

# Freud's consulting room, Hampstead



# Reflecting on alternative models of therapy

Is therapy about care of patients in distress or about cure of disease?

## ▶ **Care**

- ▶ Implies an ill – healthy continuum
- ▶ Concept of psychological hardness useful
- ▶ Chronic - could be long term support
- ▶ Outcomes subjective and hard to measure
- ▶ Eg. patient satisfaction

## ▶ **Cure**

- ▶ Implies medically based ill - healthy dichotomy
- ▶ Discrete and identifiable disorders
- ▶ Acute – short term cure in response to crisis
- ▶ Positivism and measurable outcomes
- ▶ Eg. using RCTs

# Less dichotomous in reality but an important debate for research into outcome

- ▶ Questions
- ▶ To what extent do discrete disorders exist?
  - ▶ and are they socio-culturally independent?
- ▶ Are people who are distressed likely to be multiply affected (Co-morbidity)
  - ▶ Eg depression, and anxiety, and substance abuse?
- ▶ Can disturbances be cyclical? Environmentally triggered?
- ▶ Can therapy simply bring about cure or does it work through improving self management and self awareness?

# Dilbert 1



## Dilbert 2

CONGRESS IS LYING  
ABOUT THE BUDGET,  
STOCK ANALYSTS ARE  
LYING ABOUT THEIR  
RECOMMENDATIONS,  
MY BOSS IS  
LYING...



# Dilbert 3



# Do psychological therapies work?

- ▶ This is a basic generation 1 question arising from Eysenck 1952 and led to a generation of justificatory research
- ▶ Is it a reasonable question?
  - ▶ Do we ask if friendship, theatre, music, religion 'work'?
  - ▶ Should we equate psychological therapies to physical therapies such as those involving drugs?
  - ▶ Is psychotherapy a social practice or a medical intervention?
  - ▶ Measurable outcomes or customer satisfaction?

# Fenichel 1930

- ▶ Review of outcome in Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute
- ▶ 1955 consultations - 721 cases opened
- ▶ 363 completed, 241 left prematurely, 117 still in treatment
- ▶ 11 judged cured, 89 v. much improved, 116 improved, 47 not cured etc.
- ▶ Depending on how view drop-outs....  
59 – 91% improvement



# Problems with early research

- ▶ Use of pre / post treatment comparisons only
- ▶ No comparison / control conditions
- ▶ So no control for passage of time or measure of spontaneous remission
- ▶ Ethical problems of random allocation, eg. Rogers and Dymond, 1954
- ▶ Need a control condition, either:
  - ▶ No-treatment
  - ▶ Waiting list
  - ▶ placebo

# Generation 1 research

- ▶ Arbuckle and Boy (1961)
  - ▶ 3x12 person matched samples, random allocation - client-centred therapy effective
- ▶ Sloane et al (1975)
  - ▶ 3x30 matched samples: wait list / insight therapy / behaviour therapy, 16 wks / sessions
  - ▶ Therapists matched for experience
  - ▶ Pre / post / 12 months post use of SSIAM & target symptom rating
  - ▶ Both therapies improved equally, more than wait list which also improved
  - ▶ A good small scale study

# Does the literature add up?

- ▶ What is an appropriate outcome measure?
- ▶ Insight? Support through a process? Behaviour change? Loss of symptoms?
  - ▶ Will vary with condition treated, eg. eating disorder
- ▶ Research design, choice of outcome measure, formulation and focus of therapy all related to theoretical orientation so difficult to compare therapies

# Research reviews

- ▶ Eysenck, '61, '66..... 0% effective
- ▶ Rackman, 1971..... 4% effective
- ▶ Luborsky et al 1978..... 78% effective
- ▶ So...contaminated by therapist allegiance
- ▶ Use judgement to select studies for consideration, may reject on basis of design and outcome measures
- ▶ Eg. behaviourists reject Sloane et al 1975 as outcome measures too medical / not behavioural

# Statistical issues

- ▶ Significance is a function of size of effect & sample size, small differences may be significant with large sample and vice versa
- ▶ With clinical research difficult to get large samples or to increase 2 condition contrast
- ▶ Alternative - measure effect size

# Statistical issues 2

- ▶ Effect size of 1.0 means that therapy group is 1sd better than mean of control group – 84% of therapy group better than average control group member
- ▶ Meta analysis – use effect size to quantify and aggregate a statistical review
- ▶ But....garbage in = garbage out, as Eysenck argues.

# Meta analytic reviews

- ▶ Smith et al 1980
- ▶ 474 studies, 18 types of therapy
- ▶ Effect size of 0.85 – 80% of treated sample score above mean of control sample
- ▶ Many similar studies, broadly similar results
- ▶ Efficacy of therapy demonstrated in broad terms – mean effect size of 0.74 (approaching large) quoted by Lambert & Bergin (94)

# Comparative effectiveness

- ▶ Overlap with earlier research
- ▶ Dispute over a priori assumptions
- ▶ Luborsky's review – the Dodo verdict, the outcome equivalence paradox
- ▶ Potential for meta analysis to resolve?
- ▶ Not realised, many reviews, no consistent winners and losers