

Application of Reader Response in Literary Pedagogy: A Case Study of English Literature Classroom at a Public Sector University, Pakistan

Musaib Junejo¹, Tania Shabir Shaikh¹

¹M.Phil. Scholar and Teaching Assistant at University of Sindh Jamshoro
Corresponding author's email: musaib.junejo@scholars.usindh.edu.pk

Abstract

The current study aims to analyze the application of reader response theory in literature classrooms. It focuses on the potential reader response teachers at a public sector university, Pakistan and their questioning practices in classrooms based on Probst's (1994) suggested model. Probst (1994) has given five model generic questions for reader response teachers. For this purpose a sample of three teachers of English Literature has been picked up through non probability purposive sampling method. Data is collected through recorded systematic class observation where focus was on the questions asked by the teachers. Substantial amount of literature related to reader response theory and its application in classroom is also discussed which supports the findings of this research. Through observation of teachers' classes and analysis of data, researchers advocate the use of reader response teaching methods in literature classrooms at university level. The Study further concludes that the types of questions, teachers ask impact hugely the understanding of students. Data indicates that a classroom can only be reader response when students are given space, freedom and are encouraged to discuss and give answers of open ended questions. Study also suggests, teachers' training and academic excellence also affect the degree to which a class can be reader response. So, it is necessary that teachers should be aware of reader response methods and the ways of its application in the classroom.

Keywords: *Reader Response; Literary Pedagogy; Literature Classroom.*

1. Introduction

Reader response theory RRT emerged in the latter half of the 20th century and since then it has been used by critics to interpret literary texts. The proponents of the theory deny the presence of any central authority in the meaning making process. Instead they encourage multiple interpretations form readers based on their subjective thoughts (Probst, 1994; Rosenblatt, 1994). So, the ideas of lack of central authority and multiple subjective interpretations that RRT focuses on were gaining ground in 1980's. This burgeoning scope and importance inspired educationists and scholars to use it in classrooms as well. In this regard various critics and practitioners came with new techniques for using RRT in literature classrooms. Probst (1994) advocates the use of reader response theory in literature classrooms. His ideas mostly focus on role and position of a teacher. According to Probst (1994), the aim of literature classes is not to develop literary scholars and critics but thinkers that can read and interpret independently. In this regard he devised five model generic questions for the guidance of reader response teachers. These model questions can be helpful in assessing the teachers' questioning practices and strategies in literature classrooms.

Before the emergence of RRT in literary pedagogy, students were rarely asked to bring their personal responses to what they are discussing or writing (Pearson, 2014; Yang, 2002). Probst (1994) puts forward his theory on Reader response criticism in which he gives importance to the transaction between the text and the reader. He emphasized that the transaction with the textual elements and signs stimulate areas of consciousness where the readers' responses are constituted by and constitute reading. While reading a literary text, the transactional process stimulates the life experiences of the readers that are very much influenced by their socio-cultural or political context. Hence, literary texts bring some concepts, ideas or experiences that readers can easily relate to their own life experiences and observations. They identify themselves in characters or in the storyline. This may influence the reading transaction and also the meaning-making process. Hence readers are active constructors of meaning in literary texts. Thus, the domain of reader response criticism focuses primarily on readers' responses to literary texts. It emphasizes on the role of the readers and their

relation with the text for generating meaning. Benton (2006) also constructs an argument that the text cannot have a meaningful existence outside the relationship between itself and its reader(s). Flynn (2007) also reflects that it is the reader who gives life and meaning to a text. Otherwise the words are just black marks on white pages. It is the reader who selects and synthesizes ideas into new experience (Chua, 1997) and transforms ink spots into meaningful symbols. We cannot talk about the meaning of a text without consideration of the readers' contribution to it (Selden, 2013).

Without the application of RRT in literature classes, the teachers focus on how students better answer questions related to themes and text of literary work and that had made them astray (Flynn, 2007). When it comes to responses, the teachers are concerned more about learning academic responses rather than their own reflections. The teaching approach do not allow participants the freedom to express the meanings they have created as they have read the play. In such context, teachers should focus on how to express an interpretation rather than formulating one (Probst, 1994). Teachers of literature must inspire a love of learning among students for better literary exploration and to develop their literary tastes. Students' responses must be welcomed rather than wanting them to see the same layers of meaning in a text that they have seen. But unfortunately, students are still forced to agree with teachers, critics and writers' understanding of a text. They are hardly ever asked to develop personal relation or produce opinions between them as readers and literary texts they are reading. Teachers and students have inculcated in their minds that there is just one correct explanation or interpretation of a literary work. They think that understanding authors' intention behind writing and including a character and a scene in literary work should only be focused. Therefore they are unable to critically think and relate literary experience to.

Reader response critics disagree with the idea of a rigid and fixed meaning of a literary text. Instead they believe that meaning lies beyond the text and author (Probst, 1994; Rosenblatt, 1994; Iser, 1978). According to them when a student reads a poem, novel or short story they create personal interpretations by answering the questions with their own individual experiences. In addition, RRT critics believe that teacher centered approach where just lectures are preferred over student participation and discussion causes trouble in application of reader response theory in classroom. According to them, reader response teachers always encourage critical thinking and individual interpretation of literary works. Probst (1994) also favors the idea by commenting that students should be given opportunities to come up with their literary interpretations. This way they learn the best way to explore the world represented in literary texts.

Considering the significance of reader response in literature classes, this study explores the teachers' behavior in literature classrooms at a public sector university in Pakistan with respect to their questioning practices. The study uses Probst's (1994) model questions as criteria to evaluate the teachers' questions and their conformity with RRT practices in literature classrooms. In this regard, it will be useful to have a look at the already existing research on reader response theory and its application in literature classroom.

1.1. Research Question

How the teachers of literature employ reader response questioning techniques in English literature classrooms at a public sector university, Pakistan?

2. Literature Review

Reader response theory emerged in 1930's as a reaction against prevailing phenomenon that reader is a passive agent in the meaning making process. But later on this reaction was theorized and systematized in 1970's and took a form of a theory. Modern version of reader response criticism is basically a reaction to authoritative new criticism and formalism where reader is very much reduced and meaning is considered purely objective and fixed (Goldstein, 2005). As a critical approach, reader response theory emerged as a reaction to New Criticism, emphasizing the authority of the text over the reader in the creation of meaning. Reader response criticism views the reader and the text as partners in the interpretative process. It centers on the reciprocal interplay between the reader and the text. Thus, the text is not exclusively the creator of meaning but the reader is also the part of the process (Probst, 1994; Rosenblatt, 1938/1994).

Reader response considers reader as an active agent in meaning making process, where he creates meaning through his own interpretation. Furthermore, reader response criticism is not a unified single theory, but a collection of ideas from different scholars who disagree to one another on the way in which reader creates meaning (Tompkins, 1980). In this regard Lobo (2013) also favors the active role of readers in literary transaction. Bressler (2003) also comments that meaning is created by an interpretative interaction of the text and the reader. Bressler thinks that even punctuation marks such as comma, full stop and hyphen also affect the way in which meaning is created. Tompkin (1980) comes up with his idea that a reader reacts to literary

texts in a similar way he reacts to his past and present life events, therefore literary interpretation varies from man to man and time to time. So, according to Tompkin meaning making process is purely personal and subjective. Rosenblatt (1994) further adds that while reading a literary text, the transactional process stimulates the life experiences of the readers that are very much influenced by their socio-cultural or political context. Hence, literary texts bring some concepts, ideas or experiences that readers can easily relate to their own life experiences and observations. They identify themselves in characters or in the storyline. This may influence the reading transaction and also the meaning-making process. For Langer (1994), meaning is always fluctuating and fluid. She thinks that reader creates meaning out of his religious, social and political affiliations. Thus interpretation of a reader at one point of time can be different if not opposite to the interpretation of same reader of same work at different point of time. Therefore she calls reading “exploring horizon of possibilities”. Furthermore, there are many theorists who connect reader response to Marxism, feminism, and psychoanalysis (Schweickart, 1990). If we take example of Feminist reader response critics, they believe that difference of gender affects interpretation of a text. Men’s interpretation of text authored by woman is different from women’s interpretation of the same.

3. Proponents of Reader Response Criticism

There are different models of reader response theory with their distinct focal points. Stanley Fish (1938) proposed his model of Affective stylistic reader response theory. Whereas, Subjective reader response theory, led by David Bleich, Norman (1979) talks about feelings, emotional response and evocation of memories in relation to the literary text under reading. Holland (1968) is the precursor of Psychological reader response theory that explores how the reader identifies with the character or the story and temporarily relieves his own psychological struggles. This copes with the effect of the text on the reader's mind, focusing on “What the interpretations of the readers reveal about them, not about the text” (Holland, 1968). Whereas, Wolfgang Iser developed Phenomenological reader response theory that emphasizes upon the study of the objects as they appear in people’s experiences. It focuses on the perceiver and perception process over the text. In Iser’s (1978) view, a literary text contains a number of gaps or indeterminate elements which the reader must fill by active engagement with the text. He observes that meaning evolves through the convergence of the text and the reader, as the active reader fills the gaps by exercising his imagination.

3.1. Theoretical Framework

The current study is guided by Probst (1994) model of Reader Response Theory. Robert Probst (1994) is known for his approach where RRT is used in literature classrooms. Interestingly, he relates RRT with classroom literary pedagogy and focuses on teachers and their behaviors in classrooms (Langer, 1994). Probst (1994) thinks that if someone accepts a job of a teacher then it is for him to ensure that students be able to think and feel the literature they are reading and to allow students to have an efferent transaction with the literary texts. Purpose of literature classrooms is not to create scholars and critics but independent readers and thinkers. (Shelton, 1994) Teachers enter in classrooms with preconceived meaning of the text but in actual meaning neither resides in text nor in student or critic’s mind, but it is created and recreated by the act of reading in the given situation (Probst, 1994). A literary work can instigate emotions, trigger memories and awaken thoughts in students while reading that an author, critic or teacher can’t predict in advance. Probst (1994) then talks about six goals of reading literature. 1. To learn about oneself 2. To learn about others 3. To learn about society and culture 4. To be able to know how text works and shapes thought 5. To learn how context creates meaning 6. To learn how meaning is created with interaction of all these forces. Probst has devised these six objectives of a literature classes for not only students but also for teachers. Furthermore, he talks about importance of questions in a literature classroom. He argues that teachers’ questions decide the degree to which a classroom can be reader response. Questions are raised to help students critically think and support their understanding rather than restrict.

3.2. The Role of Teacher in Reader Response

Students are at the center of reading response classroom therefore, teacher’s role is limited. He is the one who should commence the discussion and then allow students to take charge of it. So, he just works as a facilitator. Teachers need to control and guide the discussion according to students’ academic level and experience. The role of teachers in reader response classrooms is to create thinkers (Probst, 1994) Rosenblatt also talks about role of teacher in reader response classroom. According to him role of teacher in a classroom is to enable learners to make intellectual judgments related to literature they are reading (Rosenblatt, 1993) He further argues that teacher must be able to empower students to translate work under reading according to their life which is outside of classroom.

3.3. *Research Design*

As the research aims to define and describe the questioning practices of teachers in classroom therefore, it uses empirical qualitative methods for the collection and analysis of data. Creswell (2012) defines empirical research as way of gaining information through observation, experiment and empirical evidences. It can imply qualitative as well as quantitative methods. According to Bryman (2012), “qualitative research is a research strategy that usually emphasizes words rather than quantification in the collection and analysis of data” (P, 380). Kumar (2012) defines qualitative research as, research which focuses to discover understand, and clarify perceptions, feelings beliefs and values of people. Furthermore, this research follows five steps of qualitative data collection propounded by Creswell (2012). Firstly, identifying site, participants and sampling technique secondly, gaining access to site and participants through permission thirdly, prioritizing data according research questions fourthly, choosing instruments and designing protocols for data collection, and finally collecting data with focus on ethical issues.

3.4. *Research Instruments*

The study analyzes classes of two English teachers at University of Sindh, Jamshoro. For this purpose structured observation has been used as a data collection method. Structured observation can also be called systematic observation. Structured observation is practice of employing already formulated rules for recording behavior. (Creswell, 2012). Structured observation helps researchers remain focused to his set goals and data collected is also more relevant and pure. Bryman (2012) prefers usage of observation as data collection method. According to him, it is more useful observing peoples’ behavior directly rather than relying on instruments such as questionnaires. He further adds, in specific conditions such as studying behavior of teachers and recording interaction between students and teachers, structured observation is very helpful. Creswell (2012) also talks about the advantages of this method. He argues that, through this form of data collection individual’s real behavior is recorded rather than his perceptions and views. Keeping all these things in mind researchers have used structured observation as data collection instrument. Observation has been done with the help of various instruments which include note taking and tape recording.

3.5. *Sampling*

For the purpose of research, sample of two English literature teachers from University of Sindh was picked through purposive sampling. According to Bryman (2012) qualitative research mostly entails purposive sampling of some kind. Cohen, Manion & Morrison, (2013) define purposive sampling as a kind of non-probability sampling where researchers choose participants from the population relying on his own judgment keeping research questions in mind. Process of selecting sample deliberately according to objectives of research is called purposive sampling. (Kumar, 2012). So, keeping qualitative empirical research design in mind purposive sampling is used to select two teachers from population. The teachers were males, one was having English poetry and other was having English prose as their teaching subjects. Four classes of each teacher were observed and in total eight, over a time period of fifteen days. During class observation, questions were noted and in addition recorded for authenticity and reliability. It is important to note here that, only the questions asked by the concerned teachers of literature and those which were related to textual material under study were focused and noted. In addition, selected sample is representative of the target population. The number was kept small as the target was rich data not generalizability (Ritchie, Lewis and Elam, 2003).

3.6. *Selected Framework*

The data obtained through observation of classrooms consisted of teachers’ question. The researchers then organized and categorized random questions (data) based on its adherence to Probst’s model questions. Probst in his famous article “Reader Response Theory and English Curriculum” published in 1994, suggested generic model questions to analyze reader response classrooms. He argues that teachers’ questions decide the degree to which a classroom can be reader response. Questions are raised to help students critically think and support their understanding rather than restrict. So, the researchers will relate and compare the questions asked by teacher A and B in their respective classes with the questions devised by Probst in order to reach conclusion. Probst’s (1994) suggested generic model questions are given below:

- Q.1. Asks students to focus on what took place in their minds as they read: Read the text and record what happens as you read-What do you remember, feel, question, see...?
-

- Q.2. Encourages students to concentrate on what was going on in the text what did you see happening in the text? What image was called to mind by the text? Upon what did you focus most intently as you read-what word, phrase, image, idea? What is the most important word in the text?
- Q.3. Asks students to compare their reading with those of other students: Please discuss your readings with your partner/ group. Did the text call to mind different memories, thoughts feelings?
- Q.4. Asks students to reflect on the context of the reading (classroom setting and related works) Does this text call to mind any other literary work? What is the connection?
- Q.5. Asks students to consider how meaning has evolved: How did your understanding of the text or your feelings about it change as you talked? How did you respond to it?

Probst's questions give us the basis to determine and analyze the data. These questions are used as criteria to decide that whether noted and recorded questions (data) are reader response in nature. Research will consider the two teachers' questions (data) in terms of their adherence to Probst's suggested model questions.

4. Findings

Teacher A: Teacher A asked several question in his classes. But the researchers did not find any of his question which can be related to Probst's question 1. Later, during teaching essays of Charles Lamb and Matthew Arnold, teacher A guided students to read the text, then he asked some questions. These can be linked to Probst's model question 2.

- "Which words and phrases you liked the most during textual study of essays?"
- "What is the structure and style of Lamb's essay?"
- "What do words Barbarian, philistine and populace mean? Did you ever use these words previously?"

These questions can't be categorized as purely reader response in nature as they just focus on text and style of essay. But researchers have placed these questions as reader response, due to their open-endedness and close relation to Probst model question 2-which focuses on text of literature under reading.

Besides this, Teacher A asked multiple questions which correspond to Probst's question 4. Probst's question 4 talks about context of the literary works. In that question students are emphasized to connect literary work with their surroundings and to other literary works they went through in past. After reading Matthew Arnold's and Charles Lamb's essays, Teacher A asked following questions.

- "Where do we see three classes Barbarian, Philistine and populace today in our society?"
- "Majority of upper class is considered as barbarian by Arnold, what will you say in the light of your experience with upper class in your society?"
- "Can you think of related examples in society?"
- "How can idea of class by Matthew Arnold be compared to idea of class by Karl Marx?"
- "How Lamb's essays differs from that of Bacon's that you studied in your first semester?"

The above mentioned questions asked by Teacher A are categorized as reader response by the researchers. These questions were inviting students to make connections to their personal experience and previously acquired knowledge. These question also forced students to connect and study literary work in relation to the habitat.

After categorizing reader response questions from Teacher A, following is a series of questions, which the researchers will not categorize as reader response because of their deviation from Probst's model questions They are less open and more teacher oriented.

- "What do you know about life and works of Matthew Arnold?"
- "What are the characteristics of Victorian literature according to Hudson?"
- "Which class Arnold belongs to? Barbarian, philistine or populace?"
- "How will you apply Marxism to essays of Matthew Arnold?"
- "What lamb mean by young African's of our own generation?"

- “What is Lamb’s writing style?”
- “What are the elements of romanticism in Lamb’s essays?”
- “What are the autobiographical elements in the essay?”

Concluding the discussion regarding Teacher A, we can say that according to Probst’s model he asked few reader response questions. His questions are in accordance to only two questions of Probst- 1 and 4. We don’t find any question in his classes which can be linked to Probst model question 1, 3, and 5. But, researchers think that Teacher A wanted to facilitate class discussion but his way of questioning was not appropriate. Mostly questions were related to author and his intention, age in which he lived, and the linguistic elements of text. So, there were few chances of progression of discussion in the class. Researchers recommend that Teacher A can direct his class to more reader response by improving his questioning skills by reducing asking author and text based questions.

Teacher B: Teacher B’s questions correspond with all five model questions of Probst. His questions are more organized, open ended and student centered. Teacher B was teaching poetry in his classes. After reading poem "Love among the Ruins" by Robert Browning, Teacher C asked the following questions these are parallel to Probst's model question 1.

- "What author wants to tell you through this poem? How story of poem fascinates you?"
- “How you perceive this poem?”
- "What do you see? What this poem is about?"
- As you read Love among Ruins, what kind of questions would you like to ask the author about his poem?"
- “Which do you like the least about poem?"

These questions can be categorized under Probst question 1. These questions evoke students to come up with their initial understanding of the poem in comfortable atmosphere. Teacher B starts an activity by instructing students to write the answers of these questions. He says them to do free writing. This shows that students had more freedom to express their thoughts without any fear of language mistakes. Teacher B then initiates discussion among students by writing these questions on board. Groups of three and four students shared their written opinion and then discussed one another’s stance. After students finished discussion, teacher B asked one student from each group to answer the questions. In this way Teacher B uncovers how individual student understands text, makes educated judgment and relates his understanding with others.

Probst's model question 1 then leads to question 2. The first question deals with individual thinking and the second with linguistic textual interpretation. Teacher B asked several questions while teaching Browning’s “Love among the ruins” and TS Eliot’s “Hollow Man” that correspond with Probst question 2. Some questions are given below.

- “What first comes in your mind when see the title of poems?”
- “When shape of a hollow man comes in your mind, when you read the poem?”
- “What figures of speeches are used in both poems?”
- "Which are your favorite lines from the poem Hollow Man?"
- “What should we focus more, style and structure or the subject matter and themes of poems?”

As we already discussed that teacher B will assign students to do free writing. Then he will make groups of students for discussion before a general class discussion. In this regard, Probst question 3 is related to interaction of students with one another and with teacher. Here, teacher B asked some questions after discussion which correspond to Probst’s question 3. Referring to students in a classroom teacher B asked:

- “How your interpretation of text is different from another student’s in your group?”
- “What are your feelings towards the character in Browning’s “Love among the ruins?”

The discussion and explanation of these two poems continued in other classes as well. In that time Teacher B’s questions were recorded and noted down. In these questions Teacher B frequently insisted students to

connect the poems with their previous reading and with outside society. Here are some questions that are contextual and correspond to Probst question 4.

- "What else have you read about Browning?"
- "Compare Browning's poem with that of any Sindhi/Urdu poet?"
- "Have you ever read Eliot before?"
- "What are the prominent themes in the poems?"
- "How you will compare both Love among the ruins and Hollow Man?"
- "What do you think about the title of poem?"
- "Did that title surprise you?"
- "He addresses us as hollow man. Why?"

Before winding up and moving on to other poems, Teacher B asked some question which researchers think are parallel to Probst question 5. These question ask about final understanding of poems. They refer to change in their behavior and thinking after finishing these poems. These question also try to measure the extent to which their pre reading understanding and meaning has shifted during course of study. But we see, at the end of topic teacher B has mostly shifted from open to close ended questions. His question which correspond with Probst's question five are close ended. Here are these questions:

- "Do you think these two poems will impact the understanding of upcoming poems?"
- "Do you think others understanding of poem has affected your understanding?"
- "What is the difference in your earlier and later interpretation of poems?"

Teacher B's way of teaching and managing class is linked to and associated with reader response theory. He not only asks questions but also initiates discussion, and free writing activities. Teacher B, incorporated all of the Probst's model questions into his classroom. Teacher B's questioning style was congruent with reader response practices. He properly used reader response pedagogy in his classroom and appeared comfortable with it as well. He did not have preconceived questions and answers in his mind. His class questions were coming out in a form of chain reaction according to class atmosphere. So, both the teachers varied in number of questions asked which adhered to Probst's model reader response questions.

5. Discussion

Observation of classrooms provided abundant and diverse results regarding reader response theory in English classroom at University of Sindh. Two teachers under observation varied in their extent of being reader response. Both the teachers had their unique teaching pattern, as they have their individual personalities. Researchers discover that, Teacher B is a reader response in his approach but Teacher A is not. Researchers unexpectedly found that few years ago Teacher B went to England for his post doctorate and was more experienced than teacher A. Therefore, it is evident that teachers' compliance to reader response techniques was result of their experience and academic excellence. Now, questioning style of both teachers is summarized below.

Teacher A, frequently asked questions that were more textual and less contextual. Results suggest that teacher A's questions were parallel to only two model questions of Probst. Despite of this, teacher A's questions were critical in nature but he only appreciated answers that were proven by textual references. So, the original text was the center of discussion in his classes and questions revolved around that. Teacher A did not accepted involvement of personal experiences, and emotions of students in interpretation of literature. Students were always asked to justify answers by referring to text or in sometimes by a comment of critic. In addition, teacher A asked questions which encouraged students to use literary theories such as Marxism, and romanticism on the works under study. These questions can be highly critical but not reader response. As Purves says, higher order critical questions can't encourage multidimensional emotional responses that are necessary to grasp literature. (Purves, 1991) Too many critical questions drifts you from original personal taste. Reader response critics indicate that students' personal and emotional involvement is very necessary to understand literature. To conclude, teacher A's level of questions was high but they were not reader response.

As mentioned earlier, Teacher B strongly adhered to the practices of reader response in his classes. He encouraged students to do free writing, form groups, discusses things, arise questions, and compare personal

interpretations. He also suggested students to use natural language and express personal and emotional responses to literature while answering. In addition, his questions were more open and invited students' perception rather than teacher, text, or critic's. We see that his questions are mostly open and correspond to all five Probst's model reader response questions. Besides, there was no single correct answer of his questions. Therefore, students were free to answer without fear that their answer might be incorrect. Beach and Marshall support this practice. According to them teachers who adhere to reader response practices, induce more learning of the literature classrooms (Beach & Marshall, 1991). So, according to researchers, teacher B's questions were strongly reader response and he managed class by using reader response pedagogy.

6. Conclusion

The current study has analyzed the application of reader response theory in literature classrooms. It focused on the potential reader response teachers at a public sector university, Pakistan and their questioning practices in classrooms based on Probst's (1994) suggested model. Probst (1994) has given five model generic questions for reader response teachers. For this purpose a sample of two teachers of English Literature has picked up through non probability purposive sampling method. Data is collected through recorded systematic class observation where focus was on the questions asked by the teachers. Substantial amount of literature related to reader response theory and its application in classroom is also discussed which supports the findings of this research. Through observation of teachers' classes and analysis of data, researchers advocate the use of reader response teaching methods in literature classrooms at university level. The findings of the study reveal that the types of questions, teachers ask impact hugely the understanding of students. Data indicates that a classroom can only be reader response when students are given space, freedom and are encouraged to discuss and give answers of open ended questions. Study also suggests, teachers' training and academic excellence also affect the degree to which a class can be reader response. So, it is necessary that teachers should be aware of reader response methods and the ways of its application in the classroom.

The findings recommend teachers to be aware of new trends in teaching methodology. Moreover, giving students freedom and asking them to relate literary work with their personal experience and background can be helpful. Teachers now must understand that, a literary work has no single interpretation that can be called correct, but there are multiple. Therefore, every interpretation that comes from students holds some ground. Thus, researchers recommend and advocate use of reader response in University English literature classrooms.

6. REFERENCES

- Aker, D. (1992). "From runned to ran: one journey toward a critical literacy, *Journal of reading*, 36(2): 104-112
- Beach, R., & Marshall, J. (1991). *Teaching Literature in the Secondary School*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 6277 Sea Harbor Dr., Orlando, FL 32887.
- Benton, M. (2003). Reader-Response Criticism. In *International companion encyclopedia of children's literature* (pp. 81-98). Routledge.
- Benton, M. (2006). Readers, texts, contexts: Reader-response criticism. In *Understanding children's literature* (pp. 96-112). Routledge.
- Bressler, C. (2003). *Literary Criticism: an introduction to theory and practice*, Prentice Hall Press, New Jersey.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods*. Oxford university press.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2013). *Research methods in education*. Routledge publishers.
- Chua, S. H. (1997). The reader response approach to the teaching of literature. *National Institute of Education: Singapore. REACT* (1), 29-34.
- Creswell John, W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Published by Pearson Education, Inc.
- Fish, S. (1970). Literature in the reader: Affective stylistics. *New literary history*, 2(1), 123-162.
- Flynn, E. A. (2007). Reconsiderations: Louise Rosenblatt and the ethical turn in literary theory. *College English*, 70(1), 52.
- Goldstein, P. (2005). *Reader Response Theory and Criticism*, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Holland, N. N. (1975). Unity identity text self. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 813-822.
- Holland, N. N. (1998). Reader-response criticism. *International journal of psycho-analysis*, 79, 1203-1211.

- Hynds, S. (1989). Bringing Life to Literature and Literature to Life: social constructs and contexts of four adolescent. *Research Journal of English Training*, 30-59.
- Iser, W. (1993). *Prospecting: From reader response to literary anthropology*. JHU Press.
- Kumar, R. (2019). *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners*. Sage Publications Limited.
- Langer, J. (1994). *A response based approach to reading Literature*. State University of New York.
- Lobo, A. G. (2013). Reader-Response Theory: A Path towards Wolfgang Iser. *Letras*, (54), 13-30.
- Miller, S. (1991). Planning for Spontaneity: supporting the language of thinking. *The English Journal* (March), 37-44.
- Pearson, P. D. (2014). The roots of reading comprehension instruction. In *Handbook of research on reading comprehension* (pp. 27-55). Routledge.
- Probst, R. E. (1994). Reader-response theory and the English curriculum. *The English Journal*, 83(3), 37-44.
- Purves, A. (1991). Indeterminate texts, responsive readers, and the idea of difficulty in literature. *The idea of difficulty in literature and literature learning: Joining theory and practice*, 157-170.
- Rosenblatt, L. (1938). *Literature and Exploration*. Modern Language association publishers, New York.
- Rosenblatt, L. (1993). The Transactional theory: Against dualism. *College English*, 377-386.
- Schweickart, P. P. (1990). Reading, teaching, and the ethic of care. *Gender in the classroom: Power and pedagogy*, 78-95.
- Selden, R., Brooker, P., & Widdowson, P. (2013). *A reader's guide to contemporary literary theory*. Routledge.
- Tompkin, J. (1980). *The Reader in History: The Changing Shape of Literary Response*. John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Tyson, L. (2014). *Critical theory today: A user-friendly guide*. Routledge.
- Yang, A. (2002). Science fiction in the EFL class. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 15(1), 50-6