

Individual case formulation rating scale

1. The nature and source of observations are made clear and explicit

1a.

0 – Considering all of the observations in the diagram, most are too general in that they lack the specificity necessary to relate to other observations.

1 – Considering all of the observations in the diagram, most are described in the sufficient and precise detail required to make it possible to relate them to other observations.

1b.

0 – Diagram observations are mainly based on supposition or speculation, or sources of information are unclear.

1 – Diagram observations are mainly based on what has been reported or directly observed or what could be reasonably inferred.

2. The nature and basis for how observations relate to each other is made clear

0 – For the most part, the positioning of observations within the diagram and the links between them seem arbitrary or loosely based on a common underlying theme rather than depicting how circumstances actually inter-relate in real life.

1 – For the most part, the arrangement of observations (how they are positioned and linked to each other) conveys how events inter-relate in real life (i.e., what leads to what).

3. Key contextual elements are included.

The formulation incorporates moderators and other key contextual elements such as time, place, others present or absent, and any other observable factors relevant to exacerbation or amelioration of the problem, its form, and its frequency of occurrence. These can potentially contribute to an understanding of the circumstances under which the problem presents itself and the form it takes.

0 – Relevant contextual elements are not provided or those provided, for the most part, do not depict functional (causal) relations.

1 – Elements are included that provide a clear functional context for other observations and so can potentially contribute, at least in part, to a working understanding of the circumstances in which the problem can be expected to occur and the form it takes...

2 – ...and the context provided extends beyond the immediate problem to include precursors of the problem and circumstances from the individual's history where these can be clearly linked to the current situation.

4. Functional equivalence is represented.

Functional equivalence between outwardly dissimilar elements (either triggers or responses) is denoted where this has implications for understanding the problem. Identifying the shared function of the observations contributes to an understanding of the overall pattern of circumstances and clarifies when the problem is more likely to occur.

NA– Not applicable

- 0 – Functional equivalence is overlooked or not represented when appropriate
- 1 – Functional equivalence is represented...
- 2 – ...and the basis for the functional equivalence is appropriate and convincing and adds explanatory value.

5. Significant mediators are identified and their roles are made clear

Potential psychological (e.g., client self-talk and content of beliefs) or other mediators (e.g., mood) are identified through the client's report or, where clearly justified by the evidence, through inference. These are meaningfully situated within the diagram in a manner that makes their role clear.

- 0 – Mediators are not included where they would be expected to play a role or those included are not well described.
- 1 – Well-described mediators are included but their linking function between the observations they mediate is not convincingly established or made clear.
- 2 – Mediators are included that meaningfully link indirectly related observations into a coherent causal sequence.

6. Explanations are provided.

Explanations (e.g., hypotheses, theories, membership in a diagnostic group or other typology, inferred aetiology, inferred historical processes or developmental events) are included that are distinct from observations. These are used to help synthesise and make sense of the information included in the diagram.

- 0 – Needed explanations are lacking, and so there is insufficient basis provided for synthesising descriptive information across observations or observations and explanations are confused.
- 1 – An attempt has been made to provide some explanations.
- 2 – The basis for relating explanations to particular observations is sensible and clear...
- 3 – and the provided explanation(s) complement what can be conveyed descriptively by observations alone.

7. The diagram provides a basis for a coherent account of the available information that includes all major circumstances. The diagram functionally integrates and structures the information to draw together all the factors comprising and influencing the problem and portrays their patterns of interaction.

- 0 – A substantial portion of the information in the diagram seems to be fragmentary or aggregated arbitrarily, lacking a coherent structure that functionally integrates observations into patterns of interaction.
- 1 – The diagram draws observations into meaningful patterns of interaction, but there are important gaps, e.g., functional relationships that are unclear or missing antecedents.
- 2 – Most information in the diagram is contained within a structure that draws observations together into meaningful patterns of functional interaction that provide a basis for an integrated and coherent explanation of the problem.

8. The formulation delineates mechanisms of change in terms of the elements (observations and explanations) depicted in the diagram and their connections and provides a basis for understanding where and how to intervene and what to prioritise.

- 0 – The formulation does not provide a sufficient basis for establishing how the problem has arisen and how it is being sustained.
- 1 – The formulation includes material relevant to establishing how the problem has arisen and how it is being sustained but this is not organised in such a way as to provide a sufficient basis for identifying potential targets of intervention.
- 2 – The formulation identifies specific etiological and maintenance factors (how the problem has arisen and how it is being sustained) that represent potential targets of intervention.
- 3 – The formulation supports inferences about how the problem could change under different circumstances that provide a sufficient basis for choosing where and how to intervene, including what to prioritise.

9. The formulation manages complexity successfully.

NA– Not applicable

- 0 – The formulation fails to address the issue of complexity in terms of the overall organisation of information into separate or non–separate sets of problems.
- 1 – Multiple problem areas are clearly defined and discernible from each other.