

Implementation of Group Discussion Learning Method Through The Two Stay Two Stray Learning Model to Student of Elementary School 10 South Rantau Labuhan Batu

Rahma Ritonga^{1*}, Sutikno², Rahmat Kartolo³

^{1,2,3,4,6,7}Universitas Muslim Nusantara Al Washliyah, Medan, Indonesia

Email: kartolo.rahmaritonga01@gmail.com¹, sutikno@umnaaw.ac.id², rahmatkartolo@umnaaw.ac.id³

Correspondence Authors: kartolo.rahmaritonga01@gmail.com

Article history: Received November 24, 2025; revised December 18, 2025; accepted January 15, 2026

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License



ABSTRACT

The application of the Two-Stay Two-Stray Learning Model can help students become more active during learning and better master the problems discussed. Two-Stay Two-Stray is a cooperative learning model that provides an opportunity for groups to share results and information with other groups. This model teaches students to actively discuss problems in groups and work together to discuss problems. In cooperative learning, learning groups are formed heterogeneously, both in terms of academic ability, gender, race, ethnicity, and so on, so that each group member can help each other, both in receiving and providing assistance. The emphasis is not only on completing tasks but also on developing mutually respectful interpersonal relationships. Based on the results of the study, discussion activities using the Two-Stay Two-Stray learning model showed the maximum results. Students showed significant improvements in courage, enthusiasm, clarity of speech, and sentence structure during discussions. They were also able to express opinions based on rational reasons. The improvement in the discussion results can be seen in the comparison of students' abilities before and after the implementation of the action. At the pre-action stage, the students' discussion ability scores were still relatively low. Students looked passive, shy, and less active in discussions. They also lacked the courage to convey ideas or arguments, and were less fluent in speaking. After being subjected to the action, students' abilities increased significantly. The results of this study indicate that the Two-Stay Two-Stray learning model has a positive influence on group discussion skills in the Indonesian Language. This model is effective in improving the discussion skills of fifth-grade students of SD Negeri 10 Rantau Selatan, Labuhan Batu Regency, 2025-2026 Academic Year.

Keywords: Two Stay Two Stray Learning Model, Group Discussion Skills

I. INTRODUCTION

In learning speaking skills, there are various activities, including storytelling based on pictures, talking based on excitatory voice, interviews, discussions, speeches, and debates. Learning discussions are one of the skills taught in schools. In syllabus schools, learning discussions have a standard competence and competence base: 1. Express thoughts, feelings, and information through activity get to know each other, discuss and tell stories. 2. Learning is discussed as a problem (found) in various news, articles, or books).

Discussion is activity solve A problem in a way together For take conclusion from problem through discussion, students train For communicate with other people in a in groups. Students are also required for active express ideas/ concepts For give opinion about something problem through activity discuss. This is capable of stimulating creativity, courage, building cooperative groups, and training attitude moments to communicate with other people (Azzahra Henda Puspitasari et al., 2024).

In implementation learning discussions, students are often unable to engage in discussions with the right. Students only discuss carrying out tasks in eye lessons Indonesian without noticing the objectives and benefits from learning said. Many students experience difficulty when disclosing their thoughts or opinions in front of friends. Students are quieter and tend to be inactive. Moreover, in practice, students find it difficult to convey their ideas about a problem in a forum. Therefore, students need to understand What That discussion is done and how good it is, especially in group A (Anataya et al., 2024).

Therefore, an appropriate learning model is required. To increase skills, discussion students. Determining the learning model requires a deep understanding of the material to be delivered and the knowledge of the appropriate learning model. Many learning models must choose the appropriate model with objective learning.

Situations and conditions that students in the class must also notice so that in the process, no obstacles will actually harm students. Therefore, a teacher is required to select and implement learning models in the classroom so that material learning can be optimally delivered. In addition, the teacher must adapt the learning model with condition students in class during the learning process so that it can increase students' skills to speak specifically in learning discussions (Hapsari et al., 2025).

Based on the results, beginning and interview researchers with the fifth grade teacher of State Elementary School 10 Rantau Selatan Regency Labuhan Batu year learning 2025-2026, collectively found a number of obstacles encountered at the time of implementation of learning class discussions, such as students not knowing enough about good discussion, students tending passive and difficult, and students not brave enough and less active in expressing ideas or thoughts at the time of activity discussion. Learning class discussion V State Elementary School 10 South Rantau Regency Labuhan Batu year 2025-2026 learning, not yet using an appropriate learning model, so that in its implementation has not yet succeeded optimally. This becomes a problem in the learning discussion. Therefore, researchers have tried to implement two-stay two-strays learning models in learning discussions.

Two-Stay Two-Stray is a learning model cooperative that gives a group the chance to share results and information with others. Many activities study colored teaching with individual activities, even though in reality they live outside school, humans that each other need one with others (Lie, 2010: 62). In learning with this model, students taught for in a way active do discussion in a way group and work together to discuss A problem.

Advantages of Two-Stay Two-Stray Learning models This in discussion: Students can actively learn and control the issues discussed. The implementation was performed by forming a group, each consisting of four students with heterogeneous abilities. Students will feel own not quite enough answer and interest for carry out activity This. Students are also more insightful, have ideas, and actively disclose their thoughts and ideas. With a learning model, students will be capable of speaking because the step in the Two-Stay Two-Stray model requires students to speak in the A discussion.

II. METHODS

A. Research Design

Study: This includes the type study action class (PTK). PTK is a research conducted with road scrutiny to activity study teaching in the form of action, which deliberately appeared and happened in class A in a way together (Arikunto, 2006: 91). The PTK design using the model developed by Kemmis and Mc. Taggart. There are four aspects of the existing tree in the study action, according to Kemmis and Mc. Taggart in (Madya, 2006: 59-63), namely: (1) compilation plan, (2) action, (3) observation, and (4) reflection (Sugiyono, 2019).

B. Subject Research

Subject in study: This is student Class V of State Elementary School 10 South Rantau Regency Labuhan Batu year 2025-2026 learning. Determination class: This is based on the level problem in accordance with results observation and interviews with the teacher who did before research, namely: still low skills students in activity discussion.

Object in study This is a skills discussion student in the process of learning Indonesian through the learning models of Two Stay Two Strays.

C. Data Collection Technique

Data collection techniques included observation, interviews, observations, tests, field notes, and tool recording images (documentation).

Observations were made during the course of the learning process. Through observation, the researcher obtained data in the form of an overview of the practical process discussion, activeness students, attitudes students, and interactions students during the process. Observations were made using an instrument sheet. The researchers interviewed the teachers and students. Interview with the teacher, aiming for information regarding the learning process. Interview with student only done with a number of students just for asked at the time beginning and end learning. Interview: This was conducted outside of class hours.

Here, researchers test for measuring ability basis and achievement student to activity learning speak specifically discussion through test practice activity discussion (Arikunto, 2017).

The notes field used researchers to describe activities carried out by teachers and students during the activity process from beginning to end. Note the field created so that every process can record and draw conclusions. Researchers use a camera to capture images (photos) as documentation during ongoing activities.

D. Data Analysis Technique

This study uses descriptive qualitative technique analysis, namely, to describe skills discussion before and after the implementation of action. Qualitative analysis was used for qualitative data in the form of a results observation field, notes field, and results test discussion for students. Skills discussion student assessed with the guidelines assessment that has been determined.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Research Result

In this section, the results of appropriate research on formulation problems are discussed. The research results were described in such a way that details start from planning, implementation action, observation, and reflection. Research results skills speak specifically to discuss student served start from the pre-action stage until the end cycle. Before the described results, research and discussion, especially formerly described skills, discuss students before they are subject to action, namely at the pre-action stage. The following is a description of the results of the activity discussion at the pre-action stage.

The skills of beginner students can be seen from the test results before the implementation action. To determine the average class score, each aspect skill was discussed. Done calculation for each aspect of the assessment results.

Aspect courage/enthusiasm: This relates to ability and courage students to express ideas and respond to problems. In addition, this aspect is related to natural and calm attitudes. From Table 3, it can be seen that the class average grade skills discussion on aspects of courage/enthusiasm was as much as 1.54.

Based on the class average said, can know that skills discussion student in aspect This Still less. This is because some big students are still silent and shy For disclose his ideas. Attitude students also do not calm and believe in themselves. Many students perform movements that are not reasonable, such as laughter, while whispering with Friend on the same bench or those sitting in front of him. Some students slept on the top table, teased friends, and did not notice the teacher's instructions. In addition, many students are still thinking for a long time about response problems.

Aspect This relates to the ability to speak students, whether still stutter and stop, or already truly smooth. Based on the results, the average class score in table 2 shows that the aspect smoothness is still low. This is based on an average class score of 1.41.

Based on these results, many students who do not smooth and frequently stop talking. Most of them still stuttered and stopped thinking when talking. This is seen at the time when the student speaks often uttered the word ee... and long when will speak.

Aspect clarity is related to speech and word choices with vocals, structured sentences, and vocabulary. Clarity, saying this, influences reception of information at the time the student discusses. Based on Table 3, the average class value for aspect clarity was 1.41.

Average score of aspects This in category is less and occupies the same rank as aspect smoothness talking. This is caused by vocals and sounds weak students, so that they are not clear. Structure sentence: Not too noticed by the students. In addition, the choice of words used by students is also not standard because many use words inside the language area.

Most students still speak in language areas, namely Java. At the time, students still often stop and say something like "eee'.. anu, what Kae Jenenge, kui "Oh, " etc.

Mastery topic, argumentation, and direction talk are existing criteria in the aspect mastery problem. In this aspect, the student expected capable control of topics and delivered arguments. Based on the data in Table 2, it is known that results in an average class score on aspects This by 1.5.

The average score was included in the category less. This is because students do not truly control the topic discussion. Students talk more often about other things outside of the topic discussion. This makes direction talks from student no clear and does not lead to a topic discussion. In addition, the students were still not enough to convey his argument.

Aspect delivery opinion: This relates to the agreement and objections submitted by students. Is his opinion rational and accompanied by the right reason? The students' average score in this aspect was 1.45.

Based on the results, the average score of the students in Table 3, aspects of delivery opinions (agreements and objections), including in category less. This is seen from the students' opinion that is still less. Most of them were not capable of disclosing the opinion that the rationale and reasons used were still not sufficient. In addition, many students are quiet and do not have an opinion.

In addition, researchers and collaborators conduct process observations during learning discussions. Based on the results, researchers and collaborators showed that the learning process was classified as less. Most of them Still Not do not cooperate with Good, so there is domination for more active students compared to other students in the group. This does not yet show the existence of a good job in the group. During the discussion process, there was no attitude motivation shown by students, and initiative work even the group still less. In addition, some large students still do not actively engage in discussions. The following is the result of the data observation of the learning process discussion.

Table 1. Assessment Scores Skills Discussion Student Pre-action

No.	Observed Aspects	Group					
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI
1.	Solidarity (mutual cooperation)	2	2	2	2	2	2
2.	Motivating member other	2	2	2	1	2	1
3.	Organizing Work group	2	2	2	2	2	2
4.	Initiative Work group	2	1	2	1	2	2
5.	Activity	2	2	2	2	1	1

Based on the data in Table 1, the learning process discussion student was still included in the category less. All groups were still not enough in matter of solidarity (mutual cooperation) at the time discussed. Aspects motivating other members are still less, even if there are two groups, namely groups IV and VI, that are classified as not enough once. Organizing Work, the group is also less. The Initiative Work group was classified as less, and there are two groups, namely groups II and IV, which are classified as not enough once. Overall, activity students at the time discuss still not enough.

Based on data analysis, the overall good observation product and process, average pre-action scores, and notes field show that learning discussion student Class V of State Elementary School 10 South Rantau Regency Labuhan Batu year 2025-2026 learning is still low. Therefore, it is necessary to take action to address this problem. The action or variation learning required for high-quality students, teachers, and schools has increased.

Two Stay Two Stray Cycle I

After the test, pre-action researchers and collaborating teachers engage in discussion and coordination, and plan actions to be taken are carried out in cycle I based on existing problems. At stage planning, this study aims to plan study actions to be taken to increase the skills of speaking students seen from activity physique students related to their abilities in the activity discussion group. Process observation will also be conducted through response-visible students from the atmosphere class during action cycle I is underway. In product, indicator success student will be seen from score results evaluation from test measurement based on guideline evaluation discussion.

Following plan actions taken researchers and collaborators in implementation action cycle I.

- Researchers with teachers as collaborators equalize perception and planning design learning after identifying problems that arise.
- Researchers and teachers plan learning models Two Stay Two Stray.
- Determine theme appropriate discussion with student.
- Determine steps implementation learning discussion with learning models Two Stay Two Stray.
- Researchers prepare material lessons and instruments research in the form of notes, guideline evaluation discussion, sheet observation students, and tool documentation in the form of a camera.
- Determine the time implementation study, namely 4×45 minutes (two meetings), test pre-action.

The implementation was performed during two meetings. The description is as follows implementation is as following.

At the first meeting of cycle I, the teacher started learning with and apperception about learning that will be held on the day that. The teacher explained the material to the discussion section. The discussion that will be implemented is discussion in a way in groups.

The teacher continued with an explanation regarding learning models Two-Stay Two Stray and its implementation at the time of the learning discussion. The teacher explained the steps and provided opportunities for students to ask about the learning models mentioned. The details of the activities in the cycle I meeting are as follows.

- 1) The teacher conditions students and do apperception to material learning that will be implemented.
- 2) The teacher explains material discussion with learning models Two Stay Two Stray.
- 3) The teacher divides student to in a group consisting of on four student
- 4) Teachers and researchers share text to be used as material discussion with theme "Illegal Logging" Reason The biggest Damage Indonesian Forests"
- 5) Student discuss material together his group.
- a) b) Students implementing learning models: Two- Stay an Two-Stray. Students determine who they will visit and who will stay in place.
- 6) Researchers do observation with observe the way discussion on each group.
- 7) Lesson hours finished, learning will continued at the meeting next.

At the second meeting, this first cycle begins by explaining the return implementation discussion with learning models Two-Stay Two Stray. To be continued with the teacher asking students to join in accordance with their respective groups. Students were requested to discuss the return results and discuss them at the previous meeting. The teacher asked the students to discuss the results.

After that, the teacher assigned students to present the results to the discussion group in class. Students engage in class discussion. During this process, the researchers and collaborators observed the students. Lesson time finished. Activities Study teaching ended with prayers.

In implementation action in the first cycle, researchers and collaborators observed the learning process carefully. Researchers observing the learning process use instruments that previous research has agreed to and discussed with collaborators. Instruments used included researchers covering sheet evaluation discussion, sheet observations, and notes field, accompanied by documentation in the form of a photo with a camera.

The research result action of this first cycle is differentiated into two: process observation and observation product. Process observation includes student activity during implementation discussion with learning models Two Stay Two Stray.

Observation product in the form of value/score student based on results discussion inside class. a) Process observations.

From the results, researchers and collaborators show that the implementation process action is Still Not yet maximum and is still not yet in accordance with the plan. This is shown by the existence of a number of students who are still not yet understood will his job, well-visiting students, and students who live in the place. However, in the cycle This student start brave and confident self For talking, asking, and expressing opinion. Solidarity and mutual cooperation in The already visible group. Students start seeing active and some already capable motivating other members to give directions to other members who have not so understood their duties. However, some students, especially male students, still do not have sufficient understanding and less control topic discussion. The results of the data observation discussion cycle for each group Table.

Table 2. Observation of the Learning Process Discussion Group Cycle I

No.	Observed Aspects	Group					
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI
1.	Solidarity (mutual cooperation)	3	3	3	3	3	3
2.	Motivating other members	3	3	3	2	2	3
3.	Organizing Work group	3	3	3	2	3	2
4.	Initiative Work group	3	2	3	2	3	3
5.	Activity	3	3	3	3	3	2

Based on Table 2, it can be stated that, in a way, overall skills allow students to categorize as Enough Good. This shows further improvement in good compared with the moment test pre-action. Students are already sufficiently good in terms of solidarity. All groups showed solidarity and mutual cooperation at the time of the ongoing activity. In terms of motivating other members, there are two groups, namely Groups IV and V, which are still in the category less. In the aspect of organizing work groups, almost all groups are already sufficiently good. There are only two groups, namely, groups IV and VI, which are still few. Aspect initiative Work group part big Already increase compared to pre-action. In This there respect, there are two disadvantaged groups, namely, groups II and IV. All groups were already active when the activity discussion was ongoing. In the first cycle, group VI was still not sufficiently active. Overall, almost all the aspects of observing the learning process increased.

Use of Two-Stay Two Stray Learning Models This gives enough influence visible. This is seen in the active and courageous students. The existence of visiting students to group with others spurs students to talk and ask questions. Likewise, students who live in the place are motivated to express their opinion about material, and previous discussions have been discussed with his group.

These activities interact with each other to exchange opinions between visiting students and students who live there. Conditions: Attachment notes the depicted field in the vignette following.

... Then, the students start visiting group others. Atmospheres become crowded, and few are uncontrolled. Teachers actively guide students. Students in class tend to be busy and active. At the time of the visit, some student daughters were still shy when they had to visit the group student's son. As experienced by S19, when visiting Groups S5 and S6. They are Still Embarrassed for ask, but still carry out his task. Group 4 tended to be crowded. When S17 and S29 were on duty to visit, they bothered other students who were visiting other groups. The painstaking teacher reminds students to focus on their respective tasks.

a) Observation Product

The observation was conducted by the researchers during the learning process. Researchers conducted observations using instrument sheet assessment on each student. Activities discussions held using a learning model Two Stay Two Stray show improvement compared to activity beginning before subject to actions. Students who previously at the time pre-action just keep quiet and do not brave speaking. In this first cycle, Already brave speak and express his opinion. In the implementation, phase this first cycle was attended by 22 students. One student dropped out, and nine students did not follow learning because of marching training (paskibra) for one month. Table 6 shows the description of improvement skills of students from pre-action to cycle I.

B. Discussion

In this research, the discussion focused on (1) description beginning skills discussion students, (2) implementation action class with learning models Two-Stay Two Stray, (3) improvement skills discussion students with learning model Two-Stay Two Stray, and (4) research limitations. This can be explained as follows:

Test skills beginning discussion student at the time student does discussion groups and discussions class. This was done for the knowledge skills discussion student before the implementation action. The average class score for each aspect at the pre-action stage was as follows: (1) aspect courage/enthusiasm of 1.54, (2) aspects smoothness speak of 1.41, (3) aspects clarity speech and word choice of 1.41, (4) aspects mastery problem of 1.5, and (5) aspects delivery opinion (agreement and objection) of 1.45.

Overall, the average class score for each aspect was included in the category less. Most of them still do not brave enough to speak, conveying idea/arguments, less control topics, and less fluent in speaking. Situation classroom learning: Still passive. Students do not actively engage in discussion and tend to be silent. Based on problems said, researchers and teachers as collaborator agreed For implementing learning models Two Stay Two Stray For increase skills speak student specifically skills discussion (Mariska et al., 2025).

Researchers observed learning discussion student class V State Elementary School 10 South Rantau Regency Labuhan Batu year learning 2025-2026, via observation beginning. Based on the observation and assessment of skills discussion students before subject to action or at the pre-action stage, known Still Lots less students brave in conveying/arguments, students Still Not yet smooth at the moment speaking, students not enough notice clarity speech, not yet control topic discussion, and ability students in also think still low. Situational classroom learning was seen as passive and not yet conditioned with good. Some students look lazy, put their head on the table, and talk to other things outside the topic discussion.

Implementation action class using a learning model Two-Stay Two-Stray Two increase skills discussion student done for 3 cycles. Cycle I was performed to improve aspects that are still. Cycle III is used to maximize aspects that are still not sufficiently maximum in cycle I. Measuring instruments used to know improvement skills discuss student is with test discussion using a learning model Two-Stay Two Stray. The assessment used here includes five aspects: (1) courage/enthusiasm, (2) smoothness of speaking, (3) speech and word choice, (4) mastery problems, and (5) delivery opinion (agreement and objection) (Kurniawati & Suroso, 2025).

In implementation cycle I, the process carried out from planning until reflection Not yet get appropriate results plan action. Visiting students Still Shy and some Still Confused will his duties; the atmosphere class also appears not enough under control. In addition, students were still not sufficiently fluent in speaking, but they were still not enough to convey opinions and less control topic discussions. Based on the results of the implementation cycle, it is known that improvements still need to be implemented in cycle II. Improvements

in implementation action will influence the discussion of results skills at the time test post-action. The following is a picture of the situation at the time of implementation of action cycle I.

Implementation action cycle II; actions taken The same as in Cycle I. Implementation Cycle II focuses on improving aspects: fluency speaking, mastery problems, and aspects opinions (agreement and objection). In this second cycle, all aspects experience improvement in terms of both process and product. In the overall implementation, cycle II shows better results than the previous cycle. Next is the picture of students at the time of implementation of Cycle II. Students were active and their daughter, Already No, looked shy at the time of the visit. Students living in the same place actively provide information to incoming guests.

Implementation cycle III is performed to maximize the aspects that are still less in cycle II. During implementation of cycle III, all aspects of experience improvement were achieved and 75% of the students who followed learning achieved a score of > 19 . The average class score was 83.63%. The learning process is active and conducive. Students experience enthusiasm and excitement at the moment of discussion

Learning skills discussion with learning models Two-Stay Two-Stray can create an atmosphere that is more active and capable of building enthusiastic students. Students become more active, brave, and enthusiastic at the moment carry out discussion. In the initial (pre-action) condition, students tended to be silent and less brave in discussion A. Students also still not yet compact and every member group does not cooperate enough with good, initiative work student in group Still lacking and motivating between members the group also still still less. In addition, the activity student Still Not yet too visible. Students tend to be calm and passive, and not yet actively speak during discussions (Isnain et al., 2023).

Learning starts improving when implementation discussion using a learning model Two-Stay Two Stray in cycle I. Students start enthusiastic and more brave in discussion. The conditions inside the class have become more lifelong. Solidarity student Already Enough well, every member Already cooperates to look for settlement problems, students already seen motivating other members in groups, organizing the Work Group Already Enough good, and students Already Enough compact Work in group. Activity students inside class Already seen Enough well, thing This seen from conditions in the classroom are lively, and students already actively carry out discussions (Sulastri et al., 2025).

The most conducive condition was cycle III. Students Already understand with good his duties, both those who visit or those who live in the place. Students appear enthusiastic, active, and brave. The solidarity students experienced good improvement in the cycle. Students Already Each Other Work The same in carrying out discussions, students are also capable of motivating member others. Organizing the Work Group Already Good and Every member group understands their respective duties.

The evaluation skills students observe each student when they engage in discussions in their group and present results discussion in the front class (Hensley, 2025). Assessment skills discussion was conducted to measure skills discussion before and after the implementation action. Improvement skills discussion students can see in the improvement diagram skills discussion students on the pre-action score test until post-action cycle III. The following is a diagram of this increase (Rinda Tambing & Megawati Tammu, 2025)

Improvement significant class average score from moment pre-action until end implementation action, namely, cycle III. At the time of pratainaction, the class average score is 7.31, after the given action in cycle I increases to 12.59. Furthermore, in the implementation action, cycle II increased to 17.09, and increased again at cycle III to 20.90.

From the activities discussion obtained a number of evaluation that is includes:

1. Aspect Courage / spirit
2. Aspect Smoothness Speak
3. Aspect Clarity Speech and Word Choice
4. Aspect Mastery Problem
5. Aspect Delivery Opinion (agreement and objection)

Following This description improvement skills discussion student seen from each aspect.

- a) Aspect Courage / spirit

Aspect: This relates to courage students to express ideas, respond to problems, and attitudes students at the time discussed. The improvement in this aspect was very good. The Two-Stay Two-Stray learning model is able to increase courage and spirit among students For speaking at the time discuss.

At the pre-action stage, the average class score for aspect courage/enthusiasm was 1.54, experiencing an increase in cycle I to 2.82, and in cycle II it increased to 3.72 in cycle III. Increase aspect: This is the best and most included improvement in the Good very category.

b) Aspect Smoothness Speak

Aspect smoothness speaks related to smoothness, and student moment speaks whether smooth, frequently stopped, and stuttered. At this stage, students tended to be quiet and less fluent in speaking. Next, students experience improvement, which includes in the category Good once at the end post-action, namely Cycle III. Students speak well and smoothly.

The average class score aspect smoothness speaking on stage pre-action by 1.41 and increasing to 2.41 after done action in cycle I. In cycle II, it increased to 3.36, and at the end, cycle III increased to 4.13.

c) Aspect Clarity Speech and Word Choice

Aspect clarity related to sayings and word choices with vocals, structured sentences, vocabulary, and word choices spoken by students. Improvement in average class score on aspects This was classified as good once. At the time of test pre-action, the average class score aspect was 1.41. In the implementation action cycle, I experienced improvement to 2.5 and in cycle II, it experienced improvement to 3.31, and in cycle III, it increased again to 4.04.

Improvement score: the show students at the time speak Already notice structure sentences and choices he said Already standard. The vocal student is already hard and can be heard in class. Likewise, the spoken vocabulary student already varies.

d) Aspect Mastery Problem

Aspect mastery problems related to students' ability to understand topic discussion, deliver argumentation, and direct talk. Improvement average class score on aspects: This was included in the category good. At this stage, the pre-action average class score on aspects was 1.50, experiencing an increase in cycle I to 2.41, and in cycle II it increased to 3.31. At the end of the action, cycle III increased to 4.13.

When testing pre-action, some big students do not sufficiently understand the topic discussion with good. The arguments presented less and direction talk that students often go out from topic discussions. However, at the end of the implementation action, students already master and understand topic discussion, already capable express lot argumentation, and direction talks already clear, namely talk about topic discussion.

e) Aspect Delivery Opinion (agreement and objection)

Aspect delivery opinions (agreements and objections) related to opinions expressed whether students were rational or not and related with reasons included students. Aspects: This experience shows good improvement. Students were capable of conveying opinions rationally and accompanied by the right reason. This is proven by an improvement in the average class score, namely, the test pre-action of 1.45, which increased in cycle I to 2.45, in cycle II to 3.41, and in cycle III, to 4.22.

Improvement in all aspect skills can be seen from the description improvement of every aspect that has been explained. Based on the description of improvement, each aspect skills discussion shows that most aspects of experience improvement are aspect courage/spirit that achieves a score of 4.36 in cycle III, and experienced an improvement of 2.82. At the time of pre-action, students still look silent, and not many people talk. Only One or only two people talk and the aspect This Still classified as not good enough. In the implementation action cycle I, students start brave talking, but there are still a number of students who are still shy at the time conveying ideas and concepts. Implementation cycle II is better than cycle I. Most students already brave convey ideas and concepts. In cycle III, all students brave to express ideas, respond to problems, and see reasonable and calm attitudes. Furthermore, the aspects that experienced improvement in ranking second were aspect delivery opinions (agreement and objection). At the time of pre-action, the average student score is 1.45 and in cycle III, it increases to 4.22. Aspect: This represent an improvement of 2.77. At the time of pre-action, students still do not have enough opinions and are not accompanied by rational reasons. Students only conveyed one or two opinions. In cycle I, students start many times and begin to argue and provide reasons. In implementation cycle II, some big students can give opinions and reasons. The best condition is in cycle III, where each student is capable of conveying his/her opinion and gives the right reasons. The improvement aspect of the third sequence was aspect smoothness. At the time of test pre-action, the average class score was 1.41 and increased in cycle III to 4.13. Improvements to aspects This of 2.72 (Padli et al., 2024).

When pre-action, fluency still speaks less. The students remained stuttered and stopped speaking. In Cycle I, students start fluent speak, although Still often stops. In cycle II, it is already good. Most students were fluent in speaking and not stuttered. At the end of cycle, namely cycle III, all students were already smooth and good in speaking. Students also had no words in the language area at the time of speaking. Improvement aspects of the fourth sequence, namely, the aspect mastery problem. At this time, the pre-action obtains an average class score of 1.50 and increased in cycle III to 4.13. Aspect: This represent an improvement of 2.63. In the test pre-action, students' ability to understand material discussion was still less. Students only read and delved into problems. Implementation action cycle I provides sufficient influence. Students start concentrating on material

discussion and become capable of understanding problems in it. In cycle II, some of the big students were Already Good at understanding the material discussion. In cycle III, all students had already participated in the control-material discussion. This is seen from the arguments presented by the students at the time of the discussion. The final order is aspect clarity, speech, and word choice. The average score at pre-action was 1.41, increasing in cycle III to 4.04. Aspect: This represent an improvement of 2.63. At the time, pre-action, ability students in aspects This Still not enough.

Vocals student Still weak, students No notice structure sentences, vocabulary used Still little, and choice he said no standard Because Still mixed with the language area. Many students still used the language area at the time of speaking. Implementation of action cycle I shows improvement, namely, students start increasing their vocals and starting notice structure sentences as well as vocabulary used. However, words in the language area still often appear. At time cycle II, part big student already good in aspects of this. The/sound/vocal parts of big students already heard hard, vocabulary used many, structure the sentence good and deep words, and the language area started to decrease. In cycle III, all students were good in these aspects. Words in The language area Already No do not appear again.

Thus, based on the above description results, the use of learning models Two-Stay Two Stray can increase skills discussion student class V State Elementary School 10 South Rantau Regency Labuhan Batu year 2025-2026 learning

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of the research and discussion that has been presented in the previous chapter, we can conclude that learning discussion with learning models Two-Stay Two Stray can increase skills discussion student class V State Elementary School 10 South Rantau Regency Labuhan Batu year 2025-2026 learning. Improvement skills discussion students observed in the quality of processes and products as the following improvement skills discussion student seen in the quality of the learning process shown with compactness students who had good. Students who at the time pre-action were not sufficiently capable of cooperating in cycle III already compact one each other inside his group. Students capable of motivating member others, namely with reminders, will perform her duties. Organizing groups in cycle III have Good when compared to those with pre-action. Initiative Work group students at the time pre-action were not yet so visible, but in cycle III, it was already good. Students are capable of determining what should be done at the time of the discussion. The most prominent improvement was the activity of the students. If, at the time, the pre-action student saw passive and silent, at time cycle III, Already active do discussion. With the existence of visiting students, the learning atmosphere becomes more lively and enthusiastic. Improvement results/products can be determined from the ability to discuss students before being subject to action and after being subject to action. At the time of the test pre-action, the student still scored less. Students Still look quiet, shy, and lack active discussion. Students who are not brave enough convey ideas or arguments and are less fluent in speaking. After being subjected to action (cycle III), the students' ability experienced good improvement.

Improvement skills discussion students can see from five aspects: (1) aspect courage/enthusiasm, (2) aspect smoothness speaking, (3) aspects clarity speech and word choice, (4) aspects mastery problems, and (5) aspects delivery opinions (agreement and objection). Improvement in a way product based on amount average class score obtained namely on the test pre-action by 7.31 or 29.63%, in cycle I it increased to 12.59 or 50.54%, in cycle II it increased to 17.09 or 68.36%, and at the end of action cycle III increases to 20.90 or 83.63%.

Funding Statement

"No external funding was received for this study."

Ethical Compliance

All procedures performed in this study involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki Declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

Data Access Statement

No datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study

Conflict of Interest Declaration

The authors declare that they have no affiliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial interest in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks all the people in most cases and the sponsor and financial support acknowledgments.

REFERENCES

- [1] Anataya, S., Sumantri, P., & Aisyah, S. (2024). Approach Constructivism To Motivation Studying History of XI IPS Students at SMAN 2 Medan. *Jurnal Akuntansi Hukum Dan Edukasi*, 1(2), 72–78. <https://doi.org/10.57235/jahe.v1i2.3562>
- [2] Arikunto, S. (2017). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2017.
- [3] Azzahra Henda Puspitasari, P., Lestari Damayanti, I., & Nurlaelawati, I. (2024). Investigating Students' Speaking Skills through Traditional Story-Based Digital Storytelling into Genre-Based Approach (GBA). *Pedagogy: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 12(2), 250–265. <https://doi.org/10.32332/joelt.v12i2.9784>
- [4] Hapsari, R. F., Kuswardi, Y., & Andriatna, R. (2025). Students' ability of understanding concepts and computational skill based on learning styles in the discovery learning model. *Journal of Honai Math*, 8(2), 271–286. <https://doi.org/10.30862/jhm.v8i2.879>
- [5] Hensley, N. (2025). Student-led discussions for sustainability education: an autoethnographic exploration. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 26(3), 505–517. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-07-2023-0295>
- [6] Isnain, A. S., Arko, B., & Galani, A. (2023). The Effect of Two Stay-Two Stray Cooperative Learning Methods and Think Pair Share on Student Learning Outcomes of Geography. *Journal of Social Knowledge Education (JSKE)*, 4(3), 82–91. <https://doi.org/10.37251/jske.v4i3.695>
- [7] Kurniawati, H., & Suroso, E. (2025). ANALISIS KUALITATIF PENGUASAAN KOSAKATA SISWA SMP KELAS VIII DALAM PEMBELAJARAN BAHASA INDONESIA. *SECONDARY: Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Menengah*, 5(4), 587–594. <https://doi.org/10.51878/secondary.v5i4.7503>
- [8] Mariska, R., Ferdiyanto, F., & Hamdani, B. (2025). The Effectiveness of Using Two Stay Two Stray to Improve Students' Speaking Skills. *Journal of English Language and Education*, 10(3), 711–720. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v10i3.914>
- [9] Padli, P., Sabillah, M. I., Faizah, K., Irawan, B., Rahman, D., Zarya, F., Ndayisenga, J., Falaahudin, A., Festiawan, R., & Ockta, Y. (2024). Improvement of gross motor skills in children with hearing loss: through a game model reviewed from the aspect of independence. *Retos*, 61, 1116–1125. <https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v61.109095>
- [10] Rinda Tambing, M., & Megawati Tammu, R. (2025). Efforts to Develop Responsibility in Class IX Students Through the Implementation of the Group Discussion Method. *Jurnal PAJAR (Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran)*, 9(2), 173–190. <https://doi.org/10.33578/pjr.v9i2.9898>
- [11] Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung Alfabeta.
- [12] Sulastri, Suciati, Sucipto, & Purnamasari, H. (2025). Literature Study on the Implementation of the Two Stay Two Stray Cooperative Learning Model in Strengthening Motivation and Learning Outcomes of PPKN. *Jurnal Elementaria Edukasia*, 8(3), 537–548. <https://doi.org/10.31949/jee.v8i3.13716>