

DISCOVERING THE TRUTH
THROUGH
NON-CONFRONTATIONAL
INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUES

Session 5

3:15 PM – 4:45 PM

DISCOVERING THE TRUTH THROUGH NON-CONFRONTATIONAL INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUES

Jerre B. Wortham, Texas
Department of Family and
Protective Services; APS
Training Division Administrator

John J. Guzman, Jr.,
Wicklander-Zulawski &
Associates, Inc.

The background of the slide features a stylized Texas state flag. It consists of a vertical blue stripe on the left side containing a large, five-pointed white star. The rest of the background is composed of horizontal wooden planks, with the top half being light-colored and the bottom half being a reddish-orange color.

Texas APS Programs

In-Home

- Persons age 65 and older
- Adults age 18-64 with a disability
- Resides in community
- Provide protective services

Texas APS Programs

Provider

- Receives services in a state operated, contracted facility; or
- Receives Medicaid Long Term Services and Supports
- With a mental illness, physical/intellectual disability

The background of the slide is a wooden plank texture. On the left side, there is a vertical blue stripe with a large, light-colored wooden star. The rest of the background is a light-colored wood grain. The title 'Texas APS Investigations' is centered in a light green rounded rectangle.

Texas APS Investigations

Basic Skills

- Train multiple approaches to building rapport
- Reading verbal and physical behavior
- Improve active listening
- Phases of the Interview
- Phrasing appropriate questions
- Overcoming denials and objections
- Taking concise statements



Texas APS Investigations

Advanced Skills – NonConfrontational Method

- Continued development in establishing rapport
- Opening conversation
- Maintaining interaction with an unwilling subject

DISCOVERING THE TRUTH

WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

Learn how to:

- Utilize different interview techniques in different situations or interviewees.
- Identify the difference between an information gathering interview and an admission-seeking interview.
- Develop a softer, conversational approach.
- Use evidence obtained for the interview process.
- Apply principles and techniques to distinguish between innocent and guilty interviewees.
- Identify the appropriate theme for rationalizations to obtain admissions of wrong doing.



— Interview with Integrity —





John J. Guzman, CFI

jguzman@w-z.com

(800) 222-7789

— Interview with Integrity —





Construction of the Introductory Statement

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.

— Interview with Integrity —





Verify Background

- Establish subject's behavioral norm
- Plants a seed that you know a lot about them
- Calms your nerves

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



Develop Rapport

- Ask them to tell you a little about themselves
- They will tell you things about themselves that you can use as rationalizations

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



Who We Are & What We Do

- Continues to develop rapport
- Establishes your credibility
- Introduces criminal incident
- Starts the process of minimizing

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



How We Investigate

- Let's them know how we know what they did
- Establishes credibility in the investigation
- Takes hope away from the subject

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



How Crimes Occur

- Let's them know that we know what they did
- Their behavior may tell us what else they may have done

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



Rationalization Summary

- List rationalizations, i.e. peer group pressure, acting upon impulse, financial pressure, approval addiction
- Their behavior may tell you which one they are most receptive to

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



Rationalizations

- Makes it easy to admit
- Allows them to save face
- Gives them reasons or excuses
- Minimizes what they have done
- Promotes benefits of cooperation
- Takes hope away

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



First Rationalization

- Choose the first rationalization based on the subject's background or behavior you observed during summary of rationalizations
- State Rationalization i.e. Peer Pressure

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



Rationalization

- Create a story or illustration that helps the subject understand peer pressure
- State the moral of the story
- Link it back to the investigation

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



Change Perspective

- Role reversal
- Putting the subject in a decision making position
- Allows the subject to make the same decision they hope you will make with them

Copyright 2017©Wicklender-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



Second Rationalization

- If personal information is known about the subject that may relate to the reason for the crime, a rationalization that mirrors their personal situation should be used
- Follow examples from the first rationalization

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



Address Mental State

- Address the subject's hope or their mental state
- Sometimes a person thinks that by saying nothing the problem will go away

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



Create Urgency

- Let them know that the facility administration, the police or the prosecutor can resolve this situation even if they decide to say nothing.
- We need to get this resolved today!

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



Protect Evidence

- Sometimes people say, “If you have a case against me, show me what you got.” Explain that we purposely hold back information, so when someone starts telling us what we already know, then we can tell they are telling the truth.

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



Test for Submission

- Personalize your rationalization by using the word “you” or calling them by their first name
- Their behavior will let you know if the subject is ready to make the first admission

Copyright 2017©Wicklender-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



Assumptive Question

- Used only if the investigator believes the subject is ready to make an admission
- “Bill when was the first time you inappropriately touched a female client?”

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



Follow Up Question

- “It wasn’t when you were first hired was it? It wasn’t was it?”

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



Support Admission

- “It wasn’t when you were first hired was it? It wasn’t was it?”
- (Subject makes admission.)
- “Great, from the investigation I didn’t think it was that long ago.”

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



Follow Up Question

- “Bob, what was the largest amount of money you took from a client in a single day?”
- “It wasn’t \$500 was it? It wasn’t was it?”

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



Follow Up Question

- “It wasn’t \$500 was it? It wasn’t was it?”
- (Subject makes admission.)
- “Great, from the investigation I didn’t think it was quite that much.”

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



Follow Up Question

- “Bob, when was the last time you neglected a client?”
- “It wasn’t a year ago was it? It wasn’t was it?”

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



Follow Up Question

- “It wasn’t a year ago was it? It wasn’t was it?”
- (Subject makes admission.)
- “Great, from the investigation I didn’t think it was that long ago.”

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



Develop Admission

- Answer the investigative questions of who, what, when, where, how and why
- Substantiate all admissions
- Identify where to find other evidence

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.



Written Statement

- Minimize written confession as a “letter of apology” or a “letter of explanation”
- Guide the subject through the statement without dictating

Copyright 2017©Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates, Inc.