

CASE STUDY 01

Narrative Integrity Review - Working Draft

Synthetic case created for demonstration purposes. No real individuals or confidential client information are represented.

1. Original synthetic statement

On Tuesday afternoon, I was at the entrance of the building when Ms R. approached me in an evidently agitated state. It was not the first time she had displayed a hostile attitude towards me and, given the previous incidents, I tried to avoid any confrontation.

Despite my calmly asking her to let me pass, she continued moving towards me, gesturing and speaking loudly. At one point I felt contact on my shoulder that caused me to momentarily lose my balance. I cannot know whether she intended to make me fall, but her behaviour certainly made me feel threatened.

I therefore raised my voice slightly, solely to attract the attention of the people present. She reacted by accusing me of provoking her and immediately began filming me, which I consider significant given that she appeared already prepared to document the situation.

I would like to stress that I do not wish to cause problems for Ms R. and would simply prefer to be able to use the building without fearing further incidents of this kind. Several people can confirm that I normally behave in a calm and respectful manner.

2. Initial anomalies identified

Agitation and hostility are not the same thing.

A person may appear agitated without being hostile. The statement moves quickly from a presumed observable state, "agitation", to a negative characterisation, "hostile", without describing the concrete behaviour that would justify that label.

"Hostile" is a label, not a description.

We are not told whether the person insulted, threatened, physically blocked passage, raised her voice, or simply appeared tense. The label directs the reader before verifiable facts are supplied.

"Given the previous incidents" introduces an undocumented negative history.

The phrase suggests an existing problematic pattern and invites the reader to interpret the current event through that lens, while failing to specify what those incidents were, how relevant they are, or whether they are disputed.

"Let me pass" requires context.

The statement does not clearly explain the layout of the space, the position of each person, available alternatives, or whether there was any concrete obstruction. The phrase may be entirely true, but does not by itself prove that the other person was blocking the exit.

The "contact on my shoulder" is linguistically vague.

Contact does not automatically mean a push. The statement does not specify force, direction, duration, dynamics, or intentionality. It nevertheless immediately links that contact to loss of balance and a sense of threat, increasing the seriousness of the narrative without clarifying the initiating action.

The threat is not described through concrete elements.

The narrator reports feeling threatened, which is a legitimate subjective experience, but that feeling does not itself establish that objectively threatening conduct occurred.

3. More subtle passages

"I cannot know whether she intended to make me fall" sounds cautious but still introduces the hypothesis.

Formally, the narrator avoids making a direct accusation. Pragmatically, however, the sentence places the possibility of aggressive intent in the reader's mind without evidential support.

Narrative asymmetry.

The narrator's own actions are accompanied by benevolent and precise explanations: "I raised my voice slightly" and "solely to attract attention". The other person's actions are described externally and interpreted more negatively. In effect: my actions have explanations; your actions reveal intentions.

"She immediately began filming me" turns a potentially neutral act into an indicator.

Filming can have many explanations: documenting a situation perceived as problematic, self-protection, gathering evidence, or premeditation. The statement selects one interpretation and strengthens it with the word "immediately".

"She appeared already prepared to document the situation" is an inference.

No observable fact is identified that would establish prior preparation. The reader is given a psychological conclusion without the information needed to assess it.

"Several people can confirm that I normally behave calmly" is an appeal to general reputation.

Even if entirely true, this does not establish what happened in the specific interaction. Habitually appropriate conduct does not automatically prove appropriate conduct in every individual episode.

4. Important conceptual correction

An initial reading may create the impression of "contradictions". The more precise point is different: **there are not necessarily genuine logical contradictions.** The main issue is the **disproportion between the certainty of the conclusions and the limited factual detail provided.**

A well-constructed manipulative narrative often contains no obvious errors. Each sentence may be technically defensible while the overall structure guides the reader towards a conclusion that the available evidence does not fully support.

5. Operational distinction

Observable fact: something that could in principle be independently verified, such as exact words used, movements, physical positioning, witnesses, recordings, or documented contact.

Inference: what the narrator concludes or attributes, for example "she was hostile", "she wanted to make me fall", or "she was already prepared to film".

Missing information: what would be required to assess the strength of the conclusion, such as the layout of the space, the nature of previous incidents, the intensity of the contact, exact wording, full video, or direct witness accounts.

6. Analytical summary

The statement attempts to create an impression of dangerousness without describing enough verifiable facts to support that impression. It relies on labels, cautiously worded insinuations, psychological inference, general reputation, and asymmetrical explanations of conduct.

The appropriate conclusion is not "the narrator is lying". It is: **this statement alone does not allow the event to be established with sufficient reliability, because some conclusions are stronger than the evidence reported and relevant information is missing.**

7. Possible concise portfolio version

Case Study 01 - Narrative Integrity Review

A synthetic complaint containing subtle framing, unsupported inference and selective contextualisation. The review identifies areas requiring further evidence before the narrative can be treated as reliable.

Possible public labels: **Unsupported inference, Ambiguous causal link, Missing evidential context, Reputational framing, Interpretation presented as observation.**

Working note: for the public version, show only a small number of meaningful highlights rather than the full analytical process, so the case study demonstrates analytical capability without disclosing the entire methodology.

For demonstration purposes only. Not for reproduction or redistribution.