



This is a repository copy of *Smaller effects matter in the psychological therapies: 25 years on from Wampold et al. (1997)*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/196317/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Barkham, M. orcid.org/0000-0003-1687-6376 (2022) Smaller effects matter in the psychological therapies: 25 years on from Wampold et al. (1997). *Psychotherapy Research*. ISSN 1050-3307

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10503307.2022.2141589>

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Psychotherapy Research* on 16th December 2023, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/10503307.2022.2141589>.

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 including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Smaller effects matter in the psychological therapies:

25 years on from Wampold et al. (1997)

Michael Barkham

Clinical and Applied Psychology Unit

Department of Psychology

University of Sheffield UK

Wampold et al. (1997) reported a landmark meta-analysis concluding that “the efficacy of bona fide treatments are roughly equivalent” [p.203]. Crucially, the authors applied three stringent criteria to the selection of studies: direct comparisons between treatments, named treatments rather than general types, and bona fide treatments as opposed to alternate treatments. They showed all effects to centre around zero and yield a maximum true effect size (ES *d*) difference of .21, providing support for the Dodo Bird verdict of no real – or at best, small – differences between the effectiveness of bona fide psychological therapies.

Twenty-five years on, the article has achieved high impact – in the region of 1700 Google Scholar citations and 700 Web of Science (WoS) citations, twice that of the next highest-cited relevant article in WoS – and can reasonably be viewed as the high watermark of the Dodo Bird argument. Clinically, the article has done much to protect the collective body of bona fide psychological therapies, providing practitioners and patients with treatment options within the context of an ever-increasing and diverse population in need of psychological help. For research, it marked a turning point in the argument of there being a dominant single therapy modality and enabled the focus to move away from considering only differences between therapies and move towards investigating areas of variability both between and within therapies.

Of course, there *are* subtle differences between treatment modalities, often masked by meta-analyses (e.g., by classification categories of treatments) and by group mean comparisons taken at a single time point (e.g., Baldwin & Imel, 2019). While it might be argued that single studies do not outweigh meta-analytic findings, they may act as more sensitive indicators of differences derived from ‘same experiment data’. For example, a recent large (N >500) pragmatic, non-inferiority randomised trial comparing cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT) with person-centred experiential therapy (PCET), embedded in

routine practice and satisfying Wampold et al.'s three inclusion criteria, found no significant difference between treatments at 6-months but at 12 months favoured CBT (ES = 0.27; Barkham et al., 2021). Effects are not static; they can change over time post-therapy and also across the course of therapy, as evidenced in a large practice-based study where patient gains in initial sessions significantly and differentially favoured counselling but in later sessions favoured CBT (Pybis et al., 2017). Such subtle differences between therapies might have important implications for treatment assignment but are lost when considering results at an overall group level.

The counterpoint is that smaller differences are not important. But consider the maths. A traditional ES (d) of .20 is equivalent to an 11% difference in outcomes between therapy conditions (i.e., affecting 110 people per 1000 treated). In the English Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT) programme, hundreds of individual services treat thousands of patients each year and the national throughput of patients is >1m. In this context, such differences will be meaningful to patients and service providers. In short, smaller effects matter because of their collective and cumulative impact.

Consider a recent large meta-analysis reporting an overall ES d of 0.15 for routine outcome monitoring, increasing marginally to 0.17 for patients not-on-track (de Jong et al., 2021). While classed as a small effect, it is *additive* to the existing overall effect of psychotherapy (i.e., it is an effect over and above the general effect of psychological therapies). Smaller effects have value and ESs that are equal in size are rarely equal in meaning. There is an understandable search for larger effects, especially regarding process variables. But whereas between group comparisons reflect causal effects, correlational studies represent only descriptive relations between two variables. Hence, we need to be cautious in how we read, interpret, compare, and cross reference reported effect sizes, taking note of the context and research design in which they are obtained.

Returning directly to the issue of treatment comparisons, the research agenda now moves to the question: Which of these available bona fide therapies is best suited to the characteristics of this patient? Our ability to understand variability and identify moderators provides the opportunity to harness smaller effects to greatest benefit. Current attempts at matching patients to treatments through the use of machine learning, thereby maximising the impact of specific psychological therapies, is testimony to this endeavour. Differential (stratified) assignment of patients to low or high-intensity therapies in the IAPT programme has been shown to be more effective ($d = .19$) than standard stepped care, although slightly more expensive (Delgadillo et al., 2022). Again, a small effect. But there is now the real possibility of bona fide therapies being offered to patients with greater precision and impact.

Wampold et al. (1997) concluded with the question as to why researchers invest in pursuing small effects in comparison to, for example, therapist effects. The response, 25 years on, is that we need both. Therapist effects are not ubiquitous, being more apparent as patient intake severity increases (Saxon & Barkham, 2012). And considerable advances have been achieved in relation to identifying the characteristics of more effective therapists (see Wampold & Owen, 2021) as well as the potential for matching therapists with patients' presenting problems (Constantino et al., 2021). The combination of utilising differential effects for the purposes of therapist matching together with greater precision in treatment assignment holds promise for our field.

In conclusion, for the effective delivery of appropriate psychological therapies in response to a population health need, smaller effects matter and it may be time to re-evaluate Cohen's litany of small, medium, and large effects and consider the *impact* of research findings in their specific context (see Barkham & Lambert, 2021). As such, Wampold et al.'s (1977) article stands as a watershed in determining the overall similarity of psychological therapy outcomes. It is now up to the scientific community to utilise embedded pragmatic

trials, practice-based studies, meta-analyses, and other research methods to see how smaller (and other) effects between and within treatments can ensure each patient is matched with the most appropriate bona fide therapy and with the best suited therapist.

References

- Baldwin, S. A., & Imel, Z. E. (2020). Studying specificity in psychotherapy with meta-analysis is hard. *Psychotherapy Research, 30*(3), 294–296.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10503307.2019.1679403>
- Barkham, M., & Lambert, M. J. (2021). The efficacy and effectiveness of psychological therapies. In M. Barkham, Lutz, W., & Castonguay, L. G. (Eds.), *Bergin and Garfield's handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change*. 7th Edition. Wiley.
- Barkham, M., Saxon, D., Hardy, G. E., Bradburn, M., Galloway, D., Wickramasekera, N., Keetharuth, A. D., Bower, P., King, M., Elliott, R., Gabriel, L., Kellett, S., Shaw, S., Wilkinson, T., Connell, J., Harrison, P., Ardern, K., Bishop-Edwards, L., Ashley, K., . . . Brazier, J. E. (2021). Person-centred experiential therapy versus cognitive behavioural therapy delivered in the English Improving Access to Psychological Therapies service for the treatment of moderate or severe depression (PRaCTICED): A pragmatic, randomised, non-inferiority trial. *The Lancet Psychiatry, 8*(6), 487–499. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366\(21\)00083-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(21)00083-3)
- Constantino, M. J., Boswell, J. F., Coyne, A. E., Swales, T. P., & Kraus, D. R. (2021). Effect of matching therapists to patients vs assignment as usual on adult psychotherapy outcomes: A randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Psychiatry, 78*(9), 960–969.
<https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2021.1221>
- de Jong, K., Conijn, J. M., Gallagher, R., Reshetnikova, A. S., Heij, M., & Lutz, M. C. (2021). Using progress feedback to improve outcomes and reduce drop-out, treatment

- duration, and deterioration: A multilevel meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 85, 102002. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2021.102002>
- Delgadillo, J., Ali, S., Fleck, K., Agnew, C., Southgate, A., Parkhouse, L., Cohen, Z. D., DeRubeis, R. J., & Barkham, M. (2022). Stratified care vs stepped care for depression: A cluster randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 79(2), 101–108. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2021.3539>
- Pybis, J., Saxon, D., Hill, A., & Barkham, M. (2017). The comparative effectiveness and efficiency of cognitive behaviour therapy and generic counselling in the treatment of depression: evidence from the 2nd UK National Audit of psychological therapies. *BMC Psychiatry*, 17(1), 215. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-017-1370-7>
- Saxon, D., & Barkham, M. (2012). Patterns of therapist variability: Therapist effects and the contribution of patient severity and risk. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 80(4), 535–546. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028898>
- Wampold, B. E., Mondin, G. W., Moody, M., Stich, F., Benson, K., & Ahn, H.-n. (1997). A meta-analysis of outcome studies comparing bona fide psychotherapies: Empirically, “all must have prizes.” *Psychological Bulletin*, 122(3), 203–215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.122.3.203>
- Wampold, B. E., & Owen, J. (2021). Therapist effects: History, methods, magnitude, and characteristics of effective therapists. In M. Barkham, W. Lutz, & L. G. Castonguay, (Eds.), *Bergin and Garfield's handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change*, 7th Edition. Wiley.