratic, curiosity, national spirit, love of the country, respect for achievements, friendly/communicative, love of peace, love of reading, care for the environment, social care and responsibility (Jhon, Zubaidah, & Mustadi, 2021; Nurhasanah, Ridha, Buska, & Prihartini, 2020). The government strives and enforces 18 values of character education ranging from early childhood schools, elementary schools, middle schools and high schools both private and public schools to implement character-based curriculum.

Writing ability is one of the language skills that is very important to be mastered by students. The purpose of learning to write is for students to be able to express ideas, opinions and knowledge in writing and have a penchant for writing. Unfortunately, the assessment system in education in Indonesia through the national exam which determines student graduation and student language skills has not been properly implemented. National exams in the form of multiple choices, make teachers and students set aside productive writing skills.

Many studies state that teachers only focus on teaching students what will be included in the core questions of the national exam so that the ability to read or tricks to choose the right choice from these multiple choices is the focus of learning. Students' ability to write productively also requires time that takes up hours of lessons. because students tend to need more than 30 minutes to write a text.

Apart from the students, as an essential pedagogical affordance, feedback scaffolds L2 learners' writing processes and enhances their writing products (Cheng, Zhang, & Yan, 2021). Unfortunately, some of the teachers prefer to give the feedback themselves although teacher feedback is considered time consuming. Time to be able to correct one by one the results of student writing is also ineffective.

In addition to this, many scholarships and language proficiency measurements are based on students' speaking abilities. No doubt if someone is able to speak fluently, it is considered that the student is able to master English as a whole even though the student's writing ability in English is still inadequate.

From the various studies that have been carried out, it is presented that cooperative learning has succeeded in providing alternative feedback that shortens time. This certainly provides benefits for students and teachers. Not only as an alternative in providing feedback, but cooperative learning is also able to increase student character values which are developed in the process of teamwork.

Supporting the government's role in improving student character as stated in the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia No. 20 of 2018 concerning Strengthening Character Education in Formal Education Units. The government implemented a program to strengthen students' character in formal education level. Unfortunately, student character in cooperative learning still needs to be improved. What often happens is that not all students have the awareness to take part in the problem-solving process, only some students have literacy awareness to be able to independently find other sources of information, indifferent attitude

towards other group members and some members who prefer to do other activities that does not support cooperative learning.

In various studies, many researchers have investigated efforts to improve students' writing skills and improve student character through cooperative learning, unfortunately research related to improving student character focuses on characters embedded in cooperative learning which focuses on think pair share in efforts to improve writing. Therefore, efforts to improve students' writing skills are very important to do. It is necessary to do research related to improving writing ability in activities that involve cooperative skills so that not only students' cognitive skills increase but also as character building. Based on the problems described above, the aims of this research are to analize the following problems the inhibiting factors in students' English writing skill, the characters need to be improved in cooperative learning, how the think pair share improves students' writing skill; and how the think pair share improves students' cooperative skill.

Method

This study employed classroom action research that aimed to simultaneously investigate and solve issues related to literacy awareness and individual accountability character and English writing ability. This study involved 31 seventh grade students of junior high school. Action research is not only used for increasing your students' academic outcomes, the application of the action research process also contributes to improve students' behaviors. In this study, the researchers integrated literacy awareness and individual accountability character in the treatments. In this study, students' behaviour was examined within the classroom context, within a real-life situation to examine whether it is possible to improve social skill of students through think-pair-share method. Classroom observations were conducted by 3 observers while 1 researcher acted as the teacher. Classroom observations, private chats, and discussion, and written classwork were used to collect data.

This study presents the integration of quantitative and qualitative data from the treatment given in cycle 1 and cycle 2. This strategy contributes to the field of mixed-methods research by detailing the process in teaching learning process and students' behavior and character in teaching learning process. Research triangulation refers to the process that helps to increase the credibility and validity of research (Farquhar, Michels, & Robson, 2020). In other words, research triangulation basically aims at validating the results of a study. In validating research findings, the triangulation is needed (Bans-Akutey & Tiimub, 2021). This study employs data, investigator, and methodological triangulations. The data triangulation was conducted by collecting the data in different times using 2 cycles. Four researchers were also involved in this study to collect and analyzed the data so that the investigator triangulation data were achieved. The last triangulation data used was methodological triangulation. This study not only used quantitative but also qualitative data. So that to describe the results of the treatment or other changes in the learning environment that cannot be analyzed numerically can be described narratively.

This study was carried out in a junior high school in Yogyakarta. From simple random techniques, 31 students were chosen to participate in this research. The data were gathered in two ways. The quantitative data were collected using test and survey while the qualitative data were gathered using interview, observation, and documentation.

To collect quantitative data, the instruments used were tests and questionnaires. The tests were conducted before and after the treatment to find out students' writing ability. Pretest and posttest were given in the form of essay. The students were asked to write a recount text related to their previous experiences. The data gained then analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. On other hand. the questionnaires given to the students to analyzed students' cooperative character. Students were required to conduct self and peer assessment to measure their cooperative characters.

However, to support the result in quantitative data, the qualitative data were also collected. The instruments used were interview, observation, and documentation. The interviews involved both teacher and the students. Interview with the English teacher aimed to gain the description about the students' character and the previous learning. The representative students were selected to gain in-depth information related to their answer in questionnaires. While the treatment given in Cycle 1 and Cycle 2, the observations and documentation data were gathered.

This study was conducted in the form of inductive reasoning approach. This approach was used to describe the problems studied in the activity based on existing facts which are specific and then examined to solve the problems, to obtain a specific conclusion or to supply evidence for the truth of a conclusion (Sauce & Matzel, 2017). In this case, the researchers conducted the treatments as well

as systematically observes the phenomenon under study, looks for patterns, and developed a generalization from the analysis of these patterns.

Result And Discussion

From interview results with the teachers and the students, it was indicated that the writing skill of the students need to be improved. In connection with the direction from the ministry that learning in schools must also be accompanied by improving students' social skills in an effort to optimize character building. At grade 8 junior high school level at the school applies the 2013 Curriculum, therefore the character education guide follows Pancasila character education. Character education applied is character education which contains 18 important values in the 2013 curriculum, of the 18 values (Jannah, Purnomo, Asteria, Putra, 2021) are as follows: religious, honest, tolerance, discipline, hard work, creative, independent, democratic, curiosity, national spirit, love of the country, respect for achievements, friendly/communicative, love of peace, love of reading, care for the environment, social care, and responsibility. The government strives and enforces 18 values of character education ranging from early childhood schools, elementary schools, middle schools and high schools both private and public schools to implement character-based curriculum. This study emphasized in improving students' literacy awareness and students' control in smartphone during learning process.

Cooperative learning approach was chosen to solve students' problems and improve both in character and in cognitive skill. Cooperative learning is described as students working together to "attain group goals that cannot be obtained by working alone or competitively" (Johnson, Johnson Holubec, & Roy, 1984). The major goal of cooperative learning is to actively include students in the learning process, which is not achievable in a lecture style. The fundamental premise is based on constructivist epistemology. It is a process in which pupils learn knowledge and turn it into concepts to which they can connect. The information is then rebuilt and enhanced as a result of fresh learning experiences. Learning occurs in a social context through dialogue among pupils.

Cooperative learning is a methodology that uses a range of learning activities to increase students' comprehension of a subject through a systematic approach that consists of a number of phases that require students to generate, evaluate, and apply concepts (Kagan, 1990). Cooperative learning employs Vygotsky, Piaget, and Kohlberg theories in that both the individual and the social context are active dynamics in the learning process as students seek to mimic real-life learning (Kshetree, 2019). The cooperative model used in this study was Think pair share where the students were divided into big teams consisting of 4 students and small groups where the students learn in pairs.

In think pair share, students strive on obtaining both knowledge and social skills by combining teamwork and individual accountability (Delgado-García, 2022; Yang, 2023). It is a teaching technique that allows students to collaborate in small groups with people of varying talents, abilities, and backgrounds to achieve a shared objective. Each team member is responsible for studying the content as well as assisting the other team members in learning.

Students labor until each group member understands and completes the project well, resulting in "atmosphere of achievement" (Erbil & Kocabaş, 2020)). As a consequence, individuals construct new concepts by drawing conclusions based on existing information. This approach leads in a better knowledge of the content and a greater likelihood of retention.

Cooperative learning is related with two key theoretical perspectives: motivational and cognitive (Swortzel, 1997). First, because students believe their success or failure is determined by their capacity to collaborate as a group, they are more inclined to encourage one another to do whatever helps the group succeed. They are also more inclined to assist one another with the task(s). Cooperative learning, as a result, boosts student desire to complete academic work (Johnson, *et al.*, 1984).

The other viewpoint holds that cooperative learning assists pupils in developing critical thinking abilities. Because cooperative learning forces students to explain and debate multiple points of view, they get a better comprehension of the content. Because students provide and receive explanations more often, elaborative thinking is encouraged (Johnson, *et al.*, 1984).

The teacher's role in developing cooperative learning in the classroom is vital to its effectiveness (Kimmelmann & Lang, 2019). This includes giving feedback (Khan, Raja, Haq, Oad, & Aslam, 2021), understanding how to structure cooperative learning in groups, including their size and composition, the type of task assigned, student behavior expectations, individual and group responsibilities, and the teacher's role in monitoring both the process and the outcomes of the group

experience. Based on the results of interviews with teachers, character education is instilled through role play and direct character development.

Cooperative Learning Grouping

Cooperative learning involves students working together to achieve common goals, and this sense of interdependence motivates group members to assist and support one another (Mendo-Lázaro, Mendo-Lázaro, León-del-Barco, Polo-del-Río, & López-Ramos, 2022). When students collaborate, they learn to listen to others, to offer and receive aid, to settle disagreements, and to solve issues democratically.

There are various types of grouping in cooperative learning. Johnson, *et al.* (1984) propose 3 kinds of grouping namely formal, informal, and cooperative base groups. In formal cooperative learning groups, the groups range in length from one class period to several weeks while informal cooperative learning groups are ad hoc groups where it may last from a few minutes to a whole class period. The last groups were cooperative base groups which lasting at least a year. In this study, the use of informal groups was chosen because the group formation was based on students' achievement on the material. After the pretest results are known, the list of students with their scores is known. The results of these values become the benchmark for group division. This is done to be able to form groups with high achievement students as tutors and students who need to be improved in 1 group.

However, just putting students in small groups and instructing them to collaborate does not guarantee that they would cooperate. Groups must be arranged such that members work together to obtain the academic and social benefits frequently attributed to this approach to learning. In Cycle 1, the grouping was made in random technique where the students were divided into groups based on their chair position. Here, the group did not have a clear mapping regarding the distribution of achievements of each group. Therefore, in order to create more effective grouping atmosphere, the researchers conducted achievement-based grouping in Cycle 2.

Several research have looked into achievement-based grouping in cooperative learning. The following are some major discoveries from the search results. First homogeneously grouped students (who were grouped based on achievement on the first test given in the course) significantly outperformed heterogeneously grouped students in cooperative learning and proven to be more effectives than in homogeneous groups (Baer, 2003). Additionally, cooperative learning has been shown to have a positive effect on academic achievement and knowledge retention (Tran, 2014). The results of the achievement-based group show a significant thing. It is proven by the existence of intensive communication between students with low and high achievement in transferring knowledge and understanding.

Stages in Cooperative Learning Implementation

To achieve the expected goals, stages in cooperative learning need to be considered. Careful planning based on an analysis of the student situation and the learning environment is very important to consider. There are 3 stages of cooperative learning carried out in this study. The first phase is the pre-implementation phase, which includes the following activities: specifying instructional objectives, determining group sizes and assigning students to groups, arranging room, planning instructional materials to promote interdependence, assigning group roles, assigning tasks, explaining the success criteria, structuring positive interdependence and accountability, and specifying desired behaviors. In pre implementation, the students' cooperative skill and students writing skill were also measured (Figure 1 and 2).

From the data in Figure 1, it shows that literacy awareness and self-control on smartphones (individual accountability) are 2 aspects that need to be improved. The assessment was carried out to measure the cooperative aspect of the students were in 2 models, namely self-assessment and peer review to conduct the triangulation of data. Furthermore, in learning, the two student characters will be the focus of learning. The application of character building is carried out through several things, namely the selection of materials, the selection of activities and direct action.

As mentioned above that the cooperative learning not only used to improve students' character but also cognitive skill. From the preliminary study and the writing pretest (Figure 2), the researchers as the teachers also needed to focus on improving students' writing skill. It can be seen that in pretest the vocabulary and the mechanism aspects were lower than other aspects.

Self-Assessment on Cooperative Character			
Aspects	SUM	%	MEAN
Contribution to the group	111	89.52	3.6
Responsibility	106	85.48	3.4
Time Management	105	84.68	3.4
Problem solves	110	88.71	3.5
Ask for help	109	87.90	3.5
Help fellow friends	111	89.52	3.6
Literacy awareness	98	79.03	3.2
Self-control on smartphone	78	62.90	2.5
Respect for other friends	116	93.55	3.7

Peer review on Cooperative Character			
Aspects	SUM	%	MEAN
Contribution to the group	104	83.87	3.4
Responsibility	108	87.10	3.5
Time Management	103	83.06	3.3
Problem solves	106	85.48	3.4
Ask for help	104	83.87	3.4
Help fellow friends	105	84.68	3.4
Literacy awareness	94	75.81	3.0
Self-control on smartphone	77	62.10	2.5
Respect for other friends	114	91.94	3.7

Figure 1. Pretest on Cooperative Skill of the Students

In pre-Implementation, the most difficult obstacle after opting to use cooperative learning would be planning and preparing the classroom and students for CL. Before introducing cooperative learning in the classroom, a teacher must complete certain activities, according to Johnson, Johnson, & Smith (1991). This section goes through those tasks in depth. Specify CL Instructional Objectives (Academic and Social)- The teacher must explain why she is utilizing CL, its benefits, and the usual results obtained from using CL. To help with this explanation, the instructor may create and distribute a handout describing collaborative learning.

	Writing Aspects					Total score
	Content (0-20)	Organizer (0-20)	Language Use (0-20)	Vocabulary (0-20)	Mechanism (0-20)	
Average	18.54	18.29	17.64	11.45	7.5	73
Category	GA	GA	GA	GA	FP	

Note:

GA= Good to average

FP= Fair to poor

Figure 2. Pretest on Students' Writing Skill

The second part is implementation, which involves behavior monitoring, intervening as required, supporting with needs, and praising. After all the planning, it's time to go to work. Students are the most crucial players throughout the cooperative learning implementation phase. At this point, some of their responsibilities include collaboration is essential, listening to each other, interrogating one another, keeping track of their development and work, creating the evaluation job (product) and taking personal responsibility/participating in the group.

During this level, the teacher also has responsibilities. According to Johnson, *et al.* (1991), an instructor has numerous functions throughout the implementation of cooperative learning. Monitor behavior- During cooperative learning implementation, the teacher should circulate throughout the classroom, visiting each group. If necessary, intervene- The teacher sees any group dispute or off-task conduct while circulating, she should intervene. Small-group disagreement should be settled as soon as feasible, and students should be taught how to avoid future difficulties. To resolve the group's dispute, the teacher may employ a conflict resolution checklist. This checklist contains elements like discussing the value of listening to everyone in the group, establishing roles, recognizing each

person's gifts, demonstrating excellence, and fostering comedy. Including these on a handout for each group may help to reduce group dissension and off-task conduct.

Assist with needs. The instructor should assist groups with their needs while monitoring their work. This may include pointing out new materials and/or points of view, as well as assisting students in reflecting on the work they have performed and their development. Students need to know if they are completing the assignment satisfactorily, especially if they are new to working in cooperative groups. As a result, the instructor should recognize individual students and groups when they accomplish something correctly or effectively.

The third phase is post-implementation, which consists of offering closure through summarizing, assessing students' understanding, and reflecting on what occurred the strategy for cooperative learning groups is then put into effect after many hours of planning. Johnson, *et al.* (1991) provide three tasks to the teacher once the students have completed and submitted the task. Provide closure by summarizing- The instructor should rejoin the whole class. The instructor can now summarize the main aspects of the lesson/unit. Another idea is for each group to summarize their work and the aspects they believe are essential. This allows the instructor to determine the knowledge level the groups are working at. This is also consistent with the concept of articulation and reflection discussed in the Cognitive Apprenticeships chapter.

Evaluate students' learning. The instructor should grade/evaluate each group's assessment activity using a rubric. A rubric should also be used to evaluate their group effort. These rubrics should have been developed during the cooperative learning pre-implementation phase, and students should have had input into their content. After the assessments are done, the instructor must offer comments to the students on their product and group performance. Students will be unable to strengthen their cooperative learning skills until they have this knowledge.

Evaluation in this study was divided into 2, namely evaluation based on scores which were analyzed quantitatively and the results of descriptions of everything that happened in the class obtained from the results of interviews and observations which were analyzed descriptively. The quantitative results obtained are illustrated in Figure 3 and 4 below.

		Tests of Normality					
		Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Method	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
WritingSkill	Pretest	.119	31	.200*	.950	31	.161
	Posttest	.156	31	.052	.926	31	.033

Figure 3a. Tests of Normality on Students' Writing Score.

		Independent Samples Test								
		Levene's Test		T-test						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Writing Skill	Equal variances assumed	6.923	.011	-13.306	60	.000	-18.29032	1.37461	-21.03996	-15.54069
	Equal variances not assumed			-13.306	52.137	.000	-18.29032	1.37461	-21.04851	-15.53213

Figure 3b. T-Test of Students' Writing Score

From the analysis of the writing results of the students, it shows that (from Figure 3a and 3b) based on the tests of normality result, the findings indicate that the distribution of the data is normal with sig of (>0.05) 0.200 and 0.052. Based on the test of Levene's for equality of the variances, it shows that the variances of the group are not homogenous with sig of (<0.05) 0.011. From the

analysis using T test, it can be concluded that there is a significant different in the writing ability of the students taught using cooperative learning before and after the treatment with sig of (<0.05) 0.000. It can be concluded that the cooperative learning using Think pair share is successfully improve students writing skill.

Another quantitative data analysis was done to measure the improvement in students' cooperative aspects. The results were shown in Figure 4a and 4b below.

Tests of Normality

	Model	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
Cooperative skill-Peer Ass	Pretest	.160	31	.042	.929	31	.042
	Posttest	.197	31	.004	.874	31	.002

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Figure 3a. Tests of Normality on Students' Cooperative Character

		Independent Samples Test								
		Levene's Test		T-test						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Cooperative skill Peer Ass	Equal variances assumed	.011	.916	-.347	60	.730	-.35484	1.02406	-2.40326	1.69359
	Equal variances not assumed			-.347	59.997	.730	-.35484	1.02406	-2.40327	1.69359

Figure 4b. T-Test on students' cooperative characters

From the analysis above, it indicates that Based on the tests of normality result, the findings indicate that the distribution of the data is normal with sig of (>0.05) 0.042 and 0.004. Based on the test of Levene's for equality of the variances, it shows that the variances of the group are homogenous with sig of (>0.05) 0.916. From the analysis of T test, it can be concluded that there is no significant different in the cooperative ability of the students taught using think pair share before and after the treatment. No significant difference does not mean there is no any improvement at all. The improvements sometimes cannot be calculated using numerical data. That is why the supporting data from quantitative analysis was conducted in this research. It was done tofind out any single case that can only be observed using human sense and describe narratively.

Reflect on what happened in each time an instructor conducts a CL lesson or unit, the researchers should make a note of what worked and why it worked. From the observation, it can be seen that there is some improvement in the form of learning atmosphere that is more fun and the improvements on students' smartphone control as individual accountability.

Challenging in CL

In learning that applies cooperative learning such as think pair share, buzzing in the class in discussion needs to be considered. The students were engaged in taking part in their group discussions. Poor attention in teachers' instruction is going to be the challenging one (Buchs, Filippou, Pulfrey, & Volpé, 2017; Keramati & Gillies, 2021; Moges, 2019). Teachers as an instructor are lacking Cooperative learning knowledge and insufficient notion of making teamwork. In addition to the four key categories of advantages discussed above, schools who adopt this technique report an increase in student attendance because students believe they are an important and vital part of their group (McBrien, Brandt, & Cole, 1997).

In a cooperative situation, students are less prone to act out. Students act out to seek attention; however, in a cooperative atmosphere, the "stage" is eliminated since it is very difficult to grab the attention of the entire class when students are divided into smaller groups (Veldman, Doolaard, Bosker, & Snijders, 2020). Students are more likely to stay on focus and are less likely to be disruptive as a result. Because students are able to socialize during the learning process, cooperative learning helps to prevent classroom disturbances. Students require peer engagement, and without such interaction, the urge for social contact grows in a negative situation.

Students' Smart Phone Control In Learning vs Students' Accountability

Studies have found that students with lower self-control and greater stress are more likely to be addicted to smartphones (Wang, Hsieh, & Kung, 2022). Smartphones can cause self-control challenges in people's everyday lives, and trait self-control is negatively associated with students' distraction via smartphones (Troll, Friese, & Loschelder, 2021) even in the learning process. Therefore, students' self-control abilities in relation to smartphone use can have an impact on their academic performance (Troll, *et al.*, 2021) and students' accountability in cooperative learning. Students with low smart phone control tend to only focus on the other activities beside taking parts in cooperative learning. In this study, the implementation and the clear division of individual assignment reduce students' smartphone focus. The effort to control students' smartphone use can help reduce the negative impact of smartphones on learning effectiveness (Wang, *et al.*, 2022).

Not only improving students' accountability, the ability of students in controlling their smartphone is also contribute in improving students' self-regulated learning (SRL). Smartphone usage among students has been identified as contributing to lower academic achievement in a variety of settings. Therefore, it is important to target the smartphone-related habits of learners while studying and the consequent impact on achievement (Hartley, Bendixen, Gianoutsos, & Shreve, 2020).

In summary, students' self-control in smartphone use during learning can have an impact on their academic performance. Teacher can help reduce the negative impact of smartphones on learning effectiveness by controlling students' children's smartphone use and divert to more useful activities using smartphones, for example the use of e-learning applications in learning. Regulations are strict and conveyed at the start, buying awards and punishments can be an initial means of setting strict regulations to reduce smartphone addiction. It is also important to target the smartphone-related habits of learners while studying and the consequent impact on achievement.

Literacy Awareness in Cooperative Learning

Developing literacy awareness in junior high school students when searching for vocabulary is important for their academic success. Instructional strategies that provide explicit instruction in definition and contextual information and encourage students to use vocabulary can be effective in developing literacy awareness (Jitendra, Edwards, Sacks, Jacobson, 2004).

In order to improve student literacy awareness, teachers play important roles as the facilitator and the roleplay (Djaguna., *et.al,* 2021; Tursunova, 2022). In this study, teacher as facilitator was implemented. Teachers provided students by various e-learning materials and dictionary. All the learning material and dictionary are mobile-based application. It was done since the students were close to the mobile application and it is an effort to distract students' habit in smart phone during learning process. By enriching students' vocabulary, the students' literacy awareness improved. Teaching academic vocabulary in depth using multiple modalities can help students develop literacy awareness (Hidayatullah, Mulyati, Damaianti, & Permadi, 2023). Vocabulary is an important component of literacy that helps students understand the purposes of word use and communicate effectively (Rantalainen, et.al. 2021).

In summary, developing literacy awareness in junior high school students when searching for vocabulary involves explicit instruction, teaching phonemic awareness, word identification, and vocabulary instruction. Developing these skills can help students understand the purposes of word use, communicate effectively, and achieve academic success.

Conclusion

Cooperative learning is the use of small groups for education in which students collaborate to optimize their own and each other's learning. Cooperative learning has been used to solve many problems both cognitive and social inability. There are many obstacles that may occur in the process of students learning to work together, including a lack of literacy awareness and individual

accountability. The findings show that Think Pair Share is significantly improve students' cognitive ability, the English writing ability. However, the results of the t-test analysis did not reflect a significant increase in student literacy awareness and individual accountability. The increase occurred in the atmosphere of the learning process where there was a reduction in students with smartphone dependency in learning outside of learning interests and the tendency of students to try to find online learning resources through electronic dictionaries, unfortunately this impact was not significant enough to be seen significantly from quantitative data.

References

Aksoy, M., & Ceylan, T. (2021). An action research on improving classroom communication and interaction in social studies teaching. *Education Research International*, 2021(9943194), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/9943194

Baer, J. (2003). Grouping and achievement in cooperative learning. *College Teaching, 51*(4), 169-175. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567550309596434

Bans-Akutey, A., & Tiimub, B. M. (2021). Triangulation in Research. *Academia Letters* (Article 3392), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.20935/al3392

Buchs, C., Filippou, D., Pulfrey, C., & Volpé, Y. (2017). Challenges for cooperative learning implementation: Reports from elementary school teachers. *Journal of education for teaching, 43*(3), 296-306. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2017.1321673

Cheng, X., Liu, Y., & Wang, C. (2023). Understanding student engagement with teacher and peer feedback in L2 writing, *119* (103176). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103176

Delgado-García, M., Conde Velez, S., & Toscano Cruz, M. D. L. O. (2022). Cooperative learning at university: opinion of students and application of the instrument Cooperative Learning Questionnaire (CLQ). *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 59*(5), 564-573. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2021.1932557

Djaguna, F., Langasa, I. A., Husain, B., & Swara, M. M. (2021). Teacher responses of inserting role-playing strategy in EFL classroom. *JISTECH: Journal of Information Science and Technology, 1*(2), 71-80. https://doi.org/10.30862/jri.v1i2.18

Erbil, D. G., & Kocabaş, A. (2020). Flipping the 4th grade social studies course in a cooperative way: Effects on academic achievement and motivation. *Studies in Educational Evaluation 66*(100878). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2020.100878

Farquhar, J., Michels, N., & Robson, J. (2020). Triangulation in industrial qualitative case study research: Widening the scope. *Industrial Marketing Management* 87(3), 160–170. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2020.02.001

Fitriasari, S. & Masyitoh, I. S. (2020). The role of Pancasila education teachers and citizenship in strengthening character education based on Pancasila values. In *2nd Annual Civic Education Conference (ACEC 2019)* (pp. 534-540). Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200320.101

Gartland, D. (2010). Action research to change student behavior in Pelton, R.P. (ed). (2017). *Action research for teacher candidates: Using classroom data to enhance instruction*. Rowman & Littlefiled Education.

Hartley, K., Bendixen, L. D., Gianoutsos, D., & Shreve, E. (2020). The smartphone in self-regulated learning and student success: clarifying relationships and testing an intervention. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 17*(52), 1-14. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-020-00230-1

Hidayatullah, S., Mulyati, Y., Damaianti, V. S., & Permadi, T. (2023). Effectiveness of dialogical reading literacy programs in improving language skills and literacy of early students. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 22*(8), 233–252. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.22.8.13

Hung, M. (2021). Action research: Curriculum reconstruction for a college English conversation course. *Himalayan Journal of Education and Literature, 2*(5), 67-72. https://doi.org/10.47310/Hjel.2021.v02i05.011

Jannah, M., Purnomo, A. R., Asteria, P. V., Putra, R. E. (2021). A preliminary study and validation of characters as the basis for Merdeka Belajar program in university level. Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Arts and Humanities 2021 (IJCAH 2021). *Atlantis Press*. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211223.130

Jhon, W., Zubaidah, E., & Mustadi, A. (2021). Challenges in the implementation of character education in elementary school: experience from Indonesia. *Ilkogretim Online, 20*(1), 1351-1363. https://doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2021.01.130

Jitendra, A. K., Edwards, L. L., Sacks, G., Jacobson, L. A. (2004). What research says about vocabulary instruction for students with learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 70*(3), 299–322. https://doi.org/10.1177/001440290407000303

Johnson D. W., Johnson R. T., Holubec E. J., & Roy, P. (1984). *Circles of learning*. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (1991). *Active learning: Cooperation in the college classroom*. Interaction Book Company.

Kagan, S. (1990). *Cooperative learning resource for teacher*. [Online]. https://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_198912_kagan\

Keramati, M. R. & Gillies, R. M. (2021). Constraints of cooperative learning in university classrooms: A qualitative study in Iran and Australia. *Iranian Journal of Comparative Education, 4*(1), 958-972. https://doi.org/10.22034/IJCE.2020.254377.1234

Khan, N., Raja, F. U., Haq, M. A. U., Oad, L., & Aslam, R. (2021). Cooperative learning, academic, and social gain: a study of mediating role of teacher's feedback. *Humanities Social Sciences Reviews 9* (3) 169–181. https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2021.9319

Kimmelmann, N. & Lang, J. (2019). Linkage within teacher education: Cooperative learning of teachers and student teachers. *European journal of teacher education, 42*(1), 52-64. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2018.1547376

Kshetree, M. P. (2019). Underpinning theories of cooperative learning approach in learning mathematics. *International Journal of Mathematics Trends and Technology*, *65*(12), 105-114. https://doi.org/10.14445/22315373/IJMTT-V65I12P511

Kusmawati, W. E., Ghojaji, A. D., Eramansyah, M. G., Putri, R. E., Istianah, S., Asbari, M., & Purwanto, A. (2022). Pancasila based character education to form good and smart citizens. *Journal of Community Service and Engagement*, *2*(4), 11-18. https://doi.org/10.9999/jocosae.v2i4.62

McBrien, J. L., Brandt, R. S., & Cole, R. W. (1997). *The language of learning: A guide to education terms*. Association for Supervision Curricylum Development.

Mendo-Lázaro, S., León-del-Barco, B., Polo-del-Río, M. I., & López-Ramos, V. M. (2022). The impact of cooperative learning on university students' academic goals. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*(5), 787210. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.787210

Moges, B. (2019). Practices and challenges of cooperative learning in selected college of Arsi University: As a motivational factor on enhancing students' learning. *Universal Journal of Psychology, 7*(1), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujp.2019.070101

Muthohar, A. (2021). Implementation and development models of character education in school. *Tarbiyah wa Ta'lim: Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran, 8*(2), 69-82. https://doi.org/10.21093/twt.v8i2.3236

Nurhasanah, Ridha, D. S. M., Buska, W., & Prihartini, Y. (2020). The development of character education curriculum model for Islamic elementary schools in Muaro Jambi. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1471*(1), 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1471/1/012030

Rantalainen, K., Paavola-Ruotsalainen, L., Alakortes, J., Carter, A. S., Ebeling, H. E., & Kunnari, S. (2021). Early vocabulary development: Relationships with prelinguistic skills and early social-emotional/behavioral problems and competencies. *Infant Behavior and Development, 62*, 101525. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infbeh.2020.101525

Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia No. 20 of 2018 concerning Strengthening Character Education in Formal Education Units.

Sauce, B. & Matzel, L. (2017). Inductive reasoning. In *Encyclopedia of Animal Cognition and Behavior*. Springer International Publishing. https://10.1007/978-3-319-47829-6_1045-1

Tran, V. D. (2014). The effects of cooperative learning on the academic achievement and knowledge retention. *International Journal of Higher Education, 3*(2), 131-140. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v3n2p131

Troll, E. S., Friese, M., & Loschelder, D. D. (2021). How students' self-control and smartphone-use explain their academic performance. *Computers in Human Behavior, 117*, 106624. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106624

Tursunova, D. A. Q. & To'Rayeva, S. E. Q. (2022). The importance of role playing in teaching process. *Central Asian Academic Journal of Scientific Research, 2*(6), 232-236.

Veldman, M. A., Doolaard, S., Bosker, R. J., & Snijders, T. A. B. (2020). Young children working together. Cooperative learning effects on group work of children in Grade 1 of primary education. *Learning and Instruction 67,* 101308. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2020.101308

Wang, J. C., Hsieh, C.-Y., & Kung, S.-H. (2022). The impact of smartphone used on learning effectiveness: A case study of primary school students. *Education and Information Technologies, 28*(6), 6287–6320. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11430-9.

Yang, X. (2023). A historical review of collaborative learning and cooperative learning. *TechTrends, 67*(4), 719-728. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-022-00823-9.