

THE INVESTIGATOR'S BALANCE · RESOURCE 1 OF 7

The False Choice Investigators Make

Many investigators believe they must choose between caring about people and being rigorous about facts. That choice is false — and believing it is where good investigations quietly go wrong.

Be warm in method. Be strict in inference.

Empathy belongs to how you gather. Impartiality belongs to how you evaluate.

THE CATEGORY MISTAKE

The most common failure is treating empathy and rigor as opposites. Teams either lower their scrutiny in the name of care, or go emotionally cold in the name of neutrality. Both miss the point. **Empathy and investigative rigor are not true opposites.** The real tension is between empathetic engagement during the process and partiality in how evidence is weighed or how conclusions are reached.

High-quality practice keeps three things separate that are easily collapsed: a **humane interviewing stance**, an **impartial evidentiary standard**, and a **transparent decision process**. When you separate them, you no longer have to trade care for accuracy.

Empathy lives here

How you gather information

Safety, dignity, rapport, clear expectations, open and non-suggestive questions, and respect for voice. People give fuller, more reliable accounts when they are treated with care.

Impartiality lives here

How you evaluate information

Consistent standards, evenhanded credibility checks, corroboration, alternative-hypothesis testing, and evidence-weighted judgment — applied the same way for every party.

THREE DISCIPLINES THAT KEEP YOU BALANCED

Relational

Create safety, clarity, and dignity in the interaction. Warmth is a method, not a concession.

Epistemic

Verify, corroborate, challenge, and document. Test the account against records, timing, consistency, motive, opportunity, and alternative explanations.

Governance

Manage conflicts, explain decisions, correct mistakes, and recuse when role conflicts or strong alignment threaten judgment.

THE RULE THAT RESOLVES THE TENSION

Validate the person — not the proposition.

Humane, and rigorous:

"I can see why this was difficult to describe."

Humane, but not rigorous:

"I accept your account as established fact."

You can let people tell their account fully and treat them with dignity, while still comparing that account to the evidence.

Having voice is not the same as determining the result. Warmth in method preserves humanity; strictness in inference preserves the integrity of the finding.

Believe the person enough to listen. Believe the evidence enough to verify.

Dr. Marquita M. Booker, Esq. | By-The-Book Workplace Investigations | Human-Centered, Fact-Focused Companion Hub

Disclaimer: For educational purposes only; does not constitute legal advice. © By-The-Book Workplace Investigations. All rights reserved.