**General Information**

* In this line of work we introduce the *shared features principle* which refers to the idea that, when two stimuli share one feature, people often assume that they share others features as well.
* In most EC studies the shared feature is *contiguity*: the target stimulus and source stimulus are similar with regard to their spatio-temporal properties. However – *in principle* – stimuli can share other features (e.g., color/size). When this occurs people may assume those stimuli also share other features such as their valence.
* In Experiments 1-6 we explored this idea using *color and size* as a shared feature. Within the same learning procedure, source and target stimuli were presented in either the same or different colors or sizes.
* We assumed that sources and targets which shared a feature would produce larger evaluative effects than those that did not share a feature.
* Experiments 1, 3, 4 and 5 confirmed our hypothesis, showing that targets acquire the valence of the source that shares the same feature as the target. This effect was evident on implicit and explicit measures of evaluation and behavioral intentions.
* Experiment 6 replicated and extended our prior findings while also controlling for an alternative (‘odd-one-out’) explanation.
* In Experiment 7 we further extend our paradigm into a new domain (social evaluations). Until now, all evaluations have been formed towards unknown nonsense words. In order to demonstrate the generalizability of our findings, we decided to use an alternative paradigm with a different set of target stimuli (unknown male faces) and shared features (location).
* Specifically, we now present a stream of stimuli one at a time in random order – either a positive stimulus, negative stimulus, neutral face 1, neutral face 2. There is no contingency between either the valenced stimuli and/or the neutral stimuli. Thus any change in liking towards the faces cannot be due to the pairing of stimuli (i.e., it is not an EC effect).
* Prior to the acquisition phase, participants are told that the computer will pull images and words from two bags (the identity of the bags is varied across blocks of trials). They are told that the computer will show them what image or word was pulled from each bag. During the acquisition phase, and during the presentation of the aforementioned stimuli, participants see the following above the stimulus “Pulled from Bag 1/2/3/4/5/6 [specific number shown depends on the block of trials and stimulus assignment to bags]”.
* In this way, participants learn that one neutral face is pulled from the same bag as positive words whereas the second face is pulled from the same bag as negative words. Thus the fact that a target (neutral face) and source (valenced) image share one feature (bag: location) leads people to infer that the target and source share another feature (valence).
* In order to demonstrate that the effect is not due to EC we will add a second condition where the information about the bags is removed and all other information is retained. In this way, if the change in evaluation does not emerge then we can be sure that it is not an instance of EC and that it is dependent on the shared feature.
* During the review process, a reviewer argued that it would be an even stronger demonstration if we showed this effect while simultaneously telling people that the words and images being pulled from the bags was random. In other words, that there is no connection between the words and images, and that there is no such thing as a good or bad bag. Demonstrating an effect under these conditions would serve as a strong parallel to the minimal groups paradigm effect (and strengthen our claim that the latter is one instance of the shared feature effect).
* Note: even if the effect only emerges in the shared features condition, and not in the random condition, we would still provide evidence for the shared feature effect with yet another shared feature (common location or origin) and a new target stimulus (social stimuli).