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Dear Professor Brown-Schmidt,

Please find attached a manuscript titled “Effects on the Affect Misattribution Procedure are Strongly Moderated by Awareness”, to be considered for publication in *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*.

The Affect Misattribution Procedure (Payne, Cheng, Govorun, & Stewart, 2005) is one of the most frequently-used tasks in the study of implicit cognition. Over the past 15 years it has been used in social psychology (to measure attitudes and stereotypes towards race and gender outgroups; to predict sexual preferences and political orientation), personality psychology (to measure self-concept in terms of Big Five dimensions), health psychology (to predict exercise behaviors and problematic alcohol consumption), and clinical psychology (to predict self-harm, child abuse, depression, and anxiety). The AMP is used to provide insight into various forms of implicit cognition, and more recently, to prospectively predict clinical phenomena and benchmark the effectiveness of psychological interventions. It has also inspired a new wave of methodologies such as the Semantic Misattribution Procedure, the Emotion Misattribution Procedure, and Truth Misattribution Procedure.

Its success is due - in large part - to its apparent ability to capture psychological processes that occur implicitly (outside of a person’s awareness or intent). If it transpired that AMP effects were actually driven by awareness or intent, then this would pose a serious challenge to how we have interpreted past AMP research and the measure’s present and future use and utility.

Across eight preregistered studies (*N* = 1603) plus meta-analyses we re-examined the ‘implicitness’ of AMP effects, and in particular, the idea that people are unaware of the prime’s influence on their evaluations. Results indicated that AMP effects and their predictive validity are primarily moderated by a subset of influence aware trials (within individuals), and high rates of influence awareness (between individuals). An individual’s influence awareness rate on one AMP predicted how they performed on an earlier AMP, even when the two assessed different attitude domains. Taken together, our results suggest that AMP effects are not implicit in the way that has been claimed, a finding that has implications for the procedure, past findings, and theory. All materials and data are available at osf.io/gv7cm

Given the AMP’s use across many areas of psychological science, as well as it’s centrality to theory and application throughout the field, we believe our manuscript fits well with the aims and scope of JEP:G, and will be of interest to the journal’s broad readership.

All authors have approved the current version of the manuscript and made significant contributions to its writing and conceptualization. The manuscript meets the guidelines for ethical conduct and reporting of research, and holds no potential or actual conflicts of interest. The manuscript is not under review elsewhere; the data have not been published previously or accepted for publication.

Kind Regards,

Sean Hughes ([sean.hughes@ugent.be](mailto:sean.hughes@ugent.be))
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