

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

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

### 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.

1  
2  
3 **Originality/value:** This is the first review to examine team formulation through the context  
4 of the team. The authors argue that a conceptual framework to encompass team inputs,  
5  
6 processes and outputs in team formulation practice should guide future research.  
7  
8

9  
10 **Keywords:** Team formulation. Evidence based team formulation. Team formulation  
11 definition. Team formulation theory. Team context and team formulation. Team formulation  
12 impact.  
13  
14

15 **Paper type:** Literature review  
16  
17

18 Declaration of Interest: None  
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

## 1 2 3     **Introduction** 4

5     Multi-disciplinary mental health and learning disability clinical teams, working together to  
6  
7     develop individual patient case formulations is an increasing practice within the United  
8  
9     Kingdom (Johnstone., 2011). Known as 'team formulation', the purpose is to develop a  
10  
11     shared understanding of the patient to determine the interventions (Johnstone, 2014).  
12  
13     Research underpinning team formulation is of relevance to clinical practice globally. National  
14  
15     guidelines indicate that care that should be provided based on diagnosis (for example see  
16  
17     NICE, 2014a, 2014b; NIMH, 2016), however individualised care is also required (HMG/DH,  
18  
19  
20     2011; World Health Organization, 2015). Team formulation guides the design of individual  
21  
22     care for patients experiencing a range of mental health problems, some of which are  
23  
24     considered complex (for example see Berry, Barrowclough, & Wearden, 2009). Therefore,  
25  
26     determining a patient's unique needs through the lens of team formulation may afford this  
27  
28     individualised focus. Understanding the evidence base for this practice is of critical  
29  
30     importance in supporting teams to use evidence based practice.  
31

32  
33     Individual psychological case formulation (therapy formulation) emanated from behaviour  
34  
35     therapy in the 1950's when it was developed as a central component for understanding the  
36  
37     problematic behaviours of individual patients (Bruch, 2015). Now it is recognised as a central  
38  
39     tenet of most one-to-one psychological therapies where a single therapist works with a single  
40  
41     patient to develop a collaborative formulation (Sturmey, 2009). Studies examining therapy  
42  
43     formulation report a weak evidence base. For example, a recent systematic review examining  
44  
45     the inter-rater and test-retest reliability of therapy formulations across various therapeutic  
46  
47     modalities reported considerable differences in reliability. This ranged from slight to  
48  
49     substantial, depending on practitioner experience and therapy modality (Flinn, Braham, & das  
50  
51     Nair, 2015). Furthermore, there is limited evidence for impact on patient outcomes (Bieling  
52  
53     & Kuyken, 2003; Kuyken, 2006). Researchers examining formulation within the Cognitive  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

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

7  
8 Despite these uncertain foundations, formulation has continued to evolve, from one-to-one  
9 application in individual psychological therapy, to its most recent application by teams. The  
10 earliest published report of formulation being used by teams was in 1997, when a practice  
11 account of the use of Cognitive Analytic Therapy (CAT) formulation was described as a team  
12 endeavour, used to understand patients diagnosed with personality disorder. This descriptive  
13 account, published in a non-peer reviewed professional forum magazine (Dunn, 1997) has  
14 preceded further descriptive accounts (for example see Davenport, 2002; Robson & Quayle,  
15 2009; Shirley, 2010; Whomsley, 2010), and the suggested evidence for the benefits of team  
16 formulation continues to expand. However, evidence is originating from a small research base  
17 accompanied by a greater number of practice accounts and opinion pieces, published in non-  
18 peer reviewed publications, which attest to the benefits of team formualtion. This is evident  
19 from a succinct summary of team formulation offered by Johnstone, which highlights the  
20 benefits of team formualtion as supporting increased team functioning and well-being (for  
21 example using the expertise of all team memebrs, increasing team ability to reflect), and  
22 bringing a more balanced and effective approach to interventions (Johnstone, 2014). This  
23 evidence base poses several problems. Rather than evidence-based practice, team formulation  
24 is developing from a basis of untested and poorly collated, practice-based experience. As the  
25 practice spreads, the degree to which team formulation can be considered a separate  
26 phenomenon to therapy formulation, with its own unique definition and underpinning theory,  
27 is not clear. Furthermore, researchers have examined the impact of the clinician on the  
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

1  
2  
3 therapy formulation, scrutinising the level of practitioner skill and experience on the  
4 formulation produced (Dudley, Park, James, & Dodgson, 2010; T. D. Eells, Lombart,  
5  
6 Kendjelic, Turner, & Lucas, 2005), however, it is unclear whether studies on team  
7  
8 formulation are similarly accounting for the team context.  
9  
10

11 The impact of team processes on the execution of specific team tasks is well documented. A  
12 large study of over 400 United Kingdom National Health Service health care teams, including  
13 teams from physical and mental health care, concluded that team processes such as  
14 participation, reflexivity, decision making, leadership and communication impacted on team  
15 levels of effectiveness and innovative practice (Borrill et al., 2013). Teamwork is also  
16 essential for team reliability and patient safety (Baker, Day, & Salas, 2006) and professional  
17 differences in teams impact on joint working and knowledge sharing (Baxter & Brumfitt,  
18 2008). **Nonetheless, the impact of the team processes involved in team formulating remain**  
19  
20 **undefined and untested.** Considerations such as these may be crucial in developing an  
21  
22 evidence base that embeds team formulation within the team context.  
23  
24

25 The aim of this paper is to report the results of a systematic mixed study review of team  
26 formulation research. The specific objectives are to provide a systematic map of research on  
27 team formulation in adult mental health and learning disability services (including forensic  
28 and older people's services), and to examine and synthesise the findings in relation to:  
29  
30

- 31 a. how team formulation is being defined as a phenomenon in its own right  
32 and as distinct to psychological therapy formulation  
33
- 34 b. the theoretical underpinnings of team formulation  
35
- 36 c. the impact on the formulation through team involvement  
37
- 38 d. the impact on the team due to formulating as a team  
39

40 The present review takes a deductive, theory driven approach to examine if current research  
41 on team formulation addresses these aspects and highlights the direction for future research.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**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, Psyinfo, 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***

1  
2  
3 A convergent qualitative synthesis design using thematic analysis (Figure one) was employed  
4 to transform evidence from both quantitative and qualitative studies into qualitative findings  
5 (Pluye & Hong, 2014). A theory-driven strategy focusing on specific research objectives as  
6 pre-defined themes, and an amalgamation of evidence from both intervention and non-  
7 intervention research were used to understand the phenomena of 'team' within team  
8 formulation (Fetters, Curry, & Creswell, 2013; Hong, Pluye, Bujold, & Wassef, 2017).  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 Insert Figure 1 here. Synthesis design  
20  
21  
22  
23

#### 24 ***Data extraction and quality assessment*** 25

26 A standardised data extraction form (EPPI-Centre, 2003) was adapted to fit with specific  
27 review aims. The type of quality assessment used was matched to study type. Quality  
28 assessment tools included Quality Assessment Tool for Before-After (Pre-Post) Studies With  
29 No Control Group (NIH, 2014), Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) Qualitative  
30 Studies Checklist (CASP, 2017a) and CASP Randomised Control Trial Checklist (CASP,  
31 2017b). Quantitative studies with a qualitative element were assessed for both where  
32 possible. If the qualitative part of the study was not reported as such, then the main study  
33 design was assessed. Three studies were quality appraised by a second reviewer to ensure  
34 consistency in quality appraisal.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

#### 47 ***Data synthesis*** 48

49  
50  
51 Examination began with introductory and background sections to studies in order to identify  
52  
53 definitions of team formulation (review aim one). Thematic analysis was used (Braun &  
54  
55 Clarke, 2006) in which line-by-line coding was applied for both quantitative and qualitative  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 studies to create descriptive themes for all other review aims. Theoretical underpinnings  
2 (review aim two) were identified and logged semantically, as they were cited in the studies.  
3  
4 Thematic analysis was employed to establish the purpose of citing theories within studies.  
5  
6

7 Coding was employed to locate instances where the impact of the team on the formulation,  
8 and the formulation impact on the team (review aims three and four), was reported in study  
9 findings. Located instances were subjected to selective and semantic coding, in which the  
10 reviewers used the explicit descriptions given in research findings (Braun & Clarke, 2013).  
11  
12 Visual mapping was applied for instances located for review aim four in order to develop  
13 themes derived from coding (Braun & Clarke, 2013). NVivo qualitative data software was  
14 used to support the coding process (QSR International Pty Ltd, 2015). Final themes were  
15 reached through consensus agreement with an independent second reviewer (NH-G). This  
16 type of data transformation analysis is suitable to precede the development of a conceptual  
17 framework where none currently exists (Hong et al., 2017) as is the case for team  
18 formulation.  
19  
20

## 34 35 Results

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

1  
2  
3 study employing non-blinded randomisation and content analysis of semi-structured  
4  
5 interview material (Kellett et al., 2014).  
6  
7

8 Insert figure two here. PRISMA diagram  
9

10  
11 Study details and key findings including reported effect sizes are presented in table three. The  
12 team formulation in the studies was conducted either as team formulation meetings involving  
13 the whole or part of the team where the meeting was facilitated by a psychologist or  
14 psychological therapist; or team formulation training centred on real clinical case material,  
15 including team discussion. Team supervision was also provided in some instances.  
16  
17

18 Insert table three here. Included Studies Details  
19  
20

21 ***Quality appraisal results***  
22  
23

24  
25 Three of the pre-post uncontrolled intervention studies were deemed to be of poor quality  
26 (Ingham, 2011; Ingham et al., 2008; Maguire, 2006) due to high levels of bias. Two further  
27 studies of this kind were judged as poor to fair quality (Berry et al., 2009; Revolta et al.,  
28 2016) because although still vulnerable to high levels of bias due to design, clearer detail was  
29 reported about loss-to-follow-up of participants and p-values for pre to post intervention.  
30  
31

32 Three of the pre-post studies also contained a qualitative element in the form of descriptive  
33 feedback gathered from the sample post intervention (Ingham, 2011; Ingham et al., 2008;  
34 Revolta et al., 2016). In all three studies, this qualitative data focussed on acceptability of  
35 formulation training given. CASP qualitative study analysis (CASP, 2017a) suggests that the  
36 style of reporting in all three studies is not in keeping with high quality qualitative research  
37 reporting.  
38  
39

40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 Use of the CASP qualitative study tool indicated that the methodological quality of the three  
3 qualitative studies was variable, but generally of fair quality. However the qualitative part of  
4 the mixed method study (Kellett et al., 2014) was poor. The RCT feasibility study (Berry et  
5 al., 2016) was also assessed using the CASP for RCT tool and was rated as fair.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

### ***Definitions of team formulation***

13  
14 None of the studies offered a definition of formulation explicit to team formulation, and  
15 where a definition was given this was distinct to the therapy type. There was no examination  
16 of whether this definition of formulation was applicable to a formulation conducted by a  
17 team.  
18  
19  
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  
47

### ***Theoretical underpinnings***

48 Thirteen theories emerged across 10 studies in relation to team formulation research.  
49  
50 Theories were used to support both study rationale and question, or as underpinning the team  
51 formulation process. Explicit explanation in describing the link between theory and its  
52 application in the study varied. For example Berry and colleagues (Berry et al., 2009; Berry  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 et al., 2016) offered a clear link between attribution theory and study rationale. However,  
4 other researchers referred to psychological theory as underpinning formulation, without  
5 defining the theory (Ingham, 2011; Mohtashemi et al., 2016; Summers, 2006). With the  
6 exception of one study (Kellett et al., 2014), theory was applied to individual staff working in  
7 teams and not applied to group level data. The relationship to theory, its part in the studies  
8 and related findings is outlined in table four.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

17 Insert table four here. Underpinning theories.  
18  
19

### 20 ***Team impact on the formulation***

  
21

22 None of the studies purposely examined the impact of the involvement of the team on the  
23 quality, content or outcomes of the produced formulation. It was not possible to apply  
24 convergent qualitative synthesis as only one study reported results indicating two impacts that  
25 the team had on the formulation. Firstly, the amount of perceived creativity brought to the  
26 formulation by use of team input:  
27  
28

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

33 Secondly, the view that the team formulation was an enduring concept rather than a  
34 hypothesis subject to change over time:  
35  
36

37 “At least three participants seemed to consider formulations as statements of fact” (Summers,  
38 2006, p.342).

### 39 ***Formulation impact on the team***

  
40

41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Eight studies reported team outcomes occurring as a result of team formulation and coding  
4 resulted in 66 codes from which six themes were conceptualised. These themes were:  
5  
6 'increased knowledge and understanding', 'altered perceptions, leading to altered  
7 relationships, feelings and behaviours', 'space to reflect', 'useful when stuck or challenged',  
8  
9 'perceived increase in effectiveness', and 'improved team working'.  
10  
11  
12

13  
14 *Increased knowledge and understanding.* Team formulation increased understanding and  
15 knowledge of the patient, the origin and nature of their problems, and increased knowledge of  
16 the way the team and patient interacted. Although not the most frequently coded, this theme  
17 was the mechanism through which all other themes were described as operating, and as such  
18 could be seen as a key outcome of team formulation.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 *Altered perceptions, leading to altered relationships, feelings and behaviours.* Closely linked  
26 to this was the most frequently coded theme that described the impact of team formulation on  
27 staff perceptions and the resulting change in staff/patient relationships, staff feelings about  
28 the patient and staff behaviours towards the patient. Perceptions were altered in relation to the  
29 patient's problems, their efforts at recovery, how long recovery might take and how much  
30 control the patient and staff member had in this. Changed perceptions about staff/patient  
31 relationships were positive, however one study did report that staff perceived a worse  
32 relationship with patients after formulating. The impact of altered perceptions was described  
33 as resulting in altered staff feelings and behaviours, in particular less blaming behaviours  
34 towards patients, increased empathy and a more positive approach to care. Patients also  
35 reported feeling less criticised by staff. Furthermore, there was an impact on the staff  
36 perceptions of their own emotions in terms of feeling more satisfied, but with the recognition  
37 that formulating can be personally emotionally challenging.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

54 *Space to reflect.* The third theme captured the opportunities for clinical reflection afforded by  
55 team formulation. Reflection was possible as meeting to formulate gave the team increased  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 time to think about the patient. This supported creation of new ideas about the patient and the  
4 care, and was viewed as a major benefit of team formulation. There was one concern that  
5 such reflection could result in a high degree of speculative suggestion based only on partial  
6 information.  
7  
8

9  
10  
11 *Useful when stuck or challenged.* The fourth theme identified team formulation as a useful  
12 process when patients presented with behaviours that challenged the team. Team formulating  
13 was also reported as useful when teams felt 'stuck' in thinking about how to progress a  
14 patient's care.  
15  
16

17  
18 *Perceived increase in effectiveness.* The impact of having time to think and increasing  
19 understanding about the patient lead to the fifth theme in which team formulating was  
20 perceived as helping to increase the effectiveness of the team. This was described as bringing  
21 consistency to team practice, improving problem solving ability, supporting the team to  
22 change clinical direction and changing unhelpful patterns of relating with the patient. An  
23 increase in clinical confidence was perceived, leading to care which was more helpful for  
24 being based on a formulation (rather than diagnosis alone).  
25  
26

27  
28 *Improved team working.* The sixth theme, also linked to team effectiveness, described the  
29 impact of team formulation on the team as a unit, relative to strengthening how team  
30 members work together. Within this theme, team formulation was reported as improving the  
31 team climate and working capability. In addition, trust and sharing within the team were  
32 reported as improved directly due to team formulating. Team practices were improved  
33 through team formulation that brought unity to understanding, different perspectives, ideas  
34 and disciplines. Sharing information in this way was viewed as a practice of effective teams  
35 and communication via team formulation credited for turning individuals in teams into team  
36 members.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## 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

1  
2  
3 perceptions could be attributed to staff feeling that their own needs for support were better  
4  
5 met rather than the impact of formulating (Berry et al., 2016).  
6  
7

8 ***Definitions of Team Formulation***  
9

10  
11 Defining a phenomena in research is critical for the measurement of variables and  
12 comparison of findings across studies (Coolican, 2009). One included study provided no  
13 definition of formulation (Maguire, 2006) and the remaining nine applied the definition of  
14 therapy formulation to team formulation. This assumption that team formulation *is* the same  
15 as therapy formulation has not yet been examined and is further challenged by therapy  
16 formulation having more than one definition (Johnstone & Dallos, 2014). The Division of  
17 Clinical Psychology in the United Kingdom offers an overarching definition that describes  
18 psychological therapy formulation as the amalgamation of all knowledge gained by an  
19 assessment process that may involve psychological, systemic and biological aspects. The  
20 definition posits therapy formulation as drawing on psychological research and theory, to  
21 provide a framework for describing problems, needs and their development and maintenance  
22 (DCP, 2010). Other key authors of formulation literature emphasise the hypothetical nature of  
23 therapy formulations (Butler, 1998; Tracy D. Eells, 2006). Applying the therapy formulation  
24 definition to team formulation fails to account for the influences and context of the team  
25 itself. Any working definition should account for the focus on a shared understanding as  
26 proposed by Johnstone (Johnstone., 2011), but in addition acknowledge that this is  
27 underpinned by team involvement:  
28  
29

30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50 'Team formulation is a shared team activity drawing on psychological theories  
51 (individual and group), where two or more team members meet to discuss an evolving  
52 integrated formulation. Team formulation is a shared understanding which includes a service  
53 user's personal meaning of their experiences and which leads to a hypothesis about the causes  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 and maintenance of their mental health problems, strengths and coping, in turn leading to an  
3 agreed individualised plan of care to support personal recovery. The service user is involved  
4 in the formulation discussion wherever possible'.



### 11 ***Theory and Team Formulation***

12  
13 There is an assertion that team formulation is underpinned by psychological theories used in  
14 therapy formulation. Some studies specify which psychological theory, whilst others do not  
15 (see table four). This represents an assumption that therapy formulation and team formulation  
16 can be underpinned by the same theories; however, this has not been empirically examined.  
17  
18 In addition there is an emergence of studies drawing on theory (such as attachment or  
19 attribution) which drive study hypotheses proposing a relationship between team formulation,  
20 staff perceptions, attitudes and behaviours towards service users, resulting in a changed  
21 relationship. **Four** of the included studies have tested these hypotheses (see Berry et al., 2009;  
22 Berry et al., 2016; Ingham, 2011; Kellett et al., 2014). However, due to the number of studies  
23 and quality, there is no level of generalisation in these theories yet (Ravatch & Riggan, 2012),  
24 and not all study hypotheses were supported in relation to this changed staff-patient  
25 relationship (see Berry et al., 2016). In keeping with the properties of a theory, none offered  
26 have explanatory qualities in relation to the processes of team formulation (Ravatch &  
27 Riggan, 2012). In other studies, claims that such theories are important within team  
28 formulation remain an untested assertion (for example see Christofides et al., 2012; Ingham  
29 & Clarke, 2009). None-the-less, together these studies represent an early attempt to examine  
30 an evolved form of formulation (from therapy to team), and give partial support to the impact  
31 of team formulation on team members.

1  
2  
3 The application of theory in the studies is mainly about individuals in teams, rather than  
4 teams per se. Only one study aggregated the analysis of individuals in the teams studied to a  
5 group level (see (Kellett et al., 2014). This suggests that researchers are examining individual  
6 team members rather than the team as a unit. This narrow focus ignores the range of well-  
7 tested theories relating to teams generally, that may also be relevant to team formulation. For  
8 example, theories of shared mental models in teams describe a cognitive representation of  
9 shared team knowledge in relation to a task or team values (Mathieu, Maynard, Rapp, &  
10 Gilson, 2008). Team formulation may lead to developing such a shared mental model, in  
11 relation to either a particular patient, the general task of formulating or the values that  
12 formulating can bring to a team when ideas are shared. In addition, theories of team identity  
13 and cohesion may underpin team formulation research by explaining the collective sense-  
14 making that team formulation may bring, and which is understood to help team identity  
15 develop (Huettermann, Doering, & Boerner, 2017). Regular team formulating may help in  
16 developing team cohesion as team members share this common task around a set of common  
17 goals and team values (Mathieu et al., 2008).  
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

### ***Team Impact on Formulation***

40 The impact of the team on the formulation was not examined in any of the included studies.  
41 Therapist factors have been found to impact on therapy formulation quality (Dudley et al.,  
42 2010; T. D. Eells et al., 2005), yet this review did not find any studies examining the quality  
43 of the formulation produced by a team. Training the team in the mechanics of formulating  
44 was examined (see (Ingham, 2011), however this was by brief training without accompanying  
45 long-term supervision or on-going learning; aspects both recognised as important in one-to-  
46 one therapy competency and skill development (BABCP, 2010). Status of team members has  
47 been reported as influencing the ability of other team members to have a voice within group  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 meetings and discussions (Mannix & Sauer, 2006; Silver, Troyer, & Cohen, 2000). In team  
3 formulation, the dominance of one profession may serve to reduce the input of other team  
4 members and influence the formulation if key information is withheld.  
5  
6

7  
8 Although the clinical focus of the teams was reported, there was no examination of the type  
9 of team and how this influenced the team formulations. Team type is of key interest in team  
10 research where there is recognition of the interplay between team type, task and outcomes.  
11  
12 For example, established researchers of teams suggest that composition, technology and  
13 distance and the degree of empowerment and delayering present in different types of teams  
14 impacts on task performance (Tannenbaum, Mathieu, Salas, & Cohen, 2012). Other  
15 researchers suggest that not all teams function as 'real' teams, which can also influence task  
16 performance. For example 'pseudo' teams, who possess lower degrees of interdependence,  
17 shared objectives, reflexivity and boundedness may also have lower task performance ability  
18 (West & Lyubovnikova, 2012).  
19  
20

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

  
22

23 To date, team formulation studies offer only partial insights into the impact of the team  
24 formulation on the team. The review identified themes suggesting that team formulation leads  
25 to increased understanding, team reflection time and problem solving ability. This part of the  
26 review yielded the most results, perhaps reflecting the interest of researchers to identify  
27 influences on the team. However, only four included studies used validated self-report and  
28 observational measures (Berry et al., 2009; Berry et al., 2016; Kellett et al., 2014; Revolta et  
29 al., 2016), while the remaining six studies used un-validated self-report measures and  
30 descriptions of staff observations and experiences (see table three). Overall, the small number  
31 and variable quality of included studies limits the evidence for the impact of team  
32 formulation on the team.  
33  
34

1  
2  
3 Three studies (Berry et al., 2009; Berry et al., 2016; Revolta et al., 2016) examined the  
4 impact of team formulation on the attitudes of team members but did not account for possible  
5 confounds researched in other fields. For example, self-categorisation theory demonstrates  
6 the influence of group membership on attitudinal changes of individuals. The theory posits  
7 that individuals compare self to others, and are motivated to adopt the values and attitudes of  
8 other group members due to the desire to belong to the 'in-group' (Haslam, Powell, &  
9 Turner, 2000; Hogg & Terry, 2000; Reynolds, Turner, & Haslam, 2003). The impact of self-  
10 categorisation in relation to team formulation is yet to be explored.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 Time for the team to reflect on care and treatment planning by formulating as a team is also  
22 identified as a key theme within the included studies. However, from the included studies  
23 suggesting that team formulation confers this time for reflection, there is no examination of  
24 whether team formulation is the only or most appropriate method of team discussion for  
25 improving treatment planning. Research with mental health multi-disciplinary team meetings  
26 has also shown an association between the meeting process and effective treatment planning  
27 (Raine et al., 2014). In order to understand the value of team formulation as a mechanism for  
28 this, further research targeting whether teams have increased reflection time specifically  
29 because of team formulation should be undertaken. This also applies to the fourth theme  
30 identified, where team formulation was perceived as a good tool for helping teams struggling  
31 with patient behaviours. Knowing the specifics of what it is about team formulation that leads  
32 to this perception; above other forms of team discussion is needed to strengthen this claim.  
33  
34 Within the included studies, the ability of team formulation to reduce patient behaviours that  
35 challenge due to altered staff perceptions of the patient seems largely to be an opinion and  
36 claims of this outcome require consideration in conjunction with study design and limitations.  
37 To illustrate this, the study by Ingham (2011), used an idiosyncratic observation measure of a  
38 patient's challenging behaviours over time, before the introduction of formulation and after it.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 However, this measure was **not validated** and inter-rater reliability not assessed. The study  
4  
5 may have been subject to high levels of bias given its design (Goodacre, 2015), and observed  
6  
7 changes in the patient's behaviour could have been due to other factors such as medication or  
8  
9 recovery.  
10

11  
12 The perception that team effectiveness increases because of team formulation was inferred as  
13  
14 a finding, but not directly tested in three of the included studies (Christofides et al., 2012;  
15  
16 Ingham, 2011; Revolta et al., 2016). Research into team effectiveness is extensive and  
17  
18 includes factors such as team cohesion, participation, member attitudes to the team and  
19  
20 clarity of objectives (Borrill et al., 2013; Richter, Dawson, & West, 2011). None of these  
21  
22 factors were examined in the studies reviewed and therefore the impact of team formulation  
23  
24 on team effectiveness must largely be seen as an untested assumption.  
25  
26

27  
28 Overall, the findings of the fourth review aim suggest a growing interest in the impact that  
29  
30 team formulation may have on a team. Findings suggest that it can help increase a team's  
31  
32 emotional awareness and ability, while helping them to operate more efficiently. If these are  
33  
34 potential impacts then the use of team formulation may herald a new way forward in  
35  
36 promoting team effectiveness. However, present research is limited in the number of studies,  
37  
38 quality and design and cannot be considered as reliable evidence of this impact.  
39  
40

41  
42 *Limitations.* The decision to limit the review to studies published in peer reviewed journals,  
43  
44 accessible by academic database was taken in order to focus the review on the most robust  
45  
46 available evidence. This is in keeping with guidance on evidence based healthcare (National  
47  
48 Academy of Sciences, 2001; NICE, 2014b). This is important as the practice of team  
49  
50 formulation is increasingly used to plan care decisions; a crucial aspect of care. The inclusion  
51  
52 of only ten studies for analysis, although potentially affecting the ability to answer the review  
53  
54 aims, did ensure that only robust evidence was included. However, this may have limited the  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

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

1  
2 clearly defined within its own right as a team psychological activity. A conceptual  
3 framework, which informs systematic consideration of the range of factors and theories  
4 involved in team formulation, which takes into account the team inputs, processes, and  
5 outputs, of formulating as a team, should inform future research. Such a guiding conceptual  
6 framework would highlight the possibilities for future research as abundant. Lessons can be  
7 gained from therapy formulation in this respect. The evidence for therapy formulation is also  
8 considered weak, however it is drawn from sound case observations, together with general  
9 theories, which in combination produce testable theories specific to therapy formulation  
10 (Bieling & Kuyken, 2003).

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 Defining and increasing the evidence base for team formulation remains a challenge, but  
19 represents a worthwhile one if the benefits to teams as well as patients are to be firmly  
20 established.

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

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  

## References

- 10  
11 BABCP. (2010). *Core curriculum reference document*. Retrieved from Bury England:  
12  
13 Baker, D. P., Day, R., & Salas, E. (2006). Teamwork as an essential component of high-  
14 reliability organizations. *Health Services Research*, 41(4), 1576-1598.  
15 doi:10.1111/j.1475-6773.2006.00566.x  
16  
17 Baxter, S. K., & Brumfitt, S. M. (2008). Professional differences in interprofessional  
18 working. *Journal of interprofessional care*, 22(3), 239 - 251.  
19 doi:10.1080/13561820802054655  
20  
21 Berry, K., Barrowclough, C., & Wearden, A. (2009). A Pilot Study Investigating the Use of  
22 Psychological Formulations to Modify Psychiatric Staff Perceptions of Service Users  
23 with Psychosis. *Behav Cogn Psychother*, 37, 39-48.  
24 doi:10.1017/S1352465808005018  
25  
26 Berry, K., Haddock, G., Kellett, S., Roberts, C., Drake, R., & Barrowclough, C. (2016).  
27 Feasibility of a ward-based psychological intervention to improve staff and patient  
28 relationships in psychiatric rehabilitation settings. *British Journal of Clinical  
29 Psychology*, 55(3), 236-252. doi:10.1111/bjcp.12082  
30  
31 Bieling, P. J., & Kuyken, W. (2003). Is cognitive case formulation science or science fiction?  
32  
33 *Clinical Psychology-Science and Practice*, 10(1), 52-69. doi:10.1093/clipsy/10.1.52  
34  
35 Borrill, C., West, M., Dawson, J., Shapiro, D., Rees, A., Richards, A., . . . Carter, A. (2013).  
36  
37 *Team Working and Effectiveness in Health Care: Findings from the Health Care Team  
38 Effectiveness Unit*. Retrieved from <http://homepages.inf.ed.ac.uk/jeanc/DOH-glossy-brochure.pdf>  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research*  
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

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: Pergamon.

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

- 1  
2  
3 Goodacre, S. (2015). Uncontrolled before-after studies: discouraged by Cochrane and the  
4  
5 EMJ. *Emergency Medicine Journal*, 32(7), 507-508. doi:10.1136/emermed-2015-  
6  
7 204761  
8  
9  
10 Haslam, S. A., Powell, C., & Turner, J. C. (2000). Social identity, self-categorization, and  
11  
12 work motivation: Rethinking the contribution of the group to positive and sustainable  
13  
14 organisational outcomes. *Applied Psychology-an International Review-Psychologie  
15  
16 Appliquee-Revue Internationale*, 49(3), 319-339. doi:10.1111/1464-0597.00018  
17  
18  
19 HMG/DH. (2011). *No Health Without Mental Health: A Cross-Government Mental Health  
20  
21 Outcomes Strategy for People of All Ages*. London: Department of Health.  
22  
23  
24 Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. J. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in  
25  
26 organizational contexts. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 121-140.  
27  
28 doi:10.2307/259266  
29  
30  
31 Hong, Q. N., Pluye, P., Bujold, M., & Wassef, M. (2017). Convergent and sequential  
32  
33 synthesis designs: implications for conducting and reporting systematic reviews of  
34  
35 qualitative and quantitative evidence. *Systematic reviews*, 6(61), 1-14.  
36  
37 doi:10.1186/s13643-017-0454-2  
38  
39  
40 Huettermann, H., Doering, S., & Boerner, S. (2017). Understanding the Development of  
41  
42 Team Identification: A Qualitative Study in UN Peacebuilding Teams. *Journal of  
43  
44 Business and Psychology*, 32(2), 217-234. doi:10.1007/s10869-016-9446-9  
45  
46  
47 Ingham, B. (2011). Collaborative psychosocial case formulation development workshops: A  
48  
49 case study with direct care staff. *Advances in Mental Health and Intellectual  
50  
51 Disabilities*, 5(2), 9-15. doi:10.5042/amhid.2011.0107  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2 Ingham, B., & Clarke, L. (2009). The introduction of clinical psychology to an inpatient  
3 austic spectrum disorder and intellectual disabilities service: Impact and reflections.  
4  
5 *Clinical Psychology Forum*, 204, 30-34.  
6  
7 Ingham, B., Clarke, L., & James, I. A. (2008). Biopsychosocial case formulation for people  
8 with intellectual disabilities and mental health problems: A pilot study of a training  
9 workshop for direct care staff. *British Journal of Developmental Disabilities*,  
10 54(106, Pt 1), 41-54. doi:10.1179/096979508799103323  
11  
12 Johnstone, L. (2014). Using formulation in teams. In L. Johnstone & R. Dallos (Eds.),  
13  
14 *Formulation in Psychology and Psychotherapy. Making sense of people's problems*.  
15 (2nd ed., pp. 216-242). London: Routledge. Taylor Francis Group.  
16  
17 Johnstone, L., & Dallos, R. (2014). Introduction to formulation. In L. Johnstone & R. Dallos  
18 (Eds.), *Formulation in Psychology and Psychotherapy. Making sense of people's*  
19 *problems* (2nd ed., pp. 1 - 17). London: Routledge.  
20  
21 Johnstone., L. (2011). *Good Practice Guidelines on the use of psychological formulation*.  
22  
23 Retrieved from Leicester:  
24  
25 <http://www.bps.org.uk/system/files/Public%20files/DCP/cat-842.pdf>  
26  
27 Kellett, S., Wilbram, M., Davis, C., & Hardy, G. (2014). Team consultancy using cognitive  
28 analytic therapy: a controlled study in assertive outreach. *Journal of Psychiatric and*  
29 *Mental Health Nursing*, 21(8), 687-697. doi:10.1111/jpm.12123  
30  
31 Kuyken, W. (2006). Evidence-based case formulation: is the emperor clothed?? In N. Tarrier  
32 (Ed.), *Case Formulation in Cognitive Behaviour Therapy. The Treatment of*  
33 *Challenging and Complex Cases* (pp. 12-35). East Sussex: Routledge.  
34  
35 Maguire, N. (2006). Cognitive Behavioural Therapy and homelessness: A case series pilot  
36 study. *Behavioural & Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 34(01), 107-111.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Mannix, E. A., & Sauer, S. J. (2006). Status and power in organizational group research:  
4  
5 Acknowledging the pervasiveness of hierarchy In S. R. Thye (Ed.), *Social Psychology*  
6  
7 *of the Workplace* (Vol. 23, pp. 149-182).  
8  
9  
10 Mathieu, J., Maynard, M. T., Rapp, T., & Gilson, L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997-2007:  
11  
12 A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of*  
13  
14 *Management*, 34(3), 410-476. doi:10.1177/0149206308316061  
15  
16  
17 Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & Grp, P. (2009). Preferred Reporting  
18  
19 Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *Journal*  
20  
21 *of Clinical Epidemiology*, 62(10), 1006-1012. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2009.06.005  
22  
23  
24 Mohtashemi, R., Stevens, J., Jackson, P. G., & Weatherhead, S. (2016). Psychiatrists'  
25  
26 understanding and use of psychological formulation: a qualitative exploration.  
27  
28 *Psychiatric Bulletin*, 40(4), 212-216. doi:10.1192/pb.bp.115.051342  
29  
30  
31 National Academy of Sciences. (2001). *Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System*  
32  
33 *for the 21st Century*. Retrieved from Washington DC:  
34  
35 <http://www.nationalacademies.org/hmd/~/media/Files/Report%20Files/2001/Crossing>  
36  
37 [-the-Quality-Chasm/Quality%20Chasm%202001%20%20report%20brief.pdf](#)  
38  
39  
40 NICE. (2014a). *Psychosis and schizophrenia in adults: prevention and management*. *Clinical*  
41  
42 *guideline*.  
43  
44  
45 NICE. (2014b). *Using Evidence in Practice*. United Kingdom: National Institute for Health  
46  
47 and Care Excellence Retrieved from nice.org.uk/guidance/lgb23.  
48  
49  
50 NIH. (2014). Quality Assessment Tool for Before-After (Pre-Post) Studies With No Control  
51  
52 Group. Retrieved from <https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-pro/guidelines/in->  
53  
54 [develop/cardiovascular-risk-reduction/tools/before-after](#)  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 NIMH. (2016). Schizophrenia. Retrieved from  
4  
5 <https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/topics/schizophrenia/index.shtml>  
6  
7 Pluye, P., & Hong, Q. N. (2014). Combining the Power of Stories and the Power of Numbers:  
8  
9 Mixed Methods Research and Mixed Studies Reviews. In J. E. Fielding (Ed.), *Annual*  
10  
11 *Review of Public Health, Vol 35* (Vol. 35, pp. 29-45).  
12  
13  
14 QSR International Pty Ltd. (2015). NVivo qualitative data analysis Software. (Version  
15  
16 Version 11).  
17  
18 Raine, R., Xanthopoulou, P., Wallace, I., Bhaird, C. N. A., Lanceley, A., Clarke, A., . . .  
19  
20 Barber, J. (2014). Determinants of treatment plan implementation in multidisciplinary  
21  
22 team meetings for patients with chronic diseases: a mixed-methods study. *Bmj Quality*  
23  
24 & Safety, 23(10), 867-876. doi:10.1136/bmjqqs-2014-002818  
25  
26  
27 Ravatch, S. M., & Riggan, M. (2012). *Reason and Rigor. How Conceptual Frameworks*  
28  
29 *Guide Research*. London: Sage.  
30  
31 Revolta, C., Orrell, M., & Spector, A. (2016). The biopsychosocial (BPS) model of dementia  
32  
33 as a tool for clinical practice. A pilot study. *International Psychogeriatrics*, 28(7),  
34  
35 1079-1089. doi:10.1017/s1041610215002379  
36  
37  
38 Reynolds, K. J., Turner, J. C., & Haslam, S. A. (2003). *Social identity and self-categorization*  
39  
40 *theories' contribution to understanding identification, salience and diversity in teams*  
41  
42 *and organization* (Vol. 5).  
43  
44  
45 Richter, A. W., Dawson, J. F., & West, M. A. (2011). The effectiveness of teams in  
46  
47 organizations: a meta-analysis. *International Journal of Human Resource*  
48  
49 *Management*, 22(13), 2749-2769. doi:10.1080/09585192.2011.573971  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 Robson, J., & Quayle, G. (2009). Increasing the utility of psychological formulation: A case  
3 example from an acute mental health ward. *Clinical Psychology Forum*, 204(Dec),  
4 25-29.  
5  
6

7  
8 Shirley, L. (2010). Sharing formulation with care staff using the Newcastle Model - group  
9 problem-solving. *PSIGE Newsletter*, 112(Oct 2010), 55-61.  
10  
11

12  
13 Silver, S. D., Troyer, L., & Cohen, B. P. (2000). Effects of status on the exchange of  
14 information in team decision-making: When team building isn't enough. *Advances in  
15 Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams, Vol 7: Team Development*, 7, 21-51.  
16  
17

18  
19 Sturmey, P. (2009). Case Formulation: A Review and Overview of This Volume. In P.  
20  
21 Sturmey (Ed.), *Clinical Case Formulation Varieties of Approaches* (pp. 3-30).  
22  
23 Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.  
24  
25

26 Summers, A. (2006). Psychological formulations in psychiatric care: Staff views on their  
27 impact. *Psychiatric Bulletin*, 30(9), 341-343. doi:10.1192/pb.30.9.341  
28  
29

30 Tannenbaum, S. I., Mathieu, J. E., Salas, E., & Cohen, D. (2012). Teams Are Changing: Are  
31 Research and Practice Evolving Fast Enough? *Industrial & Organizational  
32 Psychology*, 5(1), 2-24. doi:10.1111/j.1754-9434.2011.01396.x  
33  
34

35 West, M. A., & Lyubovnikova, J. (2012). Real Teams or Pseudo Teams? The Changing  
36 Landscape Needs a Better Map. *Industrial & Organizational Psychology*, 5(1), 25-28.  
37 doi:10.1111/j.1754-9434.2011.01397.x  
38  
39

40 Whomsley, S. (2010). Team case formulation. In C. Cupitt (Ed.), *Reaching out: The  
41 psychology of assertive outreach*. (pp. 95-118). New York, NY US: Routledge/Taylor  
42 & Francis Group.  
43  
44

45 World Health Organization. (2015). *The European Mental Health Action Plan 2013–2020*.  
46  
47 Retrieved from Denmark:  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 [http://www.euro.who.int/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0020/280604/WHO-Europe-Mental-](http://www.euro.who.int/_data/assets/pdf_file/0020/280604/WHO-Europe-Mental-)  
4  
5 [Health-Acion-Plan-2013-2020.pdf](#)  
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

Mental Health Review Journal

1  
2  
3 Table One. Search Terms  
4  
56 Search Term  
7  
8

---

9 Team formulat\*  
10  
11 Team clinical case formulat\*  
12  
13 Team case meeting  
14  
15 Formulat\* meeting  
16  
17 Case conceptuali\$ation  
18  
19 Case discussion  
20  
21 Team case discussion  
22  
23 Case planning  
24  
25 Team case planning  
26  
27 Clinical case meeting  
28  
29 Team clinical case meeting  
30  
31 Clinical formulat\* meeting  
32  
33 Staff focused formulat\*  
34  
35 Complex case discussion  
36  
37 Complex case forum  
38  
39 Multi-disciplinary team meeting  
40  
41 Cognitive case formulat\*  
42  
43 Cognitive case conceptuali\$ation  
44  
45 Cognitive case discussion  
46  
47 Cognitive behavio\$ral formulat\* meeting  
48  
49 Cognitive behavio\$ral conceptuali\$ation meeting  
50  
51 Case formulat\* meeting  
52  
53  
54

---

55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Team case conceptualisation  
4  
5 Team psychiatric formulat\*  
6  
7 Team psychological formulat\*  
8

---

1  
2  
3 Table two. Inclusion criteria  
4  
5

---

6  
7 **Inclusion Criteria**  
89  
10 

- 11 **Review aims**  
12
  - 13 Gives any definition of formulation (applied to a team formulation study), or;  
14
  - 15 Offers a theoretical basis for *team* formulation (includes therapy formulation  
16 theories if used as underpinning team formulation), or;  
17
  - 18 Explores the impact the team has on the formulation, or;  
19
  - 20 Explores the impact on the team of formulating as a team.

21  
22 

- 23 **Setting/population**  
24
  - 25 Relevant to adult mental health multi-disciplinary teams (includes learning  
26 disability, services for older people, offender health), and;  
27
  - 28 Team formulation implemented in consultation, supervision or shared team  
29 format, and;
  - 30 Involves any therapeutic modality (e.g. \*CBT, \*CAT)

31  
32 

- 33 **Study features**  
34
  - 35 Any study design.
  - 36 Published in peer reviewed journal and available on academic database.
  - 37 Any publication date, in English language
  - 38 Includes studies regarding evaluation of training teams to formulate

---

39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44 \*CBT = Cognitive Behavioural Therapy. CAT = Cognitive Analytical Therapy  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




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

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
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.	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	NA	Psychological hypotheses were shared more often informally.																																								
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, patients easier to engage with, team climate will improve. Qualitative part aims to explore staff experience	interviews.		Team vision ( $d = 0.14$ ) small
3	Berry et al., 2016	To assess the feasibility and potential efficacy of a ward based psychological intervention to improve staff-patient relationships. Main aims were to determine rates of recruitment, uptake and retention and estimate effect size on a range of patient and staff outcomes.	RCT. Feasibility study. Validated self-report measures of staff/patient alliance, perceived criticism, ward atmosphere and staff well-being. Mixture of self-report and validated observation measures used for patient perceptions. Observation of ward environment and case notes.	51 patients, 85 staff across 10 wards. Rehabilitation in-patients	24 one hour sessions facilitated by a psychologist and therapist. Formulations derived from the meetings. All staff on duty who were available attended the mtgs.
4					Patients felt less criticised by their keyworkers and reported improved relationships and ward organisation. Staff in the intervention arm reported lower depersonalisation. But no significant differences in terms of staff perceptions of relationships, stress and other aspects of burnout, patient outcomes, length of stay, change in treatment or relapse. Staff reported a worse relationship with patients after the intervention. Some aspects of staff burnout improved. Team formulation reduced patient perceptions of criticism by
5					Therapeutic relationship effect sizes. Individual results given for each question in each scale for control and intervention mean and SD. Effect sizes calculated using effect size calculator.
6					Effect sizes included:
7					Working Alliance Inventory (two results given) ( $d = -0.648$ ) moderate negative effect
8					( $d = 1.142$ ) large positive effect.
9					Perceived Criticism Scale (four results given). ( $d = 0.499$ ) small positive
10					( $d = 0.729$ ) med positive
11					( $d = -1.742$ ) large negative
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					

---

---

1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19	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.  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 d = 0.59 (medium positive effect) on problem solving exercise

---

---

1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6	Mohtashemi et al., 2016	To understand how psychiatrists understand the concept of formulation, including team formulation	Qualitative. Informed by grounded theory.	12 psychiatrists. Various settings. AMH	Team formulation is facilitated by a psychologist	improve understanding of dementia and problem solving ability. Four conceptual categories emerged. - Formulation leads to a diagnosis, and psychological understanding is not always needed, but helpful. -Created unified understanding between psychology and psychiatry and team communication device. Brings information together. -Time is a barrier to using psychological understanding. -Pressure to treat people medically at cost of psychological understanding. Gap in psychiatry training.
7						NA
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	*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 Mental Health.					
35						
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

Author, Year	Theoretical framework	Rationale	Methodology	Findings	Conclusion
Ingham, 2011	Psychological theory (does not specify which)	Attribution	Systemic	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
Christofides et al., 2012	Behaviour		Psychodynamic	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
Kellett et al., 2014	Communication		Attachment	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
Berry et al., 2016	Social exchange		Attribution	Applies behavioural theory underpinning therapy formulation to team formulation.	NA: Theory not focus of research study
Revolta et al., 2016	Bio-psychosocial			Applies formulation to understand staff countertransference feelings towards service user to inform formulation.	NA: Theory not focus of research study
Mohtashemi et al., 2016	Psychological theory (does not specify which)			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.
				Formulating staff-patient relationships can draw staff attention to dysfunctional roles and procedures adopted by both, to see if this would alter practice.	Yes
				To support the study of staff-patient relationships as a central determinant of relapse and recovery.	Yes
				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
				Applies theory to support content of team training in use of bio-psychosocial formulation with team.	Yes
				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

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.