

Speech and Thought Presentation in *Chance* by Alice Munro: A Stylistic Analysis

Zeravan Ayoub Ahmed Zebari* & Behbood Mohammadzadeh*

Cyprus International University, TRNC

Corresponding Author: Zeravan Ayoub Ahmed Zebari, E-mail: zeravan.zebari12@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: December 04, 2020

Accepted: January 19, 2021

Published: February 28, 2021

Volume: 12 Issue: 1

Advance access: February 2021

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

Key words:

Speech,
Thought,
Presentation,
Stylistics,
Alice Munro,
Selected Short Story

ABSTRACT

This study analyses the speech and thought presentation in *Chance*, a short story written by Alice Munro. The study aims to analyse how the speech and thought of the characters in the short story are presented. The concept of speech and thought presentation is dubious and complex. This study distinguishes speech and thought presentation and identifies either the characters responsible for representing their speech and thought or the narrator whose speech or thought gets to represent in Munro's short story. The present study follows the speech and thought presentation techniques of Leech and Short (2007). The present study found out how the author used the categories of speech and thought presentation in the short story with all of their categories except DT. The findings of the study revealed a total of 293 speech and thought presentations in the short story. 235 presentations belong to speech presentations, and 58 to thought presentations. FDS and DS are the most occurred speech presentation within the short story which enabled the author to make her characters seem independent of the narrator. The FDS technique suggests that the context of speech in the story is clear enough, referring to whom the speakers are. FIS is the least occurred presentation within the short story. Besides, DT is not found in the whole short story. Munro has given the importance to the external speech rather than internal thought. The study results indicate that awareness towards speech and thought presentations leads to a better understanding of the literary texts.

INTRODUCTION

Literature is firmly related to human beings' life. Literature is situated as a medium of appreciation, expression, additionally excitement. Stylistics, or 'literary linguistics' as it is once called, is the analysis and study of the language of literary texts. Burke (2014) claims "Stylistics nowadays is a field of study that confidently has one foot in language studies and the other in literary studies" (P. 2). In linguistic studies, stylistics provides contemporary linguistic techniques and ideas for literature research (Leech & Short, 1981). Besides, the purpose of stylistics is investigating language, and examining creativity in the use of language more precisely (Simpson, 2004; Segundo & Caballero, 2016; Page, et al., 2019; Hakemulder, 2020). More to the point, Burke (2014) states that stylistics differentiate between story and discourse and between content and style and narratology. The two differences appear to match one another on the surface, with the meaning of "style" to how the material is depicted and with the meaning of "discourse" to how the stories are narrated. Speech and thought presentation may generally be called "discourse presentation," although the word 'discourse' refers to a broader definition encompassing all types of written and spoken communication. Therefore, 'speech

and thought presentation stay the more precise and specific terms to be used. Speech and thought are segregated because they different discourses, thought relates to inner mental discourse that is private to the thinker, Speech relates to external spoken discourse that can be directly heard. Speech and Thought Presentation in writings are involved with how spoken, and internal dialogue is represented. A narrator can use various techniques in writing the works. The speech and thought presentation theory circles around the concept that speech and thought are presented in prose writings in direct and indirect modes.

Speech and thought presentation in literature are dubious, complex, and debatable. It is somehow not easy to distinguish between their categories. This study tries to identify and differentiate between speech and thought presentation in the selected short story. The main aim of this study is to analyse how speech and thought presentations of the characters in the short story are presented.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Narratology is a word that arose in favour of French under the influence of structuralism and was first coined by Tzvetan Todorov (1969). Leech and Short (2007) believe

that narratology is likely the most important field for statisticians interested in studying prose fiction. It has significantly been given to understand fictional worlds, plot structure, and viewpoint, areas in which stylistics have been of particular interest for a long time. A narrative is a story that includes characters, events, and what the characters say and do, whether told in verse or prose. Some literary forms are explicit narratives told by a narrator, like the short stories and novels in prose, and the epic and romance in verse (Abrams & Harpham, 2009). Besides, Fludernik (2009) claims that the narrative is extracted from the “narrate” and is a very common activity. Therefore, the narrative is strongly linked to the narrative speech act and hence also to the narrator’s figure. Hence, everything narrates by a narrator can be defined as a narrative. Abbott (2002) defines narration as “The telling of a story or part of a story. Often used indistinguishably from the narrative, narration as it is used refers to the activity of a narrator” (p. 193). Narration can take place in first-person pronouns using “I” and “me” or the second-person pronoun “you” or third-person pronouns “he”, “she”, “him” and “her”.

One who is telling a story is not necessarily the author. Some narratologists claim that even though the narrative is an autobiography, the narrator cannot be the author. Some other scholars believe that since we can never know with certainty whether the narrator is the same as the author. It makes no sense to speak of the author as if they were involved in the narrator’s views (Abbott, 2002). Schmid (2010) suggests that the narrative text consists of two elements, the discourse of the narrator and the discourse of the characters. While the discourse of the narrator is created just in the act of narration, the discourse of the characters is depicted as having happened before the act of narration and merely being recreated in the act of narration. Also, the speech of the character is assumed to be paraphrased in the words of the narrator in indirect reporting. Besides, the narrator is presumed to report the speech of the character as it is in direct reporting. So, anything which might be inaccessible to both the readers and the narratee through the speech of the character (direct speech) in the manner of indirect reporting is given by the narrator. Hence, while the narrator is the merely way by whom the characters’ story is reported, readers have no choice but to filter through the reporting discourse.

Speech and thought Presentation

The analysis of speech and thought presentation has long been of interest among many scholars and it has been widely analysed in both stylistics and narratology (G. Leech, M. Short, McHale, D. Cohn, S. Rimmon-Kennan, E. Semino, S. M Fludernik,). Speech and thought presentation firstly developed by Leech and Short (1981). The speech and thought presentation categories of Leech and Short (1981) are technically quite similar but the writers use them differently. Leech and Short provide a system which originally includes five modes of speech and thought presentation: Direct Speech/Thought (DS/DT), Free Direct Speech/Thought (FDT/FDT), Indirect Speech/Thought (IS/IT), Free Indirect Speech/Thought (FIS/FIT), and Narrative

report of a Speech/Thought Act (NRSA/NRTA). The figure that follows (Leech and Short, 2007) explicitly depicts that speech and thought presentation norms are located at the opposing sides of the continuum. For this reason, they obtain different values.

				Norm				
Speech presentation	NRSA	IS	FIS	DS	FDS			
Thought presentation	NRTA	IT	FIT	DT	FDT			
				Norm				

Watson and Riissanen (2014) reveal that according to short (1996):

the differences between DT and DS or between FIT and FIS are partly due to IT being the norm of thought presentation, because when we move on the scale of thought presentation from the norm category IT towards FIT the narratorial influence decreases, whereas when we move from the norm category of speech presentation, DS, towards FIS the influence of the narrator increases (Short Cited in Watson and Riissanen, 2014, p. 75).

Short (1996) asserts that other people’s thoughts cannot be studied directly and only through their speech and actions; we can surmise what people think. Most importantly, the analysis in the presentation of thought and speech investigates how an author characterizes characters through thought, the speech of the characters.

Narrator’s Representation of Speech/Thought (NRS/NRT)

A reader is told in NRS and NRT that the thought or speech has occurred, without giving the content of what is thought or said (Short, 1996).

e.g. He could hear two persons talking. (NRS)

e.g. Sally was thinking. (NRT)

NRT and NRS also occur when the limited point of view of others is narrated by the character.

Narrator’s Representation of Action (NRA)/Narration (N)

The category NRA or N includes the physical description and action sentences where there is no thought or speech. This involves character acts, inanimate agent-caused events, claim perceptions, and descriptions of the character (Short, 1996,).

- a) Action by the character: she broke the window.
- b) Happenings or events (usually inanimate): It began to rain.
- c) Description of states: she was wearing a dress.
- d) Character’s perception: he saw him jumping.

Speech Presentation

Direct speech

DS is one of the most common ways in which speech is expressed in writing, particularly fiction. Leech and Short (2007) state that DS reports accurately what has been said and the actual form of words used in the reported speech.

e.g. “Didn’t you recognize me?” he said.

Indirect speech

IS is after DS, the most common category of speech presentation. The narrator reports the speech of the character to the readers with some changes in tense and other deictic expressions.

e.g. She said [that] she would go there again the following day.

Free direct speech

FDS is somehow alike to DS with distinctive characteristics. Free means free from the control of the narrator.

- (1) I will come here tomorrow, she said. (Absence of quotation marks.)
- (2) "I will come here tomorrow." (Absence of reporting clause.)
- (3) I will come here tomorrow. (freest form, no reporting clause, and no quotation marks.)

Free indirect speech

This type of representation describes in merging some characteristics of Direct Speech and Indirect Speech.

e.g. She would be there tomorrow.

Narrator's report of speech acts

NRSA brings the readers a bit closer to what is said. The act of speech is reported, often with identifying a topic within the speech.

e.g. He asked their friends for advice.

Thought Presentation**Direct thought**

DT is similar to DS in form except that one reports 'heard words' whereas the other reports 'internal words' and the verb in the reporting clause denotes mental activity, not spoken (think, decide, wonder, etc.).

e.g. "I will speak with him tomorrow," she thought.

Indirect thought

In IT the narrator reports the thought of the character to the readers with some shifts intense and other deictic features. In IT the narrator is committed to providing the content of a thought act instead of providing a verbatim report of it.

e.g. she thought that she would speak with him the following day.

Free direct thought

In FDT the character's thought is expressed explicitly instead of the speech without the narrator's intervention.

(A) I will speak with him tomorrow, she thought. (absence of quotation marks)

(B) "I will speak with him tomorrow." (absence of reporting clause)

(C) I will speak with him tomorrow. (freest form, No reporting clause or quotation marks)

Free indirect thought

FIT mixes features of DT and IT of thought presentation which is not a reproduction of the original thought. FIT, like FIS, appeared in the lack of quotation marks and mostly presented by the use of past tense (the tense of the narrative).

e.g. She would speak with him tomorrow.

Narrator's representation of thought act

NRTA expresses the thought act, and the narrator reports what the character thinks in a summary without giving the exact words.

e.g. She thought about her decision. (NRTA)

METHODOLOGY

This thesis applies a qualitative content analysis method. The short story *Chance* by Alice Munro will be analysed using Speech and Thought categories developed by Leech and Short (2007). The study of the character speech and thought presentation is a notable feature of the narrative discourse. It has been widely analysed in both stylistics and narratology (McHale, D. Cohn, G. Leech, M. Short, S. M Fludernik, E. Semino, S. Rimmon-Kennan, M. Toolan, and P. Simpson). In this tradition, Leech and Short's (2007) model is one of the most extensively used structures for the description of the phenomenon. Leech and Short developed the presentation of speech and thought categories, they are quite similar, but the writers use them differently. Moreover, the primary source is the short-short story *Chance* taken from a collection of short stories entitled *Runaway* written by Alice Munro and was published in (2004). The researcher read the whole short story and selected only significant passages. Speech and thought presentations of the short story will be analysed and categorized, and the frequency of occurrence of each category will be listed in a particular table. The secondary sources of the data are collected for analysing the speech and thought presentation in Alice Munro's short story. This study focuses on the following objectives:

1. To what extent Alice Munro has used speech presentations in her short story (*Chance*).
2. To what extent Alice Munro has used thought presentations in her short story (*Chance*).
3. To what extent Alice Munro's use of speech and thought presentation categories are in line with Leech and Short's speech and thought presentation categories.

FINDINGS AND RESULTS**Speech Presentation****Direct speech and free direct speech**

DS and FDS are the most frequent presentation in the short story *Chance*. Leech and Short (2007) approve that DS is a technique that includes the description by the narrator of

how a character speaks and the quotation marks that mark the character's utterance. The most significant characteristic of FDS is the absence of either the quotation marks or the reporting clause.

"It may be free, but it looks like you have to go and get it," she said. (1)

"Would you mind watching him while I go?" (2)

"I don't want to stay with her," the child said, without looking up. (3)

"I'll go," Juliet said. (4)

But at that moment a waiter entered the car, with the coffee wagon. (5)

"There. I shouldn't have complained so soon," the mother said. (6)

"Did you hear it was a b-o-d-y?" (7) (p. 60)

The above dialogue is between the characters Juliet, the woman, and the woman's son (the child) about the free coffee and a body crashed by a train. When the train headed to Vancouver and stopped, Juliet went back to her seat. The woman across from her spoke to her while they were waiting for the train to start again. The dialogue shows the clear characteristics of DS except for the sentences 2, 5, and 7. Also, in the above dialogue, the interference of the narrator's reporting clauses in presenting the utterances are "she said" in sentence 1, "the child said" in sentence 3, "Juliet said" in sentence 4, and "the mother said" in sentence 6. The verbs 'said' in sentences 1, 3, 4, and 6 display the speech presentations. Here, Munro mentions clearly who is speaking by quoting directly what the characters say in the dialogue. Also, the quotation marks are to clarify the utterances of the characters Juliet, the woman, and the woman's child. Thompson (1996) suggests that the use of quotation marks in dialogues is utilized as an indicator that the utterance is depicted as if it was in an original event. In sentence 7, the word (body) indicates the woman's greatest emotion. In such a case, the author intends to stimulate the senses of the readers to feel as if they are in the same position as the characters. In sentence 3, the character characterizes his behavior directly which indicates that he has something in his body whether it is fear or shame from Juliet or he doesn't want her mother to leave him alone.

In the dialogue, sentence 2, and 7 are FDS only with quotation marks without the reporting clauses. Sentence 2 is the continuance of sentence 1 and sentence 7 of sentence 6. Moreover, sentence 5 and the last part of sentence 3 are narration where no thought or speech is depicted. Also, the first part of sentence 5 "But at that moment a waiter entered the car" which indicates in bold includes an action by a character outside of the world of narration which is NRA. If we remove the narrator's reporting clauses in the above dialogue, the readers might be confused about who is talking to. Another example is

"Don't people always say that, though? To somebody who is younger? **They say, Oh, you won't feel that way someday. You wait and see.** As if you didn't have a right to any serious feelings. As if you weren't capable." (p. 67)

(Double speech in direct quotation) (Quotation marks) + (Juliet's (Character's) speech) + (Juliet's (the character

narrator's) reporting clause) + (Juliet's direct speech) + (Juliet's (character's) speech) + (quotation marks).

The speech is held while Juliet spoke to Eric who she met on the train. The speech is represented in FDS and it displays no narrator's intervention in presenting the speech. Although, the speech does not provide a clear description of how the speech is being said, and we can see the directness from the character's voice. This is because Munro gave Juliet the freedom to speak in her voice. The speech comprises two speeches belong to the same speaker by Juliet as a character, and speech two which is bolded is embedded in speech 1. Speech two is the people's speech embedded in Juliet's speech. The reporting clause "they say" in the speech is told by the character Juliet as a character/narrator. As well as, the directness of the characterization is shown by the verb 'say' which implies that the speech is reported by the character Juliet at an exact time.

Indirect speech

IS as one of the presentation techniques employed by Munro. The narrator uses it to present how the characters uttered the speech.

And people wondered what a cow would be doing up here in the bush, or why the bears were not all asleep now, or if some drunk had fallen asleep on the tracks. (p. 59)

The excerpt above indicates that it is a representation of something people say, it can probably be interpreted as a representation of something that people say to each other, instead of simply a representation of their thoughts. The verb 'wonder' here may be interpreted as a query rather than a representation of peoples' thought. The reporting clause 'wondered' is not subordinated by any conjunction. Also, there are no quotation marks.

She told him that Orion had been blinded by Enoption but got his sight back by looking at the sun. (p. 71)

In the above example, Juliet and the man talked about the stars when they were alone at night on the train. Juliet then informed him about the Greek mythological beliefs associated with stars in IS. The verb 'told' identifies the presence of the speech. The indirect speech in the above example is identified by a simple past tense in the verb 'told' and passive past perfect tense in the verb "had been blinded". Those past tenses are the indicators of the reporting speech. Hence, the above example is marked as indirect speech presentation. Thus, the reporting clause of the narrator's discourse "she told him" followed by the reported speech and subordinated by the conjunction 'that'. Semino and Short (2004) assert "FIS prototypically provides the propositional content of utterances, and therefore does not easily serve the purpose of dramatization" (p.78). Munro concentrates on what is said instead of presenting the context of saying.

Free indirect speech

Eight years ago, **he said**, Ann had been injured in a car accident. For several weeks she'd been in a coma. She came out of that, but she was still paralyzed, unable to

walk, or even to feed herself. She seemed to know who he was, and who the woman who looked after her was—with the help of this woman, he was able to keep her at home—but her attempts to talk, and to understand what was going on around her, had soon faded away. (p. 68)

The example above begins with Eric who was speaking to Juliet the one she met on the train. Eric was talking about his wife Ann how she had been injured in a car accident and paralyzed. The whole text is in FIS without the reporting clauses or quotation marks, except the first sentence is FDS which includes the reporting clause “he said”. Except for the first sentence, the other sentences are between IS and DS with no reporting clauses and quotation marks. Munro reports Eric’s speech which is speaking to Juliet in FIS. FIS category involves two voices, the character’s voice, and the narrator’s voice. This mixture of voices joins the viewpoints and positions of both the speaking character and the narrator. As a result, we know what was said, but it is hard to know whether the words belong to the character or the narrator. This kind of complexity is often beneficial for novelists in manipulating viewpoint relations. In the extract above, dashes signal a dramatic pause and reveal a more dramatic way of speaking.

- (A) He was not going to sleep. He would sit up until he got off at Regina, sometime toward morning. (p. 79)
- (B) He said that he was not going to sleep. He said that he would sit up until he got off at Regina, sometime toward morning. (the retrieved one)
- (C) “I am not going to sleep,” he said. “I will sit up until I get off at Regina, sometime toward morning,” he said. (retrieved one).

The elimination of the reporting clause in the example above “A” resulted in the freer version of an indirect form and is not subordinated by any conjunction unlike indirect form, which makes it more similar to the direct form. The two sentences are in the third person point of view ‘he’, and the past tense of the sentences indicates indirectness. For example, the two sentences “B” appear in IS because the two sentences consist of the reporting clauses ‘he said’ and subordinated by conjunctions ‘that’ in the third-person narrator. For example, “C” the speeches appear in DS because of the reporting clauses and quotation marks. The present tenses apply to DS with the use of ‘I am’ and ‘will’, and the first-person pronoun ‘I’ refers to the speaker in both speeches. These examples “A” to “C” indicate how FIS occurs between IS and DS. So, Leech and Short (2007) claim that free indirect speech is not an actual reproduction of DS, but it conveys more sense of the original speech than indirect speech at the same time.

Narrator’s representation of speech act

NRSA is identical to the IS technique both of them are reporting speech through the narrator’s total control in the presentation. The only difference is that the NRSA presentation reduces its reporting clause and directly summarizes the content of the speech in the form of a noun phrase or pronoun.

- (A) She went back to her own seat. Across from her, a child of four or five was slashing a crayon across

the pages of a coloring book. **His mother spoke to Juliet about the free coffee.** (p. 60)

- (B) **She asked about the medical experience he had referred to**, and he said, “Oh, it’s not very extensive...Or to yourself.” (p. 68)

- (C) **She told him about her job, the name of the school— Torrance Hous.** (p. 70)

The bolded parts of the presentations show the reported act of uttering speeches. For example, NRSA in “A” represents the speech act of the woman that Juliet met on the train, and there is only one clause involved which is no reporting clause. Moreover, the first sentence and the second part of the second sentence in “A” are NRA actions by the characters (Juliet and the child), and the first part of the second sentence is the narrator’s discourse. Besides, NRSA in (B and C) represent the speech act by the character (Juliet), NRSA in “B” is utilized to depict a question which is essential and very sensitive for Juliet. It can be observed in “C” that the narrator is only focusing on the summary of what the character is saying, and it does not mention the content of the speech entirely. The readers do not know what her job in the school is. Thus, NRSA usually has a backgrounding function that is associated with relatively insignificant speeches compared with more direct forms of presentation.

Thought Presentation

Free direct thought

FDT shares the identical form of the FDS. The only difference is that FDT depicts the thought of the character rather than the speech.

The visit to the cabin and Juanita being over, Juliet has thought. (p. 50)

When Juliet travelled to Whale Bay, she thought about staying there at night; then she thought about her friend’s (Juanita) cabin in the woods to stay with her. The thought occurs in Juliet’s mind appearing in Free Direct mode. The narrator is less involved in the presentation of the character’s thought with the reporting clause “Juliet has thought”, but with no quotation marks. In this example, the verb does not have any additional information about Juliet while having the thought but here present perfect shows that she has already thought about that. Moreover, in the example above the reporting clause “Juliet has thought” alone can also be NRT.

Indirect thought

IT is almost similar to IS since the use of quotation marks is omitted.

At those words, chum around, a cold turbulence rose in Juliet. **She understood that he was not trying to pick her up.** (p. 54)

When Juliet was on the train, firstly a man came and sat with her and told her “chum around” together. The bolded sentence in the above example is IT. The absence of quotation marks forms such an indirect form of the thought within Juliet’s head. Munro uses the verb ‘understood’

to picture the deep thought Juliet had at that moment. Instead of using the verb ‘thought’, Munro uses the verb ‘understood’. The verb ‘understood’ here means to perceive and realize something in the character’s mind. The reporting clause is “she understood” subordinated by the conjunction ‘that’, and the thought is the in third person viewpoint. Also, the past tense indicates that the thought is an indirect form. Moreover, the first and the second part of sentence 1 are the discourse of the narrator, and the last part is NRTA.

Below is another example:

- (A) He thought she was full of disgusting curiosity, like many other people. (p. 62)
 (B) He thought, “she is full of disgusting curiosity, like many other people”. (the retrieved one).

In sentence “A” the thought of man is depicted in the indirect form by the narrator. When the man from the observation car, whom Juliet had seen outside, walking in the snow, came through and Juliet followed to ask him a question about another man, and he refused to answer her. In “A” the thought of the character is reported in the third person with a reporting verb ‘thought’, and the absence of quotation marks and appearing past tense indicates indirectness. The sentence occurs without a subordinate conjunction. In (B) the sentence appears in DT with a reporting clause and quotation marks. The third person pronoun retains the same as in “A”, but the past tense changed to present ‘was’ to ‘is’. Unlike the indirect, free indirect portrays the thought of the characters with the discourse of the narrator.

Free indirect thought

FIT is almost identical to the FIS since it retains the similarity, which is the lack of quotation marks. This technique of thought presentation uses the third person viewpoint as an indirect feature.

She could stay until the train moved, but how long would that be? And what if somebody desperately wanted to get in? She decided that all she could do was put down the lid and get out. (p. 60)

The bolded sentence is Free Indirect Thought of Juliet when she felt a little dizzy and went to the lady’s bathroom. She wanted to leave when the train started to move because the train was standing in the station. It appears that the bolded parts have mixed the third-person narrator, and the speech of the thinking character, thus, the character and the narrator’s

speeches are blended. When the character Juliet was on the train in the lady’s bathroom, thoughts occurred in her mind in various ways. The narrator conveys those thoughts of Juliet to the readers. Besides, the tenses are back shifted to match the speaking position of the narrator. Moreover, the second sentence is IT followed by the reporting clause “she decided”, and without quotation marks. The verb ‘decided’ in the above presentation shows that the presentation is thought presentation.

And why virgin? When she had gone to such unpleasant lengths, in Willis Park, to ensure that such a condition would not be an impediment? She must have been thinking of what she would tell him — she would never be able to tell him that she was menstruating—in that event that he hoped to carry things further. how could he have had plans like that, anyway? How, where? In her berth, with **so little** room and all the other passengers likely still awake around them? Standing up, swaying back and forth, pressed against a door, which anybody could come along and open, in that precarious space between the cars? (p. 80)

The above text is recognized as Juliet’s FIT, the speech of the narrator and the speech of the character are mingled. The narrator’s presence is represented in a way that the third-person pronoun deduces the character’s thought. Furthermore, the tenses are back shifted to match the speaking position of the narrator. The structure of questioning represents the character’s thoughts and the narrator conveys those thoughts. As well, the syntactical marker selected in bold indicates the consciousness of the character. Pascal (1977) considers that FIT is usually associated with “dual voice”, which means to mix the words of the character and the words of the narrator (cited in Guo, 2017).

Narrator’s representation of thought act

NRTA shares the identical feature to the NRSA. The reported thought is reduced to give a compact report of what being thought by the character. Whereas NRSA concentrates on the speech acts, NRTA focuses on the thought acts.

But as soon as she had written the words Awful Thump, **she found herself unable to go on**. Unable, in her customary language, to go on. (p. 63)

In the above example, the bolded part is NRTA; the character’s thought process is recorded. Instead of explaining the character’s thought, the narrator only uses “unable to go on” in a summarized report.

The Frequency of occurrence of Speech and Thought Presentation in Chance

Speech Presentation			Thought Presentation		
Type	Frequency	Percentage	Type	Frequency	Percentage
DS	69	29.3%	DT	0	0%
FDS	138	58.8%	FDT	8	13.8%
IS	15	6.4%	IT	17	29.3%
FIS	5	2.1%	FIT	25	43.1%
NRSA	8	3.4%	NRTA	8	13.8%
Total	235	100%	Total	58	100%

CONCLUSION

The study focused on how speech and thought presentation categories were given by Munro in the short story *Chance* presented, and the frequency occurrence of each presentation in the story. The speech and thought of the characters are presented in different categories. The categories of representation of thought are identical to those of representation of speech. In direct mode, the narrator quotes the speeches and thoughts of the characters directly without or limited narrator's interference. Contrary, in indirect mode the speeches and thoughts of the characters are presented within the narrator's words. Consequently, the narrator has control over the speech and thought report in indirect mode. Nevertheless, the free indirect category lies between indirect and direct categories, as it contains a combined feature of both indirect and direct. In the free indirect category, the narrator's and character's discourse mingle together to produce a mixed language, as it integrates the character's voice and consciousness with the voice and consciousness of the narrator. Hence, the juxtaposition of the two voices in the free indirect category creates sympathy for the characters.

Munro used variant categories of speech and thought presentation in the short story *Chance*. The answer to the first and second objectives of the study are the presentation of speech is (235) presentations, and the presentation of thought is (58) presentations. The most used presentation category in the short story is FDS with (138) presentations and the second most used presentation is DS with (69) presentations. The third most used category is FIT with (25) presentations and IT with (17) presentations. IS is used with (15) presentations. NRSA, NRTA, and FDT with (8) presentations in each type, and the least used presentation is FIS with (5) presentations, but DT is not used in the story even with one instance. FDS and DS are the most used presentations by Munro in the short story *Chance*. Additionally, With the help of FDS and DS, the writer has tried to present the short story a lot from the protagonist's viewpoint. FIT is utilized to create sympathy in the story. Besides, FIT enabled the narrator to blend his/her voice with the voice of the characters, and in some cases, the voice of the third person narrator overrode the voice of the characters. The answer to the third objective of the study is Munro used the speech and thought presentations of Leech and Short with all of their categories, which means Munro's use of speech and thought presentation categories in the short story are in line with Leech and Short's speech and thought presentation categories. Except for DT, Munro did not use it in the entire short story because someone's direct thought is not accessible. She used more instances of IT instead of DT. In the end, the author has not given importance to the inner thought process of the characters.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Behbood Mohammadzadeh for his wonderful suggestions, invaluable guidance, and support

REFERENCES

- Abbott, H. P. (2002). *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burke, M. (Ed). (2014). *The Routledge handbook of stylistics*. London: Routledge.
- Fludernik, M. (2009). *An Introduction to Narratology*. London: Routledge.
- Guo, H. (2017). Free Indirect Thought in Stream-of-Consciousness Fiction: A Textural Cohesive Perspective. *International Journal Of English Linguistics*, 7(6), 38-46. doi: 10.5539/ijel.v7n6p38
- Hakemulder, F. (2020). Finding Meaning Through Literature: Foregrounding as an Emergent Effect. *Anglistik: International Journal of English Studies*, 31.1: 91-110.
- Leech, G. & Short, M. (2007). *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose* (2nd ed). Harlow: Pearson.
- Munro, A. (2004). *Runaway: Chance*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Page, R & Busse, B & Nørgaard, N. (2019). Rethinking Language, Text and Context Interdisciplinary Research in Stylistics in Honour of Michael Toolan. New York: Routledge.
- Rimmon-Kenan, S. (2002). *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics* (2nd ed). London: Routledge.
- Riissanen, A., & Watson, G. (2014). Gender Difference in the Use of Thought Representation: A Corpus-Based Study. *English Language Teaching*, 7(3). doi: 10.5539/elt.v7n3p71
- Schmid, W. (2010). *Narratology: An Introduction*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Segundo, P. & Caballero, G. (2016). *Stylistics in Use*. UK, Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Short, M. (1996). *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays, and Prose*. London: Routledge.
- Simpson, P. (2004). *Stylistics: A resource book for students*. London: Routledge.
- Semino, E., & Short, M., (2004). *Corpus Stylistics: Speech, Writing, and Thought Presentation in a Corpus of English Writing*. London: Routledge.
- Thompson, G. (1996). Voices in the text: Discourse perspectives on language reports. *Applied linguistics*, 17(4), 501-530.