**The Impact of Counter-conditioning on Evaluative Learning via Intersecting Regularities.**

Intersecting Regularities is a new route for changing liking. In a typical IR procedure, individuals perform a task in which they learn that valenced and neutral stimuli are related to each other via one (or more) elements in operant contingencies that intersecting with one another. For instance, a first operant contingency might consist in pressing a red button (R1) in the presence of a positively valenced source stimulus (S1) that leads to the presentation of a neutral outcome (O1). Then in a second contingency, pressing a yellow button (R2) when a neutral target stimulus is present (T1) leads to the exact same outcome (O1). Participants may evaluate the neutral target (T1) more positively than they used to do due to the fact that the two operant contingencies intersect each other in terms of a common outcome (i.e., positive source (S1)🡪 red button (R1) 🡪 neutral stimulus (O1); Neutral target (T1) 🡪 yellow button (R2) 🡪 neutral outcome (O1)). The effectiveness of evaluative learning via IR has been demonstrated on both implicit and explicit attitudes (Hughes, De Houwer & Perugini, 2016). So far IR studies have only focused on attitude formation (i.e., establishing evaluations for novel stimuli). However, an important aspect of (evaluative) learning is how to change evaluations once they’ve been acquired. In Evaluative Conditioning (EC), for instance, one way of altering evaluative responses is via *counter-conditioning*. The aim of the present contribution is to investigate whether counter-conditioning can also be used to change recently acquired evaluative responses via intersecting regularities.

**IR and Counter-conditioning**

In EC, counter-conditioning refers to an experimental procedure containing two phases. In the first phase (acquisition), the individual is exposed to a contingency between two stimuli - a conditioned stimulus (CS) and an unconditioned stimulus (US). The second phase (counter-conditioning) consists of the presentation of the CS with a US of opposite valence. Counter-conditioning seems effective in changing the valence of a stimulus (e.g., Kerkhof, Vansteenwegen, Baeyens, & Hermans, 2011; Baeyens, Eelen, Van den Bergh, & Crombez, 1989).

**Counterconditioning via IR (‘ReWiring the Intersection’)**

**Study 6**

One way of inducing counter-conditioning via IR would be to use the same stimuli presented during the acquisition phase, but by simply switching the outcomes (i.e., “reconfigure the intersections” rather than replacing the valenced stimuli) (e.g., train the following during counter-conditioning: S1🡪R1🡪O1; T1🡪R2🡪O2; S2🡪R3🡪O2; T2🡪R4🡪O1). In this way a positive source (S1) that in the acquisition phase used to intersect with a neutral target (T1) because of a common outcome (O1), would now intersect with a different target (T2) in the counterconditioning phase.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ACQUISITION** | | | **COUNTERCONDITIONING** | | |
| **STIMULUS** | **RESPONSE** | **OUTCOME** | **STIMULUS** | **RESPONSE** | **OUTCOME** |
| Positive source (S1) | Press D (R1) | **Neutral outcome (O1)** | Positive source (S1) | Press D (R1) | Neutral outcome (O1) |
| Neutral target (T1) | Press C (R2) | **Neutral outcome (O1)** | Neutral target (T1) | Press C (R2) | **Neutral outcome (O2)** |
| Negative source (S2) | Press J (R3) | **Neutral outcome (O2)** | Negative source (S2) | Press J (R3) | Neutral outcome (O2) |
| Neutral target (T2) | Press N (R4) | **Neutral outcome (O2)** | Neutral target (T2) | Press N (R4) | **Neutral outcome (O1)** |