**PET: QUALITATIVE SECONDARY DOCUMENTS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Define the** **method** | **Pre-existing data that is in a qualitative form e.g. diaries, letters, facebook accounts, photos, sociological research etc.** |
| **Example(s)** | **Archer ‘University’s not for me, I’m a Nike person’- photodiaries, Willis – diaries kept by the ‘Lads’** |
| **Circle correct** | **Quantitative** | **Qualitative** | **Positivist** | **Realist** | **Interpretivist** |
|  | **Strengths**  | **Weaknesses**  |
| **Practical** | >Could be quite inexpensive- data already exists. >Freedom of Information Act has made it easier to access restricted or non-published information.  | >May be time consuming- number of documents you have to look at could take time. >Some documents may be stored in archives which you would have to visit- again issues of time/access.>Access could be challenging- data doesn’t exist, we don’t know if it exists or it hasn’t been published e.g. government documents are often embargoed.  |
| **Ethical** | >Unobtrusive method because there is no direct human contact. >Don’t need direct consent from the owners of the material if they’ve given it to a public body. | >Might need consent/permission to view some documents. >Some people may not want the information put in the public eye.>Could be problems with the data having been tampered with e.g. official sources which have been presented in a particular way. |
| **Theoretical** | >Researcher can’t influence the behaviour as the document already exists. >Able to spend time on analysis because have the documents in front of you. >Valid- may be the only view of the time you have. Also able to compare with others like them and see if their authentic.  | >May not be objective- relying on opinions etc. >Only gives a snap shot of people’s lives, so lacks validity. >Problems with not knowing if it is an authentic (real) account.>Lack reliability- personal and written for a certain reason. >Social desirability- document perhaps written for an audience.  |