

This is a repository copy of *Considering the team in team formulation:a systematic review*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/145648/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Short, Valentina, Covey, Judith A., Webster, Lisa A. et al. (4 more authors) (2019)  
Considering the team in team formulation:a systematic review. *Mental Health Review Journal*. pp. 11-29. ISSN: 1361-9322

<https://doi.org/10.1108/MHRJ-12-2017-0055>

---

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



## Considering the team in team formulation: A systematic review

Journal:	<i>Mental Health Review Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	MHRJ-12-2017-0055.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Evidence based team formulation, Team formulation definition, Team formulation theory, Team context and team formulation, Team formulation impact, Team formulation

Considering the team in team formulation: a systematic review

Abstract

**Purpose:** Team formulation, used to understand patient problems and plan care is a growing practice in adult mental health and learning disability services. This paper explores definitions applied to team formulation (as distinct to therapy formulation), its underpinning theories, and the inter relationship between the team and the process of formulation.

**Design/Methodology/approach:** A database search (main search term of team formulation) of peer-reviewed studies was conducted using PRISMA guidelines. A main and second reviewer conducted quality appraisals and thematic analysis. Data were analysed by convergent qualitative synthesis design using thematic analysis to transform evidence from quantitative and qualitative studies into qualitative findings.

**Findings:** Initial searching produced 4532 papers, 10 of which were eligible for inclusion. Team formulation has no distinct definition. Theories underpinning the practice of therapy formulation emanating from general psychological theory underpin team formulation. Seven studies applied psychological theories to the examination of team formulation. No studies examined the impact of the team on the formulation. Six themes were generated regarding the impact of team formulation on the team; ‘increased knowledge and understanding’, ‘altered perceptions, leading to altered relationships, feelings and behaviours’, ‘space to reflect’, ‘useful when stuck or challenged’, ‘perceived increase in effectiveness’, and ‘improved team working’.

**Research limitations/implications:** Limited evidence and variable quality compromised availability of review evidence.

**Originality/value:** This is the first review to examine team formulation through the context of the team. The authors argue that a conceptual framework to encompass team inputs, processes and outputs in team formulation practice should guide future research.

**Keywords:** Team formulation. Evidence based team formulation. Team formulation definition. Team formulation theory. Team context and team formulation. Team formulation impact.

**Paper type:** Literature review

Declaration of Interest: None

**Introduction**

Multi-disciplinary mental health and learning disability clinical teams, working together to develop individual patient case formulations is an increasing practice within the United Kingdom (Johnstone., 2011). Known as ‘team formulation’, the purpose is to develop a shared understanding of the patient to determine the interventions (Johnstone, 2014). Research underpinning team formulation is of relevance to clinical practice globally. National guidelines indicate that care that should be provided based on diagnosis (for example see NICE, 2014a, 2014b; NIMH, 2016), however individualised care is also required (HMG/DH, 2011; World Health Organization, 2015). Team formulation guides the design of individual care for patients experiencing a range of mental health problems, some of which are considered complex (for example see Berry, Barrowclough, & Wearden, 2009). Therefore, determining a patient’s unique needs through the lens of team formulation may afford this individualised focus. Understanding the evidence base for this practice is of critical importance in supporting teams to use evidence based practice.

Individual psychological case formulation (therapy formulation) emanated from behaviour therapy in the 1950’s when it was developed as a central component for understanding the problematic behaviours of individual patients (Bruch, 2015). Now it is recognised as a central tenet of most one-to-one psychological therapies where a single therapist works with a single patient to develop a collaborative formulation (Sturmey, 2009). Studies examining therapy formulation report a weak evidence base. For example, a recent systematic review examining the inter-rater and test–retest reliability of therapy formulations across various therapeutic modalities reported considerable differences in reliability. This ranged from slight to substantial, depending on practitioner experience and therapy modality (Flinn, Braham, & das Nair, 2015). Furthermore, there is limited evidence for impact on patient outcomes (Bieling & Kuyken, 2003; Kuyken, 2006). Researchers examining formulation within the Cognitive

1  
2  
3 Behavioural Therapy (CBT) model challenge whether the scientific constructs underpinning  
4 formulation are evidence based and able to demonstrate a valid framework for understanding  
5 patient problems. Research has not yet comprehensively examined the descriptive and  
6  
7 explanatory elements of therapy formulation, particularly in relation to outcome prediction  
8  
9 (Bieling & Kuyken, 2003).  
10  
11  
12

13 Despite these uncertain foundations, formulation has continued to evolve, from one-to-one  
14 application in individual psychological therapy, to its most recent application by teams. The  
15  
16 earliest published report of formulation being used by teams was in 1997, when a practice  
17  
18 account of the use of Cognitive Analytic Therapy (CAT) formulation was described as a team  
19  
20 endeavour, used to understand patients diagnosed with personality disorder. This descriptive  
21  
22 account, published in a non-peer reviewed professional forum magazine (Dunn, 1997) has  
23  
24 preceded further descriptive accounts (for example see Davenport, 2002; Robson & Quayle,  
25  
26 2009; Shirley, 2010; Whomsley, 2010), and the suggested evidence for the benefits of team  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000  
1001  
1002  
1003  
1004  
1005  
1006  
1007  
1008  
1009  
1010  
1011  
1012  
1013  
1014  
1015  
1016  
1017  
1018  
1019  
1020  
1021  
1022  
1023  
1024  
1025  
1026  
1027  
1028  
1029  
1030  
1031  
1032  
1033  
1034  
1035  
1036  
1037  
1038  
1039  
1040  
1041  
1042  
1043  
1044  
1045  
1046  
1047  
1048  
1049  
1050  
1051  
1052  
1053  
1054  
1055  
1056  
1057  
1058  
1059  
1060  
1061  
1062  
1063  
1064  
1065  
1066  
1067  
1068  
1069  
1070  
1071  
1072  
1073  
1074  
1075  
1076  
1077  
1078  
1079  
1080  
1081  
1082  
1083  
1084  
1085  
1086  
1087  
1088  
1089  
1090  
1091  
1092  
1093  
1094  
1095  
1096  
1097  
1098  
1099  
1100  
1101  
1102  
1103  
1104  
1105  
1106  
1107  
1108  
1109  
1110  
1111  
1112  
1113  
1114  
1115  
1116  
1117  
1118  
1119  
1120  
1121  
1122  
1123  
1124  
1125  
1126  
1127  
1128  
1129  
1130  
1131  
1132  
1133  
1134  
1135  
1136  
1137  
1138  
1139  
1140  
1141  
1142  
1143  
1144  
1145  
1146  
1147  
1148  
1149  
1150  
1151  
1152  
1153  
1154  
1155  
1156  
1157  
1158  
1159  
1160  
1161  
1162  
1163  
1164  
1165  
1166  
1167  
1168  
1169  
1170  
1171  
1172  
1173  
1174  
1175  
1176  
1177  
1178  
1179  
1180  
1181  
1182  
1183  
1184  
1185  
1186  
1187  
1188  
1189  
1190  
1191  
1192  
1193  
1194  
1195  
1196  
1197  
1198  
1199  
1200  
1201  
1202  
1203  
1204  
1205  
1206  
1207  
1208  
1209  
1210  
1211  
1212  
1213  
1214  
1215  
1216  
1217  
1218  
1219  
1220  
1221  
1222  
1223  
1224  
1225  
1226  
1227  
1228  
1229  
1230  
1231  
1232  
1233  
1234  
1235  
1236  
1237  
1238  
1239  
1240  
1241  
1242  
1243  
1244  
1245  
1246  
1247  
1248  
1249  
1250  
1251  
1252  
1253  
1254  
1255  
1256  
1257  
1258  
1259  
1260  
1261  
1262  
1263  
1264  
1265  
1266  
1267  
1268  
1269  
1270  
1271  
1272  
1273  
1274  
1275  
1276  
1277  
1278  
1279  
1280  
1281  
1282  
1283  
1284  
1285  
1286  
1287  
1288  
1289  
1290  
1291  
1292  
1293  
1294  
1295  
1296  
1297  
1298  
1299  
1300  
1301  
1302  
1303  
1304  
1305  
1306  
1307  
1308  
1309  
1310  
1311  
1312  
1313  
1314  
1315  
1316  
1317  
1318  
1319  
1320  
1321  
1322  
1323  
1324  
1325  
1326  
1327  
1328  
1329  
1330  
1331  
1332  
1333  
1334  
1335  
1336  
1337  
1338  
1339  
1340  
1341  
1342  
1343  
1344  
1345  
1346  
1347  
1348  
1349  
1350  
1351  
1352  
1353  
1354  
1355  
1356  
1357  
1358  
1359  
1360  
1361  
1362  
1363  
1364  
1365  
1366  
1367  
1368  
1369  
1370  
1371  
1372  
1373  
1374  
1375  
1376  
1377  
1378  
1379  
1380  
1381  
1382  
1383  
1384  
1385  
1386  
1387  
1388  
1389  
1390  
1391  
1392  
1393  
1394  
1395  
1396  
1397  
1398  
1399  
1400  
1401  
1402  
1403  
1404  
1405  
1406  
1407  
1408  
1409  
1410  
1411  
1412  
1413  
1414  
1415  
1416  
1417  
1418  
1419  
1420  
1421  
1422  
1423  
1424  
1425  
1426  
1427  
1428  
1429  
1430  
1431  
1432  
1433  
1434  
1435  
1436  
1437  
1438  
1439  
1440  
1441  
1442  
1443  
1444  
1445  
1446  
1447  
1448  
1449  
1450  
1451  
1452  
1453  
1454  
1455  
1456  
1457  
1458  
1459  
1460  
1461  
1462  
1463  
1464  
1465  
1466  
1467  
1468  
1469  
1470  
1471  
1472  
1473  
1474  
1475  
1476  
1477  
1478  
1479  
1480  
1481  
1482  
1483  
1484  
1485  
1486  
1487  
1488  
1489  
1490  
1491  
1492  
1493  
1494  
1495  
1496  
1497  
1498  
1499  
1500  
1501  
1502  
1503  
1504  
1505  
1506  
1507  
1508  
1509  
1510  
1511  
1512  
1513  
1514  
1515  
1516  
1517  
1518  
1519  
1520  
1521  
1522  
1523  
1524  
1525  
1526  
1527  
1528  
1529  
1530  
1531  
1532  
1533  
1534  
1535  
1536  
1537  
1538  
1539  
1540  
1541  
1542  
1543  
1544  
1545  
1546  
1547  
1548  
1549  
1550  
1551  
1552  
1553  
1554  
1555  
1556  
1557  
1558  
1559  
1560  
1561  
1562  
1563  
1564  
1565  
1566  
1567  
1568  
1569  
1570  
1571  
1572  
1573  
1574  
1575  
1576  
1577  
1578  
1579  
1580  
1581  
1582  
1583  
1584  
1585  
1586  
1587  
1588  
1589  
1590  
1591  
1592  
1593  
1594  
1595  
1596  
1597  
1598  
1599  
1600  
1601  
1602  
1603  
1604  
1605  
1606  
1607  
1608  
1609  
1610  
1611  
1612  
1613  
1614  
1615  
1616  
1617  
1618  
1619  
1620  
1621  
1622  
1623  
1624  
1625  
1626  
1627  
1628  
1629  
1630  
1631  
1632  
1633  
1634  
1635  
1636  
1637  
1638  
1639  
1640  
1641  
1642  
1643  
1644  
1645  
1646  
1647  
1648  
1649  
1650  
1651  
1652  
1653  
1654  
1655  
1656  
1657  
1658  
1659  
1660  
1661  
1662  
1663  
1664  
1665  
1666  
1667  
1668  
1669  
1670  
1671  
1672  
1673  
1674  
1675  
1676  
1677  
1678  
1679  
1680  
1681  
1682  
1683  
1684  
1685  
1686  
1687  
1688  
1689  
1690  
1691  
1692  
1693  
1694  
1695  
1696  
1697  
1698  
1699  
1700  
1701  
1702  
1703  
1704  
1705  
1706  
1707  
1708  
1709  
1710  
1711  
1712  
1713  
1714  
1715  
1716  
1717  
1718  
1719  
1720  
1721  
1722  
1723  
1724  
1725  
1726  
1727  
1728  
1729  
1730  
1731  
1732  
1733  
1734  
1735  
1736  
1737  
1738  
1739  
1740  
1741  
1742  
1743  
1744  
1745  
1746  
1747  
1748  
1749  
1750  
1751  
1752  
1753  
1754  
1755  
1756  
1757  
1758  
1759  
1760  
1761  
1762  
1763  
1764  
1765  
1766  
1767  
1768  
1769  
1770  
1771  
1772  
1773  
1774  
1775  
1776  
1777  
1778  
1779  
1780  
1781  
1782  
1783  
1784  
1785  
1786  
1787  
1788  
1789  
1790  
1791  
1792  
1793  
1794  
1795  
1796  
1797  
1798  
1799  
1800  
1801  
1802  
1803  
1804  
1805  
1806  
1807  
1808  
1809  
1810  
1811  
1812  
1813  
1814  
1815  
1816  
1817  
1818  
1819  
1820  
1821  
1822  
1823  
1824  
1825  
1826  
1827  
1828  
1829  
1830  
1831  
1832  
1833  
1834  
1835  
1836  
1837  
1838  
1839  
1840  
1841  
1842  
1843  
1844  
1845  
1846  
1847  
1848  
1849  
1850  
1851  
1852  
1853  
1854  
1855  
1856  
1857  
1858  
1859  
1860  
1861  
1862  
1863  
1864  
1865  
1866  
1867  
1868  
1869  
1870  
1871  
1872  
1873  
1874  
1875  
1876  
1877  
1878  
1879  
1880  
1881  
1882  
1883  
1884  
1885  
1886  
1887  
1888  
1889  
1890  
1891  
1892  
1893  
1894  
1895  
1896  
1897  
1898  
1899  
1900  
1901  
1902  
1903  
1904  
1905  
1906  
1907  
1908  
1909  
1910  
1911  
1912  
1913  
1914  
1915  
1916  
1917  
1918  
1919  
1920  
1921  
1922  
1923  
1924  
1925  
1926  
1927  
1928  
1929  
1930  
1931  
1932  
1933  
1934  
1935  
1936  
1937  
1938  
1939  
1940  
1941  
1942  
1943  
1944  
1945  
1946  
1947  
1948  
1949  
1950  
1951  
1952  
1953  
1954  
1955  
1956  
1957  
1958  
1959  
1960  
1961  
1962  
1963  
1964  
1965  
1966  
1967  
1968  
1969  
1970  
1971  
1972  
1973  
1974  
1975  
1976  
1977  
1978  
1979  
1980  
1981  
1982  
1983  
1984  
1985  
1986  
1987  
1988  
1989  
1990  
1991  
1992  
1993  
1994  
1995  
1996  
1997  
1998  
1999  
2000  
2001  
2002  
2003  
2004  
2005  
2006  
2007  
2008  
2009  
2010  
2011  
2012  
2013  
2014  
2015  
2016  
2017  
2018  
2019  
2020  
2021  
2022  
2023  
2024  
2025  
2026  
2027  
2028  
2029  
2030  
2031  
2032  
2033  
2034  
2035  
2036  
2037  
2038  
2039  
2040  
2041  
2042  
2043  
2044  
2045  
2046  
2047  
2048  
2049  
2050  
2051  
2052  
2053  
2054  
2055  
2056  
2057  
2058  
2059  
2060  
2061  
2062  
2063  
2064  
2065  
2066  
2067  
2068  
2069  
2070  
2071  
2072  
2073  
2074  
2075  
2076  
2077  
2078  
2079  
2080  
2081  
2082  
2083  
2084  
2085  
2086  
2087  
2088  
2089  
2090  
2091  
2092  
2093  
2094  
2095  
2096  
2097  
2098  
2099  
2100  
2101  
2102  
2103  
2104  
2105  
2106  
2107  
2108  
2109  
2110  
2111  
2112  
2113  
2114  
2115  
2116  
2117  
2118  
2119  
2120  
2121  
2122  
2123  
2124  
2125  
2126  
2127  
2128  
2129  
2130  
2131  
2132  
2133  
2134  
2135  
2136  
2137  
2138  
2139  
2140  
2141  
2142  
2143  
2144  
2145  
2146  
2147  
2148  
2149  
2150  
2151  
2152  
2153  
2154  
2155  
2156  
2157  
2158  
2159  
2160  
2161  
2162  
2163  
2164  
2165  
2166  
2167  
2168  
2169  
2170  
2171  
2172  
2173  
2174  
2175  
2176  
2177  
2178  
2179  
2180  
2181  
2182  
2183  
2184

therapy formulation, scrutinising the level of practitioner skill and experience on the formulation produced (Dudley, Park, James, & Dodgson, 2010; T. D. Eells, Lombart, Kendjelic, Turner, & Lucas, 2005), however, it is unclear whether studies on team formulation are similarly accounting for the team context.

The impact of team processes on the execution of specific team tasks is well documented. A large study of over 400 United Kingdom National Health Service health care teams, including teams from physical and mental health care, concluded that team processes such as participation, reflexivity, decision making, leadership and communication impacted on team levels of effectiveness and innovative practice (Borrill et al., 2013). Teamwork is also essential for team reliability and patient safety (Baker, Day, & Salas, 2006) and professional differences in teams impact on joint working and knowledge sharing (Baxter & Brumfitt, 2008). Nonetheless, the impact of the team processes involved in team formulating remain undefined and untested. Considerations such as these may be crucial in developing an evidence base that embeds team formulation within the team context.

The aim of this paper is to report the results of a systematic mixed study review of team formulation research. The specific objectives are to provide a systematic map of research on team formulation in adult mental health and learning disability services (including forensic and older people’s services), and to examine and synthesise the findings in relation to:

- a. how team formulation is being defined as a phenomenon in its own right and as distinct to psychological therapy formulation
- b. the theoretical underpinnings of team formulation
- c. the impact on the formulation through team involvement
- d. the impact on the team due to formulating as a team

The present review takes a deductive, theory driven approach to examine if current research on team formulation addresses these aspects and highlights the direction for future research.

## Method

### *Literature searching*

A search strategy was created with an initial search in the Web of Science database, using the term 'team formulation'. This enabled development of a wider range of terms (Table one). Boolean operators were used and searches restricted to peer reviewed, human studies and disciplines related to mental health services. The electronic databases were searched during October 2016 and included Cinahl, Medline, Psycarticles, Psycinfo, SCIE, Social Sciences Citation Index and Embase. Date boundaries were not specified in order to maximise output from search results that ran from inception date of each database.

Insert Table one here. Search Terms

### *Inclusion screening*

Based on the inclusion criteria in Table two, all identified records were screened by title and then abstract before final full text reading of identified records.

Insert Table two here. Inclusion Criteria

Exclusion criteria included records focused on psychological therapy formulation that did not involve a team, opinion pieces, and descriptive records.

### *General approach*



A convergent qualitative synthesis design using thematic analysis (Figure one) was employed to transform evidence from both quantitative and qualitative studies into qualitative findings (Pluye & Hong, 2014). A theory-driven strategy focusing on specific research objectives as pre-defined themes, and an amalgamation of evidence from both intervention and non-intervention research were used to understand the phenomena of ‘team’ within team formulation (Fetters, Curry, & Creswell, 2013; Hong, Pluye, Bujold, & Wassef, 2017).

Insert Figure 1 here. Synthesis design

**Data extraction and quality assessment**

A standardised data extraction form (EPPI-Centre, 2003) was adapted to fit with specific review aims. The type of quality assessment used was matched to study type. Quality assessment tools included Quality Assessment Tool for Before-After (Pre-Post) Studies With No Control Group (NIH, 2014), Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) Qualitative Studies Checklist (CASP, 2017a) and CASP Randomised Control Trial Checklist (CASP, 2017b). Quantitative studies with a qualitative element were assessed for both where possible. If the qualitative part of the study was not reported as such, then the main study design was assessed. Three studies were quality appraised by a second reviewer to ensure consistency in quality appraisal.

**Data synthesis**

Examination began with introductory and background sections to studies in order to identify definitions of team formulation (review aim one). Thematic analysis was used (Braun & Clarke, 2006) in which line-by-line coding was applied for both quantitative and qualitative

1 studies to create descriptive themes for all other review aims. Theoretical underpinnings  
2  
3 (review aim two) were identified and logged semantically, as they were cited in the studies.  
4  
5 Thematic analysis was employed to establish the purpose of citing theories within studies.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Coding was employed to locate instances where the impact of the team on the formulation,  
11  
12 and the formulation impact on the team (review aims three and four), was reported in study  
13  
14 findings. Located instances were subjected to selective and semantic coding, in which the  
15  
16 reviewers used the explicit descriptions given in research findings (Braun & Clarke, 2013).  
17  
18 Visual mapping was applied for instances located for review aim four in order to develop  
19  
20 themes derived from coding (Braun & Clarke, 2013). NVivo qualitative data software was  
21  
22 used to support the coding process (QSR International Pty Ltd, 2015). Final themes were  
23  
24 reached through consensus agreement with an independent second reviewer (NH-G). This  
25  
26 type of data transformation analysis is suitable to precede the development of a conceptual  
27  
28 framework where none currently exists (Hong et al., 2017) as is the case for team  
29  
30 formulation.  
31  
32  
33  
34

## 35 Results

36  
37  
38 Figure two illustrates the search process. The search resulted in 10 research studies that  
39  
40 matched the inclusion criteria and all were UK based studies. Of these, five were  
41  
42 uncontrolled pre-post studies (Berry et al., 2009; Ingham, 2011; Ingham, Clarke, & James,  
43  
44 2008; Maguire, 2006; Revolta, Orrell, & Spector, 2016), three of which had a descriptive  
45  
46 feedback element (Ingham, 2011; Ingham et al., 2008; Revolta et al., 2016). There were three  
47  
48 qualitative studies (Christofides, Johnstone, & Musa, 2012; Mohtashemi, Stevens, Jackson, &  
49  
50 Weatherhead, 2016; Summers, 2006), and two randomised controlled trials (RCT) (Berry et  
51  
52 al., 2016; Kellett, Wilbram, Davis, & Hardy, 2014). One of the RCTs was a mixed method  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

study employing non-blinded randomisation and content analysis of semi-structured interview material (Kellett et al., 2014).

Insert figure two here. PRISMA diagram

Study details and key findings including reported effect sizes are presented in table three. The team formulation in the studies was conducted either as team formulation meetings involving the whole or part of the team where the meeting was facilitated by a psychologist or psychological therapist; or team formulation training centred on real clinical case material, including team discussion. Team supervision was also provided in some instances.

Insert table three here. Included Studies Details

*Quality appraisal results*

Three of the pre-post uncontrolled intervention studies were deemed to be of poor quality (Ingham, 2011; Ingham et al., 2008; Maguire, 2006) due to high levels of bias. Two further studies of this kind were judged as poor to fair quality (Berry et al., 2009; Revolta et al., 2016) because although still vulnerable to high levels of bias due to design, clearer detail was reported about loss-to-follow-up of participants and p-values for pre to post intervention.

Three of the pre-post studies also contained a qualitative element in the form of descriptive feedback gathered from the sample post intervention (Ingham, 2011; Ingham et al., 2008; Revolta et al., 2016). In all three studies, this qualitative data focussed on acceptability of formulation training given. CASP qualitative study analysis (CASP, 2017a) suggests that the style of reporting in all three studies is not in keeping with high quality qualitative research reporting.

1  
2  
3 Use of the CASP qualitative study tool indicated that the methodological quality of the three  
4 qualitative studies was variable, but generally of fair quality. However the qualitative part of  
5 the mixed method study (Kellett et al., 2014) was poor. The RCT feasibility study (Berry et  
6 al., 2016) was also assessed using the CASP for RCT tool and was rated as fair.  
7  
8  
9  
10

### 11 12 ***Definitions of team formulation*** 13 14

15  
16 None of the studies offered a definition of formulation explicit to team formulation, and  
17 where a definition was given this was distinct to the therapy type. There was no examination  
18 of whether this definition of formulation was applicable to a formulation conducted by a  
19 team.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25  
26 Five studies employing therapy formulation definitions, researched team formulation against  
27 these definitions (Christofides et al., 2012; Ingham, 2011; Kellett et al., 2014; Mohtashemi et  
28 al., 2016; Summers, 2006). These studies identified formulation as a hypothesis, drawing on  
29 psychological theory, regarding the origins, development and maintenance of mental health  
30 problems. Four studies provided the function of a formulation, but not the definition (Berry et  
31 al., 2009; Berry et al., 2016; Ingham et al., 2008; Revolta et al., 2016). Formulation function  
32 was described as providing a framework to understand the origin, development and  
33 maintenance of mental health problems. One study did not provide a definition or describe  
34 the function of a formulation (Maguire, 2006).  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

### 46 ***Theoretical underpinnings*** 47 48 49

50 Thirteen theories emerged across 10 studies in relation to team formulation research.  
51 Theories were used to support both study rationale and question, or as underpinning the team  
52 formulation process. Explicit explanation in describing the link between theory and its  
53 application in the study varied. For example Berry and colleagues (Berry et al., 2009; Berry  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

et al., 2016) offered a clear link between attribution theory and study rationale. However, other researchers referred to psychological theory as underpinning formulation, without defining the theory (Ingham, 2011; Mohtashemi et al., 2016; Summers, 2006). With the exception of one study (Kellett et al., 2014), theory was applied to individual staff working in teams and not applied to group level data. The relationship to theory, its part in the studies and related findings is outlined in table four.

Insert table four here. Underpinning theories.

***Team impact on the formulation***

None of the studies purposely examined the impact of the involvement of the team on the quality, content or outcomes of the produced formulation. It was not possible to apply convergent qualitative synthesis as only one study reported results indicating two impacts that the team had on the formulation. Firstly, the amount of perceived creativity brought to the formulation by use of team input:

“Participants believed that formulations benefited care planning, staff-patient relationships, staff satisfaction and team working, through increasing understanding of patients, bringing together staff with different views and encouraging more creative thinking” (Summers, 2006, p.341).

Secondly, the view that the team formulation was an enduring concept rather than a hypothesis subject to change over time:

“At least three participants seemed to consider formulations as statements of fact” (Summers, 2006, p.342).

***Formulation impact on the team***

Eight studies reported team outcomes occurring as a result of team formulation and coding resulted in 66 codes from which six themes were conceptualised. These themes were:

‘increased knowledge and understanding’, ‘altered perceptions, leading to altered relationships, feelings and behaviours’, ‘space to reflect’, ‘useful when stuck or challenged’, ‘perceived increase in effectiveness’, and ‘improved team working’.

*Increased knowledge and understanding.* Team formulation increased understanding and knowledge of the patient, the origin and nature of their problems, and increased knowledge of the way the team and patient interacted. Although not the most frequently coded, this theme was the mechanism through which all other themes were described as operating, and as such could be seen as a key outcome of team formulation.

*Altered perceptions, leading to altered relationships, feelings and behaviours.* Closely linked to this was the most frequently coded theme that described the impact of team formulation on staff perceptions and the resulting change in staff/patient relationships, staff feelings about the patient and staff behaviours towards the patient. Perceptions were altered in relation to the patient’s problems, their efforts at recovery, how long recovery might take and how much control the patient and staff member had in this. Changed perceptions about staff/patient relationships were positive, however one study did report that staff perceived a worse relationship with patients after formulating. The impact of altered perceptions was described as resulting in altered staff feelings and behaviours, in particular less blaming behaviours towards patients, increased empathy and a more positive approach to care. Patients also reported feeling less criticised by staff. Furthermore, there was an impact on the staff perceptions of their own emotions in terms of feeling more satisfied, but with the recognition that formulating can be personally emotionally challenging.

*Space to reflect.* The third theme captured the opportunities for clinical reflection afforded by team formulation. Reflection was possible as meeting to formulate gave the team increased

time to think about the patient. This supported creation of new ideas about the patient and the care, and was viewed as a major benefit of team formulation. There was one concern that such reflection could result in a high degree of speculative suggestion based only on partial information.

*Useful when stuck or challenged.* The fourth theme identified team formulation as a useful process when patients presented with behaviours that challenged the team. Team formulating was also reported as useful when teams felt ‘stuck’ in thinking about how to progress a patient’s care.

*Perceived increase in effectiveness.* The impact of having time to think and increasing understanding about the patient lead to the fifth theme in which team formulating was perceived as helping to increase the effectiveness of the team. This was described as bringing consistency to team practice, improving problem solving ability, supporting the team to change clinical direction and changing unhelpful patterns of relating with the patient. An increase in clinical confidence was perceived, leading to care which was more helpful for being based on a formulation (rather than diagnosis alone).

*Improved team working.* The sixth theme, also linked to team effectiveness, described the impact of team formulation on the team as a unit, relative to strengthening how team members work together. Within this theme, team formulation was reported as improving the team climate and working capability. In addition, trust and sharing within the team were reported as improved directly due to team formulating. Team practices were improved through team formulation that brought unity to understanding, different perspectives, ideas and disciplines. Sharing information in this way was viewed as a practice of effective teams and communication via team formulation credited for turning individuals in teams into team members.

## Discussion

This is the first review that focuses on the ‘team’ aspect of team formulation, providing a comprehensive systematic mixed studies review of the peer reviewed research evidence for this team practice. The key objectives were to identify the definitions and theories applied to team formulation research, and to qualitatively synthesise findings on the bidirectional influences of team formulation and team.

### *Methodological Rigour*

The methodological rigour of the 10 studies included suggests an emerging field of research with study quality being highly variable and mostly low. Using team formulation as the intervention in pre-post uncontrolled small-scale studies formed half of all methodological approaches. This represents a problem for the evidence base for team formulation as it is difficult to determine causation and there is a risk of high levels of bias (Goodacre, 2015). The Cochrane Collaboration recommends that such studies constitute insufficient evidence to inform theory (Cochrane, 2017).

Rigour of analysis was difficult to determine for all three studies examining the impact of team formulation on team members. The small number of studies further reduces the available research evidence that the impact of formulating has on team members.

While RCTs are considered capable of providing reliable evidence of effectiveness (Cochrane, 2017), the two RCTs within the review were compromised by methodological limitations. For example, Kellett and colleagues recognised that the sample size was small and there was a risk of contamination between the intervention and ‘treatment as usual’ arms (Kellett et al., 2014). Berry and colleagues acknowledged that the reported modified staff



perceptions could be attributed to staff feeling that their own needs for support were better met rather than the impact of formulating (Berry et al., 2016).

***Definitions of Team Formulation***

Defining a phenomena in research is critical for the measurement of variables and comparison of findings across studies (Coolican, 2009). One included study provided no definition of formulation (Maguire, 2006) and the remaining nine applied the definition of therapy formulation to team formulation. This assumption that team formulation *is* the same as therapy formulation has not yet been examined and is further challenged by therapy formulation having more than one definition (Johnstone & Dallos, 2014). The Division of Clinical Psychology in the United Kingdom offers an overarching definition that describes psychological therapy formulation as the amalgamation of all knowledge gained by an assessment process that may involve psychological, systemic and biological aspects. The definition posits therapy formulation as drawing on psychological research and theory, to provide a framework for describing problems, needs and their development and maintenance (DCP, 2010). Other key authors of formulation literature emphasise the hypothetical nature of therapy formulations (Butler, 1998; Tracy D. Eells, 2006). Applying the therapy formulation definition to team formulation fails to account for the influences and context of the team itself. Any working definition should account for the focus on a shared understanding as proposed by Johnstone (Johnstone., 2011), but in addition acknowledge that this is underpinned by team involvement:

‘Team formulation is a shared team activity drawing on psychological theories (individual and group), where two or more team members meet to discuss an evolving integrated formulation. Team formulation is a shared understanding which includes a service user’s personal meaning of their experiences and which leads to a hypothesis about the causes

and maintenance of their mental health problems, strengths and coping, in turn leading to an agreed individualised plan of care to support personal recovery. The service user is involved in the formulation discussion wherever possible’.



### *Theory and Team Formulation*

There is an assertion that team formulation is underpinned by psychological theories used in therapy formulation. Some studies specify which psychological theory, whilst others do not (see table four). This represents an assumption that therapy formulation and team formulation can be underpinned by the same theories; however, this has not been empirically examined.

In addition there is an emergence of studies drawing on theory (such as attachment or attribution) which drive study hypotheses proposing a relationship between team formulation, staff perceptions, attitudes and behaviours towards service users, resulting in a changed relationship. Four of the included studies have tested these hypotheses (see Berry et al., 2009; Berry et al., 2016; Ingham, 2011; Kellett et al., 2014). However, due to the number of studies and quality, there is no level of generalisation in these theories yet (Ravatch & Riggan, 2012), and not all study hypotheses were supported in relation to this changed staff-patient relationship (see Berry et al., 2016). In keeping with the properties of a theory, none offered have explanatory qualities in relation to the processes of team formulation (Ravatch & Riggan, 2012). In other studies, claims that such theories are important within team formulation remain an untested assertion (for example see Christofides et al., 2012; Ingham & Clarke, 2009). None-the-less, together these studies represent an early attempt to examine an evolved form of formulation (from therapy to team), and give partial support to the impact of team formulation on team members.

The application of theory in the studies is mainly about individuals in teams, rather than teams per se. Only one study aggregated the analysis of individuals in the teams studied to a group level (see (Kellett et al., 2014). This suggests that researchers are examining individual team members rather than the team as a unit. This narrow focus ignores the range of well-tested theories relating to teams generally, that may also be relevant to team formulation. For example, theories of shared mental models in teams describe a cognitive representation of shared team knowledge in relation to a task or team values (Mathieu, Maynard, Rapp, & Gilson, 2008). Team formulation may lead to developing such a shared mental model, in relation to either a particular patient, the general task of formulating or the values that formulating can bring to a team when ideas are shared. In addition, theories of team identity and cohesion may underpin team formulation research by explaining the collective sense-making that team formulation may bring, and which is understood to help team identity develop (Huettermann, Doering, & Boerner, 2017). Regular team formulating may help in developing team cohesion as team members share this common task around a set of common goals and team values (Mathieu et al., 2008).

***Team Impact on Formulation***

The impact of the team on the formulation was not examined in any of the included studies. Therapist factors have been found to impact on therapy formulation quality (Dudley et al., 2010; T. D. Eells et al., 2005), yet this review did not find any studies examining the quality of the formulation produced by a team. Training the team in the mechanics of formulating was examined (see (Ingham, 2011), however this was by brief training without accompanying long-term supervision or on-going learning; aspects both recognised as important in one-to-one therapy competency and skill development (BABCP, 2010). Status of team members has been reported as influencing the ability of other team members to have a voice within group

meetings and discussions (Mannix & Sauer, 2006; Silver, Troyer, & Cohen, 2000). In team formulation, the dominance of one profession may serve to reduce the input of other team members and influence the formulation if key information is withheld.

Although the clinical focus of the teams was reported, there was no examination of the type of team and how this influenced the team formulations. Team type is of key interest in team research where there is recognition of the interplay between team type, task and outcomes. For example, established researchers of teams suggest that composition, technology and distance and the degree of empowerment and layering present in different types of teams impacts on task performance (Tannenbaum, Mathieu, Salas, & Cohen, 2012). Other researchers suggest that not all teams function as ‘real’ teams, which can also influence task performance. For example ‘pseudo’ teams, who possess lower degrees of interdependence, shared objectives, reflexivity and boundedness may also have lower task performance ability (West & Lyubovnikova, 2012).

### ***Formulating and its Impact on the Team***

To date, team formulation studies offer only partial insights into the impact of the team formulation on the team. The review identified themes suggesting that team formulation leads to increased understanding, team reflection time and problem solving ability. This part of the review yielded the most results, perhaps reflecting the interest of researchers to identify influences on the team. However, only four included studies used validated self-report and observational measures (Berry et al., 2009; Berry et al., 2016; Kellett et al., 2014; Revolta et al., 2016), while the remaining six studies used un-validated self-report measures and descriptions of staff observations and experiences (see table three). Overall, the small number and variable quality of included studies limits the evidence for the impact of team formulation on the team.

Three studies (Berry et al., 2009; Berry et al., 2016; Revolta et al., 2016) examined the impact of team formulation on the attitudes of team members but did not account for possible confounds researched in other fields. For example, self-categorisation theory demonstrates the influence of group membership on attitudinal changes of individuals. The theory posits that individuals compare self to others, and are motivated to adopt the values and attitudes of other group members due to the desire to belong to the ‘in-group’ (Haslam, Powell, & Turner, 2000; Hogg & Terry, 2000; Reynolds, Turner, & Haslam, 2003). The impact of self-categorisation in relation to team formulation is yet to be explored.

Time for the team to reflect on care and treatment planning by formulating as a team is also identified as a key theme within the included studies. However, from the included studies suggesting that team formulation confers this time for reflection, there is no examination of whether team formulation is the only or most appropriate method of team discussion for improving treatment planning. Research with mental health multi-disciplinary team meetings has also shown an association between the meeting process and effective treatment planning (Raine et al., 2014). In order to understand the value of team formulation as a mechanism for this, further research targeting whether teams have increased reflection time specifically because of team formulation should be undertaken. This also applies to the fourth theme identified, where team formulation was perceived as a good tool for helping teams struggling with patient behaviours. Knowing the specifics of what it is about team formulation that leads to this perception; above other forms of team discussion is needed to strengthen this claim. Within the included studies, the ability of team formulation to reduce patient behaviours that challenge due to altered staff perceptions of the patient seems largely to be an opinion and claims of this outcome require consideration in conjunction with study design and limitations. To illustrate this, the study by Ingham (2011), used an idiosyncratic observation measure of a patient’s challenging behaviours over time, before the introduction of formulation and after it.

However, this measure was not validated and inter-rater reliability not assessed. The study may have been subject to high levels of bias given its design (Goodacre, 2015), and observed changes in the patient's behaviour could have been due to other factors such as medication or recovery.

The perception that team effectiveness increases because of team formulation was inferred as a finding, but not directly tested in three of the included studies (Christofides et al., 2012; Ingham, 2011; Revolta et al., 2016). Research into team effectiveness is extensive and includes factors such as team cohesion, participation, member attitudes to the team and clarity of objectives (Borrill et al., 2013; Richter, Dawson, & West, 2011). None of these factors were examined in the studies reviewed and therefore the impact of team formulation on team effectiveness must largely be seen as an untested assumption.

Overall, the findings of the fourth review aim suggest a growing interest in the impact that team formulation may have on a team. Findings suggest that it can help increase a team's emotional awareness and ability, while helping them to operate more efficiently. If these are potential impacts then the use of team formulation may herald a new way forward in promoting team effectiveness. However, present research is limited in the number of studies, quality and design and cannot be considered as reliable evidence of this impact.

*Limitations.* The decision to limit the review to studies published in peer reviewed journals, accessible by academic database was taken in order to focus the review on the most robust available evidence. This is in keeping with guidance on evidence based healthcare (National Academy of Sciences, 2001; NICE, 2014b). This is important as the practice of team formulation is increasingly used to plan care decisions; a crucial aspect of care. The inclusion of only ten studies for analysis, although potentially affecting the ability to answer the review aims, did ensure that only robust evidence was included. However, this may have limited the

ability to answer the review questions with assurance. Studies published within non-peer reviewed professional forum magazines and those not accessible by academic database would have increased the available number of studies amenable to review, but may have reduced the credibility of evidence. To mitigate further against the small number of studies reviewed, a robust methodology using PRISMA guidelines (Moher, Liberati, Tetzlaff, Altman, & Grp, 2009) was employed including the use of a second reviewer for quality appraisals.

The included research studies were variable in research aims, design, methodology, reporting, statistical analysis, sample size, and type. This heterogeneity prevented the use of one type of review analysis such as meta-analysis or qualitative evidence synthesis. Therefore, an accepted review style that could analyse the contribution of both quantitative and qualitative findings, and include the use of quality appraisals was used with rigour (Hong et al., 2017). This style limited the statistical analysis of quantitative findings, but did consolidate all kinds of evidence into a format by which the review aims (three and four) could be addressed. A second reviewer, who independently generated themes relating to the review aims, strengthened the approach.

**Conclusions**

This review found a paucity of research studies. The quality of included studies was variable and their mixed focus considerably restricts the degree of evidence behind the practice of team formulation. Yet this is a promising approach that may impact beneficially on teams as well as conferring clinical benefits via individualised care planning and increased understanding of patients. Specific aspects, which remain poorly understood, include the influence of the team on the formulation and the influence of formulating as a team on the team. The untested assumption about team formulation that it can be suitably and wholly underpinned by therapy formulation theory, is likely to continue until team formulation is

clearly defined within its own right as a team psychological activity. A conceptual framework, which informs systematic consideration of the range of factors and theories involved in team formulation, which takes into account the team inputs, processes, and outputs, of formulating as a team, should inform future research. Such a guiding conceptual framework would highlight the possibilities for future research as abundant. Lessons can be gained from therapy formulation in this respect. The evidence for therapy formulation is also considered weak, however it is drawn from sound case observations, together with general theories, which in combination produce testable theories specific to therapy formulation (Bieling & Kuyken, 2003).

Defining and increasing the evidence base for team formulation remains a challenge, but represents a worthwhile one if the benefits to teams as well as patients are to be firmly established.



References

BABCP. (2010). *Core curriculum reference document*. Retrieved from Bury England:

Baker, D. P., Day, R., & Salas, E. (2006). Teamwork as an essential component of high-reliability organizations. *Health Services Research, 41*(4), 1576-1598.  
doi:10.1111/j.1475-6773.2006.00566.x

Baxter, S. K., & Brumfitt, S. M. (2008). Professional differences in interprofessional working. *Journal of interprofessional care, 22*(3), 239 - 251.  
doi:10.1080/13561820802054655

Berry, K., Barrowclough, C., & Wearden, A. (2009). A Pilot Study Investigating the Use of Psychological Formulations to Modify Psychiatric Staff Perceptions of Service Users with Psychosis. *Behav Cogn Psychother, 37*, 39-48.  
doi:10.1017/S1352465808005018

Berry, K., Haddock, G., Kellett, S., Roberts, C., Drake, R., & Barrowclough, C. (2016). Feasibility of a ward-based psychological intervention to improve staff and patient relationships in psychiatric rehabilitation settings. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 55*(3), 236-252. doi:10.1111/bjc.12082

Bieling, P. J., & Kuyken, W. (2003). Is cognitive case formulation science or science fiction? *Clinical Psychology-Science and Practice, 10*(1), 52-69. doi:10.1093/clipsy/10.1.52

Borrill, C., West, M., Dawson, J., Shapiro, D., Rees, A., Richards, A., . . . Carter, A. (2013). *Team Working and Effectiveness in Health Care: Findings from the Health Care Team Effectiveness Unit*. Retrieved from <http://homepages.inf.ed.ac.uk/jeanc/DOH-glossy-brochure.pdf>

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77 - 101.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful Qualitative research. A practical guide for beginners*. London: Sage.
- Bruch, M. (2015). The development of case formulation approaches. In M. Bruch (Ed.), *Beyond Diagnosis* (second ed., pp. 234). Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Butler, G. (1998). Clinical Formulation. In A. S. Bellack & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Comprehensive Clinical Psychology* (Vol. 7, pp. 1-24). New York: Pergammon.
- CASP. (2017a). Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (Qualitative Checklist - online). Retrieved from <http://www.casp-uk.net/checklists>
- CASP. (2017b). Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (Randomised Control Checklist - online). Retrieved from <http://www.casp-uk.net/checklists>
- Christofides, S., Johnstone, L., & Musa, M. (2012). Chipping in!: Clinical psychologists' descriptions of their use of formulation in multidisciplinary team working. *Psychology and Psychotherapy-Theory Research and Practice*, 85(4), 424-435. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8341.2011.02041.x
- Cochrane. (2017). Cochrane Effective practice and Organisation of Care Group. Retrieved from <http://epoc.cochrane.org/>
- Coolican, H. (2009). *Research Methods and Statistics in Psychology* (5th ed.). London: Hodder Education.
- Davenport, S. (2002). Acute wards: problems and solutions: A rehabilitation approach to in-patient care. *Psychiatric Bulletin*, 26, 388-392.
- DCP. (2010). *The Core Purpose and Philosophy of the Profession*. Retrieved from Leicester:

- 1  
2  
3 Dudley, R., Park, I., James, I., & Dodgson, G. (2010). Rate of Agreement Between Clinicians  
4  
5 on the Content of a Cognitive Formulation of Delusional Beliefs: The Effect of  
6  
7 Qualifications and Experience. *Behav Cogn Psychother*, 38(2), 185-200.  
8  
9 doi:10.1017/s1352465809990658  
10  
11  
12 Dunn, M., and Parry, G. (1997). A formulated care plan approach to caring for people with  
13  
14 borderline personality disorder in a community mental health service setting. *Clinical*  
15  
16 *Psychology Forum*, 104, 19-22.  
17  
18  
19 Eells, T. D. (2006). History and current status of psychotherapy case formulation. In T. D.  
20  
21 Eells (Ed.), *Handbook of Psychotherapy Case Formulation* (2nd ed., pp. 3-32).  
22  
23 London: The Guildford Press.  
24  
25  
26 Eells, T. D., Lombart, K. G., Kendjelic, E. M., Turner, L. C., & Lucas, C. P. (2005). The  
27  
28 quality of psychotherapy case formulations: a comparison of expert, experienced, and  
29  
30 novice cognitive-behavioral and psychodynamic therapists. *J Consult Clin Psychol*,  
31  
32 73(4), 579-589. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.73.4.579  
33  
34  
35 EPPI-Centre. (2003). Review Guidelines for Extracting Data and Quality Assessing Primary  
36  
37 Studies in Educational Research. (Version 0.9.7. ed.). London: EPPI-Centre, Social  
38  
39 Science Research Unit.  
40  
41  
42 Fetters, M. D., Curry, L. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). Achieving Integration in Mixed  
43  
44 Methods Designs-Principles and Practices. *Health Services Research*, 48(6), 2134-  
45  
46 2156. doi:10.1111/1475-6773.12117  
47  
48  
49 Flinn, L., Braham, L., & das Nair, R. (2015). How reliable are case formulations? A  
50  
51 systematic literature review. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 54(3), 266-290.  
52  
53 doi:10.1111/bjc.12073  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- Goodacre, S. (2015). Uncontrolled before-after studies: discouraged by Cochrane and the EMJ. *Emergency Medicine Journal*, 32(7), 507-508. doi:10.1136/emmermed-2015-204761
- Haslam, S. A., Powell, C., & Turner, J. C. (2000). Social identity, self-categorization, and work motivation: Rethinking the contribution of the group to positive and sustainable organisational outcomes. *Applied Psychology-an International Review-Psychologie Appliquee-Revue Internationale*, 49(3), 319-339. doi:10.1111/1464-0597.00018
- HMG/DH. (2011). *No Health Without Mental Health: A Cross-Government Mental Health Outcomes Strategy for People of All Ages*. London: Department of Health.
- Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. J. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 121-140. doi:10.2307/259266
- Hong, Q. N., Pluye, P., Bujold, M., & Wassef, M. (2017). Convergent and sequential synthesis designs: implications for conducting and reporting systematic reviews of qualitative and quantitative evidence. *Systematic reviews*, 6(61), 1-14. doi:10.1186/s13643-017-0454-2
- Huettermann, H., Doering, S., & Boerner, S. (2017). Understanding the Development of Team Identification: A Qualitative Study in UN Peacebuilding Teams. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 32(2), 217-234. doi:10.1007/s10869-016-9446-9
- Ingham, B. (2011). Collaborative psychosocial case formulation development workshops: A case study with direct care staff. *Advances in Mental Health and Intellectual Disabilities*, 5(2), 9-15. doi:10.5042/amhid.2011.0107

- Ingham, B., & Clarke, L. (2009). The introduction of clinical psychology to an inpatient autistic spectrum disorder and intellectual disabilities service: Impact and reflections. *Clinical Psychology Forum*, 204, 30-34.
- Ingham, B., Clarke, L., & James, I. A. (2008). Biopsychosocial case formulation for people with intellectual disabilities and mental health problems: A pilot study of a training workshop for direct care staff. *British Journal of Developmental Disabilities*, 54(106,Pt1), 41-54. doi:10.1179/096979508799103323
- Johnstone, L. (2014). Using formulation in teams. In L. Johnstone & R. Dallos (Eds.), *Formulation in Psychology and Psychotherapy. Making sense of people's problems*. (2nd ed., pp. 216-242). London: Routledge. Taylor Francis Group.
- Johnstone, L., & Dallos, R. (2014). Introduction to formulation. In L. Johnstone & R. Dallos (Eds.), *Formulation in Psychology and Psychotherapy. Making sense of people's problems* (2nd ed., pp. 1 - 17). London: Routledge.
- Johnstone., L. (2011). *Good Practice Guidelines on the use of psychological formulation*. Retrieved from Leicester: <http://www.bps.org.uk/system/files/Public%20files/DCP/cat-842.pdf>
- Kellett, S., Wilbram, M., Davis, C., & Hardy, G. (2014). Team consultancy using cognitive analytic therapy: a controlled study in assertive outreach. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, 21(8), 687-697. doi:10.1111/jpm.12123
- Kuyken, W. (2006). Evidence-based case formulation: is the emperor clothed?? In N. Tarrier (Ed.), *Case Formulation in Cognitive Behaviour Therapy. The Treatment of Challenging and Complex Cases* (pp. 12-35). East Sussex: Routledge.
- Maguire, N. (2006). Cognitive Behavioural Therapy and homelessness: A case series pilot study. *Behavioural & Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 34(01), 107-111.

- Mannix, E. A., & Sauer, S. J. (2006). Status and power in organizational group research: Acknowledging the pervasiveness of hierarchy In S. R. Thye (Ed.), *Social Psychology of the Workplace* (Vol. 23, pp. 149-182).
- Mathieu, J., Maynard, M. T., Rapp, T., & Gilson, L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997-2007: A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 410-476. doi:10.1177/0149206308316061
- Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & Grp, P. (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 62(10), 1006-1012. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2009.06.005
- Mohtashemi, R., Stevens, J., Jackson, P. G., & Weatherhead, S. (2016). Psychiatrists' understanding and use of psychological formulation: a qualitative exploration. *Psychiatric Bulletin*, 40(4), 212-216. doi:10.1192/pb.bp.115.051342
- National Academy of Sciences. (2001). *Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century*. Retrieved from Washington DC: <http://www.nationalacademies.org/hmd/~/media/Files/Report%20Files/2001/Crossing-the-Quality-Chasm/Quality%20Chasm%202001%20%20report%20brief.pdf>
- NICE. (2014a). *Psychosis and schizophrenia in adults: prevention and management. Clinical guideline*.
- NICE. (2014b). *Using Evidence in Practice*. United Kingdom: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence Retrieved from nice.org.uk/guidance/lgb23.
- NIH. (2014). Quality Assessment Tool for Before-After (Pre-Post) Studies With No Control Group. Retrieved from <https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-pro/guidelines/in-develop/cardiovascular-risk-reduction/tools/before-after>

NIMH. (2016). Schizophrenia. Retrieved from <https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/topics/schizophrenia/index.shtml>

Pluye, P., & Hong, Q. N. (2014). Combining the Power of Stories and the Power of Numbers: Mixed Methods Research and Mixed Studies Reviews. In J. E. Fielding (Ed.), *Annual Review of Public Health, Vol 35* (Vol. 35, pp. 29-45).

QSR International Pty Ltd. (2015). NVivo qualitative data analysis Software. (Version Version 11).

Raine, R., Xanthopoulou, P., Wallace, I., Bhaird, C. N. A., Lanceley, A., Clarke, A., . . . Barber, J. (2014). Determinants of treatment plan implementation in multidisciplinary team meetings for patients with chronic diseases: a mixed-methods study. *Bmj Quality & Safety*, 23(10), 867-876. doi:10.1136/bmjqs-2014-002818

Ravatch, S. M., & Riggan, M. (2012). *Reason and Rigor. How Conceptual Frameworks Guide Research*. London: Sage.

Revolta, C., Orrell, M., & Spector, A. (2016). The biopsychosocial (BPS) model of dementia as a tool for clinical practice. A pilot study. *International Psychogeriatrics*, 28(7), 1079-1089. doi:10.1017/s1041610215002379

Reynolds, K. J., Turner, J. C., & Haslam, S. A. (2003). *Social identity and self-categorization theories' contribution to understanding identification, salience and diversity in teams and organization* (Vol. 5).

Richter, A. W., Dawson, J. F., & West, M. A. (2011). The effectiveness of teams in organizations: a meta-analysis. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(13), 2749-2769. doi:10.1080/09585192.2011.573971

- Robson, J., & Quayle, G. (2009). Increasing the utility of psychological formulation: A case example from an acute mental health ward. *Clinical Psychology Forum*, 204(Dec), 25-29.
- Shirley, L. (2010). Sharing formulation with care staff using the Newcastle Model - group problem-solving. *PSIGE Newsletter*, 112(Oct 2010), 55-61.
- Silver, S. D., Troyer, L., & Cohen, B. P. (2000). Effects of status on the exchange of information in team decision-making: When team building isn't enough. *Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, Vol 7: Team Development*, 7, 21-51.
- Sturmey, P. (2009). Case Formulation: A Review and Overview of This Volume. In P. Sturmey (Ed.), *Clinical Case Formulation Varieties of Approaches* (pp. 3-30). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Summers, A. (2006). Psychological formulations in psychiatric care: Staff views on their impact. *Psychiatric Bulletin*, 30(9), 341-343. doi:10.1192/pb.30.9.341
- Tannenbaum, S. I., Mathieu, J. E., Salas, E., & Cohen, D. (2012). Teams Are Changing: Are Research and Practice Evolving Fast Enough? *Industrial & Organizational Psychology*, 5(1), 2-24. doi:10.1111/j.1754-9434.2011.01396.x
- West, M. A., & Lyubovnikova, J. (2012). Real Teams or Pseudo Teams? The Changing Landscape Needs a Better Map. *Industrial & Organizational Psychology*, 5(1), 25-28. doi:10.1111/j.1754-9434.2011.01397.x
- Whomsley, S. (2010). Team case formulation. In C. Cupitt (Ed.), *Reaching out: The psychology of assertive outreach*. (pp. 95-118). New York, NY US: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- World Health Organization. (2015). *The European Mental Health Action Plan 2013–2020*. Retrieved from Denmark:



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

[http://www.euro.who.int/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0020/280604/WHO-Europe-Mental-Health-Acion-Plan-2013-2020.pdf](http://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0020/280604/WHO-Europe-Mental-Health-Acion-Plan-2013-2020.pdf)

Mental Health Review Journal

Table One. Search Terms

## Search Term

---

Team formulat\*

Team clinical case formulat\*

Team case meeting

Formulat\* meeting

Case conceptuali\$ation

Case discussion

Team case discussion

Case planning

Team case planning

Clinical case meeting

Team clinical case meeting

Clinical formulat\* meeting

Staff focused formulat\*

Complex case discussion

Complex case forum

Multi-disciplinary team meeting

Cognitive case formulat\*

Cognitive case conceptuali\$ation

Cognitive case discussion

Cognitive behavio\$ral formulat\* meeting

Cognitive behavio\$ral conceptuali\$ation meeting

---

Case formulat\* meeting

---

- 1
- 2
- 3 Team case conceptualization
- 4
- 5 Team psychiatric formulation\*
- 6
- 7 Team psychological formulation\*
- 8

---

Mental Health Review Journal

Table two. Inclusion criteria

---

**Inclusion Criteria**

---

**• Review aims**

- Gives any definition of formulation (applied to a team formulation study), or;
- Offers a theoretical basis for *team* formulation (includes therapy formulation theories if used as underpinning team formulation), or;
- Explores the impact the team has on the formulation, or;
- Explores the impact on the team of formulating as a team.

**• Setting/population**

- Relevant to adult mental health multi-disciplinary teams (includes learning disability, services for older people, offender health), and;
- Team formulation implemented in consultation, supervision or shared team format, and;
- Involves any therapeutic modality (e.g. \*CBT, \*CAT)

**• Study features**

- Any study design.
- Published in peer reviewed journal and available on academic database.
- Any publication date, in English language
- Includes studies regarding evaluation of training teams to formulate

---

\*CBT = Cognitive Behavioural Therapy. CAT = Cognitive Analytical Therapy




Figure 1. Synthesis design (Hong et al., 2017).




Figure two. PRISMA Flow Diagram illustrating systematic review process

Table three. Included study characteristics

Study authors	Aim of research	Methodological approach	Participants and setting	Formulating method	Key findings	Effect size
Summers 2006	To understand benefits and limitations of using psychological formulations for patients with serious mental illness. To find out via staff views.	Qualitative. Grounded theory. Semi-structured interviews	25 staff. High dependency rehabilitation unit	Team meets to formulate then therapist writes formulation up. Sometimes discussed with patient.	Staff believed formulations benefit the care plans. Staff-patient relationships, staff satisfaction, team working through understanding improved. Some staff see formulation as tentative, others as statement of fact.	NA*
Maguire, 2006	To formulate target behaviours in group of homeless men. To provide CBT* interventions. To enable staff to use CBT techniques, via formulations and supervision. To train staff to operate within CBT framework, to increase perceived capability.	Uncontrolled quantitative pre-post intervention study. Self-report using un-validated scale.	Four residents. 15 staff. Residential for homeless men	Staff training with two groups of staff. Individual formulation and treatment given to patients by team psychologists. Staff supervision and training sessions by psychologist. Not reported whether whole team was involved in project.	Staff perceived they could be more effective, less hopeless, possibly less stressed as a result of training.	Not available
Berry et al., 2009	To develop formulations for individual patients' mental health needs with staff teams and explore effects of the formulation process on staff appraisals of	Uncontrolled quantitative pre-post intervention study. Self-report using validated measures.	30 staff. Three rehabilitation in-patient units.	Formulations meetings held with groups of staff facilitated by psychologist.	Statistically significant changes in staff perceptions on all dimensions post intervention. Predictions supported.	Not available

Ingham et al., 2008	patients. To pilot a novel training workshop in bio-psychosocial formulation in terms of its effects upon awareness of bio-psychosocial case formulation with direct care staff.	Uncontrolled quantitative pre-post intervention study. Un-validated pre-post scale to measure change in ability to formulate plus self-report.	10 unqualified care staff. Acute in-patient mental health in intellectual disability setting	CBT formulation training workshop for direct care staff. Does not report if all in the same team. Used 5Ps* framework	Hypothesis supported. Staff improved in all of the 5Ps except 'predisposing'. Staff found training satisfactory. Staff appraisal ability of formulation changed. Greater feelings of mastery and understanding of patient problems. Psychological hypotheses were shared more often informally.	d = -1.927 (large effect)
Christofides, et al., 2012	To investigate use of psychological formulations in MDT* working as reported by clinical psychologists	Qualitative. Inductive thematic design. Semi-structured interview.	10 Community and in-patient adult mental health services	Psychologists who use formulation in MDTs were interviewed. They reported this as contributing informally within formulation meetings	Challenging behaviour in patient decreased. Participants felt workshops were very satisfactory.	NA
Ingham, 2011	To provide a pilot evaluation of brief formulation development workshops with direct care staff supporting people with intellectual disability.	Uncontrolled quantitative pre-post intervention study. Un-validated pre-post observational measure, plus un-validated self-report.	Seven staff. Intellectual disabilities in adult mental health	Psychologist trains team in formulation and applies to one patient in training.	Challenging behaviour in patient decreased. Participants felt workshops were very satisfactory.	Not available
Kellett et al., 2014	To evaluate the clinical and organisational efficacy of formulation based consultancy. Has three hypotheses; reduces	RCT*. Validated self-report perception scale. Validated self-report measure re team climate. Semi-structured	10 patients in each arm. Eight staff Assertive outreach.	Consultancy model. Staff were trained, supervised and had CAT* meetings with the therapist.	No differences in patient outcomes. CAT facilitated enhanced team practice.	(staff results) Participative safety (d = 1.72) large Support for innovation (d = 2.42) large Task orientation (d = 0.30) mod



1							
2		patient's distress,	interviews.				Team vision
3		patients easier to					(d = 0.14) small
4		engage with, team					
5		climate will improve.					
6		Qualitative part aims					
7		to explore staff					
8		experience					
9							
10	Berry et al.,	To assess the	RCT. Feasibility	51 patients,	24 one hour sessions	Patients felt less	Therapeutic
11	2016	feasibility and	study.	85 staff across	facilitated by a	criticised by their	relationship effect
12		potential efficacy of a	Validated self-report	10 wards.	psychologist and	keyworkers and	sizes.
13		ward based	measures of	Rehabilitation	therapist. Formulations	reported improved	Individual results given
14		psychological	staff/patient alliance,	in-patients	derived from the	relationships and ward	for each question in
15		intervention to	perceived criticism,		meetings. All staff on	organisation. Staff in	each scale for control
16		improve staff-patient	ward atmosphere and		duty who were available	the intervention arm	and intervention mean
17		relationships. Main	staff well-being.		attended the mtgs.	reported lower	and SD. Effect sizes
18		aims were to	Mixture of self-report			depersonalisation. But	calculated using effect
19		determine rates of	and validated			no significant	size calculator.
20		recruitment, uptake	observation measures			differences in terms of	Effect sizes included:
21		and retention and	used for patient			staff perceptions of	
22		estimate effect size on	perceptions.			relationships, stress	Working Alliance
23		a range of patient and	Observation of ward			and other aspects of	Inventory (two results
24		staff outcomes.	environment and case			burnout, patient	given)
25			notes.			outcomes, length of	(d = -0.648) moderate
26						stay, change in	negative effect
27						treatment or relapse.	(d = 1.142) large
28						Staff reported a worse	positive effect.
29						relationship with	Perceived Criticism
30						patients after the	Scale (four results
31						intervention. Some	given).
32						aspects of staff	(d = 0.499) small
33						burnout improved.	positive
34						Team formulation	(d = 0.729) med
35						reduced patient	positive
36						perceptions of	(d = -1.742)large
37						criticism by	negative
38							
39							
40							
41							
42							
43							
44							
45							
46							
47							

					developing empathy and understanding from staff.	(d = -1.674) large negative Ward Atmosphere Scale (six results given) (d = -0.154) small negative (d = -0.058) small negative (d = 0.018) small positive (d = 2.212) large positive (d = 3.334) large positive (d = 1.518) large positive
Revolta et al., 2016	To evaluate the feasibility of training staff from a variety of settings on the BPS* model of dementia, examining its impact on attitudes, competence and formulation skills.	Uncontrolled quantitative pre-post intervention study. Some qualitative feedback sought too regarding training. Validated self-report measures. Observation of pre-post ability using a validated model.	37 staff across three dementia care homes	Training workshops delivered which included ability to formulate. Training staff in teams to use a model which includes team formulation.	Formulation skills and ability to develop appropriate interventions increased significantly. No significant difference found in overall approach to dementia, and no significant change to levels of hope or person-centeredness. No significant difference on sense of competence. All groups showed an improved attitude towards dementia. Training helped to	d = 0.59 (medium positive effect) on problem solving exercise

1							
2						improve understanding	
3						of dementia and	
4						problem solving	
5						ability.	
6	Mohtashemi	To understand how	Qualitative. Informed	12	Team formulation is	Four conceptual	NA
7	et al., 2016	psychiatrists	by grounded theory.	psychiatrists.	facilitated by a	categories emerged.	
8		understand the		Various	psychologist	- Formulation leads to	
9		concept of		settings.		a diagnosis, and	
10		formulation, including		AMH		psychological	
11		team formulation				understanding is not	
12						always needed, but	
13						helpful.	
14						-Created unified	
15						understanding between	
16						psychology and	
17						psychiatry and team	
18						communication device.	
19						Brings information	
20						together.	
21						-Time is a barrier to	
22						using psychological	
23						understanding.	
24						-Pressure to treat	
25						people medically at	
26						cost of psychological	
27						understanding. Gap in	
28						psychiatry training.	
29							
30							
31							
32							

33 \*NA = Not Applicable. \*CBT = Cognitive Behavioural Therapy. \*5Ps = Presenting problem, Predisposing, Precipitating, Perpetuating, Protective Factors.  
34 \*MDT = Multi-Disciplinary Team. \*RCT = Randomised Controlled Trial. \*CAT = Cognitive Analytic Therapy. \*BPS = Bio-Psycho-Social. \*AMH = Adult  
35 Mental Health.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

Table five. Theories underpinning team formulation research

Study	Theories applied	How applied	Was application of theory supported in findings*
Summers, 2006	Psychological theory (does not specify which)	Applies the psychological theory underpinning therapy formulation to team formulation.	NA*. Theory not focus of research study
Maguire, 2006	Change	Used to examine whether formulation would increase staff understanding of a particular behaviour often observed in sample patient group (reluctance to change), that may invoke hopelessness, burnout and stress in staff.	Yes
Ingham et al., 2008	Bio-psychosocial	Applies theory to support integration of clinical knowledge used in therapy formulation to team formulation.	Yes
	Attribution	To see if formulating can alter unhelpful/critical appraisals and impact on staff helping behaviours.	NA: Impact of intervention on staff attribution not tested
Berry et al., 2009	Social exchange	To rationalise the study of staff-patient relationships as a central determinant of relapse and recovery.	Yes
	Attribution	To support study rationale in relation to staff attributions of patient behaviours and mental health problems. To see if formulating can alter unhelpful/critical staff appraisals and impact on staff helping behaviours.	Yes
	Cognitive Behavioural	To provide background theoretical evidence for use of formulation in teams. Applies the psychological theory underpinning therapy formulation to team formulation.	NA: Theory not focus of research study
	Interpersonal	To provide background theoretical evidence for use of formulation. Applies the psychological theory underpinning therapy formulation to team formulation.	NA: Theory not focus of research study
	Attachment	To provide background theoretical evidence for use of formulation. Applies the psychological theory underpinning therapy formulation to team formulation.	NA: Theory not focus of research study
	Cognitive Analytical	To provide background theoretical evidence for use of formulation. Applies the psychological theory underpinning	NA: Theory not focus of research study

Ingham, 2011	Psychological theory (does not specify which)	therapy formulation to team formulation. To provide background theoretical evidence for use of formulation. Applies the psychological theory underpinning therapy formulation to team formulation.	NA: Theory not focus of research study
	Attribution	To support study rationale in relation to staff attributions of patient behaviours and mental health problems. To see if formulating can alter unhelpful/critical staff appraisals and impact on staff helping behaviours.	Yes
	Systemic	Used for study rationale; patterns and narratives within staff-patient relationships are explored via formulation with the intention of producing a change in relationships.	No distinct reporting in findings in relation to this theory and impact of intervention
Christofides et al., 2012	Behaviour	Applies behavioural theory underpinning therapy formulation to team formulation.	NA: Theory not focus of research study
	Psychodynamic	Applies formulation to understand staff countertransference feelings towards service user to inform formulation.	NA: Theory not focus of research study
Kellett et al., 2014	Communication	As study rationale suggesting that therapy formulation may improve team communication and clarity of objectives.	Task orientation tested as part of quantitative measure, otherwise communication and clarity of objectives not tested.
	Attachment	Formulating staff-patient relationships can draw staff attention to dysfunctional roles and procedures adopted by both, to see if this would alter practice.	Yes
Berry et al., 2016	Social exchange	To support the study of staff-patient relationships as a central determinant of relapse and recovery.	Yes
	Attribution	To support study rationale in relation to staff attributions of service user behaviours and mental health problems. To see if formulating can alter unhelpful/critical staff appraisals and impact on staff helping behaviours.	Yes
Revolta et al., 2016	Bio-psychosocial	Applies theory to support content of team training in use of bio-psychosocial formulation with team.	Yes
Mohtashemi et al., 2016	Psychological theory (does not specify)	To provide background theoretical evidence for use of formulation. Applies the psychological theory underpinning	NA: Theory not focus of research study

which) therapy formulation to team formulation.

---

\*Note: Findings need to be regarded in conjunction with study quality appraisal and effect sizes where reported.

\*NA = Not applicable.