Original article:

“The DIRAP scores for each participant were entered into a 2 × 3 mixed repeated measures ANOVA with participant type as the between participants variable (undergraduate, main block, and open area) and IRAP effect-type as the within-participants variable (DIRAP-POS and DIRAP-NEG). Participant type proved to be significant, F(2, 40) = 4.55, p = .017, η2p = .19, as did the main effect for IRAP effect type, F(2, 40) = 12.262, p = .001, η2p = .23; however the interaction did not reach significance7, F (2, 40) = .067, p = .94, η2p = .003. Post hoc Fisher PLSD tests indicated significant differences between main block and open area prisoners (p = .006, d = 1.58) and between main block prisoners and undergraduates (p = .04, d = 1.04), but nonsignificance between open area prisoners and undergraduates (p = .9, d = .08).” (Vahey et al., 2009, p. 380)

Meta-analysis:

Vahey, Barnes-Holmes, Barnes-Holmes & Stewart (2009)

Compound DIRAPs 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

Converted to: *r* = .44; We equated the relevant statistic with r2 therefore obtaining r using the square root function.