

My Interviewing Philosophy

In every interview, before a single question is asked, something more fundamental is already happening: two human beings are sitting across from one another, each carrying their own fears, histories, pressures, and hopes. That human reality is the starting point of my interviewing philosophy. An interview is never just a procedural step in an investigation. It is a moment of human interaction under pressure, and if we forget that, we lose the very conditions that make truth possible.

I don't divide interviewing into criminal, administrative, HR, compliance, or loss prevention. Those categories may matter to organizations, but they don't matter to the human brain. People respond to threat, uncertainty, shame, and stress the same way regardless of the label on the case file. When someone sits down in an interview, they are not thinking about policy distinctions. They are thinking about what this moment means for them, what they fear, what they hope, and whether they can trust the space enough to think clearly. My work begins there.

Interviewing, at its core, is not about extracting information. It is about creating the conditions where a person can access what they know, organize it, and express it without being overwhelmed by fear or driven into defensiveness. Memory is fragile. Stress narrows thinking. Shame shuts people down. Pressure produces compliance, not clarity. If we want accurate accounts, we have to understand the human being in front of us, not as a problem to solve, but as a person navigating a difficult moment.

That is why the interviewer's presence matters as much as their questions. A dysregulated interviewer creates a dysregulated interview. Tone, pace, posture, and emotional steadiness are not soft skills; they are accuracy tools. When an interviewer is grounded, the other person can settle. When the interviewer listens without rushing to judgment, the other person can think. When the interviewer stays curious rather than adversarial, the other person can reflect rather than defend. Truth doesn't emerge because we push harder. It emerges because we create a space where thinking is possible.

I don't believe in chasing confessions. I believe in cultivating accounts, accounts that are coherent, internally generated, and aligned with what the person genuinely remembers and understands. That requires patience. It requires humility. It requires the discipline to let the person speak in their own sequence, with their own language, at their own pace. It also requires the courage to address discrepancies honestly and respectfully, without turning the interview into a contest of wills.

At the heart of my philosophy is a simple idea: people tell the truth when they feel safe enough to think. Not safe from accountability, but safe from humiliation, coercion, and collapse. My job is to create that space, a space where the person can retrieve, evaluate, and articulate their experience with as much clarity as they are capable of in that moment.

Interviewing is not a performance. It is a practice of presence. It is the disciplined work of meeting another human being where they are, not where we wish they were. When we do that well, the interview becomes more than a procedural requirement. It becomes a place where truth can actually surface, not because we forced it, but because we made it possible.

That is the philosophy that guides my work. It is not a brand or a system. It is a way of being with people that honors their humanity and protects the integrity of the truth we are responsible for developing.