



# Using a Claim-Support-Question (CSQ) Technique in Teaching and Learning English Reading for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Year English Education Students at the Department of Foreign Languages, Faculty of Education, National University of Laos

Say PHONEKEO\*, Sounieng VONGKHAMCHANH, Soutta INTHAVONG, Chanmany RATTANAVONGSA, Khamtanh INTHAVONG

Faculty of Education, National University of Laos, Lao PDR

## Abstract

**\*Correspondence:**

Say Phonekeo, Faculty of Education, National University of Laos,  
Tel: +856 20 5533 8764,  
Email:  
[phoneksaykeo2020@gmail.com](mailto:phoneksaykeo2020@gmail.com)

The main purposes of this study were to: 1) examine the efficiency index of reading lesson plans; 2) investigate the effectiveness index of learning reading outcomes; and 3) to study the 3<sup>rd</sup> year English education students' satisfaction towards the teaching and learning of reading using a CSQ technique. The research instruments include four lesson plans, a pre-posttest which consists of 21 items, an observation form, and the satisfaction questionnaire, which consists of 22 items. The target group of the study was the 3<sup>rd</sup> year English education students at the Faculty of Education, National University of Laos, with a total of 28 students (23 female). The data obtained were analysed using a computer program to find the mean ( $\bar{X}$ ), standard deviation (S.D), percentage (%), efficiency index ( $E_1/E_2$ ) and effectiveness index (E.I). The findings reveal that:

1) The efficiency index of the reading lesson plans through using a CSQ technique for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year English education students was 82.05/88.44, which is higher than the criteria of 80/80.

2) The effectiveness index of reading learning performance through using a CSQ technique was 0.6699, which was equal to 66.99%, which is higher than the criteria .05 (55%).

3) The 3<sup>rd</sup> year English education students' satisfaction towards teaching and learning reading through using a critical thinking technique (CSQ) was at a high level ( $\bar{X} = 4.29$ , S.D = 0.77).

**Keywords:** *Claim-Support-Question (CSQ), English Education Students, Critical Reading, Efficiency, Effectiveness.*

## 1. Introduction

In today's global world, the importance of English cannot be denied and ignored since it is the most common language spoken universally. Learning English requires constant practice and effort. The kind of feeling that succeeds among students is that it is not possible to achieve fluency or mastery over the English language. This kind of tendency prevents students from learning English. Most students study English from the examination point of view, so they are not able to produce even a single sentence without grammatical errors. Furthermore, sufficient practice is not given to students to learn the language. Only those who have command over the English language are given a job and possess a better opportunity (Nishanthi, 2018). Nishanthi (2018) pointed out that the English

language is a significant source of communication worldwide. It is the way through which we share our ideas, feelings, views, and thoughts with others. With help of emerging technology, English has been playing a major role in various sectors, including medicine, engineering, education, etc. It is a vital language for all kinds of professional and personal goals.

In Lao PDR, English became the important language when the government of Laos launched a new policy in 1986. This was the time when Laos opened its door to the outside world in order to enhance economic cooperation and international relations. In the Lao educational system, English is a compulsory language from grade three to university. As the least developed country, Lao PDR attracts the interest of many international organizations. The demand for

English is increasing in Laos in response to the needs of employers. The economy has been improving over recent years, and the degree of investment in tourism and industry has grown, making English a basic pillar of many of the careers (Mar Gutiérrez-Colón & Somsivilay, 2021).

Reading is one of the four macro-skills that are important for learning a language. Therefore, the main purpose of teaching reading is to foster criticality and develop strategic readers (Mokhtari & Reichard, 2002). Reading strategy refers to “the reader’s deliberate, goal-directed attempts to control and modify their efforts to decode text, understand words, and construct meaning from the text” (Afflerbach & Cho, 2009, p. 69). Hudson (2007) defines reading strategy as “any interactive process that has the goal of obtaining meaning from connected text and reading skills operate within the context of such reading strategies”. The definitions suggest that reading strategies are intentional techniques in making sense of the text. The term strategy signifies our mental constructs that are different from “traditional skilled-based reading” (Grabe, 2009).

There are problems with learning English reading in Lao PDR. Vongxay (2013) stated that the main problem of teaching reading in the Lao EFL context is that it is still influenced by the dominant use of the Grammar translation method. This teaching approach places a major dependence on the teachers while the students take on the passive role of being knowledge recipients (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). As a consequence, most Lao EFL students have a negative attitude towards learning English, including reading, as revealed in a larger study (Phonekeo, 2020). A survey investigating the Lao EFL pre-service teachers’ prior experiences of reading and the current state of reading instruction in the Lao EFL pre-service teacher education system found that most of the students encountered difficulties in constructing the meaning of the text critically. Furthermore, learning reading was mostly a matter of paying attention to discrete language features as opposed to meaning construction and critical reading development (Phonekeo & Macalister, 2021). This practice not only resulted in passive learning but also hindered the application of an innovative teaching approach into the classroom practices.

The main problem for Lao EFL learners in terms of learning to read is that they lack effective reading strategies. They need to be trained in how to analyze, evaluate, make use of reading strategies, and make sound judgements when they read. Their reading ability is at a lower level when compared with Bloom’s taxonomy (Bloom, et al., 1956). Because of the reasons mentioned above, the research team is keen and interested in using the claim-support-question technique (CSQ) (Ritchhart, 2015) in teaching-learning English reading for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year English student-teachers at the Department of Foreign Languages (DFL), Faculty of Education (FED), and National University of Laos (NUOL) with the aim of improving the learning of reading in this context.

## 2. Materials and Methods

A quantitative method was utilised in this research. Specifically, a one-group pretest-posttest design was adopted in this study (Creswell, 2018). The underlying reason for using this design is because it is classroom-based research and there is only one group (class) of the 3<sup>rd</sup> year English education students at DFL, FED, NUOL in the academic year 2021-2022.

### 2.1 Target group

The target group for this research was 3<sup>rd</sup> year student-teachers at DFL, FED, NOUL in the academic year 2021-2022. The total number was 28 students. Of which, 23 were female (Creswell, 2007, p. 12).

### 2.2 Research instruments

The following instruments were used: four lesson plans, a pre-post-test, a behavior observation form, four quizzes, and satisfaction questionnaire.

### 2.3 Data collection procedures

To collect the data, the following steps were followed:

- 1) Proposed for a permission letter from Dean of FED, NOUL to present the head of the DEL, FED, NOUL;
- 2) Informed the target group about the research procedures;
- 3) Designed and validated the lesson plans;
- 4) Conducted pre-test with the experimental group before the intervention;
- 5) Conducted by the teaching-learning by using a claim-support-question technique;
- 6) Conducted a quiz and observation during each lesson;

- 7) Administered a posttest and questionnaire after the experiment; and
- 8) Brought all data collected to check and analyse.

## 2.4 Instrument design and validation

The following aspects were taken into consideration:

- 1) Studied related theories, literature and researches;
- 2) Designed the research instruments;
- 3) Discussed the research instruments with the research team;
- 4) Brought the instruments to three experts to check the item objective congruent (IOC);
- 5) Tried out the instruments with the group of 19 students who were not the target group to find out reliability values which is at .806;
- 6) Revised the instruments; and
- 7) Used the instruments with the experimental group.

## 2.5 Data analysis

After collecting data about using a CSQ technique in teaching-learning English reading, the research team analysed the data by following these steps:

- 1) Finding out the mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) and standard deviation (S.D) of scores gained from the pre-test and post-test.
- 2) Examining efficacy index ( $E_1/E_2$ ) of lesson plans by using a CSQ technique.
- 3) Investigating effectiveness index (E.I) of reading learning outcomes of the students at DFL, FED, NUOL through using CSQ technique.
- 4) Finding out ( $\bar{X}$ ) and S.D of students' satisfaction towards learning reading by using a CSQ technique.

## 3. Results

### 3.1 Efficiency of lesson plans

The results of lesson plans efficiency analysis by using a CSQ technique according to criteria of 80/80 are introduced as follows:

- 1) The lesson 1 mean score ( $\bar{X} = 8.09$ ,  $SD = 0.26$ ) and the efficiency of the lesson was 80.71, meaning that the lesson had an  $E_1 = 80.71$ .
- 2) The lesson 2 mean score ( $\bar{X} = 8.11$ ,  $SD = 0.42$ ) and the efficiency of the lesson was 80.71, meaning that the lesson had an  $E_1 = 81.07$ .
- 3) The lesson 3 mean score ( $\bar{X} = 8.21$ ,  $SD = 0.42$ ) and the efficiency of the lesson was 80.71, meaning that the lesson had an  $E_1 = 82.14$ .

4) The lesson 4 mean score ( $\bar{X} = 8.43$ ,  $SD = 0.50$ ) and the efficiency of the lesson was 80.71, meaning that the lesson had an  $E_1 = 84.29$ .

5) The mean score of the four lesson plans was ( $\bar{X} = 63.38$ ,  $SD = 1.64$ ) and the efficiency of learning-teaching of the four lessons was 82.05, meaning that  $E_1 = 82.05$ .

The result of reading performance after the experiment revealed that the mean score ( $\bar{X} = 18.57$ ,  $SD = 1.10$ ) and the effectiveness index was 88.44, meaning that  $E_2 = 88.44$ .

### 3.2 Overall Efficiency of Learning-teaching

The total score of quizzes from four lessons was 919, the mean score was ( $\bar{X} = 63.38$ ,  $SD = 1.64$ ) and the efficiency of learning-teaching process was ( $E_1 = 82.05$ ) and the total score of the post-test was 520, mean score was ( $\bar{X} = 18.57$ ,  $SD = 1.10$ ). The effectiveness of learning ( $E_2 = 88.44$ ).

It can be concluded that the efficiency of learning-teaching reading through using a CSQ technique for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year student-teachers at DFL, FED, NUOL was  $E_1/E_2 = 82.05/88.44$ , which is higher than criteria  $E_1/E_2 = 80/80$ .

### 3.3 Effectiveness of learning reading

The effectiveness of learning from the pre-test and post-test was 382 from 28 students, mean score ( $\bar{X} = 13.64$ ,  $SD = 1.50$ ) and the post-test total score was 520; the mean score ( $\bar{X} = 18.57$ ,  $SD = 1.10$ ).

The result of effective index analysis of learning-teaching reading by using CSQ for the 3rd year English education students at DFL, FED, NUOL reveals that the pre-test score was 382 and post-test score was 520; the effectiveness index (E.I) was 0.6699 or equal 66.99% which is higher than criteria 0.50.

### 3.4 Results of students' satisfaction

Table 1 shows the overall result of students' satisfaction towards teaching reading by using a CSQ technique for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year student-teachers at DFL, FED, NUOL. As it shows, the degree of student satisfaction was high ( $\bar{X} = 4.29$ ,  $SD = 0.77$ ). When considering each component, it can be seen that the highest one was the 'setting up' ( $\bar{X} = 4.41$ ,  $SD = 0.69$ ). The second component was 'Raising questions' ( $\bar{X} = 4.35$ ,  $SD = 0.76$ ); the third one was 'Sharing ideas' ( $\bar{X} = 4.33$ ,  $SD = 0.78$ ); the fourth one was 'Identifying support' ( $\bar{X} = 4.30$ ,  $SD = 0.76$ ). The fifth component was 'Assessing learning outcomes' ( $\bar{X} = 4.20$ ,  $SD = 0.78$ ), and the final

aspect was 'Identifying claims' ( $\bar{X} = 4.16$ ,  $SD = 0.86$ ).

Table 2 shows the Mean and Standard Deviation of Item Analysis towards the Setting up Component. As it reveals, the Mean and Standard Deviation is high ( $\bar{X} = 4.41$ ,  $SD = 0.69$ ). When considering each item, it can be noted that the highest value is Item 1: The teacher explains the objectives of the lesson to the students before beginning the new lesson ( $\bar{X} = 4.61$ ,  $SD = 0.69$ ); Item 4: The teacher motivates the students to share ideas about the topic of the lesson before reading it, ( $\bar{X} = 4.43$ ,  $SD = 0.57$ ); followed by Item 2: The teacher explains the steps of using a CSQ technique for the students ( $\bar{X} = 4.32$ ,  $SD = 0.72$ ). The lowest one is Item 3: The teacher encourages the students to pay attention the new lesson by asking questions ( $\bar{X} = 4.29$ ,  $SD = 0.76$ ).

Table 3 illustrates the Mean and Standard Deviation of Item Analysis toward the Identifying Claim Component in learning-teaching reading by using a CSQ technique. As we can see, the overall mean score of the component is high ( $\bar{X} = 4.16$ ,  $SD = 0.86$ ). When looking closely at each item, the results show that the highest ones are Item 4 ( $\bar{X} = 4.25$ ,  $SD = 0.80$ ) and Item 3 ( $\bar{X} = 4.25$ ,  $SD = 0.89$ ). the third one is Item 1 ( $\bar{X} = 4.18$ ,  $SD = 0.86$ ). The lower mean score is Item 2 ( $\bar{X} = 3.96$ ,  $SD = 0.88$ ).

Table 4 indicates that Mean and Standard Deviation of Item Analysis toward the 'Identifying Support' Component. As it illustrates, the Overall Mean score is high ( $\bar{X} = 4.30$ ,  $SD = 0.76$ ). when closely considering each item, it reveals that the highest one is Item 3 ( $\bar{X} = 4.36$ ,  $SD = 0.73$ ); followed by Item 2 ( $\bar{X} = 4.32$ ,  $SD = 0.82$ ). The lower mean score is Item 1 ( $\bar{X} = 4.21$ ,  $SD = 0.74$ ).

Table 5 demonstrate the overall Mean and Deviation of Item Analysis about students' satisfaction towards the Raising Questions Component by using a CSQ technique. As the table shows, student satisfaction is high ( $\bar{X} = 4.35$ ,  $SD = 0.76$ ). Of three items, the highest mean score is Item 3 ( $\bar{X} = 4.45$ ,  $SD = 0.74$ ); the second highest one is Item 1 ( $\bar{X} = 4.29$ ,  $SD = 0.71$ ) and the lower means score in this component is Item 2 ( $\bar{X} = 4.21$ ,  $SD = 0.83$ ).

Table 6 demonstrates Mean and Standard Deviation of students' satisfaction towards the Sharing Ideas Component by using a CSQ technique. As can be noted, the mean score is

high ( $\bar{X} = 4.33$ ,  $SD = 0.78$ ). When considering each item, it shows that the highest mean score is Item 1 ( $\bar{X} = 4.50$ ,  $SD = 0.69$ ); followed by Item 4 ( $\bar{X} = 4.46$ ,  $SD = 0.84$ ). Items 2 and 3 have the same mean score of ( $\bar{X} = 4.18$ ,  $SD = 0.77$ ) and ( $\bar{X} = 4.18$ ,  $SD = 0.82$ ) respectively.

Table 7 demonstrates Mean and Standard Deviation of students' satisfaction towards the Assessing Learning Outcomes by using a CSQ technique. It can be noted that the overall mean score of the component is high ( $\bar{X} = 4.20$ ,  $SD = 0.78$ ). When closely looking at each item, it can be noticed that the highest one is Item 2 ( $\bar{X} = 4.39$ ,  $SD = 0.74$ ). the second highest one is Item 4 ( $\bar{X} = 4.29$ ,  $SD = 0.76$ ); followed by Item 3 ( $\bar{X} = 4.18$ ,  $SD = 0.77$ ) and lastly Item 1 ( $\bar{X} = 3.93$ ,  $SD = 0.86$ ).

#### 4. Discussion

Drawing from the results presented in the previous section, a number of important issues are looked at and discussed in comparison with the literature and related studies. This is to help understand the findings of this research; thus, important pedagogical implications for classroom practices can be suggested. Therefore, the findings can be discussed below.

From the research, it was found that the efficiency index of lesson plans illustrated that the lesson plans were effective and reliable after being tried out with a group of students who had similar characteristics as the participants in the research. This was encouraging for reading teachers to consider using this technique in their classroom practice to foster student reading comprehension and participation in learning reading. The findings revealed the importance of steps to be taken into the actual implementation of the Claim-Support-Question, which include 1) the setting up, 2) identifying claims, 3) identifying support, 4) raising questions, 5) sharing ideas, and 6) assessing learning outcomes. The findings here also were also supported by a study conducted by Hooper (2016) who found out the benefits of Claim-Support-Question in teaching English reading in terms of improving the efficiency of learning. The findings also showed that the student's reading performance increased significantly after using the Claim-Support-Question technique. As the findings showed, there was an increase in the mean score in the posttest after the implementation. The findings here also related to Salmon (2008) who found out that using a Claim-

Support-Question technique fostered student learning comprehension because this teaching approach, when used appropriately, can improve student confidence in analysing the text, fostering critical thinking, summarizing main ideas, developing active learning. The findings here are related to the theory of Ritchhart (2015) who stated 6 principles of a Claim-Support-Question technique: 1) using of thinking skills; 2) a social endeavor; 3) deep and meaningful learning; 4) visible thinking; 5) source and materials; and 6) cooperation and collaboration. These qualities are conducive to teaching and fostering student engagement, comprehension and participation in learning.

The findings also indicated that students were satisfied with learning reading by using a Claim-Support-Question technique after learning reading in terms of clear objectives of the lessons, seeking main ideas or claims of the text, researching more information about the topic being learned, sharing ideas with fellow students, and having sufficient opportunities to interact with peers, read silently, and reflect on the topic. The findings were also consistent with (Ritchhart et al., 2011).

## 5. Conclusion

In conclusion, the findings showed that the efficiency index of lesson plans through using a Claim-Support-Question was higher than the criteria because this teaching technique is inquiry-based which is useful for developing learning outcomes in a meaningful manner. The findings also revealed that using a Claim-Support-Question fostered reading learning outcomes because this technique focuses students on collaboration, critical thinking, and comprehension development. Through this, students had the opportunity to interact, share ideas, and reflect on their learning experiences.

The findings also indicated that the students were satisfied with using a Claim-Support-Question in teaching reading because they were motivated to identify the main points of the text, find out the evidence to support the main points and raise questions about the text. This allowed them to explore the main ideas of the text which become technique also helps explore answers to curiosity and questions when interacting with the text.

## 6. Conflict of Interest

We certify that there is no conflict of interest with any financial organization regarding the material discussed in the manuscript.

## 7. Acknowledgements

We wish to acknowledge Faculty of Education, National University of Laos for its financial support in conducting this research in academic year 2022. Without their kind support, this project would not have been able to be completed.

## 8. References

Afflerbach, P., & Cho, B. Y. (2009). Identifying and describing constructively responsive comprehension strategies in new and traditional forms of reading. In S. E. Israel & G. G. Duffy (Eds.), *Handbook of research on reading comprehension* (pp. 69-90). New York: Routledge.

Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives-handbook 1: The cognitive domain*. New York: David Mackey.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE.

Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hooper, T. (2016). Improving academic writing through thinking routines. *Kwansei Gakuin University Humanities Review*, 20, 47-63.

Hudson, T. (2007). *Teaching second language reading*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques & principles in language teaching*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.

Mar Gutiérrez-Colón, & Somsivilay, P. (2021). English as a foreign language: Listening to students and teachers, a Case Study in LAO PDR. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(2), 535-550.

Nishanthi, R. (2018). The importance of learning English in Today World. *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development*, 3(1), 871-874.

Mokhtari, K., & Reichard, C. A. (2002). Assessing students' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(2), 249-259. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.94.2.249

Phonekeo, S. (2020). *Implementing a culture of thinking in Lao EFL pre-service teacher education: A case of reading*. (PhD Thesis). Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand,

Phonekeo, S., & Macalister, J. (2021). Reading performance and perceptions of Lao EFL pre-service teachers following a culture of thinking implementation. *Reading in a Foreign language*, 33(1), 55-77.

Ritchhart, R. (2015). *Creating cultures of thinking: The 8 forces we must master to truly transform our schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ritchhart, R., Church, M., & Morrison, K. (2011). Making thinking visible: how to promote engagement, understanding, and independence for all learners. *British Journal of Learning Support*, 27(2).

Salmon, A. K. (2008). Promoting a culture of thinking in the young child. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 35(5), 457-461. doi:10.1007/s10643-007-0227-y

Vongxay, H. (2013). *The implementation of communicative language teaching (CLT) in an English department in a Lao higher educational institution: A case study*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Unitec Institution of Technology, New Zealand.

Table 1. Overall Results of Satisfaction towards Using C-S-Q

No.	Components	Statistic values		level of satisfaction
		$\bar{X}$	S. D	
I.	Setting up	4.41	0.69	High
II.	Identifying claims	4.16	0.86	High
III.	Identifying support	4.30	0.76	High
IV.	Raising questions	4.35	0.76	High
V.	Sharing ideas	4.33	0.78	High
VI.	Assessing learning outcomes	4.20	0.78	High
<b>Total</b>		<b>4.29</b>	<b>0.77</b>	<b>High</b>

Table 2. Results of Satisfaction towards Setting Up Component

	I. Setting up	Statistics			Level of satisfaction
		$\bar{X}$	S. D		
1.	The teacher explains the objective of the lesson to the students before beginning the new lesson.	4.61	0.69	High	
2.	The teacher explains the steps of using a CSQ technique for the students.	4.32	0.72	High	
3.	The teacher encourages the students to pay attention the new lesson by asking questions.	4.29	0.76	High	
4.	The teacher motivates the students to share ideas about the topic of the lesson before reading it.	4.43	0.57	High	
<b>Total</b>		<b>4.41</b>	<b>0.69</b>	<b>High</b>	

Table 3. Student Satisfaction towards Identifying Claim Component

<b>II. Identifying claim</b>	Statistics		Degree of satisfaction
	<b><math>\bar{X}</math></b>	<b>S. D</b>	
1. The teacher prepares and provides handouts for the students to work on.	4.18	0.86	High
2. The handout and worksheet are easy to understand and follow.	3.96	0.88	High
3. The teacher allows the students to read the text silently and suitable with the time given.	4.25	0.89	High
4. The teacher encourages the student to write down the claims of the text on the paper.	4.25	0.80	High
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.16</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>High</b>

Table 4. Student Satisfaction towards Identifying Support Component

<b>III. Identifying support</b>	Statistics		Degree of satisfaction
	<b><math>\bar{X}</math></b>	<b>S. D</b>	
1. The teacher encourages the students to read the text again to find out supporting evidence to the claims.	4.21	0.74	High
2. The teacher asks the students to write down the evidence on the paper around the claims.	4.32	0.82	High
3. The teacher asks the students to research/find out more information about the claims.	4.36	0.73	High
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.30</b>	<b>0.76</b>	<b>High</b>

Table 5. Student Satisfaction towards Raising Questions Component

<b>IV. Raising questions</b>	Statistics		Degree of satisfaction
	<b><math>\bar{X}</math></b>	<b>S. D</b>	
1. The teacher asks the students to think more about the reading text by asking questions.	4.29	0.71	High
2. The teacher asks critical questions which pushes me think further.	4.21	0.83	High
3. The teacher encourages the students to share ideas about addition information of the topic.	4.54	0.74	High
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.35</b>	<b>0.76</b>	<b>High</b>

Table 6. Student Satisfaction towards Sharing Ideas Component

<b>V. Sharing Ideas</b>	Statistics		Degree of satisfaction
	<b><math>\bar{X}</math></b>	<b>S. D</b>	
1. The teacher always provides opportunities for the students to share ideas.	4.50	0.69	High

2.	The teacher writes down/document the ideas being discussed on the board to allow the students to see.	4.18	0.77	High
3.	The discussion allows the students to develop thinking and ideas about the topic.	4.18	0.82	High
4	The students have sufficient opportunities to share ideas with classmates and the teachers.	4.46	0.84	High
<b>Total</b>		<b>4.33</b>	<b>0.78</b>	<b>High</b>

Table 7. Student Satisfaction towards Assessing Learning Outcomes Component

<b>VI. Assessing Learning Outcomes</b>	<b>Statistics</b>		<b>Degree of satisfaction</b>
	<b><math>\bar{X}</math></b>	<b>S. D</b>	
1. The students understand how to use CSQ.	3.93	0.86	High
2. The students are able to identify claims, support, and raise questions about the text.	4.39	0.74	High
3. The students participate in learning actively.	4.18	0.77	High
4 The students have the chance to develop criticality in reading.	4.29	0.76	High
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.20</b>	<b>0.78</b>	<b>High</b>