"'All In': When Data Collection Is Hard…Get Creative"

Study Overview

The purpose of the "All In" study was to examine the buy-in of security or medical staff working with individuals involved with the criminal-legal system who have opioid use disorder (OUD). But the study team collected many fraudulent interviews, what Dr. Carter calls "bad data." The revised study examines how researchers deal with fraudulent interviews.

Dr. TaLisa J. Carter

Bad Data/ Sad Data

Fraudulent Virtual (Audio/Video) Interviews

- Virtual data collection is more common due, in part, to COVID.
- Identifying fraudulent interviews (data) is even more important than it was previously.

TAKEAWAYS

✓ Categories of **Sad** Data: 1) **S**pam interview that the researchers caught; 2) **A**ttempted interviews (also caught), and 3) **D**eceived interviews (got away with it and received an incentive).

✓ Sad respondents did not have the same knowledge as legitimate respondents, their language was off (e.g., stigmatizing language), and their technology was suspect (e.g., camera off, spotty internet).

✓ Qualitative researchers need to know that it's acceptable to question the validity of virtual respondents. And they should know that they can make the most of the good data and turn the bad data into lessons learned.

✓ When you get lemons….make lemonade!