

The Interpretation of “Mocking Bird” in *To Kill a Mocking Bird* in Reader Response Criticism Framework

Saeid Rahimipour* (Corresponding Author)

*Assistant Professor of English Language and Literature, English Department,
Farhanigan University, Tehran, Iran*

Email: srahimipour@cfu.ac.ir ; sdrrahimipour@yahoo.com

Mohammad Reza Khodadust

*Assistant Professor of Teaching English as a Foreign Language, English
Department, Farhanigan University, Tehran, Iran*

Email: m.khodadost@cfu.ac.ir ; mr_khodadust@yahoo.com

Abstract

Literary works have been interpreted differently depending on the interpreter’s mindset and outlook. This study has launched an attempt to interpret the representation of the “Mocking Bird” in *To Kill a Mocking Bird*. Initially, a total number of 30 English majors studying at Farhangian University of Ilam were selected through convenience sampling. They were, then, provided with the PDF version of the novel, and after a few weeks’ interval of reading time, the participants were exposed to the filmed version of the story. Thereafter, using Reader Response Theory, they were asked to write their comments, impressions, and views of whom, which, or what the “mocking bird” of the novel may be. The qualitative/quantitative content analysis of their writings revealed some fascinating interpretations regarding the representation of the “Mocking Bird’s” paragon in the novel. The final part of the paper discusses the findings and their implications which revealed fascinating information in this regard.

Keywords: Interpretation, Outlook, *To Kill a Mocking Bird*, Reader Response Theory, Novel

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: Friday, August 14, 2020

Accepted: Friday, February 26, 2021

Published: Saturday, May 15, 2021

Available Online: Friday, February 26, 2021

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22049/jalda.2021.26911.1191>

Online ISSN: 2383-2460; Print ISSN: 2383-591x

Introduction

For many years, library-based descriptive research in the area of literature has been highly appreciated. However, Reader Response Theory (hereafter *RRT*) is based on the idea that any interpretation of the literary works should delve deeply into the readers' minds and the final analysis of aesthetic works forms and resides in the minds of the readers, as the second continuum of decoding the meanings encoded in the author's mind or beyond that. Much has already been carried out on the theoretical aspects of *RRT* of literary criticism; however, practically speaking, this modern framework for interpreting and criticizing literary works has largely gone unnoticed. However, it should be noted that readers are equipped with the interpretative tools of different types, the prominent of which is imagination; fiction and imagination interact and complement each other to highlight different outlooks in different fields of the study like sociology, politics, science, and literature.

The present mixed methods study is a departure from overemphasis on the theoretically existing oriented trot of studying literary works; in other words, this survey-based study, attempts to read the readers' mind in *RRT* framework to study literature, and more specifically the novel genre. This novelty in the design and procedure of the research may lead to a better understanding of literary pieces by delving into the readers' minds. This is, to a large extent, because "the urge of human feeling to express them and to encourage its interest in humanity aspects has forced human to make a literary work. That condition has influenced human all the time" (Kurniawan & Khudlori, 2018, p. 117) and has always been the safe source of inspiration and salvation for improving human life. This survey-based approach to studying literature would also reveal the hidden aspirations and interests of the writers and readers whose understanding would be out of question in any other way. It would also flourish the mind and pave the way for the better deployment and assessment of the works among which "one particularly contentious issue has centered on the relative influence of the reader, text, and reading situation on how the reading transaction is shaped" (Beach, 1993, p. 2).

To the researchers' best knowledge, a few studies have so far attempted to shun away from the purely theoretical study of literature and have used Reader Response Criticism to shed light on some unnoticed and long-ignored aspects of studying literature. For example, Eliana and Harold (2015) have dealt with the pedagogical implementation of the *RRT* in a class of English as a foreign language with pre-service language teachers as they experience the reading of two short stories. Similarly, Itisnawati (2009) has worked on the topic of *Implementing Reader-Response Theory: An Alternative Way of Teaching Literature Research Report on the Reading of Booker T Washington's Up from Slavery* which is a practical research on the deployment of *RRT* in the classrooms. Practically, Diana Mitchell (1993) has done a research on *RRT*, putting forward some practical applications for the High school literature classroom, the better manifestation of which can be observed in another research by Carlisle (2000) who has carried out a study on reading logs and the application of *RRT* in ELT which, per se, is a real class application of this approach to literary criticism.

To sum up, this study has attempted to uncover the understanding of the major theme and message of the literary works from the readers' spectacles, hinging mainly on *Reader Response Theory*.

To Kill a Mocking Bird

To Kill a Mocking Bird by Harper Lee (1993) deals with the accusation and introduction of a black person named Tom Robinson and Atticus Finch as the antagonists and Mayella Ewell as the protagonist being accompanied by many peripheral characters in the city of Maycomb. The major scenes revolve around the court and Robinson's trial which is the central theme of the story and forms the overall mood of the novel that targets the provision of whiteness granted upon the white for no good reason. The prominent theme running through the novel intrigues the nature of humanity by touching upon man's sense of sympathy or condolence for those under pressure and suppression; it is also used by many instructors at academic centers for the educational purposes, and its themes and implications can be deployed for analysis and projection upon the minds of new generations for historical, educational, social, or any other purposes.

Reader Response Theory

Eagleton (1983) has characterized the history of modern literary theory as occurring in three stages: a romantic "preoccupation with the author", a new critical "exclusive concern with the text", and, finally, "a marked shift of attention to the reader over recent years" (p. 74).

Reader Response Theory mainly deals with the readers and the way they interact with the text on the way of cajoling the intended meaning out of the text. It puts forward what the readers as individuals come up with. This procedure highlights that the way materials are understood, the role of the reader, and the active role of reader in understanding and cajoling meaning out the text as well as meaning construction all depend on the readers' previous experience of the text and his or her interpretation procedures. Readers' interpretation occurs when they interact with the text, choose, and, assert or write their understanding of the text and its organization.

As Rosenblatt (1978) states, "what the organism selects out and seeks to organize according to already acquired habits, assumptions, and expectations becomes the environment to which it also responds" (p. 17). Rosenblatt, in this regard, asserts that a reader's interpretation of a text is not a description, but the re-creation the reader makes of the text. *RRT* shifts the critical focus from the text to the reader. It concentrates on the reader as the central participant in the reading process and the creation of meaning of the text. From his view point, the reader bases his or her understanding of the text on the already existing schemata, habits, presuppositions, and mental categories of the constructs. These will lead to the emergence of individual and personal interpretation of the text, its themes, and conceptual ideosyncracies. Rosenblatt (2005) confirms that during and after an

aesthetic transaction, “the reader has a *response* to the event, which involves the organization of his or her thoughts and feelings about the text” (p. 40).

Research Questions

The following two research questions were posed in this study, and the researchers tried to answer them:

1. *Do the students introduce symbols of “mocking bird” in the novel or in their own society in the light of Reader Response Theory?*
2. *Does the application of Reader Response Theory flourish the students’ minds regarding their interpretations of their selected “mocking birds”?*

Method

Participants

In this action research, thirty female senior English majors of Farhangian University were selected through convenience sampling. They were later asked to read and watch the novel *To Kill a Mocking Bird* by Harper Lee. (1993). They were also asked to put forward the logic and reasons behind their selection of the “mocking bird”, the object, or event in the novel.

Procedure

Before the experiment, prior to the study the participants attended some courses on critical thinking and free interpretation techniques for about two months. They received instructions on literary reading and thinking about the literary pieces meanwhile. Thereafter, they were assigned to read the novel gradually in a span of 45 days. Then, they were exposed to the filmed version of the novel to remove any probable ambiguities. Right after the film was over, they were asked to write their inner feelings on whom or what in the story may have come to be viewed as a “mocking bird” from their viewpoints. The researcher’s own most possible predictions for the possible “mocking birds” has already been written down which are presented in the discussion section. The participants’ were surveyed on their interpretation of the “mocking bird”, and they were asked to write down their views in this regard. The obtained data was later analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively through percentages in Table one. The obtained idea was also screened and compared against the predictions of the researchers to answer the research questions and to either confirm the researcher’s own perceived possible “mocking bird” or refute them or come up with new representations of the “mocking birds”.

Results and Discussion

To Kill a Mocking Bird opens up new horizons for experiencing and revealing experiences over the questions of racism, suppression, early maturity, and many

more phenomena for the readers to search and exercise their understanding of those being viewed as “mocking birds”. In the novel, alongside the protagonist and the antagonist; many peripheral characters are detected as a symbol of “mocking bird”. As for the operational definition of the term “mocking bird”, in this study, it may refer to a person, an object, or an animal that may be treated cruelly or unequally during the course of the novel that may have impressed the reader and the viewer; this may put forward the opportunity to entice the real feelings of the learners with regard to their experience of reading and watching the novel on their present and previously experienced ones either in their own life or that of what they have heard or seen in other people’s lives projecting upon the other individuals.

Furthermore, research has shown that reading and teaching literature may have different voices for native speakers and non-native ones. Regarding native speakers, Borsheim (2015) believes that “traditional approaches to literature instruction, like *New Criticism* and *Reader Response*, often leave problematic race ideologies unexamined”. Borsheim (2015) exemplifies the point by asking him to put himself/herself in the position of a convict “could trivialize realities of systemic oppression” (p. 409). This, for non-native speakers, would lead to a roughly novel understanding of the same concepts from their own points of view knowing the fact that the traditions, cultures, beliefs, and modes of thinking would be drastically different from those of the native speakers. The way the comments would be cajoled are academically worthy of analysis and consideration which has already been tried out by other researchers. For example, “3,000 inter-generational and cross-cultural participants came together for a common purpose: to read, learn about, and discuss a classic piece of American literature” (Van Duinen & Bolhuis, 2016, p. 61) as a part of program based on *To Kill a Mocking Bird* to illuminate a kind of symbolic interpretation of the characters, setting, and the like. The style with which the writer reveals his ideas may be the bed for the illustration of what is supposed to be conveyed and the conveyance of ideas is mainly reflected through symbols and signs. In literature, the style has had its beginnings with the publication of *Les Fleurs du Mal* by Charles Baudelaire in 1857” (Conway 1867 as cited in Liu and Zhang, 2015, p. 278).

From Liu and Zhang’s (2015) view point, symbolism “involves the nature of the things and expresses their own views or inner hidden emotions through the specific images” (p. 279). Some objects or things are viewed as signs or symbols with special meaning by different individuals. Assigning the learners the burden and joy of decoding meaning in their own words encompasses opportunities which would capture the nature of the transactional function of literature which is facilitated through Reader Response Theory.

An extract like this can be deployed as the starting point for brainstorming the participants.

Sam: *It’s a sin to kill a mockingbird.*

Ms. Allen: *Why?*

Sam: *They don't do anything bad.*

Ms. Allen: *And if you're killing a mockingbird, something that hasn't done anything wrong, that can't defend itself, it's worse than killing something that has its own defense. How does this add to Atticus's moral character?*

Student: *(Inaudible)*

Ms. Allen: *Yes, he's an advocate for those. . . . And who is he in this case being an advocate for?*

Students: *Tom Robinson.*

Ms. Allen: *Tom Robinson could be a mockingbird, but what is it a symbol for?*

Rachel: *The Black race.*

Ms. Allen: *So our mockingbird is someone who can't defend himself, who is innocent.*

“At this point, we don't know if Tom Robinson is a mockingbird or not, but we know that Atticus is an advocate because [Tom] can't defend himself” (Borsheim, 2015, p. 419). Through this simple questioning of the status of the black, the superiority of the white, the biased judiciary system would occur to the mind and would be taken for granted. Haningrum (2018) asserts that this “epistemological framework of inter-sectionality is used to focus on the overlap of oppression, structural racism, and implicit bias evident in the stereotypes and perceptions of African American males in the United States” (p. 5). For this research, such questions form the basis of brainstorming targeting non-native language learners of literature courses. The following vignette from the novel is detected in a native setting:

“Come over here Mom and Dad!” Amanda said in an excited voice. “That's my mockingbird! That's the one that I did! Can you see it?” Amanda pointed to one of the many mockingbirds in the large collage that was displayed in the museum lobby. Amanda's parents and older sister crowded around and looked closely at the black and white striped mockingbird that she was pointing to. Across the bird's body were the words, “Mental Illness,” “Crazy,” and “Depression.” On the rest of the bird, concentric lines filled the space.(Duinen & Schoon-Tanis, 2015, p. 128)

This indicates that what exists in the individuals' minds is symbolized and is implicitly the illustration of his or her mental “mocking bird” which can become accessible either by vignettes, questioning, or the like.

The questions posed act as a sort of brainstorming technique which would implicitly convey ideas to the participants or cajole the pure answers out of them; the implication of such questioning forms the central idea that “anti-racist pedagogy with white students is disrupting Whiteness. It often takes the form of helping white students to develop an awareness of their own racial identity or consider their own privilege” (Banks, 2004; Kailin, 2002 as cited in Borsheim, 2015, p. 409).

The predicated “mocking birds” in the novel can revolve around different people and objects. Tement (2017) asserts that such attitudes are formed to a great part due to the selection of Lee’s narrator, Scout, who “frequently uses epistemic modality markers to alert the readers to the possibility that her subjective impressions may or may not be correct” leaving the hunches upon the readers (p. 4) and making the scrutiny of the passage worthy of academic research. Hence, “the novel challenges the readers to figure out what the child, Scout, is missing to make the inferences she can’t make, so we might see the story like as if the grown up Scout is looking back” (McAdem, 2018, p. 581).

In Maycomb, people view Boo Radley and his house full of horror and gossip which is considered dangerous for the children; he may be taken as the very example of being a “mocking bird” so that he is attributed some ghost-like characteristics. Children often refer to the chair in his house which is always rolling with no clear physical reason behind it; the formation of such attitudes has made him to be dismissed from the society for possessing such attributes and characteristics.

To many people, the widows who are leading their lives lonely form a part of the reality of being samples of “mocking birds” as they are deprived of having a warm and firm family upon its support they can trust whose absence has turned into the crisis of many men and women of any time on different parts of the world.

A clear crystallization of this attitude may be Scout, the lady figure child of the protagonist’s family who is being driven to the state of her womanhood when entering the school and is deprived of the boyish qualities she was enjoying when playing with her brother during the summer. To her, Jem, Dill Radley’s house has been turned into a mysterious and threatening source against which they are exercising their courage and early behaviours of maturity. The threatening figures of the drunken men in the street turn out to be mental sources of menace obsessing them and demanding upon Scout to forget her gender and behave as courageous as the boys driving her towards fighting with the boys and beating them at school as she has lost her mother to tell her some girlish and social norms.

Jem, the other scapegoat, may be lenient to be a “mocking bird”; he is allured by his father’s job which has forced him to think and feel above his age level. He participated in the court stealthily and heard something which is not at all suitable for him and specifically her sister, Scout. Thus, they live in a family atmosphere which is replete with the court news and their events and consequences due to their father’s job as a lawyer.

The mad dog can also be considered as a “mocking bird”. Maybe the occurrence of events like this has led people to form ENGOs for defending animal rights. Moreover, the comparison of dogs kept at homes as pets at present time with that of the dog in *To Kill a Mocking Bird* clarifies the inclination better; one receiving the best care and treatment while the other is left in the streets unprotected and finally is shot dead by a gunfire.

The hollow in the tree, the mysterious nest of an invisible and anonymous animal, is filled with cement by Radley signifying some sort of suppression and adding to the power of mystery which, for sure, places its “mocking bird”, Boo Radley, in isolation and under sheer cruelty and suspicion.

The Negroes serving as the working classes of the society form another group of “mocking birds”. They are deprived of their very citizenship rights to be respected and viewed equally by the white since Whiteness has proved as a privilege for them that can also, by implication, be observed in Atticus’ attitudes towards the birds when he asserts upon buying an air gun for the children: “Shoot all the blue jays you want, if you can hit 'em, but remember it's a sin to kill a mockingbird” (Lee, 1993, p. 102).

Above all, the protagonist, Atticus Finch, can be considered as an example of a real “mocking bird” because of his obsessions and responsibilities. The main structure of the novel elevates the status of Atticus Finch as a real hero for defending Tom Robinson, a miserable and harmless victim of injustice, who to Atticus Finch is innocent. He takes his case and does his best to defend him but being really aware of the injustice of the judiciary system of the white, he makes no objection and does not criticize the viciousness and inequality of the legal system to which he belongs.

The plot, which centers on Atticus Finch as the savior and as the antiracist humanitarian who defends Tom Robinson in court, reinforces the idea that racism is an individual issue rather than a systemic one. In fact, Gladwell (2009) has argued that although Atticus Finch stands up for what is right by taking Tom Robinson’s case, he never questions the injustice of the legal system. Every single sentence like this one in the course of the novel may open up lengthy debates over how it is being justified and interpreted. The collection of the participants’ assertions reveals every possible manifestation of ideas behind the sentences and elements of the novel. Many researchers, for example, have referred to Harper Lee’s (1993) own experience of bitter events like racism by presenting some clues via biographical approach to the text but the question of Reader Response Approach puts forward some genuine and authentic as well as novel uncovering procedures with and within the text.

The one which the majority of research has confirmed as the “mocking bird” has been Tom Robinson. He has seemingly been afflicted by menace and panic which may “show up in different ways including physical, psychological, and mental ways” (Rahimipour, 2011, p. 594). But this comes to direct the attention and

interpretation of the novel based on the time and setting clues in which racism has been the dominant theme.

Reading the novel at another era and interpreting it differently would highlight new aspects and attributes of the saintliness of a mockingbird to other characters whose detection and evaluation at this area and time zone would be justifiable from reader-response criticism view point.

MayalleEwell, the antagonist of this story, has got to be viewed as an example of a “mocking bird” due to the fact that she as a female figure may have been suppressed for aspirations which may have not been fulfilled in their right time and place that is why she has taken refuge to Tom for that. She may have been forced to condemn Tom for the action she knows better than anybody else he has not committed and has been innocent but insists on assigning the false guilt on Tom because of his father’s persistence, her race, or her color privilege; she is considered as a vicious character as she insists on accusing Tom of what he has not really done. This double assignment of guilt and scantity of a “mocking bird” can be detected in her behavior paving the way for the writer to leave the decoding of the work’s message or her intentions upon the reader to cross compare the go-to-gether-ness of the elements of the novel leading to the formation of the mega theme of the novel. This, per se, paves the way for the application of Reader Response Approach to reading and interpreting literary works.

Mr. Ewell as a father figure whose identity and family status has been called into question in the eyes of his neighbors with no clear idea of the truth of what has really happened behaves miserably in condemning Tom in the court. As he is suffering from the immoral deeds of her daughter and as he is trying to maneuver over the whiteness feature to achieve his goal, he is assigned an ambiguous state of a devil and a “mocking bird” too.

Coded Comments

In this study, the participants’ comments and views on the character of the “mocking bird” were coded and tabulated. The coding of the data determines their codes and higher codes, and, putting them in the form of expressions and statements, would lead to better and easier understanding of the revelation of the implications of this study. Table 1 illustrates the participants’ assertions in the framework of *RRT*. The following Table shows the coding of “mocking birds” from the participants’ point of view:

A survey of their comments would reveal their beliefs and mental mindset in their judgment on the selection of the characters as the “mocking birds”. The following excerpt from their comments would shed light on their choices:

I think Boo Radley because he is trapped in people’s beliefs. No one wanted to talk with him and there are no social relations in his family. She expands the parallel example to those who do not have

any fan in the society and are left dislocated as the real mocking birds occurred to the mind after reading the novel.

Table 1: The Coding of “Mocking Bird” by the Participants

Characters	Frequency of Selection as “Mocking Bird” by the Participants	Percent
Tom Robinson	15	.75
Boo Radley	13	.65
Jem Finch	11	.55
Atticus Finch	10	.50
Scout Finch	9	.49.50
Mayella	4	.20
MrEwell	2	.10
Dill	1	.05
Dog	1	.05

It is completed by another participant’s assertion calling Radley as he has come to be known as a psychopath killer intended to scare children in their naive thoughts appearing at night as a frightening shadow. In fact, Boo in the final verbal assertions of the participants proves to be the most ruined innocent character having been assigned various inhumane features like a malevolent phantom:

Tom Robinson as he is good-hearted and affectionate nigger has been the innocent victim of the white-favored judiciary system.

As another participant asserts, the society does not tolerate the innocence of a black person indicating that a black person cannot be innocent and should be considered a cruel person and a victim from birth. Tom is victimized by the ethnocentric society of that time suffering from poor democracy of the system and democratic thinking. Tom, in the court, after Atticus’ appeal to judge and the jury and calling their attention and understanding in the name of God so many times to fathom his innocence, realizes that he is a doomed victim; therefore, he tries to escape outside the court and is shot dead by the guardsmen. His wild escape uncovers his severe and delicate understanding of the brutality of the society towards him and his race.

Another participant asserts:

Jem and Scout are small mocking birds living in a house which has attracted the attention of the majority of people in the small city of Maycomb due to their father’s job.

This is supported by the house lady when she asserts that: *there are people like your father who do unpleasant jobs for us* after Atticus' return from the court and his failure in the trial. One assigns the children's case to the youth of the countries who have to get along with the intolerable, and unwanted living condition across the globe.

Atticus Finch has been introduced as the "mocking bird" in the comments of other participants because he has tried to revolutionize the already taken-for-granted social codes of the society, exercise his idealistic ideas against the people and the society which are glued to the old beliefs and traditions, and take the great risk of changing the norms by taking Tom's case. He has done his job in a way which would not entice the emotions of his white generation and this adds to his sanctity. As Holmes (2015, p. 59) asserts:

The implication seems to indicate that Atticus' disinterest in actively working against racist laws and ideologies is just as indicative of racism as the actions of the group of men who threaten him outside the jail while he attempts to protect Tom Robinson.

Scout as the female figure kid in the novel is considered as the "mocking bird" for witnessing all the harsh and devastating events in her life enabling her to be the omniscient character, the point of view, and the narrator of the story that from her viewpoint every action is envisaged knowing the fact that she is just a "good-hearted five-year-old child who has no involvement with the indecencies of the world" (Vinu, 2017, p. 345).

Jem, the male figure child of the family, finds his father alone and tries to support him in any possible way. He witnesses the insulting behavior towards his father time and again, is threatened by the strangers due to his father's job, and is the observer of so many events in his life which are demanding for his age and knowledge of the world.

After collection of the participants' comments and hearing out the group understanding of each other's "mocking bird" view points, they were asked if they wanted to change their "mocking birds" or add some new ideas on it; it panned out that everybody was strict and determined in her decision and added more information on illumination of his selected character as the "mocking bird". One interesting thing was that many of them put forward this premise that the existence of so many characters and things being viewed as the "mocking bird" revealed the presence of so many other interfering factors which had affected the life of human beings like *the Great Depression*, the political, industrial, and technological campaign in progress at that time. As stressed by Lee (1993, p. 189), the participants' voice in the selection of the "mocking bird", and their verbal assertions can voice some appealing tone of Atticus and his final defense:

I'm no idealist to believe firmly in the integrity of our courts and in the jury system-that is no ideal to me, it is a living, working reality.

Gentlemen, a court is no better than each man of you sitting before me on this jury. A court is only as sound as its jury, and a jury is only as sound as the men who make it up. I am confident that you gentlemen will review without passion the evidence you have heard, come to a decision, and restore the defendant to his family. In the name of God, do your duties.

The theoretical analysis of such findings regarding the selection of the kind of character serving as the “mocking bird” in the minds of different individuals reveals the fact that each interpretation proves to be correct in its own sense and justification. Implicitly, it highlights the role of literary genres in the course of history on the removal of inhumane activities, and it can leave a bigger responsibility on the part of the intellectuals to watch for the imminent and invisible events which are a threat to human being’s existence and dignity striking the mind of their role in maintaining human rights that is not lagging behind the human right activists. Indeed, a literary work better than any other activist “contextualizes disability within a frame of racial politics and notions of violence” (Murray, 2018, p. 138).

By implication, the impact of the novel on the solution of human obsessions has been great though it has suffered its own problems too. This is reiterated by Sullivan (2017) who maintains that:

knowing the fact that *To Kill a Mocking Bird* falls disappointingly short, notwithstanding the splendid moral example of Atticus Finch. Hence, a lawyer, in a sense, is the ultimate worldly figure resolving issues in what often seems a coldly positivist universe. His moral compass must be set accurately if justice is to be effected and cynicism kept at bay. (p. 42)

This shortcoming which can be taken for granted is completed by one great implication that may be taken from the very beginning mind of the narrator. In this regard, Haugen (2018) believes that although “the novel revolves around society’s perception of the others, Scout’s narrative perspective shows how she has not fully internalized these perceptions” (p. 10); this leaves the major responsibility of understanding and interpreting the real meaning of the novel to the reader. The reader harmonizes his/her understanding of the sentences and the themes conveyed with what is happening in his mind and residing in his soul, applies his understanding to what is going on in the real world. These will either soothe his anguishes or his obsessions or, in case, he has got no concerns, feels sympathy for the character. The pages of the novel act as the stage of cinema and arouse the viewers and the readers’ interest and passions forcing him/her to feel special things or leave special comments on his/her felt inspirations.

Conclusion

The analysis of works of art on the line of revealing their art for art’s sake can be fascinating to the readers. The analysis of *To Kill a Mocking Bird* from RRT view

point with regard to nonnative university students has led to the promising comments and findings whose final coding can be taken as an equivalent passion and obsession shared roughly similar by the people in different parts of the world due to the commonality of human being existential obsessions, passions, and thoughts. The analysis revealed similarly felt paragons of “mocking bird” symbols from the view of the participants in the study and those similarly experienced by other researchers and paved the way for the projection, juxtaposition, and expansion of these symbols to other existing phenomenon and people elsewhere in society which has been one of the purposes of any powerful literary work. This study acted as an igniting zest for enlightening and projecting the idea of “mocking bird” and the condemned racism to other obsessions at present which may have also driven human being to the corner that upon detection, for sure, would lead to more promising results. The divergence of the participants’ comments on the novel and the priority of their preferred “mocking birds” reveal the perceived similar experience of the dominant theme of the novel as well as the message underlying the trend of the novel and its elements.

References:

- Banks, J. (2004). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In J. A. Banks, & C. McGee Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 3–29). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Beach, R. (1993). *A teacher's introduction to reader-response theories*. USA, University of Minnesota.
- Borsheim, B. C. (2015). It's pretty much white: Challenges and opportunities of an antiracist approach to literature instruction in a multilayered white context. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 49(4), 407-429.
- Carlisle, A. (2000). Reading logs: An application of reader response theory. *ELT Journal*, 54(1), 12-19.
- Duinen, V. V. D., & Schoon-Tanis, K. (2015). Who are our Mockingbirds? Participatory literacies in a community-wide reading program. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, 11(1), pp.128-136.
- Duinen, V. V. D., & Bolhuis, A. (2016). Reading to kill a Mockingbird in community: Relationships and renewal. *English Journal*, 105(3), 81–87.
- Eagleton, T. (1983). *Literary theory: An introduction*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Eliana, G., & Harold, C. (2015). Applying the reader-response theory to literary texts in EFL-pre-service teachers' initial education. *English Language Teaching*, 8(8), 187-198.

- Gladwell, M. (2009). *Outliers: The story of success*. New York: Little, Brown, and Co.
- Haningrum, N. H. (2018). *Racial Segregation and Inequality over the Afro-American Community in Southern America Reflected In Kathryn Stockett's The Help (Sociological Approach)*, Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta.
- Haugen, M. (2018) *The Child's Perspective in to Kill a Mockingbird and the Kite Runner*, Unpublished M.A. Thesis, The Arctic University of Norway.
- Holmes, S. (2015). Cross-examining to kill a Mockingbird: Three questions raised by go set a Watchma. *Language Arts Journal of Michigan*, 31(1), 58-61.
- Iser, W. (2000), *The Range of Interpretation*, New York, Columbia: UP.
- Itisnawati, R. K. (2009). Implementing reader-response theory: An alternative way of teaching literature research report on the reading of booker T. Washington's up from slavery. *Journal of English Education*, 3(1), 1-14.
- Kurniawan, R. S., & Amin Khudlori, S. S. A. (2018). Portrait of racism in the Southern America reflection in Harpper Lee's novel to kill a Mocking Bird, *Culture*, 5(1), 117-143.
- Lee, H. (1993). *To kill a Mocking Bird*. New York: Harper Collins books.
- Liu, X., & Zhang, L. (2015). On the symbolic significance of to kill a Mockingbird. *US-China Education Review*, 5(4), 278-282.
- McAdam, R. H. (2018). The cross-examination of Mayella Ewell. *Alabama Law Review*, 69(3), 579-593.
- Mitchell, D. (1993). Reader response theory: Some practical applications for the high school literature classroom. *Language Arts Journal of Michigan*, 9(1), 41-53.
- Murray, S. (2018). *The ambiguities of inclusion: Disability in contemporary Literature*. In C. Barker & S. Murray (Eds.), *The Cambridge companion to literature and disability*. (pp. 90-103). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rahimipoor, S. (2011). The ambiguity of self and identity in Pinter's comedy of Menace. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 58(4), 593-598.
- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Sullivan, G. J. (2017). Children into men: Lawyers and the law in three novels. *The Catholic Lawyer*, 37(1), 29-43.

Tement, T. (2017). *First Person Narrator's Mind Style in Slovenian Translations of the Novel to Kill a Mocking Bird*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Univerza v Maribora.

Vinu, J. C. (2017). An analysis of social institutions in shaping the worldview of characters in Harper Lee's to kill a Mockingbird. *Language in India*, 17(5), pp. 343-352.

Author's Biography



Saeid Rahimipour (Ph.D.) is presently faculty member of Farhangian University, Ilam, Iran. He has presented many papers on English Literature and Applied linguistics. He has been teaching English language, English Literature, and Methodology for 23 years in many universities in Iran. His main interests are English Dramatic Literature, Applied Linguistics, and ESP. He can be accessed via his email address: sdrahimipour@yahoo.com



Mohammad Reza Khodadust holds a Ph.D. in TEFL. He is an Assistant Professor at Farhangian (Teacher Education) University of Tehran, Iran. He has been teaching at Iranian universities and institutions of higher education since 1998 and has published and presented some papers at national and international journals and conferences. He has also translated 7 books on various topics, especially teacher education from English to Persian. His main areas of interest include TESOL, Teacher Education, Teachers' Internship, Discourse Analysis, Translation Interaction Discourse including CF Discourse and Politeness. Presently he is working on the application of Action Research and Lesson Study in Teacher Education.
