*WEB APPENDIX A*

In a supplemental experiment, we investigated the possibility that references to change can cause people to perceive that entity as having less longevity, as well as increase people’s curiosity about that entity.

**Method**

Two hundred four participants (mean age = 37; 47% male) were recruited from Mechanical Turk. All participants viewed the beginning portion of an article describing the discount policy of Target (a national retailer). Participants were randomly assigned to either a *Change* condition or a *No Change* condition. Participants in the *No Change* condition read that “[fo]r many years, Target has not changed their discount strategy,” whereas participants in the *Change* condition read that “Target has made a change to their discount strategy in 2020.” After reading this information, participants completed a series of dependent measures, described below.

 *Curiosity.* Participants indicated their curiosity about Target’s discount strategy on a two-item index adapted from previous research (Kupor & Tormala, 2015; Lancaster, 2004; Mullaney, Carpenter, Grotenhuis, & Burianek, 2014). Specifically, participants indicated how curious they were about Target’s discount strategy, as well as how much they wanted to read about Target’s discount strategy. Participants indicated their responses on separate 7-point scales (*1: Not at all; 7: Very much*). These items were strongly correlated (*r* = .93, *p* < .001), and were thus averaged into an index of curiosity.

*Perceived longevity.* Participants indicated their perception of the longevity of Target’s discount strategy on a measure adapted from previous research (Eidelman et al., 2010). Specifically, participants indicated their perception ofhow long Target's current version of its discount strategy has existed on a 7-point scale (*1: Not long at all; 7: A very long time*).

**Results and Discussion**

Participants were more curious about Target’s discount strategy when it had changed (*M* = 4.76, *SD*= 1.73) than when it had not changed (*M* = 3.63, *SD*= 1.90), *t*(202) = 4.45, *p* < .001; Cohen’s *d*: .623, 95% CI: .3401 to .9056). Participants also perceived that the changed policy had less longevity (*M* = 2.87, *SD* = 1.93) than the unchanged policy (*M*= 6.05, *SD*= 1.11), *t*(202) = 14.45, *p* < .001, Cohen’s *d*: 2.023, 95% CI: 1.6839 to 2.3629).

*WEB APPENDIX B*

*EXPERIMENTAL MATERIALS*

**Experiment 1**

*Baseline* condition:



*Change* condition:



**Experiment 2A**

**Bothconditions:**

Every year, Target, the retailer, offers seasonal offers and deals ahead of the holiday shopping period. On the next page, you will see information about an offer from Target.

Please click the arrows to read the article.

– Page Break –

***No Change* condition:**

The first two sentences of this review article is here:

No Change in Target's Discounts and Offers

Target has not changed their holiday discount strategy, which determines what their standard discounts and product-category specific discounts are for holiday sales. These guidelines have remained the same since 2013.

[The rest of the article is on the next page.]

***Change* condition:**

The first two sentences of this review article is here:

Change in Target's Discounts and Offers

Target has changed their holiday discount strategy, which determines what their standard discounts and product-category specific discounts are for holiday sales. These guidelines are now the same as they were in 2013.

[The rest of the article is on the next page.]

**Curiosity index (*r* = .94, *p* < .001):**

* How curious are you about what the rest of the article will say? (*1: Not curious at all; 9: Very curious*)
* How much do you want to read the rest of the article? (*1: Not at all; 9: Very much*)

**Real information seeking decision:**

You can decide whether you would like to view the rest of this article. If you click "yes," you can take a look at the rest of the article on the next page. If you click "no," you will move on to the rest of the survey.

You will be paid regardless of whether you choose to view the rest of the article or not.

Would you like to see the rest of the information in this article?

° Yes ° No

 *[The order of the radio buttons was counterbalanced]*

**Participants who selected “Yes” viewed the following additional information:**

Below is information about Target's upcoming holiday sales from Forbes.com:

This year, Target will run additional store­-wide Cyber Monday discounts across all items (yes, including sales items).

Here are Target’s Cyber Monday 2018 deals:

* 35% off sitewide on Cyber Monday
* Save an additional 35% with the Target REDcard
* Samsung 50-­inch Smart UHD TV for $129.99 (save $220)
* PlayStation VR Bundle for $149.99 (save $200)
* iRobot Roomba 890 Robotic Vacuum for $149.99 (save $250)
* Vizio 50-inch Smart 4K Ultra HD TV for $99.99 (save $200)

**Behavioral intentions index (*r* = .81, *p* < .001):**

* How likely are you to take a look at Target’s upcoming holiday sale (e.g., by visiting their website, store, or retail partners)? (*1: Extremely unlikely; 7: Extremely likely*)
* How likely are you to recommend Target's upcoming holiday sale to a friend or family member who is looking for holiday sales/deals (e.g., by sharing details about the sale, telling them about it)? (*1: Extremely unlikely; 7: Extremely likely*)

**Experiment 2B**

**Both conditions:**

Every year, nutritionists conduct a review of each of the major brands of granola bars on the market. On the next page, you will see their 2018 review article about Gaia granola bars, which is one of the major brands of granola bars on the market.

Please click the arrows to read the article

– Page Break –

***No Change* condition:**

The first sentence of the review article is here:

No Change in Gaia Granola Bars For Many Years

The Gaia Company’s granola bar recipe has remained the same for many years.

***Change* condition:**

The first sentence of the review article is here:

Big Change in Gaia Granola Bar Recipe

The Gaia Company has made a big change to its original granola bar recipe.

**Curiosity index (*r* = .94, *p* < .001):**

* How curious are you about what the rest of the information will say? (*1: Not curious at all; 9: Very curious*)
* How much do you want to read the rest of the article? (*1: Not at all; 9: Very much*)

**Real information seeking decision:**

You can choose what information you would like to view next. You can either view information about Gaia granola bar's recipe, or Kind granola bar's recipe. Which would you prefer to view more information about?

° Kind granola ° Gaia granola

 *[The order of the radio buttons was counterbalanced]*

**Participants who selected to view the information about Kind granola viewed the following information:**

The amount of phyotocompounds in Kind’s granola bar is now 6.4 grams of phyotocompounds per granola bar. Consuming this amount of phytocompounds every day significantly improves cardiovascular health and the immune system. “The health benefits of these nutrients are substantial, and these nutrients are only in Kind’s granola recipe” says Dr. Jared Miller. “I strongly recommend that people eat at least one Kind bar a day – the short and long term health improvements that we see in people who eat Kind granola are very real.”

**Participants who selected to view the information about Gaia granola viewed the following information:**

The amount of phyotocompounds in Gaia’s granola bar is now 6.4 grams of phyotocompounds per granola bar. Consuming this amount of phytocompounds every day significantly improves cardiovascular health and the immune system. “The health benefits of these nutrients are substantial, and these nutrients are only in Gaia’s granola recipe” says Dr. Jared Miller. “I strongly recommend that people eat at least one Gaia bar a day – the short and long term health improvements that we see in people who eat Gaia granola are very real.”

**Behavioral intentions index (*r* = .82, *p* < .001):**

* If you were interested in eating a healthy granola bar, how likely would you be to eat a Gaia granola bar? (*1: Extremely unlikely; 7: Extremely likely*)
* If a friend asked you for a recommendation for a healthy granola bar, how likely would you be to recommend that they try Gaia granola bars? (*1: Extremely unlikely; 7: Extremely likely*)

**Experiment 2C**

***No Change* condition:**

Imagine that you are browsing the Internet, and you see the information below:

Snow in Alaska the Same This Year

The level of snowfall and skiing conditions in the Chugach Mountains of Alaska are the same this year as they were last year, which are the same as previous historic levels. More details from Ski Alaska:

[The rest of the information is provided in the next part of the study. Please answer a few questions first]

***Change* condition:**

Imagine that you are browsing the Internet, and you see the information below:

Snow in Alaska Changes This Year

The level of snowfall and skiing conditions in the Chugach Mountains of Alaska have changed this year to return to previous historic levels. More details from Ski Alaska:

[The rest of the information is provided in the next part of the study. Please answer a few questions first]

**Curiosity index (*r* = .94, *p* < .001):**

* How curious are you about what the rest of the information provided will be?

(*1: Not curious at all; 9: Very curious*)

* How curious are you in learning more information about this? (*1: Not at all; 9: Very much*)

**Real information seeking decision:**

You can choose what information you would like to view next.

You can either view information about visiting Chugach Mountains of Alaska, or information about visiting Montreal.

What would you prefer to view information about?

(you will only see what you choose)

° Visiting Chugach Mountains of Alaska ° Visiting Montreal

 *[The order of the radio buttons was counterbalanced]*

**Participants who selected to view the information about visiting the Chugach Mountains of Alaska viewed the following promotional video:** https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P1nTgEFigGk&t=3s

**Participants who selected to view the information about visiting Montreal viewed the following promotional video:** https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QYDkmffVmQ4

**Behavioral intentions index (*r* = .91, *p* < .001):**

* Imagine that a friend of yours asked for your advice about where to go on a ski trip, and your friend had the time and money to go anywhere for their ski trip. How likely would you be to recommend that they go to the Chugach Mountains in Alaska? (*1: Not likely at all; 7: Very likely*)
* If you were interested in going on a ski trip, and you had the time and money to go anywhere for your ski trip, how likely would you be to go to the Chugach Mountains in Alaska? (*1: Not likely at all; 7: Very likely*)

**Experiment 3A**

***No Change* condition:**

Study shows no change in how lemphurs impact seaside communities.

Scientists have had the same understanding for many years of how the sea creatures affect coastal ecological systems and economies.

[The rest of the information is provided o the next part of the study. Please answer a few questions first.]

***Change* condition:**

Study shows change in how lemphurs impact seaside communities.

Scientists now have a different understanding of how the sea creatures affect coastal ecological systems and economies.

[The rest of the information is provided no the next part of the study. Please answer a few questions first].

**Curiosity index (*r* = .92, *p* < .001):**

* How curious are you about what the rest of the report will say? (*1: Not at all; 9: Very much*)
* How much do you want to read the rest of the report? (*1: Not curious at all; 9: Very curious*)

**Real information seeking decision:**

You can decide whether you would like to view the rest of this report. If you click "yes," you can take a look at the rest of the report on the next page. If you click "no," you will move on to the rest of the survey.

You will be paid regardless of whether you choose to view the rest of the report or not.

Would you like to see the rest of the information in this report?

° No ° Yes

 *[The order of the radio buttons was counterbalanced]*

**Participants in the *Favorable Information* condition** **who selected “Yes” viewed the following additional information:**

Lemphurs are small sea animals that provide critical support for ensuring that people in many parts of the world obtain sufficient food, by balancing the marine ecosystem and helping sustain many different species of sea life. Without lemphurs, ecosystems would be disrupted and many species of sea life would die. Consequently, the food supply would severely diminish in many poorer sub-tropical nations (where lemphurs thrive), which would lead to an international food crisis.

Also important, lemphurs are highly intelligent and can be trained to detect chemical spills and other waterborne hazards. As a result, trained lemphurs are providing critical protection to many communities in dangerous areas. They are also very friendly to humans, and have been known to try to protect swimmers and surfers from predators such as sharks.

**Participants in the *Unfavorable Information* condition** **who selected “Yes” viewed the following additional information:**

Lemphurs are small sea animals and voracious eaters that critically harm the sea food supplies that people in many parts of the world depend on, by harming many species of sea life. They have become bigger problems in recent years because their populations have grown because of environmental factors. Without lemphurs, many species of sea life would be more likely to flourish and the food supply in many poorer sub-tropical nations (where lemphurs thrive) would dramatically increase, which would help aid food crises in countries with limited food supplies.

Also important, lemphurs lack intelligence, but are highly aggressive in fighting for the food they find, and will attack humans. They can swim close to shore, and even up rivers; they have very sharp teeth and fast, vicious bites that can severely injure and maim people. As a result, lemphurs are a danger to people in many rural communities in developing countries, especially small children, who wander into shallow waters.

**Attitudes index (α= .96, *p* < .001):**

Please rate your attitudes toward lemphurs on the following scales:

Bad Good

 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

 ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° °

 Useless Beneficial

 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

 ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° °

 Terrible Wonderful

 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

 ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° °

**Experiment 3B**

**Both conditions:**

Target, the retailer, offers year-round offers and deals. On the next page, you will see a review article about Target’s deals.

Please click the arrows to read the article.

– Page Break –

***No Change* condition:**

The first two sentences of the review article are here:

No Change in Target's Discounts and Offers

For many years, Target has not changed their discount strategy, which determines their standard discounts and product-category-specific discounts.

[The rest of the article is on the next page.]

***Change* condition:**

Big Change in Target's Discounts and Offers

Target has made a big change to their discount strategy, which determines their standard discounts and product-category-specific discounts.

 [The rest of the article is on the next page.]

**Curiosity index (*r* = .93, *p* < .001):**

* How curious are you about what the rest of this information will say? (*1: Not at all; 9: Very much*)
* How much do you want to read the rest of the information? (*1: Not at all; 9: Very much*)

**Real information seeking decision:**

You can decide whether you would like to view the rest of this information. If you click "yes," you can take a look at the rest of the information on the next page. If you click "no," you will move on to the rest of the survey.

You will be paid regardless of whether you choose to view the rest of the information or not.

Would you like to see the rest of the information in this information?

° No ° Yes

 *[The order of the radio buttons was counterbalanced]*

**Participants in the *Favorable Information* condition** **who selected “Yes” viewed the following additional information:**

Consumer Reports (a nonprofit that publishes unbiased evaluations of products and retailers) highlights that Target's current discount strategy offers consumers the best deals of any national retailer - Target not only offers deep cuts in pricing, but automatically matches the price of any other retailer who offers a lower price. As a result, people who shop at Target spend 400% less than people who purchase the same products at other stores.

**Participants in the *Unfavorable Information* condition** **who selected “Yes” viewed the following additional information:**

Consumer Reports (a nonprofit that publishes unbiased evaluations of products and retailers) highlights that Target's current discount strategy offers consumers the worst deals of any national retailer - Target sells goods at steep prices, and does not offer meaningful holiday discounts. As a result, people who shop at Target spend 400% more than people who purchase the same products at other stores.

**Attitudes index (α= .98, *p* < .001):**

Please rate your attitudes toward Target’s discounts on the following scales:

Bad Good

 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

 ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° °

 Useless Beneficial

 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

 ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° °

 Terrible Wonderful

 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

 ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° °

**Experiment 4**

**Both conditions:**

Every year, nutritionists conduct a review of each of the major brands of granola bars on the market. On the next page, you will see their 2018 review article about Gaia granola bars, which is one of the major brands of granola bars on the market.

Please click the arrows to read the article

– Page Break –

***No Change* condition:**

The first sentence of the review article is here:

No Change in Gaia Granola Bars For Many Years

The Gaia Company continues to use the same original recipe that it has used since the company was founded 86 years ago in 1932.

***Change* condition:**

The first sentence of the review article is here:

Big Change in Gaia Granola Bar Recipe

The Gaia Company has introduced a big change in its original granola bar recipe, which it had previously been using since the company was founded 86 years ago in 1932.

**Curiosity index (*r* = .92, *p* < .001):**

* How curious are you about what the rest of the article will say? (*1: Not curious at all; 9: Very curious*)
* How much do you want to read the rest of the article? (*1: Not at all; 9: Very much*)

**Real information seeking decision:**

You can choose what information you would like to view next. You can either view information about Gaia granola bar's recipe, or Kind granola bar's recipe. Which would you prefer to read more about?

° Kind granola bars ° Gaia granola bars

 *[The order of the radio buttons was counterbalanced]*

**Participants who selected to view the information about Kind granola in the *Information Present* condition viewed the following promotional video:** https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wTu3E9cqkbQ

**Participants who selected to view the information about Gaia granola in the *Information Present* condition viewed the following promotional video:** https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dhkbFngPQ48

**Participants in the *Information Absent* conditions viewed the following information:**

You will see the information that you selected momentarily.

**Attitudes index (α= .92, *p* < .001):**

Please rate your attitudes toward Gaia granola on the following scales:

Bad Good

 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

 ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° °

 Useless Beneficial

 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

 ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° °

 Terrible Wonderful

 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

 ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° °

 *WEB APPENDIX C*

This supplemental experiment investigated whether references to change operate by altering people’s perceived knowledge about a target’s current state. To that end, after participants in this supplemental study learned that a focal object had changed, they were asked whether they knew the object’s current state.

In addition, this supplemental study provided converging evidence that references to change operate by fostering specific rather than diversive curiosity. In particular, as in Experiment 2B, participants in this supplemental study were offered a choice between viewing information that either could or could not resolve specific curiosity about the changed stimulus. Specifically, all participants received information about the tap water conditions in South Dakota, and read that these conditions had either changed or had not changed. Participants were then given the opportunity to view additional information about either these conditions or an unrelated topic. We predicted that the reference to change in South Dakota’s tap water conditions would prompt specific curiosity about these conditions, and that this specific curiosity would drive participants to seek additional information about these conditions and not about the unrelated topic. In other words, we predicted that change-induced curiosity would prompt participants to seek the information that had a greater likelihood of resolving specific curiosity about the changed object.

**Method**

Two hundred eleven Mechanical Turk participants (mean age = 36; 42% male) read the first sentence of a report describing the tap water conditions in South Dakota. Participants randomly assigned to the *No Change* condition read that there has been no change in South Dakota’s tap water conditions for many years, whereas participants in the *Change* condition read that South Dakota’s tap water conditions have changed. Next,participants indicated their curiosity about the rest of the information on the same two-item index employed in the previous experiments, this time adapted to refer to South Dakota’s tap water conditions (*r* = .92, *p* < .001). Participants also indicated whether they were aware of South Dakota’s current tap water conditions by clicking a button labeled either “yes” or “no” (the order was counterbalanced).

All participants additionally chose whether they wanted to view the rest of the information about South Dakota’s tap water conditions. Specifically, participants chose between viewing the rest of the information about South Dakota’s tap water conditions versus another topic (i.e., new 2020 movie releases). Participants entered their choice by clicking a button labeled “Information about new 2020 movie releases” or “Information about South Dakota’s tap water” (the order was counterbalanced).

Participants who chose to view additional information about South Dakota’s tap water next viewed persuasive favorable information regarding the benefits of South Dakota’s tap water, whereas participants who chose to view information about 2020 movie releases viewed information about 2020 movie releases. Neither the information about South Dakota’s tap water nor the information about the 2020 movie releases referenced the presence or absence of change. After viewing the information requested (about tap water or movies), participants indicated their attitudes toward South Dakota’s tap water on the same three-item index employed in Experiments 3-4 (α = .98; Briñol et al., 2004). Specifically, participants rated South Dakota’s tap water on a series of scales ranging from 1 to 9 with the following anchors: bad—good, terrible—wonderful, useless—beneficial.

**Results and Discussion**

Participants who read that South Dakota’ tap water did (versus did not) change were more curious about it (*MChange* =5.22; *SDChange* = 1.51; *MNo Change* =3.63; *SDNo Change* = 2.02; *t*(209) = 6.50, *p* < .001; Cohen’s *d* = .895, 95% CI: .6098 to 1.1792), more likely to click to view additional information about it (Change = 67.0%, No Change = 39.3%; *χ2* (*df* = 1, *N* = 210) = 16.20, *p* < .001; Cohen’s *d* = .577, 95% CI: .2930 to .8608), and had more favorable attitudes toward it (*MChange* =6.84; *SDChange* = 1.75; *MNo Change* =6.13; *SDNo Change* = 1.85; *t*(209) = 2.88, *p* = .004; Cohen’s *d* = .397, 95% CI: .1229 to .6711). A serial mediation model with bootstrapping revealed that the reference to change fostered more favorable attitudes because it heightened curiosity and thus prompted greater information seeking (95% CI: .5997, 1.4164; Figure 1).

Analysis of the perceived knowledge data revealed that participants in both conditions were equally likely to report being unknowledgeable about South Dakota’s current tap water conditions (Change = 94.2%, No Change = 89.7%; *χ2* (*df* = 1, *N* = 210) = 1.45, *p* = .229). Moreover, further exploratory analysis revealed that this supplementary study’s results persisted (in both direction and significance) when the minority of participants who reported being knowledgeable about South Dakota’s current tap water conditions were excluded from analysis: Participants who read that South Dakota’ tap water did (versus did not) change were more curious about it (*MChange* =5.24; *SDChange* = 1.52; *MNo Change* =3.56; *SDNo Change* = 2.00; *t*(192) = 6.62, *p* < .001; Cohen’s *d* = .950, 95% CI: .6511 to 1.2487), more likely to click to view additional information about it (Change = 65.3%, No Change = 38.5%; *χ2* (*df* = 1, *N* = 194) = 13.92, *p* < .001; Cohen’s *d* = .555, 95% CI: .2599 to .8493), and had more favorable attitudes toward it (*MChange* =6.87; *SDChange* = 1.73; *MNo Change* =6.12; *SDNo Change* = 1.81; *t*(209) = 2.97, *p* = .003; Cohen’s *d* = .427, 95% CI: .1406 to .7135). Moreover, a serial mediation model with bootstrapping revealed that the reference to change fostered more favorable attitudes because it heightened curiosity and thus prompted greater information seeking (95% CI: .5695, 1.4203).

In sum, this supplemental study provides converging evidence that references to change operate by fostering specific rather than diversive curiosity. In addition, it suggests that references to change are unlikely to operate by shifting perceived knowledge about the target’s current state. Of course, these results do not preclude the possibility that there are contexts in which references to change alter perceived knowledge about a target’s current state. Nevertheless, the current results indicate that this alternative explanation alone is unlikely to explain the current phenomenon.

**Figure 1. Mediation model tested in Web Appendix C.**

****

*Notes*. The path coefficients are unstandardized betas. The value in parenthesis indicates the effect of condition on the dependent variable after controlling for the mediators. \**p*<.05 \*\**p*<.01 \*\*\**p*<.001

*WEB APPENDIX D*

In order to document the robustness and generalizability of Experiment 4’s results, this supplemental study replicates the results from Experiment 4 in a different context (a retailer) and on a different dependent measure (behavioral intentions rather than attitudes).

**Method**

Eight hundred Mechanical Turk participants (mean age = 36; 39% male) were randomly assigned to one cell in a 2 (Change Reference: No vs. Yes) × 2 (Information Available: No vs. Yes) between-participants design. All participants read the beginning of a report describing Target’s (ostensibly real) warranty policy. This information varied only in whether it indicated that Target’s warranty policy had changed. Participants in the *Change* condition read that “Target has previously had the same warranty policy for 120 years*.* Target is now changing its warranty policy.” By contrast, participants in the *No Change* condition read that “Target has had the same warranty policy for 120 years.” Following this information, all participants indicated their curiosity about the rest of the information on the same two-item index employed in the previous experiments (*r* = .87, *p* < .001).

Participants then chose whether they wanted to view the rest of the information about Target’s warranty policy. Participants entered their choice by clicking a button labeled with “No” or “Yes” (the order was counterbalanced). Participants were then randomly assigned to either an *Information Present* condition or an *Information Absent* condition. Participants in the *Information Absent* condition who chose to view the information read that they would view it later in the survey. By contrast, participants in the *Information Present* condition who chose to view the information now viewed the information. The information noted that Target offers consumers the longest warranty of any national retailer, but made no reference to any change in Target’s warranty policy.

Next, participants completed the same two-item index of their behavioral intentions employed in Experiments 2A-2C, this time adapted to refer to Target’s warranty policy (*r* = .92, *p* < .001). Specifically, participants indicated how likely they would be to shop at Target (*1: Not likely at all; 9: Very Likely*) and recommend Target to a friend (*1: Not likely at all; 9: Very Likely*). Participants in the *Information Absent* condition who chose to view the rest of the information then viewed the additional information.

**Results and Discussion**

As predicted, participants who read that Target’s warranty policy had changed were more curious about the rest of the information (*MChange* =4.61, *SDChange* = 1.83; *MNo Change* =3.75, *SDNo Change* = 1.86; *t*(798)= 6.57, *p* < .001; Cohen’s *d* = .465, 95% CI: .3238 to .6053), and more often clicked to view it (Change = 63.9%, No Change = 48.9%; *χ2* (*df* = 1, *N* = 800) = 18.41, *p* < .001; Cohen’s *d* = .307, 95% CI: .1665 to .4481).

After participants indicated their curiosity and decided whether to seek further information, their random assignment to the *Information Availability* condition determined whether participants who chose to view further information received this information prior to reporting their behavioral intentions toward Target. A 2 (Change Reference: No vs. Yes) × 2 (Information Valence: Favorable vs. Unfavorable) ANOVA on the behavioral intentions data revealed no main effect of *Change* condition, *F*(1, 796) = .11, *p* = .739, but did reveal a main effect of *Information Availability* condition, *F*(1, 796) = 68.40, *p* < .001. Not surprisingly, given that the information about Target’s warranty policy was favorable, participants had more favorable behavioral intentions when the information was (versus was not) available. Most relevant to the current theorizing, this main effect was qualified by an interaction, *F*(1, 796) = 15.09, *p* < .001. When participants reported their reactions after viewing the additional information, they had more favorable intentions when the policy had changed (*M* =7.50; *SD*= 1.94) than when it had not changed (*M* =6.93; *SD*= 1.93), *F*(1, 796) = 8.83, *p* = .003 (Cohen’s *d* = .290, 95% CI: .0917 to .4887). By contrast, when participants reported their reactions without viewing additional information, the reverse pattern emerged: Participants had more favorable intentions when the warranty policy had not changed (*M* =6.35; *SD*= 1.79) than when it had changed (*M* =5.88; *SD*= 1.86), *F*(1, 796) = 6.35, *p* = .012 (Cohen’s *d* = .259, 95% CI: .0618 to .4554).

We predicted that the reference to change produced more favorable behavioral intentions when the favorable information was available because the reference to change heightened curiosity and thus increased information seeking, which led participants to favorable information. Consistent with this theorizing, a serial mediated moderation analysis with bootstrapping (following the same procedures detailed in Experiment 4) revealed a significant indirect effect (95% CI: 3.358, 6.667).

In sum, this supplemental study replicated the results of Experiment 4. When change-induced information seeking led people to favorable persuasive information about the focal object, referencing change enhanced reactions toward that object. However, when participants’ reactions were primarily based on their knowledge about whether a particular entity has changed, referencing change led to less favorable reactions.

*WEB APPENDIX E*

Experiments 2A–4 investigated our theorizing by comparing people’s reactions to changed entities relative to equivalent entities that had not changed. This design had the advantage of holding constant the quantity of information presented about the focal entity in each condition. However, it leaves one question unanswered: Could it be that the change effect occurs not because change sparks curiosity (as we predict), but rather because the absence of change depresses curiosity? This seems unlikely given that Experiment 1 showed the effect using a baseline condition which referenced neither the presence nor absence of change. However, we investigated this question in a supplemental experiment. In this experiment, participants viewed the first section of an article which varied in whether it indicated that an entity had changed, had not changed, or made no mention of the presence or absence of change. We theorized that participants would be more curious about this entity when they read that it had changed, relative both to when they read that it had not changed and also relative to when they saw no mention of the presence or absence of change.

**Method**

Six hundred two participants (mean age = 36; 48% male) were recruited from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. All participants viewed the beginning portion of an article describing the return policy of Target (a national retailer), which began by noting that “Target’s return policy determines whether people can return products bought at Target.” Between conditions, this information varied only in whether it was accompanied with further information regarding whether Target’s return policy had or had not changed. Participants in the *Change* condition read that Target’s return policy had changed (i.e., they read that “Target is changing its return policy”). Participants in the *No Change* condition read that Target’s return policy has not changed (i.e., they read that “Target has had the same return policy for many years”). Participants in the *Baseline* condition did not view any further information (i.e., they saw no mention of the presence or absence of change in Target’s return policy).

After reading this information, participants indicated their curiosity about Target’s return policy on the same two-item index described in Experiments 2-4 (this time adapted to refer to Target’s return policy). These items were strongly correlated (*r* = .96, *p* < .001) were thus averaged into an index of curiosity.

**Results and Discussion**

As predicted, there was a significant effect of condition on curiosity, *F*(2, 599) = 15.30, *p* < .001. Participants who read that the policy had changed (*M* =4.80; *SD*= 1.86) were more curious than both participants who read that the policy had not changed (*M* =3.76; *SD*= 2.07; Fisher’s LSD: *p* < .001; Cohen’s *d* = .528, 95% CI: .3273 to .7284) and participants who saw no mention of the presence or absence of change (*M* =4.00; *SD*= 1.97; Fisher’s LSD: *p* < .001; Cohen’s *d* = .416, 95% CI: .2186 to .6126), the latter of which did not differ from each other (Fisher’s LSD: *p* = .217).