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Abstract

Background: There is a burgeoning literature examining perceptions of being defeated or trapped in different psychiatric and affective disorders. The disorders most frequently examined to date are depression, anxiety problems, posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), and suicidality.

Aims: To quantify the size and consistency of perceptions of defeat and entrapment in depression, anxiety problems, PTSD and suicidality, test for differences across psychiatric disorders, and examine potential moderators and publication bias.

Method: Random-effects meta-analyses based on Pearson’s correlation coefficient $r$.

Results: Forty studies were included in the meta-analysis ($n = 10,072$). Perceptions of defeat and entrapment were strong (around $r = .60$) and similar in size across all four psychiatric disorders. Perceptions of defeat were particularly strong in depression ($r = .73$). There was no between-study heterogeneity; therefore moderator analyses were conducted in an exploratory fashion. There was no evidence of publication bias.

Limitations: Analyses were cross-sectional, which precludes establishing temporal precedence or causality. Some of the meta-analyses were based on relatively small numbers of effect sizes, which may limit their generalizability.

Conclusions: Perceptions of defeat and entrapment are clinically important in depression, anxiety problems, PTSD, and suicidality. Similar-sized, strong relationships across four different psychiatric disorders could suggest that perceptions of defeat and entrapment are transdiagnostic constructs. The results suggest that clinicians and researchers need to become more aware of perceptions of defeat and entrapment.
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There is a burgeoning literature examining perceptions of being defeated or trapped in different psychiatric disorders and problems. To date, this research has focused on examining perceptions of defeat and entrapment in relation to depression, anxiety problems, posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and suicidality, but there is emerging evidence to suggest that perceptions of being defeated or trapped are also apparent in a range of other psychiatric disorders (Taylor et al., 2011a).

Perceived defeat involves a perception of failed struggle and powerlessness resulting from the loss or significant disruption of social status, identity, or hierarchical goals (Gilbert, 2000; Gilbert & Allan, 1998; Rohde, 2001; Sloman et al., 2003). Gilbert (2000) describes three main classes of events with the potential to induce perceptions of defeat: (1) A failure to attain, or loss of, valued social and material resources; (2) social put-downs or attacks from others; and (3) internal sources of attack, such as self-criticism, unfavourable social comparisons, or unachievable ambitions. Example defeat cognitions include: “I feel I have lost my standing in the world” and “I feel defeated by life” (Gilbert & Allan, 1998). The idea that an individual perceives that they have metaphorically struggled against or been beaten back by one or more triggering experiences, is conceptually important, and distinguishes defeat from loss or failure (Taylor et al., 2011a). Perceptions of defeat in the context of trauma and PTSD have been conceptualised slightly differently to the rest of the defeat literature, as a perceived loss of psychological autonomy, worthiness and competence, and a sense of not being human any more (Dunmore et al., 2001).

Perceived entrapment occurs when the usual psychobiological motivation to escape threat or stress is blocked because of no or low likelihood of individual agency, or rescue by others (Dixon, 1998; Dixon et al., 1989; Gilbert, 2001; Gilbert & Allan, 1998; Sloman et al., 2003). As with perceptions of defeat, individuals can experience perceptions of entrapment in relation to external (e.g., difficult job or relationship; unwanted role as a caregiver) or internal...
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(e.g., health problems; unwanted negative thoughts or emotions) experiences. Example entrapment cognitions include: “I am in a situation I feel trapped in” and “I feel trapped inside myself” (Gilbert & Allan, 1998). Entrapment is differentiated from hopelessness, which does not involve a motivation to escape, or sense of diminished status (Gilbert & Allan, 1998; Ehlers et al, 1998).

Perceptions of defeat and entrapment have been theoretically linked to the development and maintenance of various psychiatric disorders via malfunction of the “Involuntary Defeat Strategy” (IDS) (Sloman, 2000; Sloman et al., 2003; Taylor et al., 2011a). The IDS is thought to be a genetically hard-wired, evolutionarily adaptive response to perceptions of defeat, which is activated automatically as a short-term damage limitation strategy in the context of social competition or conflict for evolutionarily meaningful resources (Gilbert, 1992; Nettle, 2004; Sloman, 2000; Sloman et al., 2003). The IDS functions to signal a submissive no-threat status to others, facilitates withdrawal from unachievable ambitions, and inhibits further activity so as to avoid excessive costs (Price et al., 1994; Sloman et al., 2003). These functions are achieved via the affective, cognitive, and behavioural components of the human IDS, which are thought to include negative cognitions concerning personal adequacy and self-efficacy, toning-down of the positive reward-orientated affect system, behavioural inhibition, and hypervigilance (Taylor et al., 2011a). The IDS is suggested to contribute to perceptions of entrapment, contingent on an individual’s judgment about their ability to escape a defeating experience. Under optimal circumstances, the IDS is assumed to be active for only a brief period of time, deactivating once the individual has managed to escape, obtain help, or accept a particular defeat and move on to new goals (Sloman, 2000). For example, an individual’s IDS could deactivate when they escape an abusive relationship, elicit meaningful help from others, or accept a job loss. Various psychiatric disorders are suggested to emerge as a result of intense, chronic,
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inflexible or inappropriate IDS activation (Nettle, 2004; Sloman et al., 2003; Taylor et al., 2011a).

The Present Study

A recent narrative review reported convergent evidence across a range of designs, samples and measures, of perceptions of defeat and entrapment in depression, anxiety problems, PTSD, and suicidality (Taylor et al., 2011a). The present meta-analysis aims to quantify the size and consistency of these relationships for the first time. We also aim to explore a key but as yet untested question in the literature regarding whether perceptions of defeat and entrapment are stronger in particular psychiatric disorders. For example, do depressed individuals experience stronger perceptions of being defeated than individuals experiencing PTSD, or individuals who are suicidal? Meta-analysis additionally enables us to examine whether a number of potential moderator variables attenuate or accentuate the magnitude of these relationships, and whether the findings reported in the literature to date have been influenced by publication bias. Addressing these questions has the potential to guide the future expansion of the defeat and entrapment literature and highlight the potential importance of perceptions of defeat and entrapment for clinical practice.

Method

Selection of Articles

This review was conducted following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) Standards (Moher et al., 2009). PsycINFO, MEDLINE and Web of Knowledge databases were searched from the end of the systematic literature search conducted for the narrative review (Taylor et al., 2011a), to August 2013, using the following terms: Defeat, entrapment, and trapped, along with anxiety, PTSD, depression, and suicide (depres$, anxi$, suicid$, stress, symptoms, distress). Secondary sources (review articles, book chapters, conference abstracts, reference sections of selected
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articles) were also examined, and all researchers with one or more publication in this area were emailed to request unpublished data and forthcoming research for potential inclusion. These methods yielded a preliminary database of 286 published studies, which included 51 studies included in the previous narrative review (Taylor et al., 2011a). This initial pool of studies was reviewed by two authors (AS and PT) to determine eligibility for inclusion, with 100% agreement.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion criteria for quantitative studies were that they: (1) Used adult (18 years+) participants; (2) were written in English; (3) included a quantitative measure of perceptions of defeat and/or entrapment and a symptom-based or diagnostic measure of depression, anxiety problems, PTSD or suicidality; (4) employed measures with adequate reliability and validity, as demonstrated by published psychometric properties; and (5) reported Pearson’s correlation coefficient $r$ or provided sufficient statistical information to compute this statistic (Borenstein et al., 2009). Authors of papers with unclear statistical information were contacted to request further information. The inclusion and exclusion criteria meant that thirteen studies were excluded from the current meta-analysis which had been included in the narrative review (Taylor et al., 2011a) and eleven studies were included here that had not been included in the previous review. Details of the literature sifting process are shown in Figure 1. Included studies are described in Table 1. Forty studies met all of the requirements for inclusion.

FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE
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**Dependent Effect Sizes**

When studies reported several effect sizes for the same relationship, an average effect size was computed. When studies reported dependent measures of entrapment (e.g., separate internal and external entrapment effect sizes reported within the same study), we applied Cheung and Chan’s adjusted-weighting procedure to calculate an average entrapment effect size with an adjusted sample size (Cheung & Chan, 2004). These procedures ensured that the statistical analyses were based on independent effect sizes in the sense that each study contributed a defeat effect size and/or an entrapment effect size for each specific psychiatric disorder. Two studies contributed effect sizes from two independent samples (Gilbert & Allan, 1998; Gilbert et al., 2002). Data from the first time point was used for longitudinal studies.

**Moderator Variables**

The following information from each included study was coded in order to generate potential moderator variables: Mean age; percentage of sample female; cross-sectional design versus ‘other’ design (longitudinal, prospective); year of publication; clinical versus community sample; type of defeat and entrapment measure; and type of depression measure (see Table 4). The Entrapment subscale of the Personal Beliefs about Illness Questionnaire (PBIQ) consists of items assessing perceptions of psychosis as something frightening and uncontrollable (Birchwood et al., 1993; 2012). Three concerns with this scale meant that we examined the entrapment measure used as a moderator variable: (1) The Entrapment subscale of the PBIQ includes only four items, which are unlikely to capture the full phenomenology of perceptions of entrapment (Taylor et al., 2011a); (2) the scale was developed in the absence of an overarching exploratory or confirmatory factor analysis, meaning that there is no solid evidence to support the authors’ distinction between subscales; and (3) the PBIQ may have poor construct validity, as it appears to measure coping difficulties and low self-
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efficacy, rather than perceptions of entrapment. Following recommendations by Borenstein et al. (2009), subgroups for categorical moderator analyses had to include at least six effect sizes.

Publication Bias
Publication bias was initially assessed through visual inspection of funnel plots. Next, Vevea and Woods’ sensitivity analysis procedure was performed, which applies various a priori weights representing different types and severities of theoretical publication bias effects (Vevea & Woods, 2005). This sensitivity analysis method is argued to be particularly useful compared to alternative methods for detecting publication bias because it estimates bias in the population effect size itself, rather than being dependent on significance testing: It is more useful to know the effect of publication bias on population effect size estimates, and to correct for it, than to know how many studies would be needed to reverse a conclusion (Vevea & Woods, 2005).

Statistical Analyses
Field and Gillett’s (2010) syntax were conducted using SPSS version 19 and R version 3.0.1 to run Hedges and Vevea's (1998) random-effects meta-analysis and Vevea and Woods’ (2005) sensitivity analysis. Twenty-four studies reported both defeat and entrapment effect sizes in relation to a specific psychiatric disorder, enabling a direct comparison of the strength of defeat and entrapment effect sizes within studies. There were sufficient numbers of studies to calculate within study comparisons of defeat and entrapment effect sizes for depression, suicidality and anxiety problems only. We adapted Borenstein et al’s (2009) procedure for comparing dependent standardised mean differences within studies to examine mean differences between dependent correlations within studies. First, a difference score was calculated for each study that reported a defeat and an entrapment effect size in relation to the same psychiatric disorder. The weighted mean of the difference scores for each psychiatric
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disorder was then tested against the Null-Hypothesis of equal means using an inverse variance calculation. A statistically significant positive deviation from 0 indicates that defeat demonstrated the strongest relationship with a particular psychiatric disorder; a statistically significant negative deviation from 0 indicates that entrapment demonstrated the strongest relationship with a particular psychiatric disorder.

Moderator analyses were conducted using a random-effects general linear model (Overton, 1998). Analogue ANOVAs were conducted for categorical moderator variables, and meta-regressions were conducted for continuous moderator variables. The regression coefficient $b$ and its associated 95% confidence interval are reported for continuous moderator variables ($b$ is reported in Fisher’s $Z_r$ units). Spearman’s rho correlation coefficients are reported for continuous moderator analyses.

Results

Forty studies contributed 84 effect sizes for inclusion ($N = 10,072$ adult participants). Sample sizes used in statistical analyses ranged from nine (Clare & Singh, 1994) to 311 (Yoon, 2003) ($M = 119.90, SD = 73.68$). Five studies used a prospective or longitudinal design (20.24% of total effect sizes). Two studies reported diagnostic (categorical) measures of psychiatric disorder (Jobson & O’Kearney; 2009; Karatzias et al., 2007).

Between Study Analyses

Separate analogue ANOVAs were conducted for defeat effect sizes and entrapment effect sizes to examine whether perceptions of defeat and entrapment are stronger in particular psychiatric disorders. These analyses revealed statistically significant differences between the four psychiatric disorder groups in relation to defeat, $Q(3) = 24.33, p = .001$, but not entrapment, $Q(3) = 2.74, p = .46$. Table 2 shows that all population effect size estimates were fairly similar in size and represented statistically reliable, large effects (Cohen, 1998). There was no significant between study heterogeneity. The effect size between defeat and
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depression was particularly large ($r = .73$) and, with the exception of the suicidality and entrapment effect size, was statistically significantly larger than all other effect sizes. This appears to explain the statistically significant ANOVA result of differences across the four psychiatric disorder groups with regard to perceptions of defeat.

**TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE**

**Within Study Analyses**

Table 3 shows that defeat effect sizes were, on average, $r = .11$ statistically significantly larger than entrapment effect sizes in their respective relationship with depression. This result corresponds with the non-overlapping confidence intervals between defeat and depression and entrapment and depression in Table 2. Entrapment effect sizes were, on average, $r = .09$ larger than defeat effect sizes in their respective relationship with suicidality, and this difference was borderline statistically significantly ($p = .06$). On average, defeat and entrapment effect sizes were not statistically significantly different from one another in their respective relationship with anxiety problems.

**TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE**

**Moderator Analyses**

The absence of significant between-study heterogeneity meant that our moderator analyses were conducted in an exploratory fashion, as has been done in previous meta-analyses (Trickey et al., 2012).

**Depression.** Four groups were formed in order to determine whether the measure of depression used moderated depression effect sizes (Table 4). There was a statistically significant moderating effect, $Q(3) = 13.05, p = .005$. Effect sizes obtained using the Beck Depression Inventory were statistically-significantly larger than those obtained using the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale ($Q(1) = 4.91, p = .027$) and ‘Other’ depression measures ($Q(1) = 7.29, p = .007$), and borderline statistically-significantly larger than those
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taken using the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression scale ($Q(1) = 3.49, p = .060$). Two groups were formed in order to determine whether the measure of defeat and entrapment used moderated depression effect sizes (Table 4). There was a statistically-significant moderating effect for measure of defeat and entrapment on depression effect sizes, $Q(1) = 13.93, p = .000$. Table 4 shows that effect size estimates obtained using the Defeat and Entrapment Scales (Gilbert & Allan, 1998) were statistically-significantly larger than those obtained using alternative defeat and entrapment measures. Two groups were formed in order to determine whether the type of sample moderated depression effect sizes. Table 4 shows that effect sizes obtained in community samples were significantly larger than those obtained in clinical samples, $Q(1) = 7.09, p = .008$. The percentage of females in a sample was examined as a continuous moderator of depression effect sizes, revealing a strong positive statistically-significant relationship ($b = .007, p < .001, r_s = .51$), such that studies with a higher percentage of female participants tended to observe larger depression effect sizes. The mean age of samples demonstrated a modest negative statistically-significant relationship with depression effect sizes ($b = -.008, p = .027, r_s = -.32$). Year of publication did not moderate depression effect sizes ($b = .007, p = .181$).

| TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE |

**Anxiety problems.** Year of publication emerged as a strong positive statistically-significant moderator of anxiety problem effect sizes ($b = .023, p = .010, r_s = .74$), indicating that more recently published studies reported a stronger relationship between defeat and entrapment and anxiety problems. By contrast, sample gender composition ($b = .004, p = .077$), mean age ($b = .006, p = .197$) and the type of defeat and entrapment measure used ($Q(1) = 1.62, p = .203$), did not statistically significantly moderate anxiety problem effect sizes.
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*PTSD and suicidality.* Year of publication ($b = .04, p = .320$), sample gender composition ($b = .001, p = .558$), and mean age ($b = .000, p = .986$), did not statistically significantly moderate suicidality effect sizes; year of publication ($b = .010, p = .279$), sample gender composition ($b = .003, p = .381$), and mean age ($b = -.030, p = .090$), did not statistically significantly moderate PTSD effect sizes.

*Entrapment measure.* Use of the PBIQ emerged as a statistically-significant moderator of entrapment effect sizes, $Q(1) = 11.06, p = .001$. Table 4 shows that effect sizes obtained using the PBIQ were statistically significantly smaller than those obtained using alternative measures of entrapment.

**Publication Bias**

Funnel plots relating to the meta-analyses reported in Table 2 were created in order to explore the distribution of effect sizes against their standard errors. These are displayed in Figure 2. Small numbers of studies (> $k = 10$) meant that we did not create a funnel plot for PTSD effect sizes. There were some outliers; however, these appeared in similar numbers at both ends of the effect size distributions, suggesting that these did not unduly bias population effect size estimates. The standard errors for the majority of studies were fairly similar in size and located towards the top of the funnel, suggesting high precision for most of the included studies. The only exception concerned the suicidality effect sizes, which are all located at the base of the funnel plot. Given that some degree of asymmetry is to be expected with relatively few data points (Sterne et al., 2011), the seven funnel plots generally appear fairly symmetrical and funnel-shaped. None of the funnel plots show a sparsely populated left side: the hallmark indicator of publication bias as a result of unpublished studies reporting small effect sizes or null-findings.

INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE
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We next conducted Vevea and Woods’ (2005) sensitivity analysis, which quantifies the effect of publication bias. In Table 2, $r_{pb}$ is reported as an estimate of the population effect size when corrected for severe two-tailed publication bias. Severe two-tailed publication bias refers to a weighting function that simulates a hypothetical scenario in which studies publishing correlations near zero are less likely to be published and included in a meta-analysis, while significant correlations are more likely to be published and therefore included in a meta-analysis (Vevea & Woods, 2005). Comparing the unadjusted $r$ with the adjusted $r_{pb}$ in Table 2, it is evident that the two correlations are almost identical for each meta-analysis. These results and the funnel plots suggest that publication bias had no effect on the results reported.

Discussion

This meta-analysis quantitatively summarised findings from forty studies which examined perceptions of defeat and entrapment in depression, anxiety problems, PTSD, and suicidality; four psychiatric disorders commonly encountered in mental health services (Kessler et al., 2012; Nock et al., 2012). This meta-analysis extends the earlier narrative review of these relationships (Taylor et al., 2011a) by: (1) Bringing the literature synthesis up to date through the inclusion of recent, important studies; (2) applying more stringent inclusion and exclusion criteria, making conclusions more robust; (3) quantifying for the first time the size and consistency of the population effect size for each of the relationships; (4) testing whether perceptions of defeat and entrapment are stronger in depression, anxiety problems, PTSD, or suicidality; (5) examining potential moderator variables; and (6) examining the potential for publication bias in the literature.

The effect sizes reported here are large (Cohen, 1998), providing evidence for the clinical significance of perceptions of defeat and entrapment in depression, anxiety problems, PTSD, and suicidality (Cohen, 1998; Kraemer et al., 2003). Moreover, the publication bias
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analyses indicate that the meta-analytic results are not artificially inflated, and can be considered robust. Given the correlational nature of this meta-analysis, it is worth noting at this point that a number of studies in the literature provide preliminary evidence to suggest that the observed large correlations are not simply due to psychiatric comorbidity (Taylor et al., 2011a). For example, perceptions of defeat have been found to statistically significantly predict suicidality twelve months later when controlling for depressive symptoms (Taylor et al., 2011ab), perceptions of entrapment have been found to statistically significantly predict social anxiety problems when controlling for depressive and psychotic symptoms (Birchwood et al., 2007; Gumley et al., 2004), and perceptions of defeat have been found to statistically significantly predict PTSD when controlling for depression (Jobson & O’Kearney, 2009).

The similar magnitude correlations between defeat and entrapment and the four psychological problems may be noteworthy for suicidality researchers because several theories of suicidality posit a prominent role for perceptions of defeat and entrapment (e.g., Baumeister, 1990; O’Connor, 2011; Williams, 2001). Whilst the present results corroborate these theories, they also suggest that additional variables to defeat and entrapment are needed to explain the specific phenomenology of suicidality. It is noteworthy that our within study analyses revealed a slightly stronger relationship between entrapment and suicidality, relative to the relationship between defeat and suicidality. Although the within study analyses probably have higher validity than the between study analyses, additional research is required to arrive at a firm conclusion regarding whether perceptions of entrapment constitute a particular risk for suicidality, independent of perceptions of defeat.

This meta-analysis assumed that different triggers are interchangeable and homogeneous in bringing about perceptions of defeat or entrapment across different psychiatric disorders. For example, perceptions of entrapment by traumatic experiences were treated as being equivalent to perceptions of entrapment as a result of a caregiving role. The
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absence of significant between-study heterogeneity across all analyses supports this assumption and suggests that the literature should adopt broad (Taylor et al., 2011a) rather than disorder-specific (Birchwood et al., 1993; 2012; Dunmore et al., 2001) definitions and conceptualisations of defeat and entrapment.

Moderator Variables

One important aim of this meta-analysis was to examine whether moderator variables attenuate or accentuate the consistency of perceptions of defeat and entrapment in depression, anxiety problems, PTSD and suicidality. Moderator analysis revealed that the gender composition of samples significantly moderated depression effect sizes, whereby samples containing a higher percentage of females showed a stronger relationship. This finding is consistent with the well-established findings that adult women are twice as likely as men to experience depression (Kessler et al., 1993; Nolen-Hoeksema, 1990). Future research is required to directly explore whether gender and other individual difference and diversity variables such as culture, ethnicity and age, moderate relationships between perceptions of defeat and entrapment, and different psychiatric disorders.

Moderator analysis also revealed that effect sizes obtained using either version of the Beck Depression Inventory (Beck, 1998; beck et al., 1996) were statistically significantly larger than those obtained using alternative depression measures. Future research is needed to explain this finding, but we note that BDI items do not appear to inadvertently measure perceptions of defeat or entrapment. Moderator analysis revealed that depression effect sizes obtained using the Defeat and Entrapment Scales (Gilbert & Allan, 1998) were statistically significantly larger than those obtained using other measures of defeat and entrapment. The moderator analyses which examined measure of depression and measure of defeat and entrapment must be interpreted tentatively because, as a result of low numbers of effect sizes, several different measures were aggregated into one group and compared against the BDI and
the Defeat and Entrapment Scales respectively, which may have masked important
differences. The significant moderator result for the PBIQ potentially suggests that using this
measure may confound entrapment effect sizes, although is possible that different measure
formats (e.g., questionnaire, narrative report) may alternatively explain these moderator
results. We discussed in the Method section various concerns we have related to the
unvalidated factor structure of the PBIQ and its limited item content. We were surprised to
find that depression effect sizes obtained in community samples were significantly larger than
those obtained in clinical samples. One explanation could be that the clinical group may have
had a restricted range of scores, which would have limited the size of correlations. For this
reason, this finding should be interpreted very tentatively.

Limitations

The present findings must be interpreted in the context of several limitations, each of
which points toward important directions for future research. Several aspects of the meta-
analytic methodology warrant discussion, most notably the fact that the meta-analyses for
suicidality, anxiety problems and PTSD were based on relatively small numbers of effect
sizes, which may limit their generalizability. Additionally, failure to obtain a statistically
significant difference among subgroups in most of our moderator analyses should not be
interpreted as evidence that the effect was the same across subgroups because of the potential
for low statistical power arising as a result of low numbers of effect sizes (Borenstein et al.,

It is also important to note the heavy reliance on self-report measures and cross-
sectional designs in the literature. Additional longitudinal and experimental studies which
have the potential to establish temporal precedence and causality, are urgently needed. Only
one study (Park et al., 2010) reported adolescent data that would have been suitable for
inclusion here. This highlights the need to study defeat and entrapment in children and
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adolescents, which may prove to be particularly useful for clarifying questions around vulnerability and onset of perceptions of defeat and entrapment in different psychiatric disorders.

Conducting this review highlighted three recurrent shortcomings of the literature in terms of reporting conventions which are easily remedied by researchers, reviewers and journal Editors. First, it was often the case that studies did not report an effect size for every relationship examined, or sufficient statistical information that could be used to compute an effect size. Second, presentation of descriptive statistics for all variables (rather than just those that were statistically-significant), was inconsistent. Third, sample, design and individual difference variables were inconsistently reported.

Conclusion

Using meta-analysis, we quantitatively synthesised the existing literature and identified large relationships between perceptions of defeat and entrapment and depression, anxiety problems, PTSD, and suicidality. Our results attest to the important role that evolutionary psychology constructs may play in psychological problems. The magnitude of relationships between perceptions of defeat and entrapment and four common psychiatric conditions suggests that clinicians and researchers alike would benefit from becoming more aware of the constructs of defeat and entrapment. We hope that this meta-analysis provides a point of departure in this respect.

This study provided the first empirical test of whether relationships between perceptions of defeat and entrapment differ across psychiatric conditions. We discovered that perceptions of defeat and entrapment generally have similar-sized, strong relationships with depression, anxiety problems, PTSD, and suicidality. This is a particularly intriguing finding, and suggests that perceptions of defeat and entrapment may be transdiagnostic constructs that have similarly important relationships with all psychiatric conditions. Our findings are
consistent with the theory that underpins defeat and entrapment research, which suggests that psychological disorders arise via malfunction of the IDS (Sloman, 2000; Sloman et al., 2003; Taylor et al., 2011a), a genetically hard-wired, evolutionarily adaptive response to perceptions of defeat. The IDS is thought to be activated automatically as a short-term damage limitation strategy in the context of social competition or conflict for evolutionarily meaningful resources (Gilbert, 1992; Nettle, 2004). Psychiatric disorders are suggested to emerge as a result of intense, chronic, inflexible or inappropriate IDS activation (Nettle, 2004; Sloman et al., 2003; Taylor et al., 2011a). The particularly large relationship between defeat and depression is also consistent with IDS theory, which conceptualises depression as the direct consequence of an IDS response that has become dysfunctional (Price et al., 1994; Sloman, 2000; Sturman, 2011; Taylor et al., 2011).

Further research is now needed to explain these results. Two key priorities for the literature involve (1) further clarifying the nature of the psychological aspects of the IDS (e.g., perceptions of defeat and entrapment), and (2) examining whether there is a constant linear relationship between the psychological aspects of the IDS and psychiatric conditions. The former question arises because the “Involuntary Winning Strategy” (IWS) was recently proposed (Sloman, Sturman & Price, 2011). The IWS is thought to be triggered by perceptions of winning and success, and a failure of the IWS to deactivate has been hypothesised as one possible mechanism underlying clinical mania (Sloman & Sturman, 2012). The IDS and IWS are thus both thought to be triggered by the perception of agonistic social encounters, and both constructs have been linked to psychiatric conditions via their inflexible deactivation. Low levels of IDS or IWS activity would be hypothesised to counter (unhelpful) activation of the opposite system. Empirical investigation is now needed to explore this issue and test whether the IWS and IDS are two separate constructs, or in fact opposite poles of the same continuum. Once this work is achieved, it will be important to
clarify whether the psychological aspects of the IDS have a constant linear relationship with different psychiatric conditions in order to shed light on research methodologies that can appropriately be used in the literature. Evidence of a constant linear relationship with psychiatric conditions would support the relevance of experimentally inducing perceptions of defeat and entrapment and using analogue samples (cf. Abramowitz et al., 2014). This research endeavour may also begin to clarify at what point, and why, perceptions of defeat and entrapment become associated with different psychiatric conditions.
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## Meta-Analysis

### Table 1 Characteristics of studies included in the meta-analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Sample details</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Defeat and/or entrapment data analysed</th>
<th>Measure of defeat and/or entrapment</th>
<th>Psychiatric disorder</th>
<th>Measure(s) of psychiatric disorder</th>
<th>Mean age (SD)</th>
<th>Percentage of sample female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allan &amp; Gilbert (2002)</td>
<td>University undergraduates</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>External entrapment</td>
<td>Defeat and Entrapment Scales</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>CES-D</td>
<td>23.40 (8.0)</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birchwood et al (1993)</td>
<td>Medicated; mixed psychosis sample</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Internal entrapment</td>
<td>PBIQ</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>BDI</td>
<td>48.05 (13.2)</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birchwood et al (2007)</td>
<td>First-episode schizophrenia spectrum disorder</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Internal entrapment</td>
<td>PBIQ</td>
<td>Anxiety problems</td>
<td>Social Interaction Anxiety Scale</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carvalho et al (2013) Sample 1</td>
<td>Depressed outpatients</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Defeat; Internal and external entrapment</td>
<td>Defeat and Entrapment Scales</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>BDI</td>
<td>37.9 (10.6)</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carvalho et al (2013) Sample 2</td>
<td>School and private institution community convenience sample</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Defeat; Internal and external entrapment</td>
<td>Defeat and Entrapment Scales</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>BDI</td>
<td>35.9 (10.3)</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare &amp; Singh (1994)</td>
<td>Medicated; Mixed psychosis and other affective disorders</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Internal entrapment</td>
<td>PBIQ</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>BDI</td>
<td>35.00 (Not reported)</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunmore et</td>
<td>Mixed physical</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Defeat</td>
<td>MDTS</td>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>PTSD Symptom</td>
<td>38.10 (11.4)</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Sample details</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Defeat and/or entrapment data analysed</td>
<td>Measure of defeat and/or entrapment</td>
<td>Psychiatric disorder</td>
<td>Measure(s) of psychiatric disorder</td>
<td>Mean age (SD)</td>
<td>Percentage of sample female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunmore et al (1997)</td>
<td>and sexual assault victims</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Defeat</td>
<td>MDTS</td>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>PTSD Symptom Scale Self-Report</td>
<td>38.60 (16.2)</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunmore et al (1999)</td>
<td>Mixed physical and sexual assault victims</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Defeat</td>
<td>MDTS</td>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>PTSD Symptom Scale Self-Report</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunmore et al (2001)</td>
<td>Assault survivors</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Defeat</td>
<td>PSPS</td>
<td>Depression; Anxiety problems</td>
<td>HADS</td>
<td>44.90 (7.2)</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia-Campayo et al (2010)</td>
<td>Chronic pain (Fibromyalgia) outpatients</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>Defeat; Internal and external entrapment</td>
<td>Defeat and Entrapment Scales</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>BDI</td>
<td>22.90 (8.0)</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert &amp; Allan (1998)</td>
<td>University undergraduates</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Defeat; Internal and external entrapment</td>
<td>Defeat and Entrapment Scales</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>BDI</td>
<td>22.90 (8.0)</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert et al (2002)</td>
<td>University undergraduates</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>Defeat; External entrapment</td>
<td>Defeat and Entrapment Scales</td>
<td>Depression; Anxiety problems</td>
<td>MASQ</td>
<td>22.90 (7.7)</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert et al (2002)</td>
<td>Mixed psychiatric inpatients</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Defeat; External entrapment</td>
<td>Defeat and Entrapment Scales</td>
<td>Depression; Anxiety problems</td>
<td>MASQ</td>
<td>36.80 (13.0)</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert et al (2004)</td>
<td>Depressed inpatients and outpatients</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>External entrapment</td>
<td>Custom interview concerning entrapment</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>BDI-II</td>
<td>43.45 (Not reported)</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert et al</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Internal and</td>
<td>Defeat and</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>CES-D</td>
<td>22.07 (7.2)</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Meta-Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Sample details</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Defeat and/or entrapment data analysed</th>
<th>Measure of defeat and/or entrapment</th>
<th>Psychiatric disorder</th>
<th>Measure(s) of psychiatric disorder</th>
<th>Mean age (SD)</th>
<th>Percentage of sample female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2005)</td>
<td>undergraduates</td>
<td></td>
<td>external entrapment</td>
<td>Entrapment Scales</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>BDI</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldstein &amp; Willner (2002)</td>
<td>University undergraduates</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Defeat; Internal and external entrapment</td>
<td>Defeat and Entrapment Scales</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>CES-D; STAI: State subscale</td>
<td>36.90 (8.3)</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffiths et al (2014)</td>
<td>Community sample from low SES backgrounds</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Defeat; Internal and external entrapment</td>
<td>Defeat and Entrapment Scales</td>
<td>Depression; Anxiety problems</td>
<td>Brief Symptoms Interview: Social Anxiety BDI</td>
<td>34.35 (8.4)</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumley et al (2004)</td>
<td>Schizophrenia spectrum disorder</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Internal entrapment</td>
<td>PBIQ</td>
<td>Anxiety problems</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iqbal et al (2000)</td>
<td>Schizophrenia spectrum disorder</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Internal entrapment</td>
<td>PBIQ</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>37.21 (13.4)</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson &amp; O’Kearny (2009)</td>
<td>Community sample: traumatic experiences</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Defeat</td>
<td>Mental defeat rated from narrative PBIQ</td>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>Post-Traumatic Stress Diagnostic Scale SCID: Comorbid Anxiety or Affective Disorder CES-D</td>
<td>36.60 (9.8)</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karatzias et al (2007)</td>
<td>Schizophrenia spectrum disorder</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Internal entrapment</td>
<td>PBIQ</td>
<td>Depression; Anxiety problems</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin et al (2006)</td>
<td>Caregivers of Alzheimer disease patients</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>External entrapment</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Connor et al (2013)</td>
<td>Individuals who had attempted suicide attending A&amp;E</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Defeat; Internal and external entrapment</td>
<td>Defeat and Entrapment Scales</td>
<td>Depression; Suicidality HADS; Suicide Ideation subscale of the Suicide</td>
<td>35.6 (13.24)</td>
<td>58.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Sample details</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Defeat and/or entrapment data analysed</td>
<td>Measure of defeat and/or entrapment</td>
<td>Psychiatric disorder</td>
<td>Measure(s) of psychiatric disorder</td>
<td>Mean age (SD)</td>
<td>Percentage of sample female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panagioti et al (2012)</td>
<td>Community sample: experienced a traumatic event</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Defeat; Internal and external entrapment</td>
<td>Defeat and Entrapment Scales</td>
<td>PTSD; Suicidality</td>
<td>Probability Scale</td>
<td>29.10 (11.5)</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasmussen et al (2010)</td>
<td>Individuals who had attempted suicide</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Defeat; Internal and external entrapment</td>
<td>Defeat and Entrapment Scales</td>
<td>Depression; Anxiety problems; Suicidality</td>
<td>Suicide Probability Scale; HADS</td>
<td>34.92 (13.4)</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stommel et al (1990)</td>
<td>Caregivers of elderly relatives</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>External entrapment</td>
<td>CBS-E</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>19.00 (Not reported)</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturman (2011)</td>
<td>University undergraduates</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Internal and external entrapment</td>
<td>ISQ</td>
<td>Depression; Anxiety problems</td>
<td>CES-D</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturman &amp; Mongrain (2008)</td>
<td>Formerly depressed students</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Internal and external entrapment</td>
<td>Defeat and Entrapment Scales</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>SCID: Depression</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tang et al (2007)</td>
<td>Chronic pain patients</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>Defeat</td>
<td>PSPS</td>
<td>Depression; Anxiety problems</td>
<td>HADS</td>
<td>46.10 (12.3)</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tang et al (2010)</td>
<td>Chronic pain patients</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Defeat</td>
<td>PSPS</td>
<td>Depression; Anxiety problems</td>
<td>HADS</td>
<td>46.10 (Not reported)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor et al (2010)</td>
<td>Schizophrenia spectrum disorder</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Defeat; Internal and external entrapment</td>
<td>Defeat and Entrapment Scales</td>
<td>Beck Scale of Suicidal Ideation</td>
<td>42.50 (11.8)</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Sample details</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Defeat and/or entrapment data analysed</td>
<td>Measure of defeat and/or entrapment</td>
<td>Psychiatric disorder</td>
<td>Measure(s) of psychiatric disorder</td>
<td>Mean age (SD)</td>
<td>Percentage of sample female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor et al (2010)</td>
<td>University undergraduates with past or current suicidal ideation</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>External entrapment</td>
<td>Scales</td>
<td>Suicidality</td>
<td>Suicidal Behaviors Questionnaire–Revised BDI-II; Suicidal Behaviors Questionnaire–Revised CES-D</td>
<td>23.45 (7.1)</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor et al (2011)</td>
<td>University undergraduates</td>
<td></td>
<td>Defeat; Internal and external entrapment</td>
<td>Scales</td>
<td>Depression; Suicidality</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.61 (4.5)</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trachsel et al (2010)</td>
<td>Community sample (general population)</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>Internal and external entrapment</td>
<td>Scales</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>CES-D</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troop &amp; Baker (2008)</td>
<td>Female office workers</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Defeat; Internal and external entrapment</td>
<td>Scales</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>BDI-II</td>
<td>24.60 (7.6)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troop &amp; Hiskey (2013)</td>
<td>Community sample recruited from stress and trauma-related websites</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>Defeat; Internal and external entrapment</td>
<td>Scales</td>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>Post-Traumatic Diagnostic Scale</td>
<td>31.60 (11.4)</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troop et al (2014)</td>
<td>Eating disorder history</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>Defeat; Internal and external entrapment</td>
<td>Scales</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>BDI-II</td>
<td>35.50 (9.9)</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troop (2014)</td>
<td>Eating disorder inpatient and outpatients</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Defeat; Internal and external entrapment</td>
<td>Scales</td>
<td>Depression; PTSD</td>
<td>Post-Traumatic Diagnostic Scale</td>
<td>33.70 (10.3)</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Meta-Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Sample details</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Defeat and/or entrapment data analysed</th>
<th>Measure of defeat and/or entrapment</th>
<th>Psychiatric disorder</th>
<th>Measure(s) of psychiatric disorder</th>
<th>Mean age (SD)</th>
<th>Percentage of sample female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White <em>et al.</em> (2007)</td>
<td>Schizophrenia spectrum disorder</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Internal and external entrapment</td>
<td>PBIQ</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>Calgary Depression Scale for Schizophrenia BDI</td>
<td>39.40 (11.2)</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willner &amp; Goldstein (2001)</td>
<td>Mothers of children with special educational needs</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Defeat; Internal and external entrapment</td>
<td>Defeat and Entrapment Scales</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>BDI</td>
<td>40.20 (7.2)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyatt &amp; Gilbert (1998)</td>
<td>University undergraduates</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Defeat</td>
<td>Defeat and Entrapment Scales</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>CES-D</td>
<td>24.88 (8.3)</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoon (2003)</td>
<td>Caregivers of family member with functional and/or cognitive impairment</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>External entrapment</td>
<td>CBS-E</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>Self-Rating Depression Scale</td>
<td>56.10 (15.6)</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: BDI = Beck Depression Inventory, BDI-II = Beck Depression Inventory – II, CBS-E = Caregiver Burden Scale – Entrapment subscale, CES = Caregiver’s Entrapment Scale, CES-D = Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale, HADS = Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale, MASQ = Mood and Anxiety Symptoms Questionnaire, MDTS = Mental Defeat during Trauma Scale, PBIQ = Personal Beliefs about Illness Questionnaire, PBIQ-R = Personal Beliefs about Illness Questionnaire-Revised, PSPS = Pain Self Perception Scale, SCID = Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV Disorders, STAI-State = State Trait Anxiety Scale – State subscale.
### Table 2

Meta-analyses of perceptions of defeat and entrapment in depression, anxiety problems, posttraumatic stress disorder and suicidality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$Q$</th>
<th>$I^2$ (95% Confidence Interval)$^a$</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>$z$</th>
<th>$r_{pb}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defeat</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42.07</td>
<td>.10 (.00, .39)</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>23.45***</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>.02 (.00, .50)</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>20.11***</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety problems</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>.00 (.00, .71)</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>20.36***</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>.06 (.00, .73)</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>9.50***</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicidality</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>.03 (.00, .75)</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>12.07***</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrapment</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.22</td>
<td>.05 (.00, .32)</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>22.52***</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29.28</td>
<td>.04 (.00, .34)</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>17.48***</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety problems</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>.00 (.00, .66)</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>7.39***</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.00 (.00, .35)</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>14.63***</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicidality</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>.00 (.00, .74)</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>9.91***</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *** = $p < .001$, ** = $p < .01$, * = $p < .05$; $k$ = number of studies; $r_{pb}$ = estimate of the population effect size under severe two-tailed publication bias (Vevea & Woods, 2005). PTSD = posttraumatic stress disorder; $^a$95% confidence intervals are calculated as proposed by Higgins and Thompson (2002).
Table 3
Within study mean difference comparisons of defeat and entrapment effect sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychiatric disorder</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Mean difference Δr (Defeat - Entrapment)</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>2.87**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety problems</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicidality</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-1.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *** = p < .001, ** = p < .01, * = p < .05; k = number of studies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderator</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depression measure</td>
<td>BDI/BDI-II</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>19.26***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CES-D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>29.83***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HADS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>20.86***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other depression measures</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>6.48***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defeat and entrapment measure</td>
<td>Defeat and Entrapment Scales</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>25.49***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other defeat and</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>9.87***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>entrapment measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical status of sample</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>21.88***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>16.88***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *** = \( p < .001 \), ** = \( p < .01 \), * = \( p < .05 \); \( k \) = number of studies; BDI = Beck Depression Inventory, BDI-II = Beck Depression Inventory – II, CES-D = Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale, HADS = Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale, Other depression measures consisted of the Mood and Anxiety Symptoms Questionnaire, Structured clinical interview for DSM-IV disorders, Calgary Depression Scale for Schizophrenia and the Self-Rating Depression Scale, Other defeat and entrapment measures consisted of Personal Beliefs about Illness Questionnaire, Personal Beliefs about Illness Questionnaire-Revised, Mental Defeat During Trauma Scale, Pain Self Perception Scale, Custom Interview Concerning Entrapment, Mental Defeat Rated from Narrative, Carer’s Entrapment Scale and the Carer Burden Scale – Entrapment subscale.
Figure Captions

Figure 1: Flow diagram of the study selection procedure.

Figure 2: Funnel plots of meta-analyses reported in Table 1. Diagonal lines represent a 95% confidence interval.
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