

Study 1

For brevity of reporting, we used the following acronyms for experimental conditions.

Social Curiosity: SC

Unguided Social Curiosity: USC

Object Curiosity: OC

No Curiosity: NC

I. Participant

S1. Power analysis for three guided conditions (SC, OC, NC conditions).

A power analysis was conducted using the *LRcat* package in RStudio (Aberson, 2024) prior to data collection to determine the required sample size. The analysis indicated that a total of 96 participants would be sufficient to detect medium condition effect on children's choice in the Choice Task using a logistic regression, assuming 80% power and an alpha level of .05.

The effect size was estimated based on (1) pilot data ($N = 19$, $n_{SC} = 7$, $n_{OC} = 7$, $n_{NC} = 5$) and subsequently corroborated through review of (2) prior developmental studies (e.g., Colantonio & Bonawitz, 2018; Stamkou et al., 2023) that employed a between-subject design and conducted a single, brief intervention targeting an epistemic emotion (e.g., awe), using a similar experimental paradigm.

Specifically, a logistic regression with the pilot data revealed that the odds of choosing Sam in the SC condition were 1.77 times higher than in the OC condition ($p = .023$), suggesting a small-to-medium effect in the primary contrast. Combined with Colantonio & Bonawitz (2018) and Stamkou et al. (2023), where medium- to-large effect sizes were reported, we anticipated a medium-sized effect.

The USC condition was added following a reviewer's suggestion to diversify the extension measures and evaluate the robustness of the task, after data collection for the three guided conditions had been completed. As this condition was not part of the original power analysis, its sample size was set to match the guided conditions to maintain balanced group sizes across conditions.

S2. Exclusion criteria and demographic information

An additional 12 children were recruited but excluded due to procedural errors ($n = 2$), refusal to complete the task ($n = 2$), caregiver interference in children's decision-making ($n = 2$), failing to understand the task instructions ($n = 3$), or falling outside the target age range ($n = 3$). Thus, the final sample was 128, and based on caregiver report, 59% of children were identified as White, 15% as Multiracial, 12% as Latinx/Hispanic/Latin American, 9% as Asian/Asian American, 3% as Black/African American, 2% as Native American/American Indian/Alaskan Native, and less than 1% Not Listed. Most caregivers had completed higher education (8% high school diploma, 17% some college, 36% college degree, 39% graduate degree).

II. Methods

S3. Justification Coding for the Choice Task and the Extension Choice Task

Separate coding schemes were developed for each task based on recurring themes in children's explanations. While some codes were shared across the tasks, others reflected task-specific reasoning patterns.

Table S3a. Summary of the justification coding scheme for the Choice Task

Main Classification	Subcategory	Definition	Example
Knowledge Gap	NA	Expressing a feeling of uncertainty and/or directly or indirectly mentioning a lack of knowledge	I need more information about Sam/the Apple House
Others	Certainty	Indicating an abundance of information/knowledge about the choice	I know a lot about Sam/the Apple House
	Personal Preference	Stating one's subjective inclination for the choice	I love apples; I love traveling
	Characteristic	Explaining characteristics of the choice based on the obtained information during the game or personal beliefs and observations	It looks fun; S/he looks like a cool person
	Higher Category	Mentioning the broader category of the choice	Because s/he is a human; I love fruits
	Cannot Articulate	Not providing a reason after asking three times	I don't know

Notes. Examples were drawn from participants' responses. The categories were not mutually exclusive, meaning that children's responses could belong to multiple categories.

Table S3b. Summary of the justification coding scheme for the Extension Choice Task

Main Classification	Subcategory	Definition	Example
Unresolved Curiosity	NA	Indicating unresolved curiosity or a continuation of interest stemming from the initial choice in the Choice Task.	They (Sam and Erin) are the same things (category)
Others	Knowledge Gap	Expressing uncertainty or lack of knowledge about the new topics,	Because I don't know Erin

	without linking it to the initial choice.	I haven't learned Erin/the Strawberry House yet
Personal Preference	Stating one's subjective inclination for the choice	I love strawberries; I love traveling
Characteristic	Explaining characteristics of the choice based on the obtained information during the game or personal beliefs and observations	It looks fun; S/he looks like a cool person
Cannot Articulate	Not providing a reason after asking three times	I don't know

Notes. Examples were drawn from participants' responses. The categories were not mutually exclusive, meaning that children's responses could belong to multiple categories.

III. Results

S4. Choice task

Testing model:

Main effect: $\text{glm}(\text{choice} \sim \text{condition} + \text{counterbalancing} + \text{centered trait social curiosity})$

Interaction effect: $\text{glm}(\text{choice} \sim \text{condition} * \text{centered trait social curiosity} + \text{counterbalancing})$

Since the interaction term was not significant ($\chi^2(3)=2.25, p=.523$), we reported the results from the main effect model.

Table S4a. Logistic regression results predicting learning choice by condition

	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z-value</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p-value</i>
Intercept	2.01	0.54	3.75	[1.04, 3.16]	<.001
USC	-1.04	0.60	-1.74	[-2.27, 0.10]	.082
NC	-2.02	0.60	-3.35	[-3.27, -0.89]	<.001
OC	-3.31	0.69	-4.8	[-4.77, -2.05]	<.001
Counterbalancing	-0.94	0.43	2.20	[-1.81, 0.12]	.028
Trait Social Curiosity	0.12	0.29	0.42	[-0.45, 0.69]	.674

Notes. Reference group: Social Curiosity condition. Apple House coded as 0, Sam coded as 1. There was a main effect of the counterbalancing order of the question. Sam first coded as 0, Apple House first coded as 1. Specifically, when Sam was presented first ("Do you want to learn more about Sam or the Apple House?"), children were more likely to choose Sam, suggesting a possible primacy effect.

Table S4b. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons of the odds of choosing Sam

	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z-value</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p-value</i>
--	-----------------	-----------	----------------	---------------	----------------

SC-USC	1.04	0.60	1.74	[-0.50, 2.57]	.303
SC-NC	2.02	0.60	3.35	[0.47, 3.57]	.004
SC-OC	3.31	0.69	4.80	[1.54, 5.08]	<.001
USC-NC	0.98	0.54	1.82	[-0.40, 2.36]	.264
USC-OC	2.27	0.63	3.60	[0.65, 3.89]	.002
NC-OC	1.29	0.63	2.07	[-0.32, 2.90]	.165

Notes. Estimates represent differences in the log-odds of choosing Sam (coded as 1) over Apple House (coded as 0) between conditions. Tukey's HSD p-value correction was applied.

In addition to the logistic regression, we conducted binomial exact tests to evaluate whether the observed proportion of children choosing Sam in each condition significantly differed from 50%. As shown in Table S5, significantly more than half of the children chose Sam in the SC condition and chose the Apple House in the OC condition. In contrast, children's choices in the USC and NC condition were evenly distributed between the two options.

Table S4c. Binomial exact test of children's learning choice against chance

Number of Children			
Condition	Sam	Apple House	Binomial Test
SC	26	6	81.3% [63.56, 92.79]*** Cohen's $g = 0.31$
USC	20	12	62.5% [43.69, 78.90] Cohen's $g = 0.13$
NC	13	19	40.6% [23.70, 59.36] Cohen's $g = 0.09$
OC	5	27	15.6% [5.28, 32.79]*** Cohen's $g = 0.34$

Notes. 95% CIs are presented in brackets; $p < .001$ ***; Cohen's $g > 0.25$ is considered a large effect size (Cohen, 2013).

S5. Justifications in the Choice Task

Table S5a. Breakdown of children's justifications in the Choice Task

Condition	Choice	Knowledge Gap	Certainty	Personal Preference	Characteristic	Higher Category	Cannot Articulate	Total
SC	Sam ($n = 26$)	20		2	1	1	3	27
	AH ($n = 6$)		1	3	2		1	7
USC	Sam ($n = 20$)	15		2	4		1	20
	AH ($n = 12$)		3	5	6			14
OC	Sam ($n = 5$)		3	1			1	5

NC	AH ($n = 27$)	17	7	3		1	28
	Sam ($n = 13$)	1	6	7	2	1	17
	AH ($n = 19$)	2	6	9	1	3	21

Notes. AH = Apple House. n in the Choice column indicates the number of children who selected the corresponding topic. Categories are not mutually exclusive; if a child mentioned multiple categories, each was counted separately. The Total column reflects the number of justification instances, which may exceed the number of children in the Choice column because some children provided more than one justification.

Table S5b. Binomial exact test for justifications of choosing the Apple House

Condition	Number of Children		Binomial Test
	KG	Other	
SC	0	6	-
USC	0	12	-
NC	2	17	10.5% [1.30, 33.14] *** Cohen's $g = 40$
OC	17	10	63.0% [42.37, 80.60] Cohen's $g = 0.13$

Notes. KG = Knowledge gaps. $p < .001^{***}$; Cohen's $g > 0.25$ is considered a large effect size (Cohen, 2013).

S6. Rating Task

Table S6a. Means and standard deviations of children's ratings for each topic by condition

Condition	Mean (SD)	
	Sam	Apple House
SC	4.38 (1.16)	2.81 (1.73)
USC	3.25 (1.57)	3.34 (1.68)
OC	1.88 (1.43)	4.59 (0.91)
NC	3.13 (1.68)	3.81 (1.55)

Notes. Scores on scale ranging from 1 ("a little") to 5 ("the most")

Table S6b. Correlations between children's choices and ratings

	1	2	3
1. Choice (0 = Apple House, 1 = Sam)	-	.73***	-0.61***
2. Sam Rating		-	-0.46***
3. Apple House Rating			-

Notes. Pearson's product-moment correlations were used. Correlations were calculated across all conditions combined. *** $p < .001$

Table S6c. Mixed-effects multiple regression results for condition $\times$ topic interaction predicting curiosity rating

Testing model:

Main effect: $\text{lmer}(\text{rating} \sim \text{condition} + \text{topic} + \text{counterbalancing} + \text{centered trait social curiosity})$

Interaction effect: $\text{lmer}(\text{rating} \sim \text{condition} * \text{topic} + \text{counterbalancing} + \text{centered trait social curiosity})$

Since the interaction term was significant ($\chi^2(3) = 62.69, p < .001$), we reported the results from the interaction effect model.

	Estimate	SE	z-value	95% CI	p-value
Intercept	4.35	0.27	15.91	[3.81, 4.88]	<.001
USC	-1.18	0.37	-3.23	[-1.91, -0.46]	.001
OC	-2.50	0.36	-6.88	[-3.22, -1.79]	<.001
NC	-1.31	0.37	-3.58	[-2.03, -0.59]	<.001
Apple House	-1.56	0.36	-4.30	[-2.28, -0.85]	<.001
Counterbalancing	0.06	0.18	0.32	[-0.30, 0.42]	.752
Trait Social Curiosity	0.03	0.13	0.20	[-0.23, 0.28]	.844
USC * Apple House	1.69	0.52	3.26	[0.67, 2.71]	.001
OC * Apple House	4.28	0.51	8.32	[3.27, 5.29]	<.001
NC * Apple House	2.40	0.52	4.63	[1.38, 3.42]	<.001

Notes. Reference: Social Curiosity condition and Sam rating. For counterbalancing order, the case in which Sam was rated first was coded as 0.

Table S6d. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons for ratings of Sam (top) and the Apple House (bottom).

Sam Rating					
Contrast	Estimate	SE	t-value	95% CI	p-value
SC - USC	1.18	0.37	3.16	[0.22, 2.15]	0.009

SC - NC	1.31	0.37	3.50	[0.34, 2.28]	0.003
SC - OC	2.5	0.37	6.74	[1.54, 3.46]	< .001
USC - NC	0.13	0.38	0.34	[-0.85, 1.10]	0.986
USC - OC	1.32	0.37	3.52	[0.35, 2.29]	0.003
NC - OC	1.19	0.37	3.18	[0.22, 2.16]	0.009

Apple House Rating					
Contrast	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t-value</i>	95% CI	<i>p-value</i>
OC - SC	1.78	0.37	4.80	[0.82, 2.74]	< .001
OC - USC	1.27	0.37	3.40	[0.31, 2.24]	0.004
OC - NC	0.69	0.37	1.85	[-1.66, 0.28]	0.254
NC - SC	1.09	0.37	2.91	[0.12, 2.06]	0.021
NC - USC	0.58	0.38	1.54	[-0.39, 1.56]	0.415
USC - SC	0.51	0.37	1.36	[-0.46, 1.48]	0.527

Notes. Tukey's HSD p-value correction was applied.

S7. Robust linear mixed-effect models for the Rating Task

Preliminary analyses revealed that residuals from the linear models were not normally distributed. Thus, robust generalized mixed-effects models with the *robustlmm* package were additionally conducted (Koller, 2016). Importantly, the results critical for testing the main hypotheses remained consistent across the linear and robust models. Thus, the results from the regular linear-mixed effects models were reported in the main text, but both are reported below. *Testing model: $rlmer(rating \sim condition * topic + counterbalancing + centered\ trait\ social\ curiosity + (1|ID))$*

Table S7. Robust mixed-effects multiple regression results for condition $\times$ topic interaction predicting curiosity rating

	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t-value</i>
Intercept	4.41	0.31	14.17
USC	-1.22	0.42	-2.93
OC	-2.71	0.41	-6.54
NC	-1.37	0.42	-3.28
Apple House	-1.66	0.41	-4.01
Counterbalancing	0.07	0.21	0.34
Trait Social Curiosity	0.01	0.15	0.04
USC * Apple House	1.83	0.59	3.10
OC * Apple House	4.56	0.59	7.80
NC * Apple House	2.60	0.59	4.41

Notes. Reference: Social Curiosity condition and Sam rating. For counterbalancing order, the case in which Sam was rated first was coded as 0. As the *robustlmm* package does not provide *p*-values for predictors, $t > |2.0|$ is considered indicating a statistically significant effect (Gelman & Hill, 2007; Lenhart et al., 2019).

S8. Extension Choice Task

Note that only children in the guided conditions (SC, OC, and NC) completed this task.

Testing model: $glm(new\ choice \sim condition + counterbalancing + centered\ trait\ social\ curiosity)$

Interaction effect: $glm(choice \sim condition * centered\ trait\ social\ curiosity + counterbalancing)$

Since the interaction term was significant ($\chi^2(2)=8.89, p = .012$), we reported results from both the main effect and interaction models.

Table S8a. Logistic regression results predicting extension learning choice by condition

	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z-value</i>	95% CI	<i>p-value</i>
Intercept	-0.26	0.50	-0.52	[-1.26, 0.71]	.601
NC	-1.49	0.61	-2.44	[-2.75, -0.33]	.015
OC	-1.48	0.62	-2.40	[-2.75, -0.31]	.017
Counterbalancing	0.60	0.52	1.15	[-0.40, 1.64]	.249
Trait Social Curiosity	0.45	0.37	1.21	[-0.26, 1.22]	.226

Notes. Reference group: Social Curiosity condition. For counterbalancing order, the case in which the Strawberry House was presented first in the question (“Do you want to learn more about the Strawberry House or Erin?”) was coded as 0.

Table S8b. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons of the odds of choosing Erin

	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z-value</i>	95% CI	<i>p-value</i>
SC-NC	1.48	0.62	2.40	[0.03, 2.92]	.044
SC-OC	1.49	0.61	2.44	[0.06, 2.92]	.039
NC-OC	-0.01	0.66	-0.02	[-1.56, 1.53]	.999

Notes. Estimates represent differences in the log-odds of choosing Erin over the Strawberry House between conditions. Tukey's HSD *p*-value correction was applied.

In addition to the logistic regression, we conducted binomial exact tests to evaluate whether the observed proportion of children choosing Erin in each condition significantly differed from 50%. As shown in Table S8c, significantly fewer than half of the children chose Erin in the NC and OC conditions, indicating a strong baseline preference for the Strawberry House. However, this preference was no longer observed in the SC condition, which raises the possibility that social curiosity about one target may reduce baseline preferences for an exciting new object, and extend to novel social targets.

Table S8c. Binomial exact test of children’s extension learning choice against chance

Number of Children			
Condition	Erin	Strawberry House	Binomial Test
SC	14	13	51.9% [31.95, 71.33] Cohen’s <i>g</i> = 0.02
NC	7	23	23.3% [9.93, 42.28]* Cohen’s <i>g</i> = 0.27

OC	6	24	20% [7.71, 38.57] ^{***} Cohen's $g = 0.3$
----	---	----	---

Notes: 95% CIs are presented in brackets; $p < .01^{**}$; $p < .001^{***}$. Cohen's $g > |0.25|$ is considered a large effect size. The Extension Choice tasks were added after 8 participants had already participated ($n_{SC} = 4$, $n_{OC} = 2$, $n_{NC} = 2$), resulting in different sample sizes across conditions. In the SC condition, two additional children were excluded due to refusal to complete the task ($n = 1$).

Table S8d. Logistic regression results for condition $\times$ trait social curiosity interaction predicting extension learning choice

	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z-value</i>	95% CI	<i>p-value</i>
Intercept	-0.24	0.51	-0.48	[-1.27, 0.76]	.634
NC	-2.44	1.06	-2.30	[-5.39, -0.76]	.021
OC	-1.48	0.62	-2.37	[-2.78, -0.30]	.018
Counterbalancing	-0.64	0.61	-1.04	[-1.97, 0.49]	.297
Trait Social Curiosity	0.51	0.54	0.94	[-0.54, 1.61]	.346
NC * Trait SC	3.31	1.41	2.35	[0.99, 6.92]	.019
OC * Trait SC	1.28	0.97	1.32	[-0.54, 3.34]	.187

Notes. Reference group: Social Curiosity condition. For counterbalancing order, the case in which Strawberry House was presented first in the question ("Do you want to learn more about the Strawberry House or Erin?") was coded as 0.

Table S8e. Simple slopes for the main effect of trait social curiosity on extension learning choice

	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z-value</i>	95% CI	<i>p-value</i>
SC	-0.64	0.61	-1.04	[-1.84, 0.56]	.297
NC	2.67	1.27	2.101	[0.19, 5.15]	.035
OC	0.65	0.76	0.85	[-0.84, 2.13]	.393

Notes. Estimates represent differences in the log-odds of choosing Erin over the Strawberry House between conditions.

S9. Justifications in the Extension Choice Task

Table S9a. Breakdown of children's justifications in the Extension Choice Task

Condition	Choice	Unresolved Curiosity	Knowledge Gap	Personal Preference	Characteristic	Cannot Articulate	Total
SC	Erin ($n = 14$)	5	1	2	1	5	14
	SH ($n = 13$)			3	10	2	15
NC	Erin ($n = 7$)	2		4	6		12
	SH ($n = 23$)		5	10	8	2	25
OC	Erin ($n = 6$)		2	1	4		7
	SH ($n = 24$)	5	2	12	6		25

Notes: SH = Strawberry House. Categories are not mutually exclusive. Therefore, when children referenced multiple categories, each corresponding category was counted once.

Table S9b. Binomial exact test for justifications of choosing the Strawberry House

Condition	Number of Children		Binomial Test
	UC	Other	
SC	0	13	-
NC	0	23	-
OC	5	19	26.3% [0.09, 0.51] Cohen's $g = 0.26$

Notes. UC = Unresolved curiosity from the Choice Task. Cohen's $g > 0.25$ is considered a large effect size (Cohen, 2013).

S10. Extension Rating Task

Table S10a. Means and standard deviations of children's ratings for each topic by condition

Condition	Mean (SD)	
	Erin	Strawberry House
SC	3.68 (1.40)	3.68(1.42)
NC	3.22(1.56)	4.09(1.40)
OC	2.78(1.75)	4.31(1.12)

Notes: Scores on scale ranging from 1("a little") to 5 ("the most").

Table S10b. Correlations between children's extension choices and ratings

	1	2	3
1. Choice (0 = Strawberry House, 1 = Erin)	-	.53***	-0.59***
2. Erin Rating		-	-0.19
3. Strawberry House Rating			-

Notes. Pearson's product-moment correlations were used. Correlations were calculated across all conditions combined. *** $p < .001$

Table S10c. Mixed-effects multiple regression results predicting extension curiosity rating
Testing model:

Main effect: lmer (rating ~ condition + topic + counterbalancing + centered trait social curiosity)

*Interaction effect: lmer (rating ~ condition*topic + counterbalancing + centered trait social curiosity)*

Since the interaction term was significant ($\chi^2(2) = 8.96, p = .011$), we reported the results from the interaction effect model.

	Estimate	SE	t-value	95% CI	p-value
Intercept	3.65	0.28	13.11	[3.10, 4.20]	<.001
NC	-0.47	0.36	-1.28	[-1.18, 0.25]	0.202
OC	-0.9	0.36	-2.5	[-1.61, -0.19]	0.013
Strawberry House Rating	0.0	0.36	0.0	[-0.71, 0.71]	1.000
Counterbalancing	0.07	0.21	0.34	[-0.34, 0.48]	0.738
Trait Social Curiosity	0.14	0.15	0.91	[-0.16, 0.44]	0.363
NC * Strawberry House	0.94	0.51	1.82	[-0.08, 1.95]	0.070
OC * Strawberry House	1.53	0.51	3.01	[0.53, 2.53]	0.003

Notes. Reference: Social Curiosity condition and Erin rating. For counterbalancing order, the case in which Strawberry House was rated first was coded as 0.

Table S10d. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons for ratings of Erin (top) and the Strawberry House (bottom).

Erin Rating					
Contrast	Estimate	SE	t-value	95% CI	p-value
SC - OC	0.90	0.37	2.48	[0.03, 1.77]	.040
SC - NC	0.47	0.37	1.25	[-0.41, 1.34]	.424
NC - OC	0.44	0.37	1.18	[-0.43, 1.30]	.465

Strawberry House Rating					
Contrast	Estimate	SE	t-value	95% CI	p-value
OC-SC	0.63	0.37	1.72	[-0.24, 1.50]	.202
OC-NC	0.16	0.37	0.44	[-0.71, 1.03]	.901
NC-SC	0.47	0.37	1.27	[-0.41, 1.35]	.412

Notes. Tukey's HSD p-value correction was applied.

S11. Robust linear mixed-effect models for the Extension Rating Task

Preliminary analyses revealed that residuals from the linear models were not normally distributed. Thus, robust generalized mixed-effects models with the robustlmm package were additionally conducted (Koller, 2016). However, the results critical for testing the main hypotheses remained consistent across the linear and robust models. Thus, the results from the regular linear-mixed effects models were reported.

Testing model: *rlmer(new rating ~ condition*topic + counterbalancing + centered trait social curiosity + (1|ID))*

Table S11. Robust mixed-effects multiple regression results for condition × topic interaction predicting extension curiosity rating

	Estimate	SE	t-value
Intercept	3.73	0.3	12.24
NC	-0.53	0.4	-1.33
OC	-1.08	0.39	-2.74
Strawberry House Rating	-0.02	0.4	-0.05
Counterbalancing	0.12	0.23	0.51
Trait Social Curiosity	0.14	0.17	0.84
NC * Strawberry House	1.09	0.56	1.94
OC * Strawberry House	1.72	0.56	3.08

Notes. Reference: Social Curiosity condition and Erin rating. For counterbalancing order, the case in which Strawberry House was rated first was coded as 0. As the *robustlmm* package does not provide *p*-values for predictors, $t > |2.0|$ is considered indicating a statistically significant effect (Gelman & Hill, 2007; Lenhart et al., 2019).

S12. Willingness-to-Pay Task.

Note that children only in the Unguided Social Curiosity condition completed this task.

Testing model:

Main effect: *glm(trading decision ~ learning choice + counterbalancing + centered trait social curiosity)*

Interaction effect: *glm(trading decision ~ condition*centered trait social curiosity + counterbalancing)*

Since the interaction term was not significant ($\chi^2(1)=1.98$, $p=.159$), we reported the results from the main effect model.

Table S12. Logistic regression results predicting trading decision by learning choice

	Estimate	SE	z-value	95% CI	p-value
Intercept	-0.21	0.74	-0.29	[-1.75, 1.27]	0.775
Learning Choice	1.36	0.96	1.41	[-0.49, 3.40]	0.159
Counterbalancing	1.44	1.00	1.44	[-0.43, 3.64]	0.151
Trait Social Curiosity	-0.95	0.66	-1.43	[-2.53, 0.21]	0.152

Notes. Learning choice refers to children's choices in the Choice Task (Apple House coded as 0, Sam coded as 1). Did not trade coded as 0, Traded coded as 1. For counterbalancing order, the case in which the "trading" option was presented first in the question ("Do you want to trade your stickers to learn more about Sam or keep them for yourself?") was coded as 0.

Study 2

For brevity of reporting, we used the following acronyms for experimental conditions.

Social Curiosity: SC

Unguided Social Curiosity: USC

Object Curiosity: OC

No Curiosity: NC

I. Participant

S13. Power Analysis

A power analysis was conducted using the pwr package in RStudio (Champely, 2020) prior to data collection to determine the required sample size. The analysis indicated that 96 participants would be sufficient to detect a small to medium interaction effect between condition and trait social curiosity on children's sharing, after controlling for age, with 80% power and an alpha level of .05. The effect size was estimated based on prior research employing interventions comparable to the current study (brief, single-session, between-subjects design) aimed at promoting children's sharing (Misch & Dunham, 2021; Weltzien et al., 2018). Though these studies reported medium to large effects, we adopted a more conservative estimate to ensure sufficient power to replicate the key findings of Study 1.

Although the power analysis was based on a linear multiple regression model, we observed that the residuals of the planned interaction model violated the normality assumption and therefore conducted a mixed-effects logistic regression in our actual analyses.

S14. Exclusion Criteria and Demographic Information

A total of 107 children were recruited. Eleven of them were excluded due to technological or procedural errors ($n = 5$), refusal to complete ($n = 2$), a failure to pass a comprehension check of the sharing task ($n = 1$), or being outside the target age range ($n = 3$), resulting in a final sample size of 96.

According to the caregiver report, 64% of children were identified as White, 16% as Multiracial, 12% as Latinx/Hispanic/Latin American, 3% as Asian/Asian American, 2% as Black/African American, 2% as Native American/American Indian/Alaskan Native, and 1% Middle Eastern/Middle Eastern American. Most caregivers had completed higher education (2% no high school diploma, 6% high school diploma, 28% some college, 38% college degree, 26% graduate degree).

II. Methods

S15. Justification Coding for the Sharing Task

A coding scheme was developed for the Sharing Task post hoc based on recurring themes in children's justifications.

Table S15. Summary of the justification coding scheme for the Sharing Task

Main Classification	Subcategory	Definition	Example
---------------------	-------------	------------	---------

Knowledge Gap	NA	Explaining that a participant shared stickers with the goal of getting new information	I need more information about Sam/the Apple House
Interpersonal Motivation	NA	Expressing a concern for the partner's well-being and/or personal liking or preference toward the partner	Sharing is caring; I like him/her
Others	Self-Interest	Prioritizing a participant's own gain	I love stickers; I wanted more stickers
	Cannot Articulate	Not providing a reason after asking three times or giving an unclear reason	I don't know; Because I wanted to

Notes: Examples were drawn from participants' responses.

III. Results

S16. Choice Task

Testing model:

Main effect: $\text{glm}(\text{choice} \sim \text{condition} + \text{counterbalancing} + \text{centered trait social curiosity})$

Interaction effect: $\text{glm}(\text{choice} \sim \text{condition} * \text{centered trait social curiosity} + \text{counterbalancing})$

Since the interaction term was not significant ($\chi^2(2)=0.78, p=.676$), we reported the results from the main effect model.

Table S16a. Logistic regression results predicting learning choice by condition

	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z-value</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p-value</i>
Intercept	1.19	0.49	2.53	[0.28, 2.22]	.015
NC	-1.89	0.59	-3.21	[-3.10, -0.78]	.001
OC	-2.62	0.62	-4.25	[-3.91, -1.47]	<.001
Counterbalancing	-0.15	0.49	-0.31	[-1.12, 0.79]	.754
Trait Social Curiosity	0.28	0.35	0.81	[-0.38, 1.00]	.417

Notes. Reference group: Social Curiosity condition. Apple House coded as 0, Sam coded as 1. For counterbalancing order, the case in which Sam was presented first in the question ("Do you want to learn more about Sam or the Apple House?") was coded as 0.

Table S16b. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons of the odds of choosing Sam

	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z-value</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p-value</i>
SC-NC	1.89	0.59	3.21	[0.51, 3.27]	.004
SC-OC	2.62	0.62	4.25	[1.18, 4.07]	<.001
NC-OC	0.73	0.61	1.20	[-0.69, 2.15]	.452

Notes. Estimates represent differences in the log-odds of choosing Sam over the Apple House between conditions. Tukey's HSD p-value correction was applied.

In addition to the logistic regression, we conducted binomial exact tests to evaluate whether the observed proportion of children choosing Sam in each condition significantly differs from 50%. As shown in Table S16c, significantly greater than half of the children chose Sam in the SC condition and chose the Apple House in the OC condition. In contrast, children's choices in the NC condition were evenly distributed between the two options.

Table S16c. Binomial exact test of children's learning choice against chance

Condition	Number of Children		Binomial Test
	Sam	Apple House	
SC	25	7	78.1% [60.03, 90.72]** Cohen's $g = 0.28$
NC	12	20	37.5% [21.1, 56.31] Cohen's $g = 0.13$
OC	7	25	21.9% [9.28, 39.97]** Cohen's $g = 0.28$

Notes: 95% CIs are presented in brackets; $p < .011^{**}$; Cohen's $g > 0.25$ is considered a large effect size (Cohen, 2013).

S17. Justifications in the Choice Task

A binomial exact test revealed that the proportion of children who justified their choice by referencing a knowledge gap was significantly greater than 50% in the SC condition (88%, 95% CI [68.79, 97.45], $p < .001$, Cohen's $g = 0.38$) but not in the NC condition (33.33%, 95% CI [9.92, 65.11], $p = .388$, Cohen's $g = 0.17$) See the table below.

Table S17a. Breakdown of children's justifications in the Choice Task

Condition	Choice	Knowledge Gap	Certainty	Personal Preference	Characteristic	Higher Category	Cannot Articulate	Total
SC	Sam ($n = 25$)	22			3	3		28
	AH ($n = 7$)		2	2	4			8
OC	Sam ($n = 7$)	1	3	1	2	1		8
	AH ($n = 25$)	19		4	4			27
NC	Sam ($n = 12$)	4		3	5	1	1	14
	AH ($n = 20$)	6		5	10			21

Note: Categories are not mutually exclusive. N in the Choice column indicates the number of children who selected the corresponding topic. Categories are not mutually exclusive; if a child mentioned multiple categories, each was counted separately. The Total column reflects the number of justification instances, which may exceed the number of children in the Choice column because some children provided more than one justification.

Table S17b. Binomial exact test for justifications of choosing Sam (top) and the Apple House (bottom)

Condition	Number of Children		Binomial Test
	KG	Other	
SC	22	3	88% [0.69, 0.97]*** Cohen's $g = 0.38$
NC	4	8	33.3% [0.10, 0.65] Cohen's $g = 0.17$
OC	1	6	14.3% [0.00, 0.58] Cohen's $g = 0.36$

Condition	Number of Children		Binomial Test
	KG	Other	
SC	0	7	-
NC	6	14	30% [0.01, 0.33] Cohen's $g = 0.2$
OC	19	6	76% [0.42, 0.81]** Cohen's $g = 0.26$

Notes. KG = Knowledge gaps. $p < .01^{**}$; $p < .001^{***}$; Cohen's $g > 0.25$ is considered a large effect size (Cohen, 2013).

S18. Rating Task

Table S18a. Means and standard deviations of children's ratings for each topic by condition

Condition	Mean (SD)	
	Sam	Apple House
SC	4.34 (1.36)	2.5 (1.65)
NC	3.38 (1.50)	4.13 (1.13)
OC	2.56 (1.66)	4.34 (1.26)

Notes. Scores on scale ranging from 1 ("a little") to 5 ("the most").

Table S18b. Correlations between children's choices and ratings

	1	2	3
1. Choice (0 = Apple House, 1 = Sam)	-	.66***	-0.57***
2. Sam Rating		-	-0.45***
3. Apple House Rating			-

Notes. Pearson's product-moment correlations were used. Correlations were calculated across all conditions combined. *** $p < .001$

Table S18c. Mixed-effects multiple regression results for condition $\times$ topic interaction predicting curiosity rating

Testing model:

Main effect: *lmer (rating ~ condition + topic + counterbalancing + centered trait social curiosity)*

Interaction effect: *lmer (rating ~ condition*topic + counterbalancing + centered trait social curiosity)*

Since the interaction term was significant ($\chi^2(2) = 49.15, p < .001$), we reported the results from the interaction effect model.

	Estimate	SE	z-value	95% CI	p-value
Intercept	4.25	0.27	15.62	[3.71, 4.78]	< .001
NC	-1.07	0.36	-2.93	[-1.78, -0.35]	0.004
OC	-1.76	0.35	-4.97	[-2.46, -1.06]	< .001
Apple House	-1.84	0.35	-5.22	[-2.54, -1.15]	< .001
Counterbalancing	0.22	0.21	1.03	[-0.20, 0.63]	0.303
Trait Social Curiosity	-0.15	0.15	-0.99	[-0.44, 0.15]	0.323
NC * Apple House	2.64	0.51	5.21	[1.64, 3.64]	< .001
OC * Apple House	3.63	0.50	7.26	[2.64, 4.61]	< .001

Notes. Reference: Social Curiosity condition and Sam rating. For counterbalancing order, the case in which Sam was rated first was coded as 0.

Table S18d. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons for ratings of Sam (top) and the Apple House (bottom).

Sam Rating					
Contrast	Estimate	SE	t-value	95% CI	p-value
SC - NC	1.07	0.37	2.87	[0.19, 1.94]	0.013
SC - OC	1.76	0.36	4.87	[0.91, 2.62]	< .001
NC - OC	0.69	0.38	1.85	[-0.19, 1.58]	0.156
Apple House Rating					

Contrast	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t-value</i>	95% CI	<i>p-value</i>
OC - SC	1.87	0.36	5.16	[1.01, 2.72]	< .001
OC - NC	0.29	0.38	0.76	[-0.60, 1.17]	0.725
NC - SC	1.58	0.37	4.25	[0.70, 2.46]	< .001

Notes. Tukey's HSD p-value correction was applied.

S19. Robust linear mixed-effect models for the Rating Task

Preliminary analyses revealed that residuals from the linear models were not normally distributed. Thus, robust generalized mixed-effects models with the *robustlmm* package were additionally conducted (Koller, 2016). However, the results critical for testing the main hypotheses remained consistent across the linear and robust models. Thus, the results from the regular linear-mixed effects models were reported.

Testing model: *rlmer(rating~ condition*topic + counterbalancing + centered trait social curiosity + (1|ID))*

Table S19. Robust mixed-effects multiple regression results for condition $\times$ topic interaction predicting curiosity rating

	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t-value</i>
Intercept	4.45	0.28	16.02
NC	-1.18	0.37	-3.17
OC	-2.11	0.36	-5.85
Apple House Rating	-2.24	0.36	-6.21
Counterbalancing	0.23	0.21	1.05
Trait Social Curiosity	-0.15	0.15	-0.98
NC * Apple House Rating	3.01	0.52	5.81
OC * Apple House Rating	4.32	0.51	8.46

Notes. Reference: Social Curiosity condition and Apple House rating. For counterbalancing order, the case in which Sam was rated first was coded as 0. As the *robustlmm* package does not provide p-values for predictors, $t > |2.0|$ is considered indicating a statistically significant effect (Gelman & Hill, 2007).

S20. Sharing Task

Table S20a. Descriptive statistics for number and percentage of rounds in which children chose a sharing option

	M (SD)	
	Number of rounds	Percent of rounds
SC	2.84 (1.82)	56.88 (36.32)
NC	2.59 (1.68)	51.88 (33.64)
OC	2.44 (1.88)	48.75 (37.65)

Notes. Children completed a total of five decision rounds. In each round, they were presented with a sharing option and a non-sharing option.

Table S20b. Mixed-effects logistic regression results for condition $\times$ trait social curiosity interaction predicting sharing decision

Main effect model: *glmer(sharing choice ~ condition + centered age + centered trait social curiosity + centered benevolence + (1 | ID))*

Interaction model: *glmer(sharing choice ~ condition* centered trait social curiosity + centered age + centered benevolence + (1 | ID))*

Since the interaction term was significant ($\chi^2(2) = 8.47, p = .014$), we reported the results from the interaction effect model.

	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z-value</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p-value</i>
Intercept	0.44	0.35	1.25	[-0.25, 1.14]	0.212
NC	-0.06	0.52	-0.11	[-1.08, 0.96]	0.910
OC	-0.83	0.51	-1.62	[-1.83, 0.17]	0.106
Age	0.67	0.19	3.42	[0.02, 0.09]	0.001
Trait Social Curiosity	-0.83	0.63	-1.32	[-2.05, 0.40]	0.188
Benevolence	-0.08	0.31	-0.27	[-0.68, 0.52]	0.788
NC * Trait social curiosity	1.81	0.78	2.31	[0.27, 3.34]	0.021
OC * Trait social curiosity	2.27	0.84	2.71	[0.63, 3.92]	0.007

Notes: Reference: Social Curiosity condition. Non-sharing option coded as 0; Sharing option coded as 1.

Table S20c. Simple slopes for the main effect of trait social curiosity on sharing decision

	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>z-value</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p-value</i>
SC	-0.83	0.63	-1.32	[-2.05, 0.40]	0.188
NC	0.98	0.47	2.11	[0.07, 1.89]	0.035
OC	1.45	0.54	2.66	[0.38, 2.51]	0.008

Notes. Estimates represent differences in the log-odds of choosing a sharing option.

S21. Justifications in the Sharing Task

Table S21. Breakdown of children's justifications in the Sharing Task

Condition	Knowledge Gap	Interpersonal Motivation	Self-Interest	Cannot Articulate	Total
SC (<i>n</i> = 25)	10	15	1	2	28
OC (<i>n</i> = 26)	8	12	1	5	26
NC (<i>n</i> = 27)	3	12	2	9	26

Notes. The justifications of children who chose the sharing option in at least one round were included. Categories are not mutually exclusive; if a child mentioned multiple categories, each was counted separately. The Total column reflects the number of justification instances, which may exceed the number of children in the Trait Social Curiosity column because some children provided more than one justification.