

# The Steve Jarding Method

))) Values Answers

[www.imaginepublicspeaking.com](http://www.imaginepublicspeaking.com)

# Values Answers

We are having great success in getting trainees to answer questions in interviews using “values” to make their case.

That is, instead of offering a detailed substantive answer to a question, begin your answer by offering why your position on an issue is based on a value you feel strongly about.



Example

*“I want a better health care system because it is wrong that people are dying under our current plan because they cannot get access to affordable health care.”*

Once you have established your value, if you have time you can offer the substance of your position which will now be more believable.

If you don't have time to offer much by way of a substantive value add to your answer, at least you have established your values – something most any audience will understand and respect.

# Blocking and Bridging

**What if you get a question you don't want to answer?**

There is a technique in communication training called blocking and bridging, wherein when you get a question you don't want to answer, you simply change or "block" the question and "bridge" to an answer you are more comfortable giving.



**To "Block" the question you use a transitional phrase such as:**

- "What's more important..."
- "Another thing to remember"
- "That's not my area of expertise, but what I can tell you is..."
- "What I have said is..."
- "My record is clear..."

- + When testing this technique, we found that most of the time, reporters will not follow up on the original question.

I have also found that significant percentages of audiences do not even realize that the interviewee has NOT answered the question. Indeed, most audience members believe the “bridge” response was a legitimate answer.



REFERENCE VIDEO

*Kennedy, Ted and Roger Mudd interview*  
*O'Reilly, Bill interviews President Obama*

# How to Handle the “Gotcha” Question

The difference between a “gotcha” question that is true vs. one that is false.



If false, weigh whether to respond and how to respond.



If the attack is false but is a character attack, study shows you **MUST** respond. If you don't people will think the attack must be true.



If the attack is false but is an attack on a policy stance you have taken, weigh how heavily to respond.



If the attack is based on truth – that is, you are guilty of what you are being accused of in the attack – what kind of answer works best?



Don't lie



Don't get defensive



Don't try to ignore the question

Instead – take ownership and offer an act of contrition as a firewall for you to fall back on when asked follow-up questions.

- + Tested 269 different human mistakes and with a genuine act of contrition, the perpetrator of the human mistake was forgiven – why?
- + Only one was not.

## Remember:

The act of contrition must be genuine, or people will see through it.



REFERENCE VIDEO

*Hillary Clinton's ABC apology on the server issue*