

'Conceptually-rich'	'Thicker description' but not 'conceptually-rich'	'Thinner description'
Theoretical concepts are unambiguous and described in sufficient depth to be useful	Description of the programme theory or sufficient information to enable it to be 'surfaced'	Insufficient information to enable the programme theory to be 'surfaced'
Relationships between and among concepts are clearly articulated	Consideration of the context in which the programme took place	Limited or no consideration of the context in which the programme took place
Concepts sufficiently developed and defined to enable understanding <i>without</i> the reader needing to have first-hand experience of an area of practice	Discussion of the differences between programme theory (the design and orientation of a programme - what was intended) and implementation (what 'happened in real life')	Limited or no discussion of the differences between programme theory (the design and orientation of a programme - what was intended) and implementation (what 'happened in real life')
Concepts grounded strongly in a cited body of literature	Recognition and discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the programme as implemented	Limited or no discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the programme as implemented
Concepts are parsimonious (i.e. provide the simplest, but not over-simplified, explanation)	Some attempt to explain anomalous results and findings with reference to context and data	No attempt to explain anomalous results and findings with reference to context and data
-	Description of the factors affecting implementation	Limited or no description of the factors affecting implementation
-	Typified by: <u>Terms</u> - 'model', 'process' or 'function' <u>Verbs</u> - 'investigate', 'describes', or 'explains' <u>Topics</u> - 'experiences'	Typified by: Mentioning only an 'association' between variables