

The Psychological Record

Reply to Barnes-Holmes & Harte (2022) "The IRAP as a Measure of Implicit Cognition: A Case of Frankenstein's Monster"

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:		
Full Title:	Reply to Barnes-Holmes & Harte (2022) "The IRAP as a Measure of Implicit Cognition: A Case of Frankenstein's Monster"	
Article Type:	Brief Communication	
Funding Information:	Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (464488178)	Dr. Ian Hussey
Abstract:	<p>Barnes-Holmes & Harte (2022) recently provided an account of the history of the development and use of the Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure (IRAP), and used this account as a springboard for suggestions for future research. Unfortunately, their core assertions are at odds with the published scientific record. This raises questions about the reliability of their recommendations. This reply uses a systematic review of the published IRAP literature to show that, contrary to Barnes-Holmes & Harte's (2022) account, (1) Barnes-Holmes repeatedly and explicitly stated that the IRAP is an implicit measure, and (2) Barnes-Holmes did not "lose control" of the task. Rather, he and his research group have produced the majority of all IRAP publications. The credibility of Barnes-Holmes & Harte's (2022) suggestions regarding the future of the IRAP is undermined by their inaccurate account of its past. However, their analogy with Frankenstein's monster still holds, albeit under an alternative and correct reading of Shelly's novel as a cautionary tale about scientific recklessness.</p>	
Corresponding Author:	Ian Hussey, PhD Ruhr-Universitat Bochum Gent, BELGIUM	
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:		
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Ruhr-Universitat Bochum	
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:		
First Author:	Ian Hussey, PhD	
First Author Secondary Information:		
Order of Authors:	Ian Hussey, PhD	
Order of Authors Secondary Information:		
Author Comments:	See attached (non blinded) cover letter.	
Suggested Reviewers:	<p>Ian Stewart, PhD Prof, NUI Galway: University of Galway ian.stewart@universityofgalway.ie Prof Stewart is listed among the frequent users of the IRAP and was involved in some of the early IRAP publications. He could speak to the accuracy of the commentary and original article.</p> <p>Michelle Kelly, PhD NCI: National College of Ireland michelle.kelly@ncirl.ie Prof Kelly is also listed among the frequent users of the IRAP.</p>	

Reply to Barnes-Holmes & Harte (2022) “The IRAP as a Measure of Implicit Cognition:
A Case of Frankenstein’s Monster”

Ian Hussey

Author note: Ian Hussey, Ruhr University Bochum, Germany. ian.hussey@rub.de. This research was supported by the META-REP Priority Program of the German Research Foundation (#464488178). All data, code and materials are available at osf.io/3bp84.

Abstract

Barnes-Holmes & Harte (2022) recently provided an account of the history of the development and use of the Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure (IRAP), and used this account as a springboard for suggestions for future research. Unfortunately, their core assertions are at odds with the published scientific record. This raises questions about the reliability of their recommendations. This reply uses the publications found by an existing systematic review of the published IRAP literature to show that, contrary to Barnes-Holmes & Harte's (2022) account, (1) Barnes-Holmes repeatedly and explicitly stated that the IRAP is an implicit measure, and (2) Barnes-Holmes did not "lose control" of the task. Rather, he and his research group have produced the majority of all IRAP publications. The credibility of Barnes-Holmes & Harte's (2022) suggestions regarding the future of the IRAP is undermined by their inaccurate account of its past. However, their analogy with Frankenstein's monster still holds, albeit under an alternative and correct reading of Shelly's novel as a cautionary tale about scientific recklessness.

Reply to Barnes-Holmes & Harte (2022) “The IRAP as a Measure of Implicit Cognition:
A Case of Frankenstein’s Monster”

Barnes-Holmes & Harte (2022) recently provided their historical account of the development and use of the Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure (IRAP). Unfortunately, their core assertions are at odds with the published scientific record. As scientists generally, we should be concerned with verifiable facts and avoid revisionism. As behaviorists specifically, we should take responsibility for how we have arranged the environment and how this has influenced the behavior of other scientists. For example, other researchers are likely to use a task as an implicit measure if we repeatedly assert that it is one. This commentary therefore details and corrects the two key inconsistencies between the account provided by Barnes-Holmes & Harte (2022) and the actual contents of Barnes-Holmes’ published work on the IRAP. Specifically, they argued that (1) “the IRAP did not start out as a measure of implicit cognition” (pp. 5-6) and (2) “the creator of the IRAP seemingly lost control of his creation as the procedure became almost exclusively employed as a measure of implicit cognition” (p. 2). These points are both key to Barnes-Holmes & Harte’s (2022) account and demonstrably not the case. These corrections are not merely pedantic: Barnes-Holmes & Harte (2022) provided a roadmap for future research based on their view of the past nearly two decades of IRAP research. If future investments into IRAP research are to be successful we must build them on an accurate account of the work to date. Indeed, the credibility of any recommendations for the future of the task should be informed by the accuracy of the account of its past.

Systematic review of published IRAP research

Barnes-Holmes & Harte’s (2022) claims were therefore testing using the list of 151 IRAP publications returned by an existing systematic review of the published IRAP literature

(2006 to 2022, in English, listed in the Web of Science or psycINFO databases). Full details of that systematic review, including Boolean search strings, all materials necessary to reproduce, reuse, or update the review, all data, and R code to reproduce the analyses are available in that publication (Hussey, 2023). Data and R code to reproduce the current analyses are available (blinded link for peer review:

https://osf.io/3bp84/?view_only=6f29e185bac745d991b95e56cdb45fa6).

Barnes-Holmes consistently stated that the IRAP was created as an implicit measure

Claim 1: “The IRAP did not start out as a measure of implicit cognition” (Barnes-Holmes & Harte, 2022, pp. 5-6). On the contrary, the early IRAP literature is very explicit that it was created and used as one. The first IRAP publication, Barnes-Holmes et al. (2006), was subtitled “Developing the Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure (IRAP) as a direct measure of implicit beliefs” and furthermore stated that “the IRAP provides a measure of implicit beliefs” (p. 173). Some might argue that this alone is sufficient to settle the question of whether the IRAP began as an implicit measure.

To demonstrate that this wasn’t an isolated claim, I provide quotes from each of the first ten published IRAP articles and book chapters of which Barnes-Holmes was a co-author. The second IRAP publication, stated, “another procedure for assessing implicit cognitions has been proposed, the Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure” (p. 254), and “the current findings provide some support for the IRAP as an implicit measure” (McKenna et al., 2007, p. 267). Cullen & Barnes-Holmes (2008) stated “it is prudent to develop additional methodologies that aim to provide relatively direct measures of implicit cognition. One such methodology has recently been offered: the Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure” (p. 35). Barnes-Holmes et al. (2008) stated, “the IRAP meets the second two criteria for an implicit measure” (p. 512). Chan et al. (2009) referred to the IRAP as an implicit measure in their title and stated, “The results support the use of the IRAP as a measure of implicit

attitudes” (p. 317). Dawson et al. (2009) also referred to the IRAP as an implicit measure in their title and stated, “The aim of the present study was to determine if the IRAP would be more effective at revealing sexual offenders’ implicit beliefs about children than an explicit (questionnaire-based) methodology” (p. 63). Vahey et al. (2009) stated the IRAP was “used with all participants to measure implicit self-esteem” (p. 374). Barnes-Holmes et al. (2009) stated that their “findings support the IRAP as a potentially useful measure of implicit attitudes.” (p. 389). Power et al. (2009) referred to the IRAP as an implicit measure in their title and that the IRAP “was designed to examine implicit beliefs or attitudes” (p. 621). Cullen et al. (2009) stated “at the very least, therefore, the current findings indicate that the IRAP could provide a possibly useful alternative to the IAT [Implicit Association Test, the most popular implicit measure]” (p. 611).

Barnes-Holmes continued to refer to the IRAP as an implicit measure for over a decade. In order to not labor the point, I provide quotes from just one publication co-authored by Barnes-Holmes per year: “it would also seem prudent to attempt to develop additional methodologies that aim to provide relatively direct measures of implicit cognition. The IRAP may be one such method” (Barnes-Holmes et al., 2010, p. 45); “The Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure (IRAP) is an implicit measure” (Campbell et al., 2011, p. 378); “A broad implicit measure of depressive emotional reactions was created by mapping the content of the depression scale from the Depression Anxiety and Stress Scale (DASS) on to the Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure (IRAP)” (Hussey & Barnes-Holmes, 2012, p. 573); “the Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure (IRAP), which was designed to measure the professional’s implicit attitudes to this particular disability” (Kelly & Barnes-Holmes, 2013, p. 5); “implicit measures such as the Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure ... may provide novel perspectives into disorders such as OCD” (Nicholson et al., 2014, p. 32); “the IRAP is uniquely equipped to measure implicit cognition” (Vahey et al., 2015, p. 60); “we

hypothesized that the self-focused measure of implicit evaluations of death (i.e., personal IRAP) would be a superior predictor of group membership than the measure of abstract implicit evaluations of death (i.e., abstract IRAP)” (Hussey et al., 2016, p. 3); “The implicit measures used (IAT and IRAP) are computer-based tests that assess reaction time biases” (Stewart et al., 2017, p. 64).

Barnes-Holmes’ last reference to the IRAP as an implicit measure (i.e., Perez et al., 2019) seems to have been just before the publication of two independent meta-analyses of the IRAP’s psychometric properties (Greenwald & Lai, 2020; Hussey & Drake, 2020). These reviews both concluded that the IRAP demonstrates poor reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .56$ and $.51$ respectively; test-retest reliability $r = .45$ and $ICC_2 = .21$ respectively). As such, its psychometric properties make it a poor implicit measure relative to others (see Greenwald & Lai, 2020).

Note that this question of whether the IRAP was claimed to be an implicit measure is agnostic to whether it also has real or potential utility within behavior-analytic research (e.g., as a measure of natural verbal relations). Barnes-Holmes has explicitly stated his position elsewhere that functional-analytic explanations and cognitive representational explanations of behavioral phenomena are separate levels of analysis that do not interact or preclude one another (Barnes-Holmes & Hussey, 2016). As such, the question of whether the IRAP is an implicit measure or a measure of natural verbal relations is not an either-or question. Barnes-Holmes & Harte’s (2022) claim was that the IRAP did not start out as an implicit measure. The published scientific record demonstrates otherwise.

Barnes-Holmes cannot have lost control of his creation because he produced most of the literature

Claim 2: “the creator of the IRAP seemingly lost control of his creation as the procedure became almost exclusively employed as a measure of implicit cognition” (Barnes-

Holmes & Harte, 2022, p. 2). The implication here is that researchers other than Barnes-Holmes used the task extensively by others, perhaps in ways not intended by its creator. Putting aside the question of how it was used (i.e., given that the previous section shows that it was consistently described as an implicit measure), this claim can be easily tested by examining the authorship of IRAP publications. If Barnes-Holmes & Harte's (2022) claim that Barnes-Holmes "lost control" of the task is valid, then the task would have to have seen extensive use by others.

The articles and book chapters found in the systematic review included 279 individual authors. The median number of publications per author was 1, with low variation (Median Absolute Deviation = 0). This demonstrates that the modal researcher who uses the IRAP uses it just once. To understand repeat users of the task, I extracted all researchers with at least five publications using the IRAP. Twenty such researchers were found (see Table 1). Results demonstrated that Dermot Barnes-Holmes was a co-author of 48% of all IRAP publications between 2006 and 2022. Of these twenty frequent publishers of IRAP research, one was Dermot Barnes-Holmes himself, fifteen were his current and former students, and one was his former student's student. Only three individuals who have frequently published IRAP studies did not come from Barnes-Holmes's academic lineage. 70% of all IRAP publications included Barnes-Holmes, his students, or his students' students as a co-author.

Collectively, this analysis of the authorship patterns in the IRAP literature reduces the credibility of Barnes-Holmes & Harte's (2022) claim that the task's creator lost control of the IRAP and the implication that it was authors other than Barnes-Holmes that used the IRAP as an implicit measure.

Table 1. Authors who have five or more IRAP publications and their association with Barnes-Holmes.

Author	Number of publications	Percent of all publications	Student of DBH	Student of DBH's student
Dermot Barnes-Holmes	72	48%	-	-
Yvonne Barnes-Holmes	31	21%	Yes	-
Ciara McEnteggart	18	12%	Yes	-
Ian Stewart	17	11%	Yes	-
Carol Murphy	14	9%	Yes	-
Michelle E. Kelly	10	7%	Yes	-
Diana Ferroni Bast	9	6%	Yes	-
Ian Hussey	9	6%	Yes	-
Júlio C. de Rose	7	5%	No	-
Chad E. Drake	7	5%	No	-
Sean Hughes	7	5%	Yes	-
Louise McHugh	7	5%	Yes	-
Renato Bortoloti	6	4%	No	-
Colin Harte	6	4%	Yes	-
Deirdre Kavanagh	6	4%	Yes	-
Emma Nicholson	6	4%	Yes	-
João Henrique de Almeida	5	3%	Yes	-
Lynn Farrell	5	3%	No	Yes
Martin Finn	5	3%	Yes	-
Aileen Leech	5	3%	Yes	-

The analogy with Frankenstein

Barnes-Holmes & Harte's (2022) analogy between the IRAP and Frankenstein's monster is instructive and worth exploring. They stated that "In Mary Shelley's classic novel, Frankenstein (1818), we are presented with the case of a doctor who creates a living monster by successfully piecing together and reanimating body parts from different people. However, not long after the monster has been brought to life he becomes Dr. Frankenstein's nemesis and eventually leads to their joint demise. ... However, as was the case with Dr. Frankenstein's monster, the creator of the IRAP seemingly lost control of his creation as the procedure became almost exclusively employed as a measure of implicit cognition. ... we hope that this story will not end in the same way that Shelley's did. Rather we hope that the

IRAP, unlike Frankenstein's monster, will be tamed and refined into a better understood, more precise, functional-analytic tool" (pp. 1-2). This rendition of the novel's plot and themes is a common and ironic misunderstanding: Shelly's Frankenstein is a story about the follies of scientific ambition that is blind to responsibility. Through his labors, Victor Frankenstein creates new life. But he does not lose control of the creature: he abandons and betrays it. The creature goes on to cause carnage, but the ultimate cause of this damage is Frankenstein's failure to stay true to his prior words or take responsibility for his influence over his creation.

Conclusion

Contrary to what Barnes-Holmes & Harte (2022) claimed, examination of the published IRAP literature showed that, from its inception, Barnes-Holmes stated that the IRAP was created and used as an implicit measure. Barnes-Holmes never 'lost control' of the task but rather has continued to be the primary author of IRAP publications. Barnes-Holmes has therefore played a central role in the verbal community that establishes and maintains the labelling and use of the IRAP as an implicit measure. Revisionism or obfuscation of the IRAP's history and evolution only serves to mislead readers and further confuse the task's purpose and potential utility. Unfortunately, the credibility of Barnes-Holmes & Harte's (2022) vision for the future of the IRAP is undermined by their mischaracterization of its past.

Conflict of interest statement

On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

References

- Barnes-Holmes, D., Barnes-Holmes, Y., Power, P., Hayden, E., Milne, R., & Stewart, I. (2006). Do you really know what you believe? Developing the Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure (IRAP) as a direct measure of implicit beliefs. *The Irish Psychologist*, 32(7), 169–177.
- Barnes-Holmes, D., & Harte, C. (2022). The IRAP as a Measure of Implicit Cognition: A Case of Frankenstein’s Monster. *Perspectives on Behavior Science*.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s40614-022-00352-z>
- Barnes-Holmes, D., Hayden, E., Barnes-Holmes, Y., & Stewart, I. (2008). The Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure (IRAP) as a response-time and event-related-potentials methodology for testing natural verbal relations: A preliminary study. *The Psychological Record*, 58(4), 497–516.
- Barnes-Holmes, D., & Hussey, I. (2016). The functional-cognitive meta-theoretical framework: Reflections, possible clarifications and how to move forward. *International Journal of Psychology*, 51(1), 50–57. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12166>
- Barnes-Holmes, D., Murphy, A., Barnes-Holmes, Y., & Stewart, I. (2010). The Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure: Exploring the impact of private versus public contexts and the response latency criterion on pro-white and anti-black stereotyping among white Irish individuals. *The Psychological Record*, 60, 57–66.
- Barnes-Holmes, D., Waldron, D., Barnes-Holmes, Y., & Stewart, I. (2009). Testing the validity of the Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure and the Implicit Association Test: Measuring attitudes toward Dublin and country life in Ireland. *The Psychological Record*, 59(3), 389–406. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03395671>

- Campbell, C., Barnes-Holmes, D., Barnes-Holmes, Y., & Stewart, I. (2011). Exploring Screen Presentations in the Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure (IRAP). *International Journal of Psychology & Psychological Therapy*, 11(3), 377–388.
- Chan, G., Barnes-Holmes, D., Barnes-Holmes, Y., & Stewart, I. (2009). Implicit attitudes to work and leisure among North American and Irish individuals: A preliminary study. *International Journal of Psychology & Psychological Therapy*, 9(3), 317–334.
- Cullen, C., & Barnes-Holmes, D. (2008). Implicit pride and prejudice: A heterosexual phenomenon? In M. A. Morrison & T. G. Morrison (Eds.), *The psychology of modern prejudice* (pp. 195–223). Nova Science Publishers.
- Cullen, C., Barnes-Holmes, D., Barnes-Holmes, Y., & Stewart, I. (2009). The Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure (IRAP) and the malleability of ageist attitudes. *The Psychological Record*, 59(4), 591–620. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03395683>
- Dawson, D. L., Barnes-Holmes, D., Gresswell, D. M., Hart, A. J., & Gore, N. J. (2009). Assessing the implicit beliefs of sexual offenders using the Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure: A first study. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment*, 21(1), 57–75. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063208326928>
- Greenwald, A. G., & Lai, C. K. (2020). Implicit Social Cognition. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 71(1), 419–445. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010419-050837>
- Hussey, I. (2023). *A systematic review of Null Hypothesis Significance Testing, sample sizes and statistical power in research using the Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure*. PsyArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/g2x9p>
- Hussey, I., & Barnes-Holmes, D. (2012). The implicit relational assessment procedure as a measure of implicit depression and the role of psychological flexibility. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, 19(4), 573–582. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpra.2012.03.002>

- Hussey, I., Barnes-Holmes, D., & Booth, R. (2016). Individuals with current suicidal ideation demonstrate implicit “fearlessness of death.” *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 51, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbtep.2015.11.003>
- Hussey, I., & Drake, C. E. (2020). The Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure demonstrates poor internal consistency and test-retest reliability: A meta-analysis. *Preprint*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/ge3k7>
- Kelly, A., & Barnes-Holmes, D. (2013). Implicit attitudes towards children with autism versus normally developing children as predictors of professional burnout and psychopathology. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 34(1), 17–28.
- McKenna, I. M., Barnes-Holmes, D., Barnes-Holmes, Y., & Stewart, I. (2007). Testing the fake-ability of the Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure (IRAP): The first study. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy*, 7(2), 253–268.
- Nicholson, E., Dempsey, K., & Barnes-Holmes, D. (2014). The role of responsibility and threat appraisals in contamination fear and obsessive-compulsive tendencies at the implicit level. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science*, 3(1), 31–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcbs.2013.11.001>
- Perez, W. F., de Almeida, J. H., de Rose, J. C., Dorigon, A. H., de Vasconcellos, E. L., da Silva, M. A., Lima, N. D. P., de Almeida, R. B. M., Montan, R. N. M., & Barnes-Holmes, D. (2019). Implicit and Explicit Measures of Transformation of Function from Facial Expressions of Fear and of Happiness via Equivalence Relations. *The Psychological Record*, 69(1), 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40732-018-0304-1>
- Power, P., Barnes-Holmes, D., Barnes-Holmes, Y., & Stewart, I. (2009). The Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure (IRAP) as a measure of implicit relative preferences: A first study. *The Psychological Record*, 59(4), 621–640.

1 Stewart, C., Rogers, F., Pilch, M., Stewart, I., Barnes-Holmes, Y., & Westermann, S. (2017).

2 The effect of social exclusion on state paranoia and explicit and implicit self-esteem
3 in a non-clinical sample. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*,
4 57, 62–69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbtep.2017.04.001>
5
6
7

8
9 Vahey, N. A., Barnes-Holmes, D., Barnes-Holmes, Y., & Stewart, I. (2009). A first test of the

10 Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure as a measure of self-esteem: Irish prisoner
11 groups and university students. *The Psychological Record*, 59(3), 371–388.
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
61
62
63
64
65

66 Vahey, N. A., Nicholson, E., & Barnes-Holmes, D. (2015). A meta-analysis of criterion
67 effects for the Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure (IRAP) in the clinical
68 domain. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 48, 59–65.
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000



**RUHR
UNIVERSITÄT
BOCHUM**

RUB

RUHR UNIVERSITY BOCHUM | 44780 Bochum | Germany

**FACULTY OF
PSYCHOLOGY**

**Psychology of
Human Technology
Interaction**

Dr. Ian Hussey

Phone +32 (0)470 396842

Email ian.hussey@rub.de

January 27, 2023

Manuscript submission: ‘Reply to Barnes-Holmes & Harte (2022) “The IRAP as a Measure of Implicit Cognition: A Case of Frankenstein’s Monster”’

Dear Prof Fryling,

Please find attached my manuscript ‘Reply to Barnes-Holmes & Harte (2022) “The IRAP as a Measure of Implicit Cognition: A Case of Frankenstein’s Monster”’. I wish to submit it as a Brief Communication (word count: 2269 words).

Perspectives on Behavior Science recently published Barnes-Holmes & Harte (2022) “The IRAP as a Measure of Implicit Cognition: A Case of Frankenstein’s Monster”. In that article, the authors provided an account of the history of the development and use of the Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure (IRAP). They state (1) that the IRAP did not start out as an implicit measure, and (2) that Barnes-Holmes “lost control” of the task and others used it as one. They imply that other researchers misused the task and diverted the research agenda away from behaviorist goals. They use this account to as a springboard for suggestions for future IRAP research. Unfortunately, their core assertions are at odds with the published scientific record, including Barnes-Holmes own IRAP publications.

This reply uses a systematic review to test Barnes-Holmes & Harte’s (2022) two aforementioned claims. I show that the IRAP was consistently stated to be an implicit measure, and that Barnes-Holmes never lost control of the task but is in fact author of 48% of all IRAP publications. The credibility of Barnes-Holmes & Harte’s (2022) suggestions regarding future IRAP research are undermined by their inaccurate account of its past. Given that Barnes-Holmes & Harte (2022) argues for and is likely to be cited as a justification for a pivot in the use of the IRAP, I think that it is important that future research be based on an accurate representation of the facts, without revisionism, and that readers not be misinformed.

Perspectives on Behavior Science desk-rejected this manuscript on the grounds that they do not publish replies even those that raise factual inaccuracies. This was disappointing, and is unfortunately in line with observations made elsewhere that it can be difficult to publish critiques of already-published research (e.g., Gelman 2013, 'It's Too Hard to Publish Criticisms and Obtain Data for Replication'). I understand that it is less typical to publish replies in a different journal to that which published the original article, but the Psychological Record has published many IRAP papers, and I therefore hope that this Brief Communication is of interest to you and your readers.

Should you be willing to review it, I would request that Dermot Barnes-Holmes and Yvonne Barnes-Holmes not be involved in the editorial process, given their conflict of interest. The manuscript has not been published previously and it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere.

Kind regards,

Ian Hussey