Dutta-Flanders, Reshmi (2023) *The crime-culture connection in a crime fact story: An applied approach.* Cogent Social Sciences, 9 (1). ISSN 2331-1886.

The crime-culture connection in a crime fact story: An applied approach

Reshmi Dutta-Flanders

Published online: 12 Apr 2023.

Submit your article to this journal ⤤

Article views: 77

View related articles ⤤

View Crossmark data ⤤

*Corresponding author: Reshmi Dutta-Flanders, English Languages & Linguistics, Division of Arts and Humanities, University of Kent, Canterbury CT2 7NF, UK
E-mail: reshmidf@gmail.com

Reviewing editor:
Guangchao Charles Feng, College of Communication, Shenzhen University, Shenzhen, China

Additional information is available at the end of the article

MEDIA & COMMUNICATION STUDIES | RESEARCH ARTICLE

The crime-culture connection in a crime fact story: An applied approach

Reshmi Dutta-Flanders[1]*

Abstract: This paper explores "crime" as cultural and not simply an individual act. The aim is to contextualize a transgression as an outcome of a social "phenomenon" that happens in real-time, is reported in the newspaper and TV documentaries, and is adopted for analysis as a "crime fact story". Using a "discourse-based" frame analysis of the non-linear narrative characteristic of offender engagement discourse, I reorganize the narrator's experience. Secondly, in the narrative act of the "double function" of a narrator as a character, I reveal an "unreliable" stance when the narrator, like the transgressor, is the victim of the interpretations the actors make of their surroundings in the 1st story of crime. In reorganizing the narrator's experience, there are "microcontexts" which, as alternative storyworld, emulate the causes leading to the transgression left unnarrated in the 2nd "story of investigation". Consequently, a "perpetrator-culture" nexus is conceptualized in the dichotomy of social factors and criminal behaviour, which is a phenomenon and represented as antecedentless pronouns and inanimate nouns in the text, stylistically "repeated" for emphasis in the discourse. The paper emphasizes the need to consider the impact of factors that influence society and inform deviance within a context of "culture" that is of shared value and behaviour and situates an offence to the interpretations the actors cognitively make of their surroundings.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Reshmi Dutta-Flanders' research interests are in the form and function of criminal narratives, in the grammar of crime discourse, and in the processing of offender engagement discourse for storylines that formulate alternate plot lines in crime narratives, which situate the crime to factors other than the offender itself. A combined functional linguistics and stylistics-based interdisciplinary approach to the forms of communication is processual and allows one to examine an idea in the text in context. As a technique, such a language-based applied linguistics approach also allows exploring in practice a theory of crime and criminality conceptualized in the forensic domain. The author is also interested in researching 'variations' in the form and the function of the English language use due to first language interference conditioned by one's 'cultural nativeness'.

1. Introduction

This study shows how the crime-culture connection situates deviance to how actors interpret their social context and practices, such as in the school playground narrativized in, *The End of Everything*. As a crime fact story, the narrative incorporates a "crime of power" played out in the school playground with devastating consequences, which is synonymous with the offence documented in media, such as in a three-part TV series, Sex on trial (Channel 4, UK). An elite athlete is not sanctioned for this transgressive act. An undergraduate is raped in episode 2, and the police and the school authorities take time to bring the accused to trial. The rape victim gets justice only when "affirmative consent" redefines consensual sex.

Similarly, another teenage offence is reported in the media when the school authorities are accused of not monitoring the senior school staff as they cannot deal with a "peer-on-peer" abuse of female pupils who are objectified, harassed, and sexually assaulted. This problem was front-page news in *The Sunday Telegraph* (2021:1), and the circumstance is described in *The Sunday Times* (2021: 4) as,

> 'Lord of the Flies culture' [which] had engulfed respected private education institutions and spread to some state schools. (Emphasis added)

The highlighted words and phrases in bold in all quotes in this article are for emphasis.

Schemes like "pay-to-play" when an athlete is financially supported to play with famous athletes provide them with UCAS points in order to pursue higher education in elite colleges, otherwise unachievable for winning athletes from poor backgrounds. However, a winning athlete from an elite college is often unable to take advantage of the education and drops out or remains unemployed.

Social practices like pay-to-play favoured the few with UCAS points for elite colleges. Such an approach influenced teenage reality relating to higher education upon the basis of which a student chooses the course of action that governs adolescent behaviour. Based on this rationale, Evie's transgression (to run away with an older man to compete with her elder sister) is found to be an outcome of the interpretation that the teenage actor attributed to her surroundings and the conduct narrativized in the game scenario in the analyzed story which as culture is about, in Neuberger (1993, p. 9),

> ... shared values, practices and codes of behaviour, along with the means for enforcing regulations and the forms for expressing them, ... [that] delineate [or describe] a community [like that described in the novel used as a case study in this paper]. ... Culture, ... , is [therefore] not static, ... enduring aspects of culture provide the materials for constructing our perception for interpreting the new.

Also, Yar (2018, p. 117) states,

> The conceptualisation of culture as a shared framework of meanings situates the offending conduct in the interpretations that actors attribute to their [surrounding] ... and to their conduct [such as rivalry, power, and control, which has consequences].

If society is the perpetrator that situates the deviance, then the teenage practices, as reported in the media cited above, are a group-based predicted behaviour (such as prejudices and biases on the football ground, or peer-on-peer pressure as a code of conduct in school playground) that blurs the lines of traditional crime such as in hooligan crime. Such is "cultural practice-based crime" (my term) evidenced in the football ground and in the changing rooms when the predicted behaviour,

> ... starts to reflect [the] popular ... prejudices as a deviant act. (Neuberger, 1993, p. 275–282)

cogent ·· social sciences

The crime, therefore, becomes an "existential" pursuit of passion and excitement and the analysis of which as a deviant act relates to the predicted behaviour that predicts the "culture" of crime. Suppose the expected behaviour stems from rivalry and jealousy; in that case, the ensuing conflicts and tensions between the teenage actors as the causal outcome of external (social-structural) and internal (psychological) forces, direct certain individual conduct in society. The culture associated with the organisation in Hayward (2004, p. 9) is then about practical consciousness,

> [Society] as an object or process which exists in, wells up from, and is the workings of common sense [illuminates the way] deviance [becomes a product of contemporary behaviour and therefore, necessary to] 'reinterpret [the deviant behaviour in society] as a technique [that will] ... resolve (in terms of meaning) the conflicts linked with contemporary life' (Hayward, 2010: 204).

If the social context narrativized in, *The End of Everything* wells up from the workings of teenage common sense, then it relates to the,

> 'causal and mechanistic underpinnings of [a] phenomenon [or a circumstance that] 'explains ... [I-narrator Lizzie's linguistic] choices [like repeated use of proforms] across a wide range of actual and counterfactual accounts [in the discourse]' (Fumagalli, 2019: 64).

Such representation of the social context as a phenomenon is narrativized as the game scenario in the crime fact story. This phenomenon remains unnarratable for the teenage narrator Lizzie. She represents the antecedentless pronoun *something* as an entity *thing* (*something*) when Lizzie accounts for her best friend Evie's disappearance for 19 days. The criminal context behind the transgression is provided in section 2 below. Before then, the question is, why is the teenage narrator unable to contextualize the phenomenon that underlies Evie's transgression explored in the language as in Ricoeur (1985: 88),

> The question ... [is] to determine by which spatial narrative means the narrative is constituted as the discourse of the narrator [distinct from a 'retrospective' narrator in a post-crime scenario] recounting the discourse of itself as a 'character.

If media and cultural studies demonstrate the way "factuality" is structurally a complex construct and, as an alternative practice, achieves the appearance of truthfulness through elaborate representational techniques (Yar, 2010: 68–69) in language [linguistics], then it is necessary to distinguish the narrator stance from itself as a participating character in,

> The pair utterance/statement ... formulated in vocabulary [such as the repeated proforms] when the discourse spoken by the character concerning their experience is incorporated in the diegesis. The utterance becomes the discourse of the narrator, while the statement becomes the discourse of the character.

Analyzed in this way, *The End of Everything* becomes a crime fact story (a term used by journalists specializing in reporting an actual crime). Therefore, the social issues narrativized as the game scenario resonates with factors such as the "peer-on-pressure" in elite schools cited in the media.

The aim is also to evaluate the cause-and-effect chain, the causation[1] in the narrative, which is non-linear and is evident following the frame numbers in parenthesis and correspond to the novel's page numbers when contextualizing the rivalry narrative below before undertaking the linguistic analysis of the repeated pronouns. However, this causation analysis at the micro-level in the text is not carried out in this paper due to space constraints. For future research, participant analysis (*effector* vs *villain* disposition) is recommended in the criminal context.

2. Contextual information

The End of Everything is set against the backdrop of playground experiences. This setting is ideal for studying the communication occurring amongst adolescents in their school playground and interpreting their shared practices as codes of behaviour to work out the parallel with the predicted behaviour cited in the media.

Thirteen year old Lizzie observes how Evie's elder sister Dusty is their father, Mr Verver's favourite; this does not sit well with Evie who also wants to show her popularity with older men and decides to compete with Dusty by disappearing with Mr Shaw, an insurance agent, and a family friend for 19 days. Mr Verver is the school coach where Evie and Lizzie study. Lizzie appears to spend most of her time with her best friend Evie and her family. Lizzie's parents are divorced.

The popular deduction is that Evie is a victim of "grooming" by Mr Shaw, who regularly visits the Verver family. Though the authorities are looking for Evie is the *2ⁿᵈ story of investigation*, the primary focus in the narrative is on the "Evie and Mr Shaw" situation narrativized as the "Cartwheel" and "cigarette" scenarios such as quoted below following a "discourse-based" frame analysis (FA) of the crime narrative in the appendix,

Evie springing, legs flying, hair whipping around her face, her body never stopping, and Mr Shaw still looking, even after he's gone [italics in the original text]. . . . Oh, how his heart must have ached. (Cartwheel scenario: "Evie and Mr Shaw" situation)

I [Lizzie] feel myself standing like Mr Shaw did, . . . dangling it [cigarette] between my [Lizzie] fingers watching Evie turn cartwheels, one after another. The cigarettes, the lighter, seeing them [in the milk chute in Shaw's Garden], it is such redemption.(Cigarette scenario: "Evie and Mr Shaw" situation)

Mr Shaw, sitting there in his car, and Evie knows, she knows and she's giving him quite a show [doing cartwheels]. A taunt, a tease, an invitation. (Cartwheel scenario: 'Evie and Mr Shaw' situation)

At the outset, the **prospective** reader remains unaware if I-narrator Lizzie has no knowledge of Evie's **intent** to disappear with Mr Shaw, such as in the frame (215a, appendix). A fight ensues between the siblings, after which Evie gets into Mr Shaw's car, to which Lizzie reacts in the frame (18),

Something in my [Lizzie] head flickers, but I can't place it. . . . But when I turn around, Evie's gone, . . . Do I hear her say, . . . **a creeping knowingness always between us?** Do I hear her [Evie] say, This is the last time, this is the last time?

Repetition of the rhetorical question, *This is the last time?* draws the reader's attention to the demonstrative noun, *"this,"* in the frame above. Considering the pronoun "this" is a *textual antecedent*[2] for Evie's prior encounters with Mr Shaw (narrativized as repeated frames 37, 38, 167, and 170), this situation is lexicalised by Lizzie as the *creeping knowingness* in the frame (18) as a participatory response of a **character**, distinct from herself as an **I-narrator**.

Therefore, frame (18) is cognitively a *"withheld"* frame where narrator Lizzie is "in-the-know" of Evie's past encounters with Mr Shaw in the cartwheel and cigarette scenarios quoted above. Moreover, the repeated pronoun *something* (microcontext 1, note 7) in the ongoing text is the I-narrator's *mental representation*[3] (Rapp & Gerrig, 2006, p. 55) of Evie's past encounters with Mr Shaw. However, Evie's past meetings with Mr Shaw in the Verver yard are made clear indirectly when Lizzie realizes she is in the dark about this situation, but Dusty is aware of it in the frame (31),

How dare she [Evie] kept it [Mr Shaw in Verver backyard] from me [Lizzie]?

Much later in the narrative, it is evident that it was Evie's intent all along to disappear. This *secret knowledge* **episodically** (note 7) links back with Lizzie's *creeping knowingness* in the frame (18) because in the frame (215a),

. . . She [Evie] knew somehow she'd end up in that car with him [Mr Shaw].

With a "discourse-based" FA of the narrative (appendix), it is possible to sequentially arrange the frames like the above for the concealed context. Also, the strategy of repeated pronoun use in the discourse is evident when they are episodically linked with Evie's *secret* (in frame 215a). The episodic links formulated contextualize the fact that Lizzie is at the outset aware of Evie's intent to disappear in the repeated **frames** (37), (38), and (167),

Sometimes at night, he's [Shaw] out there [in the backyard]. I never told [Dusty and Verver]. It [the secret] was mine [Lizzie's] and **I didn't want to share it**.

Though Lizzie is not aware of the specifics that Mr Shaw watches Evie every night standing outside her window, the repeated frames draw attention due to the repetition of the context and, when sequenced together, formulate a **cohesive tie** between themselves in the propositional knowledge in each repeated frame (the *content plane*) *framing* narrator Lizzie as protecting best friend Evie's intent to compete with Dusty. This subsequently prompts an assessment of the "reliability" status of the I-narrator in the **"before-and-after"** frame sequenced as an **event chain** which appears thus,

The frame (31): content plane, Lizzie in the dark of Evie's secret > repeated frames (37), (38), and (167): content plane, Evie telling Lizzie of her secret meetings with Mr Shaw in the Verver backyard.

Symbol **>** means "followed by" in the sequence drawn up above.

The question of **unreliability** also brings to the fore, that the Evie and Mr Shaw situation is contextually *dark tales* and *mysteries* in the frame (243), connoting a youth-adult [deviant] relationship pattern from the vantage point of sibling rivalry represented by Evie as "*it*" in the frame (235),

I [Evie] see how **it** is, Mom sees how **it** is. "Dusty, you can want him [Mr Verver] your whole life, and Dad's never going to give **it** [sex?] to you. (p. 235)

Such is the perception of the father-daughter relationship, which is also represented by Lizzie when she describes the father-daughter love as *everything* in the frame (241),

[Dusty] can never yield herself to [boys of her age], [she] doesn't even care to try. Mr Verver gives her **everything** and asks nothing in return, except **everything**. **Everything**. . . . And then . . . after Evie went away . . . oh, for Dusty not to have **that gaze** [of Mr Verver] on her. (Context of the phenomenon: microcontext 1)

It is perplexing why Lizzie and Evie represent an innocent father-daughter love as *it* and *everything* in the narrative, such as quoted above. Narrative **suspense** is constituted in this way in the antecedentless pronouns *it, everything* and *something* which draw attention to the "**dual position-ing**" of the I-narrator. Also the repetition of "*I know*" (microcontext 2, appendix) infers a situation from which Lizzie desires to protect her best friend and her favourite coach Verver as an "experi-encing-self" in the here-and-now of herself as a **character.**

An **anticipatory sphere** of saving is subsequently advanced as the value position in the text following analysis of the counterfactual account of Lizzie, which is an alternative *storyworld* [4] (SW) that links with the underpinning aggression the teenagers are subjected to and is narrativized as the game scenario where an aggressive *mindstyle*[5] is constructed in the language, when the siblings are in the frame (238) in the game scenario,

> … **keening rivals**, **circling** each other, **marking** each other tightly.

A football/baseball game (Evie is good at) is also lexicalized in the game scenario as *victim, doom, safety,* and *monsters [not players]* in the semantic field of "battleground" when the playground wounds are contextualized as *battle scars*. Community doctor Aiken also comments on this intense behaviour as an entity *thing* in the frame (225),

> "**Things** can get pretty rough out [in the playground]," … You're all bunch of **warriors**, aren't you? Lionhearted [Lizzie]." (The game scenario)

An analyst needs to in this way contextualize a *discourse referent* [6] (DR) for the antecdentless proforms *something, it, everything,* and *thing* which are repeated several times in the text, and when **episodically**[7] linked with each other in the repeated context in the intervening text, the pronominal representations in meaning and context formulate different themes (as *microcontexts,*[8] my term, appendix); otherwise, the repeated context remains backgrounded in the dominant narrative of rivalry without the textual processing of the repeated pronominals following a "discourse-based" FA of the report in, *The End of Everything.*

The repeated words are functioning as "causal factors" in the discourse that additionally prompt an instantiated new focus; for instance, the situation of the "Lizzie and Mr Verver" scenario (in column 6 in the appendix) running concurrently alongside the primary focus of the "Evie and Mr Shaw" situation in the text. These situations as **situational factors** in the narrative conceptualize the playground experience as an unnarratable entity *"thing"* in frames (150–6 and 201), that remains unresolved and from which Lizzie wants to *save* her best friend and coach Verver.

This *thing*, repeated as *something* (*thing*), is a circumstance—a phenomenon of competition and rivalry in the Verver household underlying Evie's transgression from which Evie is saved when she gives *this thing* in the frame (236),

> "I'm not really sorry [for disappearing with Mr Shaw]," she says carefully. "He [Mr Shaw] **saved** me, so I gave **this thing**. I guess I don't feel bad for it. (Saving scenario: microcontext 3)

Hence, the hypothesis is,

3. The hypothesis

Suppose an (offender) theme of competitive behaviour triggers a reckless attitude that results in Mr Shaw taking his own life. In that case, Evie's transgression is an **"effect"** of an intense (playground) temperament that resonates with the semantic field of aggression narrativized in the game scenario and in a real-time context is synonymous with the code of behaviour on the football ground, in changing rooms and the peer-on-peer pressure in elite schools reported in newspaper and TV documentaries.

The analyst needs to see beyond Evie's deviant act of disappearing in the continued intrusion by I-narrator Lizzie to understand why the narrator underpins her OWN *"rhetorical intent"* to *save* that situates her as a **narrative object**"[9] (i.e., a victim of her surrounding circumstance) which Evie takes advantage of to gain power and control over sister Dusty to become her father's favourite. As

a *focalizer*[10] of the circumstance of aggression, Lizzie wants to *save them all [Evie and coach Verver]* in the frame (94),

> And so I must **save** her [Evie], **save them all** [Mr Verver and Evie].

Then in the frame (149),

> I choose to **protect** him [Mr Verver].

And in frame (176),

> We have **restored** him [Mr Verver], I think, and then wonder at the "we". It's **me, me, me** [Lizzie].

If *the thing* (*something*) is the circumstance/phenomenon lexicalized as *private things, Mr Verver things* in the frame (209), and as *that gift* in frames (116) and (177), which no one is supposed to see for Lizzie in the frame (177),

> … waiting for that **gift**, … he [coach Verver] hands out so freely. … **something** no one's supposed to see,

Then this *thing* is also the pro nominal "*it*" in the frame (235),

> [Evie says to Dusty] Mom sees how **it** [father–daughter relationship] is.

As a *dramatized narrator* (Booth, 1983, p. 223) it appears Lizzie gives one kind of story that the authorities looking for Evie but, as an **experiencing self**, Lizzie is coming to grips with a relationship situation perceived as deviant and ends up giving an account that narrativizes her *desire* where she wants to be the centre of attention of coach Verver just like her siblings.

The relationship factor becomes a shared value in the text that relates to the teenage competition and rivalry, which subsequently directs the readers' gaze to the "Lizzie and Mr Verver" situation (column 6 in appendix); as the 2nd situational factor this scenario relates to the *peer-on-peer pressure* inferred in frames (105) and (201) that resonates with broader environmental tensions reported in the media.

> Hence, in theory,

> '[if the] *society … represented as an **object or process** which exists in, wells up from, and is the workings of [actors'] common sense,*

Then, the workings of the teenage common sense are deemed as the *phenomenology*[11] of criminal activity (Hayward, 2004, p. 9), and the type of interaction taking place between **actors** Evie, Lizzie, and Dusty compels an analyst to view *The End of Everything* as a *crime fact story* functioning as an **interface between factual account represented in fictionality.** This is also because of the predicted behaviour, which Evie summarises as,

> Didn't dad [coach Verver] always say she [Dusty] was too sophisticated for high school boys, that she was meant for men? (p. 232)

That justifies Evie's decision to compete with sibling Dusty over her father, Mr Verver,

> Evie who was always in the background [in her family] … trying to be heard. Didn't she long to be the centre? And now she was [by running away with Mr Shaw] (p. 233)

Such a backgrounded situation of rivalry and competition, coupled with competitive aggression in the playground, becomes the *crime of power,* and the analyst must assess Evie, the transgressor, either as,

- A "product" of emergent outcomes of **teenage surroundings**, or,
- An outcome of **teenage attitude** (competitive mindstyle and sibling rivalry), or
- An outcome of **individual psychological traits** (such as power and control emerging from teenage anxiety and aggression/behaviour).

The above is structurally analyzed by drawing up episodic links in the text between,

- the repeated antecedentless pronouns (as a phenomenon) with,
- the repeated semantic field of the lexical item *saving* with
- the predicted behaviour in repeated *word use* and *counterfactual accounts.*

It is noted that the *word use* [lexicon] is a linguistic practice and is highlighted by psychologists Hirsh and Peterson (2009, pp. 524–526) for ascertaining behaviour,

> [There is] strong correlation between language use … showing that **word use predicted ratings of behaviour in personality-specific language use**, seen clearly during the production of self-narratives.

In light of Evie's transgression alongside the broader concerns reported in the media, the objective is,

- Firstly, if **deviance** is related to an individual's experience or the practices as a code of behaviour in society, the individual conduct must not be viewed as a psychological trait.
- Secondly, if the transgression is an outcome of a predicted behaviour (like the rivalry in this study), then a default relationship norm as the primary focus derives from the "interpretations" the teen-agers as actors attribute to their surroundings.

Hence, at the discourse level, the aim is to assign a DR for the repeated pronominals that constitute a phenomenon and situate Evie's transgression to a **culture of practice** specific to the code of practice in the playground in the crime narrative analyzed. The concept of a *phenomenology* (Hayward, 2004, p. 9) of the criminal act (from narrative criminology) is also adopted in theory for the analysis of the DR because in a non-linear narrative,

> … the **storylines** of crime present themselves in ongoing prior narratives [as backgrounded microcontexts] and draw on the events and other phenomenological tensions that matter to us. (O'connor, 2015, p. 177)

In the storylines in a non-linear narrative, it becomes possible to situate the offending behaviour as a phenomenon in the signals of Lizzie as the *focalizer* of teenage actions she associates with her playground experiences, thereby framing Evie's transgression within the framework of a culture that resonates with underpinning tensions, like the *peer-on-peer pressure* in elite schools reported in the media.

Before applying the theory of phenomenology, it is necessary to draw out episodic links between the repeated context in the intervening text in the narrative using frame theory in linguistics for textual processing. The frame theory is as follows.

4. Framework 1

4.1. Textual processing tool: a 'discourse-based' frame analysis (FA)
There is no simple chronology of events in, *The End of Everything*. Readers need to constantly update their knowledge about the characters in the *textual world* because Lizzie provides a great deal of detail about Evie and Dusty's interactions with Mr Shaw and Mr Verver, respectively.

A "discourse-based" FA processes this non-linear organization of I-narrator Lizzie's account. A (social) phenomenon in the story remains backgrounded or gapped by exclusion (Ungerer and Schmid, 1997: 221–222) in the discourse. This limits the inferencing process of an unnarrated circumstance inferred as *this thing* and *something* at the surface level in the text. Such a narrative technique causes a breach of the "communicative contract" between the reader and the speaker, like in Christie's *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd* when the narrator fails to reveal that he is the murderer (Dutta-Flanders, 2017a: chapter 2). The framework below is to work out the communicative breach between the speaker and the reader that limits the inferencing process in the text.

The reader, at this point, may look at the appendix to see the processing of the microcontexts when frame patterns (as "repeated", "withheld" frames or contextually a "desire" frame, "motive" frame) at the surface level of text are noted in column 2 in the appendix. The repeated proforms and word uses are then clustered as **microcontexts** and at the discourse level they are,

- the "saving scenario" in the lexicon of *saving* (microcontext 3),
- the Lizzie "in-the-know" in the repetition of *I know* (microcontext 2), and
- the repeated proforms *something, everything,* and *it* clustered (microcontext 1).

Microcontext 1 is of interest for analysing the *discourse referent* (DR) for the repeated proforms in the text. Secondly, the *double claim* of a *"narrating-I"*, distinct from itself as an *"experiencing-self"* in the narrative act of "double function"[12] (DF), enables one to formulate the alternate SWs (Framework 2) when it is possible to,

- Analyse the "discourse referent" (DR) for repeated proforms (6.6)
- Evaluate the counterfactual account for character SW (6.7)
- Conceptualise the entity *thing* (*something*) as a phenomenon (7).

4.2. Frame analysis (FA): a three-dimensional approach for processing a non-linear text
Traditionally, *frame analysis* (FA) in linguistics is an essential analytical tool pointed out by Goffman (1974) in Hayward (Aspden & Hayward, 2015, p. 14),

> ... 'frames' both organize the past and help shape and determine how new experiences are felt and interpreted.

In Van Dijk (1977, p. 159), a *frame* is,

> ... an *organization principle* relating to a concept, such as a restaurant frame, would be general but [also] culture-dependent, ... The explicit **propositional knowledge** from frames establishes **coherence** between sentences of a discourse [in an intervening text].

Unlike a restaurant frame (or *schema*), the "crime narrative" frame is culture-dependent, where *frames* at the surface/clause level function as a *mental store* of information and carry facts that are *episodic* within the *represented world* of the crime. This means a "frame" may be true on one occasion, like a *contextual frame* (Emmott, 1997, p. 121) but may not be relevant beyond that point in the text. The default frame at the surface level in a crime narrative is contextually an **intent** and/or **desire frame, a motive frame** in a forensic context.

In Minsky (1980: 16), the *frame levels* [at the micro level] are categorized as,

- *Surface syntactic frames*: **Prepositional** and **word order** conventions
- *Surface semantic frames*: **Qualifiers** and **relations** concerning participants, instruments, goals, consequences, and side effects.

When frame levels involve larger structures than sentential grammar, such as ideas and keywords in discourse, a *frame* (Minsky in Metzing, 1980: 14–16) evokes assumptions from memory, such as,

- *Thematic frames*: **Scenarios concerned with topics and settings** are culture-dependent, such as a party scenario where the *default frame* is about cutting cake or going to a pub.
- *Narrative frames*: **Skeletal forms for typical stories** are conventions about **foci**, protagonists, and a development designed to **construct** a new instantiated thematic frame in mind.

Frames also represent *causation* (Ungerer and Schmid, 1997: 218), i.e., the "cause-and-effect" relations formulated, such as in the episodic links between *frames* in this study which can change a conceptual viewpoint in the story. For example, a simple "**before-after frame pair**" (an *event chain*) condenses complex situations (like microcontexts in this study, appendix) which otherwise remain *backgrounded* (or *withheld*) as in the frame below when the wolf is looking for an excuse to kill the lamb for its dinner, emphasis added,

> … **even though** he [wolf] himself was upstream, he accuses the lamb of stirring up the water and keeping him from drinking … ' (Minsky in Metzing, 1980: 12)

The above *surface semantic frame* is contextually a "*desire (intent) frame*" because, from a "*three-dimensional*" perspective, the common sense "assumption" is that contamination cannot flow upstream; hence, the wolf's "desire" to eat the lamb is "withheld" but is **presupposed** in the **cognitive interpretation** of the linguistic connector, *even though*, which grammatically functions as a *qualifier*.

However, the pairing of frames at the **discourse level** prompts a *frame-pair scenario* (an **event frame**[13]) that contextualizes the wolf's **withheld** intent embedded in the *context of an utterance* characterized as a frame. Such is a **three-dimensional analysis** (Dutta-Flanders, 2019), which is not the same as the two-dimensional "pattern recognition" process (or *schema*) and represents, as a data structure, a stereotyped situation like a restaurant frame (Minsky, 1980: 3).

Furthermore, to cope with the process of *gapping* (or **omission**) from an offender/participant's vantage point, the FA of a crime narrative enables the reorganisation of a non-linear (criminal) account to **process the manipulation,** such as in the "withheld", "repeated" or in the "overlapping" of frames (as in this study).

Frame analysis as a mechanism, therefore, helps with *the examination [of discourse] in terms of the organization of experience* (Goffman: 155), while as a three-dimensional approach, the "discourse-based" FA (in appendix) is a "text processing" tool that allows the analyst to make **episodic links** between *surface frames,* especially when frames are repeated such as in this study. Otherwise, the repeated context remains *repeated* lexical choices in the discourse without the help of the "*before-and-after*" frame sequence (event chain) that forms a **cohesive tie** between each repeated instance in the text and enables **coherence** at the macro level of discourse for the organization of experience in a non-linear text.

To summarise, a "three-dimensional" *discourse-based FA* enables one to "draw up" *episodic links* between surface syntactic frames, which,

- Foreground and categorize nonstandard actions that appear as discourse patterns in a text, i.e., "*repeated*" frames, "*overlapping*" frames, etc. (column 3 in appendix)
- Establish coherence between sentences of discourse that are part of a backgrounded scenario, and,
- Formulate new and instantiated focus (column 6) in the "overlapping" of frames (column 5) due to *episodic links* drawn up between repeated frames (column 2).

It is noted that the *"**overlapping**"* of frames is not an *overlapping focus* (Aspden & Hayward, 2015, p. 238), such as in narrative criminology. An *overlapping focus* is about shared concerns about human beings who are products of their everyday life and their self-narratives (autobiographies).

While the "overlapping" of frames between microcontexts (in column 5) in this study is due to the **repeated** word use (in column 6), which as *thematic frames* (are additional topics/settings), and is advanced as the value position in the narrative.

4.3. Repetition: a discourse pattern for emphasis and cohesion

Repetition as a discourse strategy enables one to create an ideological bias, such as in accountancy narratives (Brennan & Merkl Davies, 2013, p. 16). Repetition is a rhetorical feature and is also for effect, such as in stylistics and draws the reader's attention to an underlying message, such as the ***dramatization*** of a circumstance in *Belfast*, Anna Burn's novel, where the protagonist remains the *milkman* in the story. The author says,

> … [Such strategy] adds to the sense of menace and persuasion and to the **surface threat** that is there [in Belfast]. … there is no explicit violence in the book; there is a **collective mindset** that is more important than the individual autonomy or identity that comes through the namelessness.

Today Programme (2018) BBC Radio 4, 14th October

The keyword is the **collective mindset** causing a code of behaviour practiced as competition and rivalry but with devastating consequences in, *The End of Everything*.

Also, in the meaning and context of repeated word use, an analyst realizes an *artful [re] construction of [the] story* (H. P. Abbott, 2007, p. 43), such as the three microcontexts embedded in, *The End of Everything* highlight an **iterative manner** of narrating or reporting past events and utterances with slight variation for a ***retrospective characterization*** of a critical instance, such as different versions of the drowning event (5.5) provided by Evie and Lizzie. Repetition of this event is done with a slight variation of an instance of rescuing from drowning that offers the reader a *distinctive evaluative assessment of what sort of an instance of the type [of] the … undertaking was* (Goffman, 2007, p. 154), such as a rivalry between Evie and Lizzie over coach Verver.

To summarise, **repetition** as a mechanism creates *cohesion* at the discourse level. It is formulated in the episodic link that establishes *coherence* (Jeffries & McIntyre, 2010, p. 85) between *the [repeated] word use between sentences of a discourse* (Van Dijk, 1977). The episodic link subsequently processes a *retrospective characterization* (Goffman, 2007, p. 155) of the repeated instance when different topics/settings emerge as microcontexts and scenarios that develop the story by reconstructing the dominant *narrative frame*. Alternative narrative frame provide material to situate Evie's transgression to a phenomenology of criminal activity in the 1st story of crime. The findings follow the application of the "discourse-based" FA (in the four steps below) and then the SW analysis (Framework 2).

5. Application & findings

5.1. Application: a page-by-page recounting of events (step 1)

The processing of a "discourse-based" FA (appendix) of a text is like the *retrospective* recording on an hour-by-hour basis of the whereabouts and activities of respondents as in the "space-time-budget method" in criminological research (Gelder and Deale, 2014: 2). Similarly, a "page-by-page" *recounting* of utterances and events in the text as frames (in column 1) with their corresponding **content plane** for the *propositional knowledge* is quoted from the text (in column 2). Consequently, the **repeated** lexical items (in bold in column 1) are classified as "repeated" frames' or **contextually** as withheld, desire, secret, or a motive frame (column 2).

The *surface syntactic* frames at the micro level of discourse are then clustered as **microcontexts** in the semantic field of the repeated word use, such as,

- A semantic field of "saving" (microcontext 3),
- A narrator "in-the-know" in the repetition of *I know* (microcontext 2),
- A circumstance as DR for repeated proforms *something*, *it*, *everything*, and *thing* (microcontext 1).

For copyright reasons, microcontext one is analyzed to work out the *retrospective characterization* of a critical instance represented as an entity (*that thing*) that removes the offender, and situates the offence in the *phenomenology* of criminal activity (6.6). The frame numbers in parenthesis correspond to the page numbers in the text that display the "non-linear organization of experience" as a *"cultural convention"* noted in offender engagement discourse.

5.2. Application: categorizing frames (step 2)
A conceptual configuration of the *surface frames* (in column 2) is carried out by *contextually* categorizing frames as a "desire" frame, "intent" frame, etc., and the discourse patterns as *repeated frames* or cognitively as *withheld frames* and in the lexicalized meanings of word-use in each frame.

5.3. Finding: additional thematic frames as microcontexts (step 3)
In the reorganizing and reshaping of the past (in column 5) by using the surface semantic frames, it is possible to determine the additional focus (in column 6) in the "overlapping" of repeated word use when episodically repeated lexical choices are linked between microcontexts providing other dimensions such as,

- An unreliable narrator (6.4),
- A phenomenon *gapped* (6.6 and 6.7), and
- An anticipatory sphere of *saving* from an unnarrated phenomenon (6.7).

These above findings then provide material to conceptualize the primary focus, "Evie and Mr Shaw",in the narrative as the *mental path* to evaluate the *crime of power and control* that counters the dominant narrative of rivalry.

5.4. Finding: the mental path that contextualizes transgression (step 4)
The "Evie and Mr Shaw" situation appears as the main reference point in column 6 in the table. Like a *hot spot*,[14] this *reference point* becomes the **primary focus** in the story and evokes a *mental path*[15] along which Evie's motive to compete with elder sister Dusty over their father is reinterpreted in the "experiential" content (the *propositional knowledge* quoted in column 2) that positions the primary focus within a broader context represented as an entity *thing, something* narrativized as the game scenario in the story sequenced as an event chain,

> Frame (63): *I seem to know* **something** ... > frame (105–6): *the ways boys need* **things** ... > frame (174): *I stand there waiting ... for* **something** *else, but* **that thing** *never comes back.* > (201): *"I know* **things** *about boys"* ... > (219): *"He saved me, so I gave* **this thing**. ...".

A sensual reference that is constituted in the *propositional knowledge from each frame* (Van Dijk, 1977, p. 159) functions as a *context of the situation* (G. Brown & Yule, 1983, p. 35) that provides *meaning and context of an utterance* (Fillmore, 1977: 119) for an entity *that thing* and *something* in the above sequence.

Similarly, the repeated word *sickness/sick* are linked together, such as in the frame (233),

> *how she'd [Dusty] have to show him [Mr Verver]* **the sickness** *[Evie and Mr Shaw situation] polluting the [Verver] house[hold].* (233)

With *sick* in frame (234),

*It's **sick** what you're [Evie] doing, she [Dusty] said. He's [Mr Shaw] a pervert and now you're [Evie] a pervert too.*

In the above meaning and the context from the propositional knowledge of *sickness*, Dusty and Evie's perception of the youth-adult relationship is then **episodically** linked with Lizzie's desire to *save* in the frame (94),

*And so I must **save** her [Evie], **save** them [Evie and coach Verver] all.*

And then, when Evie is *saved* [from Mr Shaw] because she gives *this thing* in the frame (219),

*"'He [Mr Shaw] saved me, so I gave **this thing**. . . .'".*

In the before-and-after frame sequence, such as the above, the repeated lexical choice *save* is contextually linked further with the repeated entity *thing*, and the event chain appears as follows,

The frame (233) > frames (234) > frame (18) > frame (94) > frame (219).

The I-narrator lexicalizes this decontextualized entity *thing* as,

*Only **private things**, me-and-Mr**Verver things** (209)*

Which is *that gift* Lizzie is *waiting for* in the frame (105),

*. . . . waiting for that **gift**, any gift, **the gift** he* [coach Verver] *hands out so freely.*

And then the *thing* is the [Verver] *magic* in the frame (162–3),

*he [Mr Verver] hurls his **magic** at me.*

The expressions: *private things*, *Verver magic*, and *gift* evoke or co-evoke each other and generate an *event frame* for the entity *that thing* and *something* that constitutes the *anticipatory sphere* in the propositional knowledge for each repeated instance in the frame sequence like drawn up above. In the meaning and the context of utterances in each frame (the **content plane**) the event frame for the entity *thing* is an additional *mental path* along which the teenage experience in the playground, inferred as *things* is interpreted further in the experiential content of frames in the following sequence as the game scenario,

*. . . the ways boys need **things**, (105)*

and then,

*I know **things** about boys (201)*

The entity *thing* is a *situational factor* (as in frame theory) which contextualizes the *thing* actors Evie and Lizzie experience in their playground, which, when linked with Evie and Lizzie's perception of the father-daughter relationship, another relationship factor is found running alongside the narrative of rivalry in the text and is as follows.

5.5. Finding: additional situational factor underpinning transgression and rivalry

The "Evie and Mr Shaw" relationship issue is because of Evie's intent in the frame (215a) to compete with sister Dusty over their father, coach Verver. This *situational factor* comes full circle when the Evie and Mr Shaw situation as a *fictive path* [16](as in frame theory) puts the reader in the same position of a *language recipient*, i.e., the way Lizzie as a recipient becomes a *focalizer* of the

primary focus and is responding to her best friend's rivalry with Dusty over coach Mr Verver. In so doing, brings to focus the rivalry between Lizzie and Evie, again over coach Verver and gets coded when Lizzie wants to *rescue* Evie from an unnarratable *thing (something)* and as a character, Lizzie is in the frame (242),

> . . . stringing clues together, tracing the breadcrumbs back. Dropping breadcrumbs myself. All to **rescue** her [Evie] from him [Mr Shaw]. (Saving scenario: microcontext 3)

Lizzie's perception of the youth-adult relationship, perceived as deviant by Evie, also surfaces in her lexical choices for coach Verver in the frame (162–3),

> . . . he [Mr Verver] hurls his **magic** at me [Lizzie] . . . hadn't I been waiting for **it** for my whole life,

And then, as *that gift* in the frame (177),

> waiting for that **gift**, any **gift**, **the gift** he [coach Verver] hands out so freely.

The above event chain is the *fictive path*: frame (242) > frame (162–3) > frame (177), where Lizzie is the **narrative object/the victim** of her desire for a father figure. The analyst thus looks beyond Evie's disappearance for the material content that contextualizes Lizzie's desire to *save* and *protect* Evie and *rescue* Mr Verver from a circumstance lexicalized as *dark tales* and *mysteries* the siblings hide from their parents in the frame (243).

5.6. Finding: victim or an unreliable narrator?

While Lizzie is sympathized for protecting her best friend's intent to compete with sister Dusty in frame (18), she is also judged for her fixation on coach Verver. Her fixation on Mr Verver are *private things* in the frame (209), *something you weren't supposed to look at it* in the frame (201). The pronominal is a *withheld* situation and is an additional focus in Lizzie's account of the father-daughter relationship in the Verver household as *something* and the boy-girl relationship factor as the *thing* in the game scenario in the narrative, and conceptualized by as *the sickness* and *sick* in frames (233) and (234),

> . . . show him [Mr Verver] **the sickness** polluting the house. . . .

> It's **sick** what you [Evie] are doing [going away with Mr Shaw].'

If the entity *thing* is the *sickness* polluting the Verver household, then as a circumstance, the relationship factor for Lizzie is an issue, and is the primary focus in the dominant narrative of rivalry when Evie intends to compete with Dusty over their father in the frame (63); however, *the thing* that,

> I [Lizzie] realize it's **not about Evie at all** but **the thing** that took Evie deep inside and is hiding there.

For the I-narrator is *something* Lizzie *didn't want to share* in the frame (166), emphasis added,

> **The lie** is somewhere else. . . . It was mine [Lizzie], and I **didn't** want to share **it**.

A sub-narrative of the relationship, the Lizzie and Mr Verver scenario, is constructed as a factor alongside the primary focus of rivalry between the siblings. The existence of a reality that Lizzie counters as *the lie* relates to her desire that wells up from the dominant rivalry narrative. Hence, the reinterpretation of Evie's situation with Mr Shaw as a mental path resolves teenage conflicts,

underpinning the circumstance *the thing* conceptualized as *the sickness* in the frame sequence or the event chain,

> The frame (235): *I [Evie] see how* ***it*** *is, Mom sees how* ***it*** *[Dusty and Mr Verver relationship] is . . .* > repeated frame (233): *. . . how she'd [dusty] have to show him [Mr Verver]* ***the sickness polluting his own house*** > repeated frame (234): *It's* ***sick*** *what you're [Evie] doing, . . . He's [Mr Shaw] a pervert and you're a pervert too.* > frame (63): *I realize it's not Evie at all but* ***the thing*** *that took Evie deep inside . . .* > frame (166): ***The lie*** *is somewhere else. . . . It was mine [Lizzie], and I didn't want to share* ***it***,

The content plane in each frame *evokes* or *co-evokes* a relationship between each other that links the Evie and Mr Shaw situation with *the thing* that allowed Evie to become even with sister Dusty over father, Mr Verver, but for Lizzie is about a *lie somewhere else*.

This *somewhere else* is about the "Lizzie and Mr Verver" scenario (column 6) instantiated in the repetition of "*I know*" (microcontext 2) by Lizzie. This new and instantiated **situational factor** and the "Evie and Mr Shaw" **situation** co-evoke each other when the I-narrator is a **victim of** her desire stemming from a **circumstance** of rivalry—the control and power (the *crime of power*) from which Lizzie wants to save in an *anticipatory sphere of saving* (microcontext 3) instantiated in the semantic field of saving. This value position in the text counters Lizzie's secret desire for her coach Verver.

Episodic links like the above, also prompt the above storyline analysis in the distinction of the narrator participating as a character in the principle of a *double claim* in the utterance and statement pair in the discourse. In the *double function*[17] (DF) of the narrator, there is an **"experiencing"** Lizzie as a **character** expressing her secret desire in the Lizzie and Mr Verver scenario and the secret desire is incorporated in the *diegesis* when there is,

- an unreliable I-narrator stance,
- an anticipatory sphere of *saving* advanced as value position in the text, and
- the entity *thing, something* as a phenomenon.

And the above is intensified in the language, such as in hypotheticality and counterfactuality taken up in the section below.

6. Framework 2

6.1. Storyworld (SW) analysis in counterfactuality: narrator vs character disposition

The counterfactual account is of particular interest in this study. Counterfactuality in the text is not about **disnarration**: *a narrator explicitly states that something did not happen* (Lambrou, 2019, p. 20), nor as *something that might have been but was not* (Dannenberg, 2014, p. 59). **Counterfactuality** is about interpreting an *alternate storyworld* (SW), by which spatial narrative means (in negation and modality) an **expression plane** is distinct from the "recounting" of events as a "post crime" retrospective narrator in the discourse of itself as a **character**.

Linguistically, counterfactuality is also a representational technique at a functional level that,

> *. . . infer* ***the negation of reality*** *from the expression of only* ***partial reality*** *in* ***counterfactuality***, *how this is inferred is from the* ***structure of utterance***, *from the* ***world knowledge about a situation***, *or various* ***discourse clues***. (Ziegler, 2000, p. 59)

The expression "world knowledge" differs from "world view" (*mindstyle*[18]). For instance, offending conduct is set up against the *world knowledge . . . [of controversial] situations*. The Evie and Mr Shaw's **situation** is a "situation" due to sibling rivalry, while the new instantiated focus—the 'Lizzie

and coach Verver's scenario is a "cognitive mindset" of Lizzie relating to her school coach, Mr Verver.

Counterfactual accounts, like "rhetorical questions", are akin to the **statement** of a character in an offender engagement discourse, and as overt markers of a character's point of view are positioned in the meanings and wordings, such as,

- In modal expressions: *ought to, should* that indicate an evaluative stance
- In continuous tense aspect with no endpoint: *wanting, waiting, sharing*
- In negation: *don't know; can't watch; was never coming back; will never tell*
- In conditional "if" statements
- In default present tense "*now*" vs past tense "*did made*" vs future tense "*will never tell*"

The analyst must objectively attend to all counterfactual accounts (mainly in negation and in continuous tense aspect) that account for the way the speaker/writer expects its readers to respond to a proposition. This proposition is an anticipatory sphere of saving from an unnarratable phenomenon and provides material for interpreting the two situational factors (the Evie and Mr Shaw situation plus the Lizzie and Mr Verver scenario) hypothesized as an outcome of peer-on-peer relationship patterns such as in the game scenario that links with peer pressures in elite schools reported in the media.

6.2. Finding: discourse referent (DR) for antecedentless something/thing in utterance, statement pair

I-narrator Lizzie creates a dialogue between her reader and herself in the "drama of telling" where an "experiencing" Lizzie (or the *dramatized character*) establishes a relationship with her *2nd self*, when (emphasis added),

> ... the I-narrator **knows but does not know** what [she] is [on] about. (Booth, 1983, p. 213)

Suppose the counterfactual accounts are a form of "intrusion" in which the narrator points to an "alternate" story situation which (in Ziegler, 2000) infers the negation of reality from the expression of only partial reality. In that case, the primary focus as the situational factor is a **partial reality**, while the "Lizzie and Mr Verver" scenario becomes the reality because experiencing Lizzie, as a character, negates her *strange secret ... I'll never tell* in frames (209) and (245).

Furthermore, suppose that the counterfactual accounts are formulations by which the I-narrator Lizzie modulates her attachment/detachment from a "value position" or a "truth condition" covertly incorporated and advanced in the *diegesis*,[19] then the "overlapping" of frames in column 5 also provides the *tellability* factor of the new instantiated situational factor as a new focus/reality in column 6. This cognitively situated 2nd relationship scenario is about Lizzie's desire for a father figure, *wanting something so badly* in the frame (245), which Evie regains but *never comes back* to Lizzie in the frame (174),

> I don't know why, but I can't watch. ... **Waiting** for **something** else, but **that thing** never comes back. (The 'Lizzie and Mr Verver' scenario)

Linguistically, the continuous tense aspect, *waiting*, is not the past tense form with an endpoint, e.g., "waited". In other words, Lizzie's desire remains unresolved as a circumstance, which is an ongoing situation without an endpoint, but in counterfactuality, remains an unnarratable *thing* and is countered as a *lie* by the I-narrator in the frame (166); Lizzie *didn't want to share*,

> **The lie** is somewhere else ... I didn't want to share **it**.

A linguistically untrained reader remains unaware of the above *episodic link* between frame (166) with the *context of an utterance* in the frame (174) and **fails to** comprehend why Lizzie is unable to watch Mr Verver running to see Evie in the frame (174),

> I [Lizzie] stop and cover my eyes.

> **I don't know** why, but **I can't watch** [Mr Verver running up to Evie back from hospital].

Her father is understandably anxious about Evie returning from the hospital, having disappeared for nineteen days. The logical argument is that Lizzie is **competing** with Evie over their school coach for a father figure, which is supported by the *retrospective characterization* of a drowning event analysed below.

Lizzie's fixation on a father figure is because her parents are divorced. Nevertheless, from a **behavioural perspective**, the pronoun *something* like *everything* is the predicted behaviour of rivalry, which Diane Lizzie's mum observes as a "condition" (a phenomenon) that must *break* in the Verver household,

> I [Diane] guess[ed] it always seemed like **something** like this [Evie disappearing with Mr Shaw] might happen to … the Ververs. Like **something** had to break. It could only go so long before **something** had to break.

This condition is perceived as *sick* by Evie in frame (235) and as *sickness* by Dusty in frames (234) and (235), respectively, and it dominates the Verver household where Lizzie spends most of her time.

Another ensuing rivalry over coach Verver is evident in the *retrospective characterization* of a drowning event in the Green Hollow Lake when Evie and Lizzie disagree with each other over "who is saved by whom".

In Lizzie's version,

> *I tumbled into the lake, and no one saw. … That is how I think of it now, … Until **Mr Verver scooped me, … and saved me then and there**. … I remember that.* (62) (italics in the original text for emphasis)

In Evie's version Mr Shaw,

> "**He [Mr Shaw] pulled me [Evie] out**," … No one saw me fall, but he saw, and he **rescued** me." (215)

But in fictional reality, Diane says, Mr Shaw saved Lizzie,

> It was at Green Hollow Lake. … "You fell and Harold Shaw was right there. **He [Shaw] plucked you [Lizzie] out and I still remember** … You were holding onto him so tight. (244)

If an *iterative narration* of the same drowning event with a slight variation like the above is to *provide readers with an evaluative assessment of what sort of an instance of the type of particular undertaking is* (Goffman in Lemert and Branaman, Goffman, 2007, p. 155), then Evie's version of the drowning episode *pronounces* the event not simply as an act of rivalry between Evie and Lizzie, but as a code of behaviour is a condition in the Verver household [that] *has to break* in Diane's version when a competitive Lizzie is a *dramatized character* and lets her best friend disappear with Mr Shaw in frame (130), in italics in the original text,

> *I let her. I let her* [Evie disappears with Shaw]. … *I **hate** myself for it.*

Lizzie might *hate* herself in retrospect for not stopping her best friend from going away with Mr Shaw in frame (130). However, the frame contrasts with I-narrator Lizzie wanting to **protect** Mr Verver in frame (149),

> *I [Lizzie] choose to **protect** him [Mr Verver from the siblings concealing about Mr Shaw visiting Evie every evening in the Verver backyard],*

Then when Lizzie asks Dusty to **save** Evie in frame (169),

> *"Don't you want to **save** her [Evie and get her back home]? I say finally.*

And, when Evie is herself being **saved** in the frame (219),

> *He [Mr Shaw] **saved** me [Evie] and I gave him [Mr Shaw] this thing.*

A common-sense assumption is that Mr Shaw cannot *save* Evie because he committed suicide out of shame for disappearing with Evie for 19 days. Hence, it makes sense when Dusty says to Lizzie in the frame (169),

> *"'What makes you think she [Evie] wants to be **saved**?'"*

In the semantic field of *protecting/saving* repeated in the discourse, an anticipatory sphere of saving is advanced as a value position in the text by the speaker, following Martin and White (2005, p. 93),

> *The **dialogic perspective** leads [readers] to attend to the **anticipatory aspect** of **the text** – to the **signals** speakers/writers provide us to **how they expect those they address to respond** to the current proposition and the value positions it advances.* (Emphasis added)

Lizzie, therefore, is making her readers attend to an *anticipatory aspect* of competition when she counters in negation in frame (245),

> *Wanting **something** so badly … It's a **strange secret**, sharing and I'll **never tell**.*

Linguistically, in the continued tense aspect, Lizzie has been **waiting** for this *something* which is a *gift* in frames (116) and (177) and is *Verver magic* in the frame (162), but is a *secret knowledge* in the frame (129) besides *a lie* in frame (166). These lexical choices form a cohesive tie with *private things* Lizzie *wants back* in frame (209),

> *Only **private things**, **me-and-Mr Verver things** … I want it back, I do.*

Lizzie is caught up with the desire to be the centre of attention of coach Verver like the siblings. As a lexicon, the *Private things, gift, and magic* are coding a youth-adult relationship pattern that characterizes Lizzie's desire for a father figure when she is idolizing her coach using the above lexical choices.

> However, an unnarratable circumstance is a *strange secret* for Lizzie she has been *waiting for her whole life* in frame (162), which she thought she has now lost forever in frame (202),

> *There was **something**, and you **weren't supposed to** look at **it**, … And **now something's gone forever**, and I feel its loss. It crushes me.* ('Lizzie and Mr Verver' scenario)

Suppose the pronoun *something* is a circumstance that has *gone forever* for Lizzie; *something* is a change of state Lizzie experiences as a character because Evie has now become the centre of

attention of coach Verver in frame (174). In other words, Lizzie's secret desire for Mr Verver's attention becomes a situational factor, which relates to Lizzie's world knowledge of the youth/adult relationship such as in the continuous tense aspect in frame (245),

> **Wanting** something so badly, you make it so. He [Mr Verver] and I, we share that. It's a strange **secret**, **sharing**, and I'll never tell.

Lizzie's *secret* in frame (245) is comparable to Evie's *secret* in frame (67),

> I [Lizzie] know **it**, soul deep [it is Mr Shaw]. ... And didn't Evie share **it** ... in her backyard, kneeling over cigarette stubs, a **secret so perilous** she could scarcely utter it?

The above two frames are **motive frames** and contextually relate to the narrative of teenage rivalry on the one hand; on the other, positions **I-narrator** Lizzie as a **character** "in-the-know" (microcontext 2) of an unnarratable circumstance she represents as the *thing*. Hence, narrator Lizzie remains concerned about this *thing* (*something*) and wants to save her best friend and coach Verver from this unnarratable entity that dominates the Verver household and is experienced in the game scenario.

Evie's disappearance is an outcome of competition and rivalry that has turned toxic and is a *sickness* for Dusty in frames (234) ad (235); this condition says Diane Lizzie's mum must *break* in frame (175). Hence the anticipatory sphere in the lexicon of *saving* (microcontext 3) is advanced as a value position in the text that episodically links with the semantic field of *heal* and *save* in a "hypothetical"[20] SW of *power* (though negated) in frame (186),

> Evie felt Mr Shaw's love, and what girl **wouldn't** eventually sink into that love, its dreamy promise? ... He **would** tear it down because one just downward glance from her would **heal** him, **save him**. She has the power. What girl **wouldn't** want that **power**?

Hence, the above **rhetorical SW** of power characterizes Evie's transgression as a *crime of power* (as opposed to a *crime of strength* – these expressions of criminality are observed by an IPS officer in her talk for International Day on the "Violence against Women" in the Indian context attended on Thursday 25th November 2021).

> The repetition of the word, *save* also linguistically,

> signal [s] how the speaker [Lizzie] expects us [readers] to respond [to this context of saving and] how those ... [she] address [es] to respond to ... [this] current proposition [as the] the **value position** [which the text] advances.

In modal *would* (though negated) in frame (186), Lizzie is not *denying* or *countering* (in category: *disclaim*), nor *concurring* or *endorsing* Evie's power over Mr Shaw in negation *wouldn't*. However, Lizzie is *proclaiming: pronouncing* the *world knowledge of a situation* (Martin & White, 2005, p. 98) that relates to the issue of power and control between best friends and the siblings, but remains *unnarratable* (Prince, 1988) as antecedentless pronouns for Lizzie, who as a *focalizer* of Evie and Mr Shaw's relationship situates her *secret* desire in her cognitive world of the "Lizzie and Mr Verver" scenario, which is, in reality, a phenomenon/circumstance of power and rivalry backgrounded in the story.

In this way, the underpinning of a "truth condition" of power is intensified as a rhetorical statement of a **participating character** from which character Lizzie wants to *rescue* Mr Verver and save him from being overwhelmed by *everything* in the saving scenario in frame (243),

> He [Mr Verver] seems overwhelmed, by **everything**. I want to **rescue** him from **it** [i.e., the *dark tales* and *mysteries* both siblings decide not to share with their dad in the frame (243)].

Hence, ***everything*** is about a code of conduct practiced for power and control and, as a **phenomenon**, is dominating Evie's interpretation of her father-sister relationship issue in frame (235) on the one hand, and the other, as a *thing* that relates to peer-on-peer pressure in the school playground in the game scenario in frames (63; 105–6; 174; 202 and 219). Such cohesive tie between frames situates the cognitive world of Lizzie and Mr Verver.

Understandably, such an environment is overwhelming for the school coach from which Lizzie wants to *protect* Mr Verver because this circumstance is about *dark tales* that *the sisters hide* in the frame (242b). Speaker Lizzie is, in this way, taking a particular position on reality because, emphasis added,

> The **dialogic perspective** leads [readers] to attend to the **anticipatory aspect** of the text – to the **signals** the speaker/writers provide us to **how they expect those they address** to respond to the current proposition and the value positions it advances. (Martin & White, 2005, p. 93)

The analyst, therefore, attends to this anticipatory aspect in the lexicon: *rescuing*, *healing*, and *saving* in the frame (186) and responds to the proposition of saving as a value position in the text. Subsequently, the semantic field of saving situates the competition and rivalry as a code of conduct in the "discourse world" of Lizzie, which, when episodically linked with the context of Lizzie "in the know" of Evie's intent to disappear is to get even with Dusty in the frame (215a),

> ... she [Evie] knew somehow **she'd end up in that car with him** [Mr Shaw],

And above frame links the saving scenario with Evie's intent to compete with Dusty which contextualizes the underpinning factor as a truth value and narrativized as *the thing* in the school playground in frames (105) and (201).

6.3. Finding: Situating the offence to a broader context of peer-on-peer pressure in schools

If Lizzie's cognitive world is an outcome of a code of conduct of competition and rivalry that has devastating consequences, then *the sickness* is also the pronominal *it* and the *thing* that Evie conceptualizes in frame (235),

> I [Evie] see how **it** is, Mom sees how **it** is. "'Dusty, you can want him [Mr Verver] your whole life and dad's never going to give **it** to you'".

The pronominal *"it"* is then about a deviant mindset of Evie, which is becoming a growing setting that provides material for the cognitive world of Lizzie manifested as the "Lizzie and Verver" as the 2nd situational factor in the 2nd story of investigation, which when *cohesively* ties in with the game scenario contextualizing a peer-on-peer relationship pattern as an unnarratable entity *thing* for young Lizzy in the frame (201),

> "'I know **things** about boys'", I [Lizzie] blurt.

And, when Evie explains to Lizzie in frame (106),

> ... sometimes the ways boys need **things** ... it almost scared her.

These frames then decode,

> … a **shared framework** of meanings [that] situates [Evie's] offending conduct in the inter-pretations that actor [Lizzie as a character in the crime story] attribute[s] to [her playground] surrounding.

And is contextualized in the propositional content in the event chain:

> Frame (245): **something** > frame (129): **this secret knowledge** > frame (209): *only* **private things** > frame (162–3): *he hurls* **his magic** *at me* > frame (201): **something** *you weren't supposed to lean in …***something's gone forever** > frame (106): *boys need* **things**,

This above chain, as representative of Lizzie's cognitive world (or her *mindstyle*), is intense, such as in frame (178),

> A **baton** passed, from her to me, even as she hadn't meant to pass it, even as she still felt it in her tight, **clawed hands**, (Game scenario)

From which the siblings want *to keep their noble king [dad] safe* in the frame (243),

> … [have] decided what mattered to them. … it was Mr Verver, … The **him of him**, and **the idea of him**, … to keep their noble king **safe**.

Entity *thing* is now personified as *him of him* and *the idea of him* in the frame (243) and therefore ceases to be about Evie and Mr Shaw, as Lizzie rightly states in frame (166), *the lie is somewhere else*. This shifts the reader's gaze to this alternative SW repeated as "*I know*" (microcontext 2) in the rivalry narrative.

A youth-adult relationship issue in this way forefronts an unnarratable *something* from which Mr Verver is protected by his daughters as *palace guards*, but Mr Shaw becomes the **"object"** of Evie's desire in the game of *power* over Dusty and situates Evie's offending conduct to a phenomenon of power and control used by Evie to get even with Dusty in the frame (210),

> "*It's all done, she says with almost a sigh.* "*It's all done.*

In the episodic links formulated, a complicated cluster of emotions forefronts Lizzie's **discourse world** in which the narrator resides as a teenager, conceptualized as the "Lizzie and Mr Verver" scenario. The siblings may have overcome their rivalry over their father; but, Lizzie is left with her contradictions and the inequalities that relate to her struggles of being without a father figure where *youth* is,

> … . characterised by a **culture** created out of tensions between regulation and rebellion; control and care; the civilised and the savage. The result is a **carnivalesque** culture that forever pushes at the boundaries of transgression. (Presdee, 2000, 114)

Referring to the above quote, if youth **culture** is an outcome of teenage tension, then Evie's transgression is a teenage protest that prompts panic from the "adult society" when Dusty learns to share her place in the family alongside her sister Evie. As a situational factor, in the first instance, the transgression conceptualizes the rivalry narrative. Along with the 2nd situational factor, in the second instance, the rivalry becomes an outcome of the interpretation of the shared practices in Evie and Lizzie's surrounding, which at the point of telling, remains backgrounded or withheld as the *thing, something, and it*. As *intentional gaps* (Lambrou, 2019, p. 28), these proforms also prompt a complex behavioural pattern which is an outcome of a circumstance/phenomenon that remains unnarratable as *something* [that] *had to break* according to Diane, Lizzie's mum in frame (175), prompting a crime-culture nexus.

7. The factual dimension of a fictional representation: the crime-culture nexus

This story of *something* comes full circle in the notion of "rescue" from an unnarratable circumstance which is conceptualized as *the sickness* by Dusty and by Diane as *something [that] has to break* in the Verver household. On the other hand, the narrator personifies *the sickness* as *him of him* and *the idea of him* in frame (243) and is lexicalized further as the *Verver magic* and *gift* by Lizzie as a character. In other words, if a social context is *mimetic* of Lizzie's teenage experiences, then the "Evie and Mr Shaw" situational factor becomes the *mental path* along which a relative material deficit (i.e., the deviant father-daughter relationship concept an outcome of jealousy and rivalry) is *bridged* by Evie (as a transgressor). But an "**experiencing**" Lizzie in the "Lizzie and Mr Verver" scenario feels *its loss* as a father figure in frame (174).

A relationship factor as pronominal "*it*" is, therefore, about the teenage mindstyle from which Dusty wants to protect her sister in Frame (18), but in fictional reality are *dark tales* and *mysteries* from which the siblings want to *protect* their father. Contextualized further, the unnarratable *it* is described as *boys' things* by both Evie and Lizzie in frames (105–6) and (201). Consequently, the entity *thing* situates "experiencing" Lizzie as a ***fictive subject*** (or the subject matter/**object**) of teenage experiences evidenced in the school playground when Mr Shaw is the object of Evie's desire to win over Dusty.

Such is the **existential** or **factual** dimension in this crime fact story where everyday teenage anxiety finds expression as a crime of power and control that conceptualizes an adolescent culture in interpreting the playground experience. A sub-narrative of "saving" as an anticipatory sphere emerges within the default narrative of competition and rivalry that the speaker provides as the value position in the text. Examined in this way, the deviant act is a *dichotomy* of crime with the *individual* on the one hand and the *culture* on the other that situates the offence as an *experience* rooted in the existential aspects of (teenage) culture (as a social practice). This is the *culture-perpetrator nexus* contextualized within a story theme of saving scenario.

8. Conclusion

Lizzie is a 13-year-old *focalizer* trying to report her understanding of her social world but fails to conceptualize a circumstance Dusty perceives as *sickness* and by Diane as a *condition*. Lizzie narrates this phenomenon in repetitive and vague language, using antecedentless proforms, *something,* and *that thing* besides *everything,* and *it* in the discourse.

Applying the theory of phenomenology (from narrative and cultural criminology) and undertaking a discourse-based FA in practice evidence how crime fiction (like in the media) incorporates social problems. A *phenomenology of criminal activity* enables one to *explore the practical knowledge* [which the teenagers] *have of their social world and … [to] realise the dynamic nature of experience … and the experiential (if not existential) dynamic that underpins [the] aggression* [in, *The End of Everything*].

In practice, this paper provides a framework to interpret the transgression within a social and cultural context that situates the discourse world of Evie and Lizzie's *shared values, practices and codes of behaviour, along with the means for enforcing the codes and the forms for expressing them,* such as Evie's perception of her father-daughter Dusty's love coloured by her jealousy over elder sister Dusty, and Lizzie's cognitive world of her fixation with her school coach as a father figure. Evaluated in this way, *The End of Everything* is a *crime fact story* that upholds teenage tensions as experiences in reality in society.

Secondly, applying a "three-dimensional" approach to a non-linear text provides means to evaluate the *tellability factor* represented in the repeated proforms, which is an unnarratable phenomenon/circumstance that Evie takes advantage of and situates Lizzie as a *victim* of this unnarrated circumstance when she competes with Evie over coach Verver. Swept up by the heat of

competitive behaviour, the transgression in, *The End of Everything* gets triggered by the interpretations that actors attribute to their surroundings when Lizzie becomes the "narrative object" of an unnarratable phenomenon *thing* Evie takes advantage of. There is a theme of "saving" advanced as the value position by the speaker that decodes Evie's transgression to a code of behaviour in the narrative.

To summarise, the above *retelling* of the dominant narrative of rivalry as a *crime of power and control* is thus achieved linguistically, firstly by,

- Foregrounding "microcontexts" in *repeated frames*
- Constructing a "backstory" in *event chains* for the *retelling* of the dominant narrative
- Evaluating a *mental path* along which a new instantiated focus provides material to remove the offender from the transgression
- Situating the offending conduct to the existential aspects of society and culture contextualized.

Secondly, in the *double claim* of the "participating" I-narrator, distinct from itself as an "experiencing" character in the storyworld analysis, it is possible to,

- Evaluate the *intentional gap* in counterfactuality,
- Contextualize the value position in the "lexicon" of an anticipatory sphere
- Situate the offending conduct in the interpretations that teenage actors attribute to their "peer-on-peer" experiences in reality.

Evaluated in this way, the transgression ceases to be an act of an individual, albeit executed by one in the story of crime where group-based predicted behaviour of rivalry and competition transgresses a norm that remains *unnarratable or nonnarratable* (Prince, 1988) in the repeated proforms. Consequently, the practical knowledge that Evie and Lizzie as actors have of their social background becomes *mimetic* of their *discourse world* synonymous with the circumstances reported in *The Sunday Times* and *Telegraph* (April 2021), like "online image consciousness" causing self-harm and suicide among teenagers, young people turning to online porn as an educational tool, and a "rape culture" found in elite schools; all this, narrativized as a youth/adult relationship issue in the crime fact story.

9. Direction for future research based on findings

A crime fact story (also as a genre) may be attempted to analyse group-based predicted behaviour in the forensic domain. However, one needs to work out what is a crime fact story as a genre. An initial suggestion is that true-crime stories are based on real crimes. These crime texts may be used to analyze predicted behaviour with a cultural connection; for example, terrorism is more of a "culturally-motivated" crime, albeit carried out by an individual.

Due to space constraints and also to explore the narrative as a whole for the crime-culture connection, a discourse-based macro-level analysis of the text is practical for exploring the *interface* between the fictional representation of factual circumstances causing behavioural issues in the adolescent society.

As directions for future research based on the findings in this paper, a causation analysis of participants, such as victims and an effector analysis of actors, in a narrative could be useful because *direct causation*, as opposed to *analytical* and *manipulative causation* in transitivity analysis, provides more than one processional layer in the Medium vs Agent role analysis of participants in a criminal context.

cogent social sciences

9.1. Additional information
Public interest statement—a description of your paper of NO MORE THAN 150 words suitable for a non-specialist reader, highlighting/explaining anything which will be of interest to the general public.

9.1.1. Description of your paper
The relation between the cause-and-effect that links transgression as being an outcome of a group-based predicted behaviour remains unclear in a crime fact story. The cause-and-effect chain or 'causation' establishes a perpetrator-culture connection and reveals deviant conduct as a 'culturally practised' phenomenon.

   The fictional story evaluated in the paper resembles broader concerns that reflect society currently. A language-based analytical approach contextualizes how crime narrative incorporates social problems like in the media. Otherwise, a factual group-based practice remains obscure in fictionality. Also, the methodology as a framework examines how criminality is conceptualized, which traditionally remains assigned to an individual without having evaluated the text at both the micro and macro level of discourse in a forensic context.

Author details
Reshmi Dutta-Flanders[1]
E-mail: reshmidf@gmail.com
ORCID ID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9710-8098
[1] English Languages & Linguistics,Division of Arts and Humanities, University of Kent, Canterbury, UK.

Notes
1. Causation—as a process (the cause-and-effect chain) may be brought about by an entity and may not be a direct participant engaged in the process. The cause-and-effect chain is linear in structure. For example, (a) *the lion* (Agent) *chased* (process) *the tourist* (object/recipient). *The tourist* is the recipient of the lion's action because it is the meal for the lion. However, *the tourist* is the medium through whom the process *chase* comes into existence. Such is the reading of causation when there is a double reading of the same participant, *tourist*, as both the object and agent in the clause structure. The double analysis of the transitivity function, such as above, is significant for participant role analysis in the criminal context. (Dutta-Flanders, 2014, p. 203)
2. It is about information from the surrounding text that provides context for the proform. The information inferred for the proform is about a context of utterance in prospection.
3. Explain how the information provided at an earlier point in the text is available at the following points to supplement the literal words of the text. ... For narrative text, meaningful mental representations are entity representations which provide information about characters. Contextual **frames** [or frames described as a mental store of information about the current context] monitor which characters are together at a particular time. These representations explain characters' behaviour and provide information that enables "shorthand" forms such as pronouns to be interpreted. (Emphasis added) (Emmott, 1997: 121, 197).
4. When a story is told, either in conversation, through letters, or in any sort of literary work, a storyworld is created with its own spatial and temporal reference points in the "here", "I" and "this" of the character in the story, different from the "here", "I" and this [or that] of the narrator. There is the *storytelling world/exit talk* (e.g., the speaker explains to the listener her inability to remember the person holding the gun against her head, and says, "If it ever happens to you ... ") and the *SW/swing phrase* (the speaker switches back into the story in the pronoun *you*). (Polanyi in Tannen, Polanyi, 1982, pp. 165–6).
5. Is a distinctive linguistic presentation of an individual mental self. A mind-style may analyse a character's mental life radically ... or relatively superficial or ... fundamental aspects of the mind. ... presents topics on which a character reflects ... preoccupations, prejudices, perspectives and values which strongly bias a character's world-view. ... [For example, the character] may choose words that betray the limitations of the [character's] experience and social affiliations. On the other hand, syntax ... vocabulary is important in establishing a character's mind-style. (Fowler, 103: 1979).
6. Is an *entity* articulated during narration, where a reference in a specific frame is indexed to an object in the immediate context, [and] functions differently to an anaphoric and cataphoric referential pronoun. This inferencing process is functionally synonymous with the mental processing of the pronoun it in the example, *Kill an active plump chicken, prepare it for the oven* (G. Brown & Yule, 1983, p. 202). When the reader must amalgamate the NP, active plump chicken with the verb kill to form a new mental representation for the proform, "*it*", which is the chicken that is killed (Dutta-Flanders, 2017a: 23, 27).
7. Because frames are episodic within a fictional world, with discourse-based FA, it is possible to form *episodic links* between frames. This is because an episodic link instantiates *mental representations* (Emmott, 2004: 196), which provide information about particular characters and [of other] frames [in the link/event chain]. ... [As *entity representation* (ibid: 106)] explain the behaviour of other characters and provide [facts] which enable "shorthand" forms such as pronouns to be interpreted. (Emphasis added).
8. Is processed as a *scenario* (theme frame) by clustering the repeated and overlapping frames in a non-linear discourse. Clustered as microcontexts, they

also function as *the point of reference* and provide contextual meaning for processing the substituted narrative for the motive in the offender context. (Emphasis added) (Dutta-Flanders, 2017a, p. 10).

9. *Object* here refers to a person or other entity involved in the situation. In a criminal context, a person is an object (NO) of the crime narrative. The object is the *narrative focus* that coincides with the character who then becomes the "fictive subject" of all perceptions. (Dutta-Flanders, 2017a, p. 12).

10. *Focalization* means a restriction of the field. The instrument of this possible selection is a *situated focus*, a sort of information-conveying pipe that allows passage only of information that is authorized by the situation. (Genette, 1990: 74).

11. Are a means of evoking the dynamic nature of experience generally and the experiential (if not existential) dynamic that underpins the aggression … focus on the shared production of social meaning and its attention to the interactive processes involved. … It is designed to explore people's practical knowledge of their social world. Society is [about] practical consciousness. Society is represented as an object or process which exists in, wells up from, and is workings of common sense. (Hayward, 2004, p. 9).

12. Is regarded as a *narrative act*. As a functional environment, the act resurfaces the double positioning of the narrating-I in the deep-structure analysis of clauses in offender engagement discourse. DF is based on the principle of tense alternation technique (Wolfson, 1982: 4). The CHP tense alternates with the default narrative past tense form in a way that simple past tense is substitutable for CHP without change in referential meaning. For example, there is referentially no difference between the underlined verbs in, "the guy was picking up one hundred pounds now", or "I was picking up two hundred pounds off the floor". (Dutta-Flanders, 2014: 6, 144).

13. An *event-frame* is defined as a set of conceptual elements and relationships that … are evoked together or co-evoke each other and can be said to lie within each other or constitute an event-frame. (Talmy in Ungerer and Schmid, 1997: 221).

14. What follows and how it is delivered signals a true hot spot. [For example, there is] … a significant contemplative frame break where [the narrator] drops the action scene [e.g., of narration] and relates a recall of contemplation of action. (O'connor, 2015, p. 183).

15. A **path** is explained as, … a linguistic means by which the windowing and gapping process are achieved … [i.e.] a speaker may foreground, or "window for attention", certain portions of the PATH by explicitly using linguistic expressions that refer to them. … if a conceptual element part of the event-frame is not expressly referred to, it is backgrounded by exclusion or "gapped". (Ungerer and Schmid, 1997: 224).

16. The *open path* is defined as a path whose beginning, and end points are at different locations in space [like the restricted context in Emmott (2004: 130), where people in two boats are at a distance; they can see but not hear each other. The **closed path** is like a circular arrow, where the starting and the end point of the closed path coincide at the same point. While in a *fictive path*, the reader must put itself in the position of the language recipient, i.e., like the hearer/reader who first responds by directing its mind's eye to a reference point [like

the repeated proforms], and then constructs a *mental path* by considering situational factors [as overlapping frames] that are outside or constitute the reference point for an inferential conceptualizing of the reference point. (Ungerer and Schmid, 1997: 225, 226).

17. (DF) is a narrative act. As a functional environment, the act resurfaces the double positioning of the narrating-I in the deep-structure analysis of clauses in offender engagement discourse. DF is based on the principle of tense alternation technique (Wolfson, 1982: 4). The CHP tense alternates with the default narrative past tense form in a way that simple past tense is substitutable for CHP without change in referential meaning. For example, there is referentially no difference between the underlined verbs in, "the guy was picking up one hundred pounds now", or "I was picking up two hundred pounds off the floor". (Dutta-Flanders, 2014: 6, 144).

18. Is a distinctive linguistic presentation of an individual mental self. A mind-style may analyse a character's mental life radically … or relatively superficial or … fundamental aspects of the mind. … presents topics on which a character reflects … preoccupations, prejudices, perspectives and values which strongly bias a character's world-view. … [For example, character] may choose words that betray the limitations of the [character's] experience and social affiliations. On the other hand, syntax … vocabulary is important in establishing a character's mind-style. (Fowler, 103: 1979).

19. There is a degree of directness in the mode of narration. The narrative modes run from the authority of a controlling narratorial report (diegetic summary), through "indirect" modes (INDIRECT SPEECH) to the forms of DIRECT AND FREE DIRECT SPEECH … it is possible to argue that *mimesis* (emphasis added) is a kind of diegesis: that a narrator is "implied", and may explicitly provide the TAGGING ("he said", etc). … diegesis leads to summary, and distance from an event. … In Genette's work … ., such as heterodiegetic for a narrative told in the third person (*he, she*)' and autodiegetic for a first person (*I*) narrative. (Wales, 2001, p. 109).

20. Hypotheticality enhanced by undercutting the lexical sense of volition (willingness) and intention in linguistic elements such as *could, shall* (hypothetical modals), or Counterfactual inferences improved in negation and the modal *would*. (Dutta-Flanders, 2017a, p. 427).

References
Abbott, H. P. (2007). Story, plot and narration. In D. Herman (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to narrative* (pp. 39–51). Cambridge University Press.
Abbott, M. (2011). *The end of everything*. Little Brown and Company.
Andrews, M. (2004). Opening to the original contributions: Counter-narratives and the power to oppose. In M. Bamberg & M. Andrews (Eds.), *Considering counter-narratives: Narrating, resisting, making sense* (pp. 1–5). John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Aspden, K., & Hayward, K. J. (2015). Narrative criminology and cultural criminology: shared biographies. In L. Presser & S. Sandberg (Eds.), *Narrative Criminology: Understanding stories of crime* (pp. 235–259). New York University Press.

Blast! Films. (2019a, 9th September) PBS America. *Student Athlete*. https://www.pbsamerica.co.uk/series/student-athlete/

Blast! Films. (2019b, 6th May) Channel 4, UK. *Sex on Trial*. https://distribution.channel4.com/programme/sex-on-trial

Booth, W. C. (1983). *The rhetoric of fiction*. The University of Chicago. chapter 8

Brennan, N. M., & Merkl Davies, D. M. (2013). Accounting narratives and impression management. In L. Jack, J. Davison, & R. Craig, (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to accounting communication* (pp. 2–40, Chapter 8). Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.

Chen, G. (March 17, 2021, last updated). *Pros and Cons of Sports Competition at the High School Level*. https://www.publicschoolreview.com/blog/pros-and-cons-of-sports-competition-at-the-high-school-level

Dannenberg, H. P. (2014). Gerald Prince and the fascination of what doesn't happen. *Narrative, 22*(3), 304–311. https://doi.org/10.1353/nar.2014.0024

Das, S. (2021, April 4th) Porn sites used by children show 'criminal' sex acts. *The Sunday Times*, 4.

Dutta-Flanders, R. (2014). Concealment and revelation: An interdisciplinary approach to reader suspense. *Style Summer, 48*(2), 219–242. https://www.jstor.org › stable › style.48.2.219.

Dutta-Flanders, R. (2017a). Double Function. In *The language of suspense in crime fiction: A linguistic stylistic approach* pp. 137–185. Palgrave Macmillan. www.palgrave.com/br/book/9781137470270https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-47028-7

Dutta-Flanders, R. (2017b). Offender Theme Analyses in a Crime Narrative: An applied approach. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue Internationale de Sémiotique Juridique, 31*(4), 721–743. 10.1007/s11196-017-9534-9

Dutta-Flanders, R. (2019). The plotting of criminal relevance: Five little pigs. *Journal Studies in Crime Writing, 2*(2020), 1–22. https://sicw.newberry.edu/index.php/sicw/index

Emmott, C. (1997). *Narrative Comprehension: A discourse perspective*. Clarendon Press.

Fill, C. J. (1977). Topics in Lexical Semantics. In R. W. Cole (Ed.), *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*. Indiana University Press.

Fumagalli, R. (2019). How thin rational choice explains choices. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science, 83* (2020), 63–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsa.2020.03.003

Gerald, P. (1988). The Disnarrated. *Style, 22*, 1–8.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the organization of Experience*. Penguin Books Ltd.

Goffman, E. (2007). Frame analysis. In C. Lemert & A. Branaman (Eds.), *The Goffman Reader* (pp. 149–166). Blackwell Publishing Limited.

Harding, J. R. (2007). Evaluative stance and counterfactuals in language and literature. *Language and Literature, 16*(3), 263–280. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963947007079109

Hayward, K. J. (2004). *City limits: Crime, consumer culture and the Urban Experience*. The Glass House Press.

Hayward, K. J. (2010). Opening the lens: Cultural Criminology and the image. In K. Hayward & M. Presdee (Eds.),

Framing Crime: Cultural Criminology and the Images chapter 1 http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/kentuk/detail.action?docID=547337

Hirsh, J. B., & Peterson, J. B. (2009). Personality and Language use in self-narratives. *Journal of Research in Personality, 43*(2009), 524–527. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.01.006

Hope, C., & Sawer, P. (2021, March 28th). Whitehall inquiry into elite school sex scandal. *The Sunday Telegraph*, Sunday 1.

Jeffries, L., & McIntyre, D. (2010). *Stylistics*. Cambridge University Press.

Lambrou, M. (2019). *Disnarration and the Unmentioned in Fact and Fiction* (chapter 2). https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-50778-52

Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The Language of evaluation: Appraisal in english*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Minsky, M. (1980). A Framework for Representing Knowledge. In D. Metzing (Ed.), *Frame Analysis: Text Understanding* (pp. 3–12). Palgrave Macmillan.

Neuberger, J. (1993). Introduction: Crime and Culture. In Hooliganism: Crime, Culture, and Power in St. In *Petersburg*. University of California Press.

O'connor, P. E. (2015). Telling moments: narrative hot spots in accounts of criminal acts. In L. Presser & S. Sandberg (Eds.), *Narrative Criminology: Understanding stories of crime* (pp. 174–206). New York University Press.

Polanyi, L. (1982). Literary complexity in everyday storytelling. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Spoken and written language: Exploring orality and literacy vol, IX* (pp. 155–169). Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Rapp, D. N., & Gerrig, R. J. (2006). Predilections for narrative outcomes: The impact of story contexts and reader preferences. *Journal of Memory and Language, 54*(2006), 54–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2005.04.003

Ripley, A. (2013, October) *The case against high-school sports*. https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2013/10/the-case-against-high-school-sports/309447/

Rose, J. (2018, 14th October) BBC Radio 4. *Today Programme*.

Sternberg, M. (2013). Universals of narrative and their cognitive fortunes (1). *Poetics Today, 24*(2), 297–395. https://doi.org/10.1215/03335372-24-2-297

Ungerer, F., & Schmid, H.J. (1997). An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics. *Longman*, Chapter 5.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1977). *Text and context: Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse*. Longman. chapter 5

Van Gelder, J. L., & Van Deale, S. (2014). Innovative data collection methods in criminological research: Editorial introduction. *Crime Science: A SpringerOpen Journal, 3* (6), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40163-014-0006-1

Varma, R. (2021, December 16) *Webinar of international day for Eliminating violence against women* [Video]. YouTube. https://youtu.be/P91Ezopvclw

Wales, K. (2001). *A dictionary of stylistics* (2nd ed.). Longman.

Yar, M. (2010). Screening crime: Cultural criminology goes to the movies. In K. Hayward & T. Presdee (Eds.), *Framing Crime: Cultural Criminology and the Image*. Taylor & Francis Group.

Yar, M. (2018). Toward a cultural criminology of the internet. In K. F. Steinmetz & M. R. Nobles (Eds.), *Technocrime and Criminological Theory* (pp. 116–132). Routledge.

Ziegler, D. (2000). Hypothetical modality as a grammatical category. In W. Abraham & M. Noonam (Eds.), *Hypothetical modality: Grammaticalisation in an L2 dialect (Studies in Language Companion Series 51)* (pp. 15–43). John Benjamins Publishing Company.