## **PET - QUALITATIVE SECONDARY DOCUMENTS**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Define the**  **method** | **Information that has been collected or created by someone else for their own purposes, but which the other sociologists can use.** | | | | |
| **Example(s)** | **Public Documents (Black Report 1980)**  **Personal Documents (letters, diaries)** | | | | |
| **Circle correct** | **Quantitative** | **Qualitative** | **Positivist** | **Realist** | **Interpretivist** |
|  | **Strengths** | | **Weaknesses** | | |
| **Practical** | * Public documents are often easily accessible, (eg David Gilborn 1995) * Cheap and not very time consuming source of data. | | * Personal documents can be more difficult to access such as personal diaries. * Some educational documents are confidential, such as teachers’ personnel files and pupils’ disciplinary records. | | |
| **Ethical** | * Don’t need to get consent for public documents in an archive. | | * Ethical problems with personal documents, informed consent has to be obtained. | | |
| **Theoretical** | * Official documents are legally required of all schools and colleges. This makes it more likely that we can form a representative picture. * Documents can provide important insights into the meanings held by teachers and pupils and can therefore be high in validity. | | * Personal documents are often less representative. * However, all documents are open to different interpretations. * You do not know how they were collected tin the first place, may be unreliable. | | |