

# 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:	PSRE-D-23-00014	
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 &amp; 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 &amp; 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 &amp; 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](mailto: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](https://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).

### **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	-



Author	Number of publications	Percent of all publications	Student of DBH	Student of DBH's student
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.

### **Availability of Data and Materials**

All data and R code to reproduce the analyses are available (blinded link for peer review: [https://osf.io/3bp84/?view\\_only=6f29e185bac745d991b95e56cdb45fa6](https://osf.io/3bp84/?view_only=6f29e185bac745d991b95e56cdb45fa6)).

### **Compliance with Ethical Standards**

Not Applicable.

## 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](mailto: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