**Supplementary Table 1**

*A summary of the 56 r effects that comprised the meta-analysis: Each r effect’s study citation, the criterion relationship it described, and details of the effect size statistic it originated from*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Study Citations, IRAP effects and their Involvement in Criterion Relationships** | **Original Metric with Degrees of Freedom** | **Resulting**  ***r* Metric#** |
| Carpenter, Martinez, Vadhan, Barnes-Holmes & Nunes (2012) |  |  |
| *‘With-cocaine-positive’* *trial-type* *DIRAP* at baseline |  |  |
| Negative correlation with number of vouchers earned by cocaine addicts’ during first phase of treatment for cocaine addiction. | *r*(17) = -.46 | .46 |
| Negative correlation with cocaine addicts’ percentage attendance during first phase of treatment for cocaine addiction. | *r*(17) = -.58 | .58 |
| Negative correlation with cocaine addicts’ percentage of negative urine tests for cocaine use during first phase of treatment for cocaine addiction. | *r*(17) = -.56 | .56 |
| *‘With-cocaine-negative’ trial-type* *DIRAP* at baseline |  |  |
| Negative correlation with number of vouchers earned by cocaine addicts’ during first phase of treatment for cocaine addiction. | *r*(17) = -.38 | .38 |
| Negative correlation with cocaine addicts’ percentage attendance during first phase of treatment for cocaine addiction. | *r*(17) = -.48 | .48 |
| Negative correlation with cocaine addicts’ percentage of negative urine tests for cocaine use during first phase of treatment for cocaine addiction. | *r*(17) = -.48 | .48 |
| *‘No-cocaine-negative’ trial-type* *DIRAP* at baseline |  |  |
| Negative correlation with number of vouchers earned by cocaine addicts’ during first phase of treatment for cocaine addiction. | *r*(17) = -.47 | .47 |
| Negative correlation with cocaine addicts’ percentage attendance during first phase of treatment for cocaine addiction. | *r*(17) = -.23 | .23 |
| Negative correlation with cocaine addicts’ percentage of negative urine tests for cocaine use during first phase of treatment for cocaine addiction. | *r*(17) = -.40 | .40 |
| Dawson, Barnes-Holmes, Gresswell, Hart & Gore (2009) |  |  |
| *‘Child-sexual’ trial-type DIRAP* |  |  |
| Positive effect between controls versus paedophilic sex-offenders. | *F*(1, 30) = 6.136 | .41a |
| Positive one-group effect among controls. | *d*(15) = 1.34\* | .56b |
|  |  |  |
| **Study Citations, IRAP effects and their Involvement in Criterion Relationships** | **Original Metric with Degrees of Freedom** | **Resulting**  ***r* Metric#** |
| *‘Child-innocent’ trial-type DIRAP* |  |  |
| Positive one-group effect among controls. | *d*(15) = .94\* | .42b |
| *‘Adult-sexual’ trial-type DIRAP* |  |  |
| Positive one-group effect among controls. | *d*(15) = 1.43\* | .58b |
| *‘Adult-innocent’ trial-type DIRAP* |  |  |
| Positive one-group effect among controls. | *d*(15) = .70\* | .33b |
| Hooper, Villatte, Neofotistou & McHugh (2010) |  |  |
| *Compound DIRAP* for all four IRAP trial-types about experiential avoidance |  |  |
| Positive interaction from baseline across interventions designed to induce mindful thinking versus thought suppression. | *F*(1, 22) = 5.37 *ηp2* = .196 | .44c |
| Hussey & Barnes-Holmes (2012) |  |  |
| *Compound DIRAP* for all four IRAP trial-types about depressive thinking |  |  |
| Positive interaction between controls versus group with mild depression from baseline across an intervention designed to induce sad thinking. | *F*(1, 24) = 8.24 | .51a |
| Kishita, Muto, Ohtsuki & Barnes-Holmes (2014) |  |  |
| *Raw latency IRAP effect* across all four IRAP trial-types evaluating calmness versus anxiety |  |  |
| Positive omnibus raw latency IRAP effect across both undergraduate groups at baseline. | *F*(1, 23) = 21.96 | .70c |
| Kosnes, Whelan, O’Donovan & McHugh (2013) |  |  |
| *‘I-expect-positive-things’ trial-type*  *DIRAP* |  |  |
| Positive effect between groups low versus high in depression. | *t*(69) = 3.309\* | .37d |
| Nicholson & Barnes-Holmes (2012a) |  |  |
| *Compound DIRAP* from the two IRAP trial-types with pictures of spiders |  |  |
| Positive correlation with scores from the Fear of Spiders Questionnaire (FSQ). | *r*(28) = .47 | .47 |
| Positive linear regression with number of steps completed in a behavioural approach task. | *R2*(28) = .166 | .41e |
| Positive one-group effect for those scoring high on the FSQ. | *t*(14) = 3.29 | .66d |
| Nicholson & Barnes-Holmes (2012b) |  |  |
| *Compound D­IRAP* from the two IRAP trial-types about ‘Disgust Sensitivity’ |  |  |
| Positive correlation with number of steps completed in a behavioural approach task. | *r*(24) = .47 | .47 |
| *Disgusting-pictures-bad’ trial-type DIRAP*  Positive one-group effect across general student population sampled. | *t*(25) = 4.43 | .66d |
| **Study Citations, IRAP effects and their Involvement in Criterion Relationships** | **Original Metric with Degrees of Freedom** | **Resulting**  ***r* Metric#** |
| *‘Disgusting-picture-distressing’ trial-type DIRAP* |  |  |
| Positive one-group effect across general student population sampled. | *t*(25) = 2.53 | .45d |
| Nicholson, Dempsey & Barnes-Holmes (2013) |  |  |
| *Compound DIRAP* from the two IRAP trial-types with pictures stereotypically related to contamination |  |  |
| Positive one-group effect in the ‘high OCD group’. | *t*(13) = 5.616\* | .84d |
| Positive correlation with contamination subscale of the Padua Inventory. | r(27) = .44 | .44 |
| Positive correlation with responsibility/threat subscale of the Obsessive Beliefs Questionnaire. | r(27) = .23 | .22 |
| Positive correlation with responsibility/threat subscale of the Comb Behavioral Approach Task. | r(27) = .43 | .43 |
| *Compound DIRAP* from the two IRAP trial-types with pictures stereotypically related to cleanness |  |  |
| Positive one-group effect in the ‘high OCD group’. | *t*(13) = 3.586\* | .71d |
| Nicholson, McCourt & Barnes-Holmes (2013) |  |  |
| *‘Disgusting-pictures-negative’ trial-type DIRAP* |  |  |
| Positive one-group effect. | *t*(26) = 4.43 | .66d |
| Positive correlation with the Obsessive Beliefs Questionnaire. | *r*(25)Ϯ = .48 | .48 |
| Positive correlation with the compulsive checking subscale of Padua Inventory. | *r*(25)Ϯ = .50 | .50 |
| *‘Disgusting-pictures-positive’ trial-type DIRAP* |  |  |
| Positive one-group effect across the general student population sampled. | *t*(26) = 5.35 | .72d |
| Parling, Cernvall, Stewart, Barnes-Holmes & Ghaderi (2011) |  |  |
| *‘Bad-me-fat’ trial-type DIRAP* |  |  |
| Positive one-group effect among those diagnosed with anorexia. | *d*(15) = .52 | .25b |
| Positive effect between a control group versus those diagnosed with anorexia nervosa. | *F*(1, 26) = 5.76 | .43c |
| Positive correlation with scores from the Body Shape Questionnaire. | *r*(26) = .14\* | .14 |
| *‘Good-me-thin’ trial-type DIRAP* |  |  |
| Positive one-group effect among those diagnosed with anorexia. | *d*(15) = 1.53 | .61b |
| Positive effect between a control group versus those diagnosed with anorexia nervosa. | *F*(1, 26) = 1.66 | .25c |
| Positive correlation with scores from the Body Shape Questionnaire. | *r*(26) = .35\* | .35 |
| *‘I-don’t-want-to-be-fat’ trial-type DIRAP* |  |  |
| Positive one-group effect among those diagnosed with anorexia. | *d*(15) = 1.56 | .62b |
| *‘I-want-to-be-thin’ trial-type DIRAP* |  |  |
| Positive one-group effect among those diagnosed with anorexia. | *d*(15) = 1.42 | .58b |
| **Study Citations, IRAP effects and their Involvement in Criterion Relationships** | **Original Metric with Degrees of Freedom** | **Resulting**  ***r* Metric#** |
| *‘It’s-ok-for-me-to-be-thin’ trial-type DIRAP* |  |  |
| Positive one-group effect among those diagnosed with anorexia. | *d*(15) = .93 | .42b |
| Remue, De Houwer, Barnes-Holmes, Vanderhassalt, & DeRaedt (2013) |  |  |
| *Compound DIRAP* from the four IRAP trial-types evaluating idealized self |  |  |
| Positive one-group effect across those scoring higher on Beck Depression Inventory (BDI). | *d*(28) = 1.15 | .50b |
| *Compound DIRAP* from the four IRAP trial-types evaluating actual self |  |  |
| Positive one-group effect across those scoring lower on BDI. | *d*(26) = .80 | .37b |
| *Compound DIRAP*s from the IRAP trial-types evaluating idealized- versus actual-self |  |  |
| Negative within-group effect among those scoring higher on BDI. | *t*(28) = -3.65 | .58d |
| Positive within-group effect among those scoring higher on BDI. | *t*(26) = 2.17 | .38d |
| Timko, England, Herbert & Forman (2010, Study 1) |  |  |
| *Compound DIRAP* for all four IRAP trial-types about personal body image |  |  |
| Negative effect between those not dieting versus those dieting. | *d*(39) = .94 | .45d |
| Positive correlation with scores from the Body Shape Questionnaire. | *r*(48) = .48 | .48 |
| Positive correlation with the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales. | *r*(48) = .29 | .29 |
| Vahey, Barnes-Holmes, Barnes-Holmes & Stewart (2009) |  |  |
| *Compound DIRAP* from the IRAP trial-types involving positive self-descriptors |  |  |
| Positive one-group effect across the undergraduates. | *t*(23) = 6.76 | .82d |
| *Compound DIRAP* from the IRAP trial-types involving negative self-descriptors |  |  |
| Positive one-group effect across the undergraduates. | *t*(23) = 3.415 | .58d |
| *Compound DIRAP*s from the IRAP trial-types involving positive versus negative self-descriptors |  |  |
| Positive effect among mainstream prisoners versus undergraduates and open area prisoners. | *F*(2, 40) = 4.55, *ηp2* = .19 | .44e |
| Vahey, Boles & Barnes-Holmes (2010) |  |  |
| *‘Smokers-popular’ trial-type DIRAP* |  |  |
| Positive one-group effect among adolescent smokers (aged 11-19 years of age). | *t*(4) = 3.831 | .89d |
| Positive effect between adolescent non-smokers versus smokers. | *U*(11) = 15 | .21f |
| *‘Non-smokers-unpopular’ trial-type DIRAP* |  |  |
| Positive one-group effect among adolescent smokers. | *t*(4) = 1.316\* | .55d |
| Positive effect between adolescent non-smokers versus smokers. | *U*(11) = 14 | .25f |

# *r* values involving a criterion variable measured in reversed terms were themselves reverse scored. \*Indicates that the relevant statistic was alluded to but not reported in its cited publication. Ϯ Although the original publication reported *N* = 43 for these effects it was a typographical error alerted to us by discrepancies among the degrees of freedom reported for the various effects in Nicholson, McCourt & Barnes-Holmes (2013). a Produced using Rosnow, Rosenthal & Rubin’s (2000) *F* to *r* conversion formulae. b Produced using Rosenthal & DiMatteo’s (2001) *d* to *r* conversion formulae. c Produced using Laken’s (2013) *F* to *ηp2* conversion formula. d Produced using Rosnow, Rosenthal & Rubin’s (2000) *t* to *r* conversion, e We equated the relevant statistic with *r2* therefore obtaining *r* using the square root function. f Produced using Rosenthal & Dimatteo's (2001) methods of converting the standard normal deviate of *U*-rankings into *r*.