THE EFFECTIVENESS OF QUESTION-ANSWER RELATIONSHIP AND ANTICIPATION-REACTION GUIDE STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING READING HORTATORY EXPOSITION TEXTS TO STUDENTS WITH HIGH AND LOW CRITICAL THINKING

Haris Hamdani
haris.hamdani@dsn.ubharajaya.ac.id
Universitas Bhayangkara Jakarta Raya

ABSTRACT

This research investigates the effectiveness of Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies for enhancing students' reading comprehension to students with high and low critical thinking. This research is quantitative research by applying experimental factorial design 2x2. The participants of this research were 26 students of *XI-IPS1* as the first experimental group and 25 students of *XI-IPS 2* as the second experimental group at the Islamic Private Senior High School *Sultan Agung 3* Semarang. The findings of this study show that (1) Question-Answer Relationship strategy has a better effect for students with high and low critical thinking (2) Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies are equal treated to students with high critical thinking (3) Question-Answer Relationship strategy has better effect to students with low critical thinking (4) the students with high and low critical thinking improve equally treated by Question-Answer Relationship strategy (5) the students with high critical thinking improve better treated by Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy (6) there is an interaction among reading comprehension, teaching strategies, and their critical thinking. To sum up, there is an interaction among teaching strategies, reading comprehension, and students' critical thinking in teaching reading hortatory exposition texts to students with high and low critical thinking.

Keywords: *Anticipation-Reaction Guide, High Critical Thinking, Low Critical Thinking, Question-Answer Relationship, Teaching Reading*.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31943/wej.v5i2.133

INTRODUCTION

English is an international language. It is essential to master it either in spoken or written form. People should communicate in English when they go abroad to avoid misunderstanding. Moreover, ASEAN communication globalization begins recently. ASEAN People should master English well to compete in the ASEAN globalization era. ASEAN countries negotiate their products or join one another to gain several advantages, mainly to increase their income. They, of course, use English as a means of communication. Indonesian

people have various talents. It should be prepared well for battling in life, mainly for students who are still studying at school. Schools tend to foster their students to improve their ability to learn subjects at school. They provide facilities for their learning as well as possible to obtain the best output.

Reading is one of the skills which the students must master. The skill is related to the implementation of the School-Based Curriculum in comprehending the English materials. The teachers try to facilitate their students to master English through reading comprehension. In the process of reading comprehension, students get involved in comprehending the meaning of the text read. Snow (2002: xiii) stated that the RRSG started its thought by describing the term *reading comprehension* as the activity of simultaneously extracting and creating meaning from interaction and participation with written language.

There are several kinds of text which can be taught at school, particularly at Senior High School. One of them is the hortatory exposition. This text enhances students' reading comprehension and critical thinking, such as giving opinions toward the text conveyed by the writer.

There are several strategies to support the teachers teaching in the classroom. The techniques are used to teach reading, listening, speaking, or writing skills. One of the reading strategies is Question-Answer Relationship (QAR). This strategy is appropriate to enhance students' reading comprehension. Furtado and Pastell (2012: 1) stated that the Question-Answer Relationship (QAR) strategy provides students with tools to decode and understand what they read.

Another strategy used in teaching reading comprehension is Anticipation-Reaction Guide. In this strategy, students need to interpret their thought through the statements stated on the question sheet. They are needed to solve through agreement or even notice. Bean (2003: 8) said that Anticipation-Reaction Guide consists of sequences of messages at the three levels of comprehension-right on the page, thinking and searching, and on your own. Based on the information above, students need to think critically in conveying their thoughts toward the question sheet's statements.

Critical thinking can support students in reading and making notes when reading. Cottrell (2005: 164) said that it is not unusual for people to suspend critical thinking when reading and to make notes. For instance, they often think it is tolerable to read and make notes in a non-selective or non-critical way, collect a collection of notes, and then utilize critical thinking to the messages.

From the elaborated description above, the researcher is interested in researching by the title "The Effectiveness of Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide Strategies for Teaching Reading Hortatory Exposition Texts to Students with High and Low Critical Thinking." The researcher talks about the increase of students' reading comprehension through both strategies. The research includes first and second experimental groups, which receive different treatments from each group. It is expected that students can enhance their reading comprehension through both strategies.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Reading skill is very important to have for people particularly students. People can get more knowledge through reading. They can obtain information by

reading texts or even signs. They have accurate references, cannot avoid reading, and read the news everywhere.

There are four skills in studying English. Reading is one of them. Meanwhile, the kinds of the skill generally are two. They are productive and receptive skills, as explained by Hadfield and Charles (2008: 72). They explained productive skills require students to produce something such as language, such as are writing and speaking.

In contrast, receptive skills such as reading and listening require students to receive and understand the information from the learning materials. So, reading skill requires students to absorb the knowledge from the materials taught.

In the activity of reading comprehension, students are required to respond to a given text in some ways as they try to understand what they are reading. There are some processes in reading comprehension. Firstly, focusing on and retrieve explicitly stated information. Students need to find the information or ideas in the text related to the answer. The information obtained is usually found in a single sentence or phrase. Secondly, making straightforward inferences. Students need to connect two ideas in closed sentences and fill a gap in meaning. They tend to recognize the relationship even though the idea is not stated in the text. Thirdly, interpreting and integrating ideas and information. Their reading comprehension enhances students through their critical thinking or thought. They connect the text with their own knowledge and experience. Fourthly, examining and evaluating the content, language, and textual elements. Students need to organize their understanding of the text genre, structure, and comprehension in language devices.

Students need to actively process what they read to be successful in reading comprehension. They need to be supported by the necessary vocabulary, fluency, and text-appropriate background knowledge. They can expand their understanding through practice with some strategies to monitor their understanding, increase their intrinsic interest in the text, and create objectives and aim for their reading.

There are several activities in getting successful reading comprehension. They are prior knowledge activation, pre-reading, predicting, extending comprehension strategies, and summarizing. There is a student relationship between both the questions and answers of this strategy. Students are encouraged to classify the different kinds and levels of questions such as thinking and searching, right there, my mind questions, and the author and me. It assists them in considering the answers from the text and their background knowledge.

National Behaviour Support Service (NBSS, n.d.: 1) proposed the designs of teaching QAR. The procedures are as follows:

(1) The teacher is Introducing the strategy to the students with the chart of the method. It can help students refer to the strategy.
(2) The teacher is making QAR questions from the small section of text. The questions are usually not more than five sentences. The questions can be taken from four types of QAR questions. They are thinking and searching, right there, on my mind questions, and author and me. Thinking and searching questions can be answered from the pieces of text. Right there questions can be answered from the phrase within one sentence. "Own mind"

questions can be answered from students' prior knowledge. Meanwhile, author and my mind questions can be answered from the text stated indirectly and previous knowledge of students.

(3) The teacher is giving them the example of questions to answer in tiny groups and recognize the QAR levels they used.
(4) The teacher is asking them to work individually to answer the questions and get them to explore the kinds of questions in their textbooks.

Reading cited in Peng (2007: 2) raised two concerns with using QAR. Firstly, QAR was intended to explain question-answer types rather than to determine the correct responses. Secondly, he argues that deciding the nature of the question-answer relationship logically follows the answering of the question rather than preceding it. It can be indicated that QAR can be best regarded as a monitoring tool for readers to receive feedback on their responses.

There are several benefits of a Question-Answer Relationship strategy. The students become aware of what the question is and where it comes from. Students can recognize the types of questions related to the text. They can answer quickly by identifying the types of questions.

Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy engages students in reading. It gives them something to think before reading and something to look for while reading. This strategy also forces them to find evidence for their beliefs. They should think to state their statement of agreement or disagreement. The strategy helps students enhance their thought by providing their arguments towards the comments.

Here are the procedures of an Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy conducted in the classroom proposed by Bouchard (2005: 66):

(1) The teacher is beginning the procedure by classifying three to five significant concepts. They can be explicit or implicit.
(2) The teacher is is writing a short, clear, brief, and declarative sentence for every idea.
(3) The teacher is giving the students a copy of the Anticipation-Reaction Guide before they read the text. They respond to the sentences and check the suitable box, disagree or agree. Then, they talk about their previous reaction and prepare to control themselves. After that, they read the text. They continue to respond to their decision in the first step before reading the text. They compare "before" and "after" responses and talk about any changes in critical thinking.
(4) It can also be conducted in a small cooperative group setting.

There are six core critical thinking skills that students must master in learning English, particularly reading comprehension. They are analysis, evaluation, inference, interpretation, self-regulation, and explanation.

People sometimes refer to the word "argument" as a quarrel or verbal fight, but in critical thinking, an argument can be classified as the reasons supporting a claim. The argument can be either bad or good. A lousy argument fails to show that a closure is worthy of acceptance. Meanwhile, a good argument shows that the closure is worthy of acceptance.

RESEARCH METHOD

The approach of this research is a quantitative study because it deals with counting terms. The design of this study is an experimental one. It focuses on the

effectiveness of Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies in enhancing students' reading comprehension of hortatory exposition texts to high and low students' critical thinking. This study uses a post-test comparison group experimental design to compare the effects of a Question-Answer Relationship to an Anticipation-Reaction Guide on students' reading comprehension.

The population of this research is the students of eleventh grade. They are the second grade level of Senior High School and chosen as the subject of the study. There are 81 students in the eleventh grade of Islamic Private Senior High School *Sultan Agung 3* Semarang in 2014/2015. In the second semester, the School-Based Curriculum contains the genre of hortatory exposition text supporting the research in that level. The sample of the study was *XI-IPS 1*. *It* consists of 26 students, and *XI-IPS 2* consists of 25 students. The first experimental group is *XI-IPS 1* and the second experimental one is *XI-IPS 2*.

The methods in collecting the data of the research are critical thinking level tests, try-out, pretest, treatments, and post-test. The try-out was done in the first step. It was used to determine the validity, reliability, and practicality of the instrument. There were 15 questions of try-out questions administered to students. The form of the test was a reading comprehension test. A Critical thinking test was conducted in the first meeting of the research. The result of the test helped the researcher classify the students into high and low critical thinking. They were asked to rewrite the text which they read by using their own words. The pretest was done in the following meeting. The students had a pretest before they were taught by using Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies. The form of a pretest was in the form of reading comprehension of hortatory exposition text. The treatments were conducted in teaching reading hortatory exposition texts to students of the first experimental group through a Question-Answer Relationship strategy. There were three meetings of the treatments. The treatments were conducted in teaching reading hortatory exposition texts to students of the second experimental group through an Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy. There were three meetings of the treatments. Posttest was conducted. The students had a post-test after they were taught by applying Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies. The form of the post-test was in the form of reading comprehension of hortatory exposition text.

The assessment rubric of critical thinking measures the data acquired from a critical thinking level test. Meanwhile, the data gained from the pretest and post-test were measured by a reading rubric. The data of critical thinking level and post-test were examined by utilizing SPSS 18.0. It is to see the significant difference in students' achievement. The data of study hypotheses 1 to 5 were examined by utilizing an independent sample t-test of SPSS 18.0. Then, the data of study hypothesis 6 were examined by utilizing ANOVA of SPSS 18.0.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Finding

The research begins with the test of critical thinking. Then, the researcher conducted a pretest. The first strategy used in the study was a Question-Answer

Relationship strategy. This strategy was implemented to teach reading hortatory exposition texts to students with high and low critical thinking in the first experimental group. The second strategy applied in this research was an Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy. This strategy was implemented to teach reading hortatory exposition texts to students with high and low critical thinking of the second experimental group. The last step of the research was a post-test. The test of hypothesis is used to answer the questions of research.

The null hypothesis (H_0) 1 indicates no significant difference between Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies in teaching reading hortatory exposition texts. Then, the alternative hypothesis (H_a) 1 shows the significant difference between Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies in teaching reading hortatory exposition texts to students with high and low critical thinking.

Table 1. Independent Samples Test of Hypothesis 1

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Posttest	Equal variances assumed	1.422	.239	3.317	49	.002	11.13385	3.35706	4.38759	17.88011
	Equal variances not assumed			3.296	43.752	.002	11.13385	3.37783	4.32520	17.94250

It indicates that the score of sig (2-tailed) is 0.002. It means that H_0 is denied, and H_a is received. So, there is a significant difference for both Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies implemented in teaching reading hortatory exposition texts to students with high and low critical thinking. The strategy that has a better effect in education reading hortatory exposition texts to students with high and low critical thinking is a Question-Answer Relationship strategy. The mean score of a Question-Answer Relationship strategy is higher Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy is lower.

The null hypothesis (H_0) 2 of the research shows no difference in the effectiveness for both Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies in teaching reading hortatory exposition texts to students with high critical thinking. Then, the alternative hypothesis (H_a) 2 of this research shows that a Question-Answer Relationship strategy is more effective than an Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy in teaching reading hortatory exposition texts to students with high critical thinking.

Table 2. Independent Samples Test of Hypothesis 2

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Post test	Equal variances assumed	.463	.504	.116	21	.909	.54545	4.71270	-9.25513	10.34604
	Equal variances not assumed			.114	18.558	.910	.54545	4.77214	-9.45887	10.54978

It indicates that the score of sig (2-tailed) is 0.909. It means that H_0 is received, but H_a is denied. So, there is no significant difference for both Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies for students with high critical thinking. Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies are equal in the effectiveness of teaching reading hortatory exposition texts to students with high critical thinking. There is no significant difference for both Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies to students with high critical thinking.

The null hypothesis (H_0) 3 of this research shows no difference in the effectiveness for both Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies in teaching reading hortatory exposition texts to students with low critical thinking. Then, the alternative hypothesis (H_a) 3 shows that a Question-Answer Relationship strategy is more effective than an Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy in teaching reading hortatory exposition texts to students with low critical thinking.

Table 3. Independent Samples Test of Hypothesis 3

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Posttest	Equal variances assumed	.291	.594	5.355	26	.000	19.50000	3.64135	12.01510	26.98490
	Equal variances not assumed			5.355	24.899	.000	19.50000	3.64135	11.99896	27.00104

It indicates that the score of sig (2-tailed) is 0.000. It means that H_0 is denied, and H_a is received. So, there is a significant difference for both Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies for students with low critical thinking. Question-Answer Relationship strategy has a better effect than Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy in teaching reading hortatory exposition texts to students with low critical thinking. The mean score of the Question-Answer Relationship strategy is higher than the Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy.

The null hypothesis (H_0) 4 of this research shows no difference in the improvement between students with high and low critical thinking in teaching reading hortatory exposition texts through the Question-Answer Relationship strategy. The alternative hypothesis (H_a) 4 of this research shows students with high critical thinking improve better than students with low critical thinking in teaching reading hortatory exposition texts using the Question-Answer Relationship strategy.

Table 4. Independent Samples Test of Hypothesis 4

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Post Test	Equal variances assumed	.039	.845	.303	24	.764	1.21429	4.00735	-7.05648	9.48505
	Equal variances not assumed			.305	23.884	.763	1.21429	3.97831	-6.99865	9.42723

It indicates that the score of sig (2-tailed) is 0.764. It means that H_0 is received, but H_a is denied. There is no significant difference for both students with high and low critical thinking treated by using a Question-Answer Relationship strategy. Students with low and high critical thinking improve equally treated utilizing the Question-Answer Relationship strategy because there is no significant difference for both students with low and high critical thinking treated by using the Question-Answer Relationship strategy.

The null hypothesis (H_0) 5 of the research shows no difference in the improvement between students with high and low critical thinking in teaching reading hortatory exposition texts using an Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy. The alternative hypothesis (H_a) 5 of the research shows that students with high critical thinking improve more than students with low critical thinking in teaching reading hortatory exposition texts using an Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy.

Table 5. Independent Samples Test of Hypothesis 5

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Post test	Equal variances assumed	1.050	.316	-4.142	23	.000	-17.74026	4.28349	-26.60133	-8.87919
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.947	16.651	.001	-17.74026	4.49508	-27.23921	-8.24131

It indicates that the score of sig (2-tailed) is 0.000. It means that H_0 is denied, and H_a is received. So, there is a significant difference for both students with high and low critical thinking treated by using an Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy. Students with high critical thinking improve better than the

students with low critical thinking treated by using an Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy because the mean score of students with high critical thinking is higher than the students with low critical thinking.

The null hypothesis (H_0) 6 of this research shows no interaction among reading comprehension, teaching strategies, and students' critical thinking in teaching reading hortatory exposition texts to students with high and low critical thinking. Then, the alternative hypothesis (H_a) 6 of this research shows an interaction among reading comprehension, teaching strategies, and students' critical thinking in teaching reading hortatory exposition texts to students with high and low critical thinking.

Table 6. Factorial Design 2x2 with ANOVA Analysis

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	3528.098[a]	3	1176.033	10.859	.000
Intercept	217108.149	1	217108.149	2004.754	.000
Teaching Strategies	1267.174	1	1267.174	11.701	.001
Critical Thinking	861.268	1	861.268	7.953	.007
Teaching Strategies * Critical Thinking	1133.003	1	1133.003	10.462	.002
Error	5089.942	47	108.297		
Total	225395.000	51			
Corrected Total	8618.039	50			

From the table above, it can be known that the P-value of teaching strategies is 0.001. It is lower than α 0.05, which means that H_0 is denied, but H_a is received. It shows a significant difference between Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies on the value of the post-test. The P-value of critical thinking is 0.007. It is lower than α 0.05, which means that H_0 is denied, but H_a is received. It shows a significant difference between students with high and low critical thinking on the post-test. The P-value in teaching strategies*critical thinking is 0.002. It is lower than α 0.05, which means that H_0 is denied, but H_a is received. It shows that there is an interaction for both teaching strategies and critical thinking. From the result above, it can be figured that there is an interaction among reading comprehension, teaching strategies, and students' critical thinking in teaching reading hortatory exposition texts to students with high and low critical thinking.

Discussion

This study aims to determine the effectiveness of Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies in teaching reading hortatory exposition texts to students with high and low critical thinking at Islamic Private Senior High School *Sultan Agung 3* Semarang. There are two groups in this research. The first experimental group is *XI-IPS 1*. A Question-Answer Relationship strategy treats this class. The second experimental group is *XI-IPS 2*. This class is treated using an Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy.

A Critical thinking test was conducted in the first meeting of the research. It was used to classify students with high and low critical thinking. They need to read the text in several minutes. Then, they were asked to rewrite the text that they

had read without looking at the text, meaning that they are asked to use their critical thinking in rewriting the text. The pretest was conducted in the following meeting. The use of pretest was to compare the students' results of high and low critical thinking. It was used before they were treated using Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies and the post-test result after they were treated using Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies.

The researcher, as the teacher, implemented a Question-Answer Relationship strategy for teaching reading hortatory exposition texts in the first experimental group. There were three meetings for teaching the class. The researcher used a Question-Answer Relationship strategy in the teaching process. The researcher, as the teacher, implemented an Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy for teaching reading hortatory exposition texts in the second experimental group. There were three meetings for teaching the class. The researcher used an Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy in the teaching process.

After being treated by the strategies, the students had a post-test. It was used to compare students with high and low critical thinking after they were treated using Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies with the result of pretest before they were treated using Question-Answer Relationship Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies. The sample of the research was taken for a test in statistics. It was used to know the standard deviation, median, mean, minimum score, and maximum score.

Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for one sample in SPSS 18.0 was applied to identify the normality test data in pretest and post-test. The P-values in the normality of the pretest in the experimental group one in pretest are 0.939 and 0.874. The P-values are higher than α 0.05. Then, The P-values for the experimental group two in the pretest are 0.973 and 0.755. They are higher than α 0.05. It can be figured that the data in the experimental group one and two in the pretest have a normal distribution. The normality of the post-test shows that the first experimental group post-test P-values are 0.989 and 0.703. They are higher than α 0.05. The P-values in the post-test of an experimental group two are 0.997 and 0.866. The P-values are higher than α 0.05. It can be described that the data of the experimental group one and two in the post-test have a normal distribution.

Levene's test is used to analyze the data of homogeneity test in pretest and post-test. Based on the homogeneity test of the pretest, it indicates that P-value is 0.392. It shows that P-value is higher than α 0.05, which means that H_0 is received, but H_a is denied. It can be figured that the data of the pretest are homogeneous. Based on the homogeneity test of the post-test, it shows that P-value is 0.344. It shows that P-value is higher than α 0.05, it means that H_0 is received, but H_a is denied. It can be figured that the data of post-test are homogeneous. In analyzing the first question, the value of sig (2-tailed) in the post-test result of Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide Strategies to students with high and low critical thinking is 0.002 H_0 is rejected, and H_a is accepted. So, there is a significant difference between Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies implemented in teaching reading hortatory exposition texts to students with high and low critical thinking. The strategy that has a better effect in teaching reading to students with high and low critical thinking is a Question-Answer Relationship

strategy. The mean score of a Question-Answer Relationship strategy is higher than an Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy.

From the second research question, the value of sig (2-tailed) in a post-test on Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies is 0.909. It means that H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected. So, there is no significant difference between Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies for students with high critical thinking. Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies are equal in the effectiveness of teaching reading hortatory exposition texts to students with high critical thinking. There is no significant difference between Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies to students with high critical thinking.

From the third research question, the value of sig (2-tailed) in a post-test on Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide to low critical thinking students is 0.000. H_0 is denied, but H_a is received. So, there is a significant difference between Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies for students with low critical thinking. Question-Answer Relationship strategy has a better effect than Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy in teaching reading hortatory exposition texts to low critical thinking students. The mean score of the Question-Answer Relationship strategy is higher than the Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy.

From the fourth research question, the value of sig (2-tailed) in a post-test of high and low critical thinking students who are treated using the Question-Answer Relationship strategy is 0.764. It means that H_0 is received, and H_a is denied. So, there is no significant difference for both students with high and low critical thinking treated applying a Question-Answer Relationship strategy. Students with high and low critical thinking improve equally by using the Question-Answer Relationship strategy because there is no significant difference for both students with high and low critical thinking treated applying the Question-Answer Relationship strategy.

Based on the fifth study question, the value of sig (2-tailed) in a post-test of high and low critical thinking students who are treated using the Anticipation-Reaction Guide Strategy is 0.000. It means that H_0 is denied, and H_a is received. So, there is a significant difference for both students with high and low critical thinking treated by applying an Anticipation Reaction Guide strategy. The students with high critical thinking improve better than the students with low critical thinking treated by using an Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy because the mean score of students with high critical thinking is higher than the students with low critical thinking.

Related to the sixth research question, the P-value of teaching strategies is 0.001. It is lower than α 0.05, it means that H_0 is denied, but H_a is received. It shows a significant difference between Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies on the value of the post-test. The P-value of critical thinking is 0.007. It is lower than α 0.05, which means that H_0 is denied, but H_a is received. It shows a significant difference for both students with high and low critical thinking on the post-test result. The P-value in teaching strategies*critical thinking is 0.002. It is lower than α 0.05, which means that H_0

is denied, but H_a is received. It shows that there is an interaction for both the strategies of teaching and critical thinking. There is an interaction among reading comprehension, the strategies of teaching, and critical thinking.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

There are six findings of the study. Firstly, the strategy that effectively teaches reading hortatory exposition texts to high and low critical thinking students is a Question-Answer Relationship strategy. The mean score of a Question-Answer Relationship strategy is higher than an Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy. Secondly, Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies are equal in the effectiveness of teaching reading hortatory exposition texts to high critical thinking students. There is no significant difference for both Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies to students with high critical thinking. Thirdly, a Question-Answer Relationship strategy has a better effect than an Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy in teaching reading hortatory exposition texts to low essential students of thinking. The mean score of a Question-Answer Relationship strategy is higher than an Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy. Fourthly, the students with high and low critical thinking improve equally by applying the Question-Answer Relationship strategy because there is no significant difference for both students with high and low critical thinking treated by applying the Question-Answer Relationship strategy. Fifthly, the students with high critical thinking improve better than the students with low critical thinking treated by using an Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategy because the mean score of students with high critical thinking is higher than the students with low critical thinking. Sixthly, there is an interaction among reading comprehension, teaching strategies, and critical thinking.

There are suggestions for other researchers. The other researchers should do the other research dealing with the implementation of Question-Answer Relationship and Anticipation-Reaction Guide strategies to gain the more precise results of the research. They also should do further research related to critical thinking on reading. The focus is on hortatory exposition texts to obtain deeper findings.

REFERENCES

Aloqaili, A. S. 2012. The Relationship between Reading Comprehension and Critical Thinking: A Theoretical Study. *Journal of King Saud University-Languages and Translation*. 24: 35-41.

Alyousef, H. S. 2006. Teaching Reading Comprehension to ESL/EFL Learners. *Journal of Language and Learning.* 5 (1): 63-73.

Bean, T. W. 2003. *Using Young-Adult Literature to Enhance Comprehension in the Content Areas.* Naperville: Learning Point Associates.

Bouchard, M. 2005. *Comprehension Strategies for English Language Learners*. New York: Scholastic. Inc.

Brown, H. D. 2004. *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Pearson Education.

Cohen, L et al. 2007. *Research Methods in Education Sixth Edition.* New York: Routledge.

Cottrell, S. 2005. *Critical Thinking Skills: Developing Effective Analysis and Argument.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dagostino, L et al. 2014. Assessment of Reading Comprehension Instrument as It Relates to Cognitive Abilities as Defined by Bloom's Revised Taxonomy. *Current Issues in Education Journal.* 17 (1): 1-15.

Dawson, C. 2007. *A Practical Guide to Research Methods: a User-Friendly Manual for Mastering Research Techniques and Projects Third Edition*. Oxford: How to Books.

Fard, H. M and Nikou, F. R. 2014. The Effect of Question-Answer Relationship (QAR) Strategy on First Grade High School EFL Students' Reading Comprehension. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW).* 7 (2): 300-312.

Furtado, L and Pastell, H. 2012. Question Answer Relationship Strategy Increases Reading Comprehension among Kindergarten Students. *Applied Research in English Journal*. 1 (1): 1-19.

Gay, L. R et al., 2011. *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications.* Trenton: Pearson Education.

Goddard, W, and Stuart, M. 2001. *Research Methodology: An Introduction Second Edition*. Lansdowne: JUTA.

Hadfield, J, and Charles, H. 2008. *Oxford Basic: Introduction to Teaching English.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hartono, R. 2005. *Genres of Texts*. Semarang: English Department Faculty of Languages and Arts, Semarang State University.

Hatch, E. and Farhady, H. 1982. *Research Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics*. London: Newbury House Publisher.

Judge, B et al. 2009. *Critical Thinking Skills for Education Students*. Exeter: Learning Matters Ltd.

Knapp, P, and Megan, W. 2005. *Genre, Text, Grammar: Technologies for Teaching and Assessing Writing*. Sydney: A UNSW Press Book.

Kozen et al. 2006. Increasing All Students' Change to Achieve: Using and Adapting Anticipation Guides with Middle School Learners. *Intervention in School and Clinic.* 41 (4): 195-200.

Kucer, S. B. 2009. *Dimension of Literacy: A Conceptual Base for Teaching Reading and Writing in School Settings Third Edition*. New York: Routledge.

Lykins, E. 2011. *Question-Answer Relationship EL*. http://free2read. wikispaces.com / Question-Answer+Relationships+EL (Retrieved on September 28, 2015).

Maezun, K. 2011. *Contoh Teks Hortatory Exposition*. http://khampuse.blogspot.com/2011 /04/contoh-teks-hortatory-exposition.html (Retrieved on March 11, 2015).

Muijs, D. 2004. *Doing Quantitative Research in Education: with SPSS*. London: Sage Publications.

National Behaviour Support Service. *Question-Answer Relationship (QAR): Reading and Learning Strategy-After Reading Strategy*. http://www. nbss. ie/sites/default/files/publications/qar_strategy_handout.pdf (Retrieved on January 19, 2015).

Parr, C, and Vear, W. 2013. Reading Comprehension Strategy Instruction in a First-Year Course: an Instructor's Self-Study. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. 4 (2): 1-19.

Peng Swee Goh, G. R et al. 2007. Impact of Question-Answer Relationships on Reading Comprehension. *Pei Chun Public School and Marymount Convent Ministry of Education*. 1-19.

Raphael, T. E and Au, K. H. 2005. QAR: Enhancing Comprehension and Test Taking Across Grades and Content Areas. *International Reading Association*. 206-221.

Rustipa, K. (n.d). *Genre Analysis on English Learners' Hortatory Expositions*. http://download.portalgaruda.org/article.php?article=7806&val=553(Retrieved on January 19, 2015).

Schick, T. Jr and Lewis, V. 2005. *How to Think About Weird Things: Critical Thinking for A New Age Fourth Edition*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Snow, C. 2002. *Reading for Understanding: Toward a Research and Development Program in Reading Comprehension.* Pittsburgh: RAND Education.

Tilus, G. 2012. *6 Critical Thinking Skills You Need to Master Now*. http://www.rasmussen.edu/student-life/blogs/main/critical-thinking-skills-you-need-to-master-now/ (Retrieved on September 10, 2015).

Utama, D. A. 2014. *Contoh Teks Hortatory Exposition Bahasa Inggris*. http://diyoalifutama.blogspot.com/2014/02/contoh-teks-hortatory exposition-bahasa.html (Retrieved on March 11, 2015).

Wang, D. 2006. What Can Standardized Reading Tests Tell Us? Question-Answer Relationship and Students' Performance. *Journal of College Reading and Learning* 32 (2): 21-37.