

**The Beneficial Role of Curiosity on Route memory in Children**

Yadurshana Sivashankar<sup>1</sup>, Myra Fernandes<sup>1</sup>, Pierre-Yves Oudeyer<sup>2</sup> & Hélène Sauzéon<sup>2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology, University of Waterloo

<sup>2</sup>Flowers Team; INRIA

<sup>3</sup> BPH Bordeaux Population Health, University of Bordeaux

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to:

Yadurshana Sivashankar, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6341-070X>; Department of Psychology, University of Waterloo, 200 University Ave W, Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1. Tel: (437) 353-1767; Fax 519-746-8631. Email: [ysivasha@uwaterloo.ca](mailto:ysivasha@uwaterloo.ca)

Myra Fernandes (Email: [mafernan@uwaterloo.ca](mailto:mafernan@uwaterloo.ca)); <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1467-0342>

Pierre-Yves Oudeyer (Email: [pierre-yves.oudeyer@inria.fr](mailto:pierre-yves.oudeyer@inria.fr)); <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1277-130X>

Hélène Sauzéon, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5781-9891>; Flowers team, centre Inria, 200 avenue de la vieille Tour, Talence, F-3405 cedex. Tel : (+33) 524574111; Email : [helene.sauzeon@inria.fr](mailto:helene.sauzeon@inria.fr)

## **Acknowledgements**

We are very grateful to the children and their parents for agreeing to participate in this study. We would also like to thank Anouche Banikyan and Emma Tison for their help with data collection.

The data necessary to reproduce the analyses presented here are publicly accessible, as are the materials necessary to replicate the findings. These are available from author HS upon request. The analytical code necessary to reproduce the analyses presented in this paper is not publicly accessible. However, the JASP files (statistical outcomes) are available from author HS upon request. The analyses here were not preregistered.

## **Disclosure of Interests: None**

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

## **Funding**

The authors disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This work was supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) Discovery Grant 2020-03917 awarded to author MAF, and by the Idex fund from the university of Bordeaux (France) and Inria funds for Master's internships awarded to author HS . Writing of this manuscript occurred during the tenure of the Mitacs Globalink Scholarship awarded to author YS.

## **Abstract**

We assessed the influence of trait and state curiosity on route memory. Forty-two 10-year-old children with low and high-trait curiosity (20 Females; 22 Males) actively explored virtual environments that elicited varying levels of uncertainty (i.e., state-curiosity). As trait curiosity increased, so did memory performance in low and high uncertainty conditions, suggesting that high-curiosity children can better recruit cognitive resources within non-optimal environments. Children with high compared to low curiosity also reported greater feelings of presence during exploration. Importantly, in environments with medium uncertainty, children with low trait curiosity were able to perform as well as those with high curiosity. Results show that individual differences in trait curiosity influence route learning, and interact dynamically with state-curiosity invoked within different environments.

Since the last decade, there has been a growing interest in the role of innate curiosity on facets of human cognition, such as in spatial learning and memory. Early definitions of curiosity by William James (Buheji, 2019; p.g., 14) describe it as a “*higher, more intellectual form of impulse*” that internally drives children to explore their external environment to acquire new information. States of curiosity evoked by exploratory activities or stimuli that are surprising, novel, and of intermediate complexity, foster both spontaneous exploration and active learning in children, young as well as older adults (for reviews: see Gruber et al., 2014; Oudeyer, 2007, Sakaki et al., 2018). For example, Stahl and Feigenson (2015) observed that infants created stronger associations between sounds/words and visual objects in a context where object movements violated the expected laws of physics (i.e., a context that contradicted one’s internal expectations about a target event). The primary objective of the current study was to create and use an experimental paradigm that assessed the influence of trait curiosity on spatial learning and memory, in environments that elicited varying levels of uncertainty (i.e., state of curiosity).

Prior studies investigating the influence of curiosity on memory are based on Loewenstein's *Information Gap Theory (IGT)* (Loewenstein et al., 1992). *IGT* views curiosity as "arising when attention is focused on a gap in knowledge" (Loewenstein et al., 1992; p.g., 75). According to this theory, this gap produces a sense of knowledge deprivation that motivates one to seek out the missing information in order to eliminate the knowledge gap. For instance, Loewenstein and colleagues (1992) found that participants were more curious when there was an information deficit than when there was none, and significantly more curious when they had some knowledge about the target information.

In another study utilizing both behavioural and imaging methods, Kang and colleagues (2008) were among the first to use a Trivia question paradigm to show precisely the benefit of curiosity on memory. Here participants were presented with a series of trivia

questions that served to elicit participants' interest to seek the correct answer. The researchers then examined how interest triggered by knowledge gaps facilitated memory for the answer. They found that adults exhibited enhanced long-term memory retention for verbal material for which they had expressed high relative to low knowledge gaps. They also observed greater neural activity in the striatum and inferior frontal cortex prior to the presentation of answers to questions evoking high-curiosity (due to there being a high knowledge gap). Moreover, when participants observed answers that did not match their predictions (i.e., a prediction error), an increase in activation in putamen and left inferior frontal cortex was observed. Using trivia questions, several studies consistently found that curiosity in knowing the answer was positively related to memory performance in people of various ages (Fastrich et al., 2018; Gruber et al., 2014; Kang et al., 2008; Marvin & Shohamy, 2016; McGillivray et al., 2015; Mullaney et al., 2014; Murayama & Kuhbander, 2011). Importantly, using a Trivia question paradigm, recent results in children (10-14 years) further support the claim of a memory benefit from curiosity-driven learning (Fandakova & Gruber, 2021).

### **1.1 Limitations of Previous Research on Curiosity-based Memory**

While a Trivia question paradigm has some advantages in terms of facilitating the study of curiosity-based memory, it has several limitations (Fastrich et al., 2018). First, questions are prepared in an ad-hoc manner with large discrepancies from one study to the next (content, set size), with potential item effects that have an influence on statistical inference in intra-individual analysis (Murayama et al., 2014; 2019). Second, trivia question paradigms do not allow interpretation of the curiosity state of participants before and after the answer is presented. Importantly, the amount and range of interest that trivia questions induce in participants is unclear, and it is difficult to compare the results across different studies. The ability to draw comparisons across different studies is particularly important in children where intra- and inter-individual variabilities are high. This underscores the need to design

curiosity paradigms that are reliable and robust to intra- and inter-individual variability.

Further, Gruber and colleagues (2019) suggested that hippocampal-dependent memory for curiosity-related information is enhanced because it engages attention, exploration, and information-seeking behaviour. This neurocognitive framework of curiosity's effect on memory stresses the interplay between curiosity and the so-called reward network in the brain, whereby curiosity enhances memory through the release of dopamine in the hippocampal memory system (Düzel et al., 2010; Lisman & Grace, 2005; Shohamy & Adcock, 2010). In light of these findings, we believe that hippocampal-mediated memory for a route travelled (Jansen-Osmann & Wiedenbauer, 2004) could be better remembered, if a curiosity-state is induced.

## **1.2 Past Studies of Spatial Memory**

Past studies have found that children are more inclined to explore a novel environment when some information about the surrounding is provided prior to exploration, compared to when little to no information is revealed (Baer & Kidd, 2022; Jach et al., 2022; Jirout & Klahr, 2012; Kashdan et al., 2018). In light of these findings, Jirout and Klahr (2012) has defined curiosity as “*the threshold of desired uncertainty in the environment which leads to (joyous) exploratory behavior*” (p.g., 125). Specifically, they assert that curiosity is most likely to occur when there is a “medium” or “optimal” level of uncertainty about the environment, resulting in an inverted-U shape relationship between curiosity and uncertainty. That is, children may feel overwhelmed to explore a surrounding of high uncertainty, and may feel bored to explore one with minimal (low) uncertainty. They feel most interested in exploring environments eliciting medium levels of uncertainty (Jirout & Klahr, 2012). Their view also suggests that the peak of this inverted-U shape could differ as a function of individual differences, such as a child's trait level of curiosity. Children who are inherently inclined to resolve highly uncertain questions are considered high in trait curiosity (Jirout & Klahr, 2012).

To the best of our knowledge, no study in children has investigated the role of curiosity elicited by an uncertainty manipulation, on spatial memory. For example, following exploration of large-scale environments, wayfinding and ability to re-trace a route can be assessed as a proxy for spatial memory. It is well established that navigational tasks can be measured by different types of spatial knowledge, including landmark knowledge (visual entities), route or procedural knowledge (sequential order of landmarks encountered, as well as associations between landmarks and changes in direction), and survey knowledge (cognitive map with Euclidean information allowing three dimensional representations; Chrastil and Warren, 2011 for review). Several studies highlight the important role of ‘decisional landmarks’, such as those present at crossroads or reorientation points, in route memory (Meade et al; 2019; Michon & Denis, 2001). Such landmarks have been shown to improve memory in children as young as 6 years of age, as well as adults (Farran et al., 2012). Young children’s (<8 years) ability to learn sequences of landmarks is worse than that of older children (12 years; Jansen-Osmann & Wiedenbauer, 2004). However, they are more inclined to use landmark knowledge as a form of directional guidance on a route memory task, revealing that this facet of navigation develops sometime before age 10 (Jansen-Osmann & Fuchs, 2006).

These differences and changes in spatial knowledge creation, in middle childhood, fit with age-related brain changes observed during this developmental period. Indeed, children between the ages of 7-12 experience a gradual maturation of the hippocampus and this corresponds to an increase in use of symbolic spatial representations, such as maps and models (Vasilyeva & Lourenco, 2012), suggesting that middle childhood is an important developmental period for spatial memory processing (Piaget & Inhelder, 1967). Gruber and Fandakova (2021) proposed that developmental changes that occur in neural circuits of the neocortex might also enhance the benefit of curiosity on route memory. For example, in early

childhood, the curiosity-reward circuit may be more directly related to the memory-hippocampal circuit.

### 1.3 Current Study

In the current study, we constructed a game-based virtual reality (VR) program consisting of nine different maps containing varying levels of uncertainty (low, medium, high). Children with different levels of trait curiosity explored these environments, after which memory for the route travelled was assessed. As reviewed by Jirout (2020), several studies have demonstrated that the presence of uncertainty leads to higher engagement (Howard et al., 2009) of map exploration, and greater information seeking (e.g., Jirout & Klahr, 2012; Litman et al., 2005). Similar to the experimental paradigm used by Jirout and Klahr (2012), we manipulated state curiosity within each environment by increasing the level of uncertainty (i.e., low, medium, and high) in correctly predicting the appearance of a cartoon character when exploring a path. That is, at each three-way intersection (see Figure 1), participants selected a path to explore based on the cartoon character they predicted they would encounter during exploration of the chosen path. All participants experienced all three levels of uncertainty conditions (within-subject factor).

In the *low uncertainty condition*, the presence of only one image provided participants a 100% success rate in correctly predicting the appearance of a cartoon character during exploration. In the *medium uncertainty condition*, participants chose one character from three images shown prior to entering a path (~33% success rate), and in the *high uncertainty condition*, seven images were displayed (~14% success rate) at the entrance of paths making up an intersection. The process of observing and selecting characters at the entrance of paths was repeated during the entire duration of exploring a map. Therefore, in the medium and high-uncertainty conditions, there was greater ambiguity in terms of which character would appear during exploration. Based on past findings, we reasoned that greater ambiguity in



predicted presence of the desired target stimuli (cartoon characters) in our medium and high uncertainty environments would evoke greater state curiosity in children, and subsequently enhance memory for spatial routes (Gruber et al., 2019; Jirout and Klahr, 2012; Kreidler et al., 1975; Wu & Chen, 2016).

Further, we also assessed individual differences in spatial navigation, digital media use, and importantly trait curiosity to determine whether these measures correlated with how well participants remembered the routes explored. Trait curiosity was measured using a trait curiosity questionnaire (*Interest and Deprivation Type Epistemic Curiosity Scale; IDEC*, Piotrowski et al., 2014). This questionnaire allowed us to determine whether trait curiosity altered the influence of our uncertainty manipulation (state curiosity) on spatial learning (Litman, 2005). To this end, we relied specifically on the scores from the Interest-type subscale of the *IDEC* questionnaire to stratify our sample into high and low trait-curiosity groups (i.e., between-subjects factor).

Interest-type (I-type) subscale of the *IDEC* questionnaire correlates positively with openness and tolerance to ambiguous information (Litman, 2005). In contrast, endorsement of Deprivation-type (D-type) items (e.g., frustrated if I can't figure out a problem) signify feelings of perplexity or frustration due to having an incomplete understanding of something, or lacking the solution to a specific problem when individuals have partial knowledge about a phenomenon (e.g., “tip-of-the-tongue” responses to questions; Litman, 2005). Therefore, relying on the I-type subscale allowed us to capture children who are either high or low in trait curiosity. For instance, children who score high on I-type items will be more likely to enjoy exploration and to work through problems containing ambiguous information, relative to children who score low on this subscale. (Litman, 2005). In addition, the properties of the *IDEC* questionnaire are well validated (Litman, 2005). Thus, we reasoned that our choice of using

the I-type items to stratify our sample into the two groups (low vs high-trait curiosity) is one that is theoretically sound. Further, our choice of classifying children who enjoy uncertainty and explorative behaviour as those with high trait-curiosity is also in line with Jirout and Klahr's (2012) definition of curiosity. Finally, given that our research is in a novel domain, and we are replicating and extending the work of Jirout and Klahr (2012) to examine the influence of both state and trait curiosity on route memory, our work can be described as explorative, with a-priori predictions informed by past work.

## 2. Method

### 2.1 Participants

Forty-two children (20 females [ $M_{\text{age}} = 10.25$ ,  $SD = 0.55$ ]; 22 males [ $M_{\text{age}} = 10.23$ ,  $SD = 0.53$ ]) enrolled in fourth grade of primary school (within municipalities in and around the city of Bordeaux in the New-Aquitaine region of France), between the ages of nine and eleven were recruited (on volunteer basis) to participate in the study. We conducted a posteriori power analysis using the G\*Power software according to a mixed ANOVA design with both between and repeated measures. The selected sample ensured power of 0.95 (at  $p < .05$ ) to detect medium Curiosity group x Uncertainty condition interactions ( $F = .252$ ) in a 2 (curiosity group) x 3 (uncertainty condition) ANOVA. The *Research Ethics Committee* approved all study procedures. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants and their parents prior to experimentation. Data collection took place between February and July of 2021. The law in France prohibits data collection of socio-demographic information pertaining to racial and ethnic identities of research participants, unless it is the primary focus of the research question; therefore, we did not collect data on such variables.

Before the experiment began in VR, we asked the parents or guardians of participants to complete the *IDEC Scale* for young children, as a measure of trait curiosity (Piotrowski et al., 2014). Based on the scores obtained on the *Interest subscale* of the *IDEC* scale, we divided

participants into two groups: 'high curiosity' and 'low curiosity' (High Curiosity group included children scoring above the median value of 15; Low Curiosity group included children scoring below this median value), see Table 1. Individual difference measures were also collected to probe for personal interest in exploring new environments, visual-spatial functioning, digital usages and simulator sickness (see Table 1). These measures were included to control for their possible influence on route memory score within our VR paradigm.

Visuospatial functioning was assessed before exposure to our VR experiment using three test measures. The spatial visualization ability of participants was evaluated using the *Hooper Visual Orientation (HVO)* test (Boyd, 1981). This test contains 30 line drawings of common objects that are portrayed as having been cut up and misaligned; participants are instructed to mentally rotate and piece together the visual information, to identify the depicted object. Visuo-spatial short term and working memory were assessed using the *Corsi Block-Tapping Task* (Arce & McMullen, 2021) to establish the forward and backward visuospatial span. Finally, spatial orientation ability of participants was evaluated with the *Santa Barbara Sense-of-Direction (SBSDS)* scale (Hegarty et al., 2006). Each participant rated their endorsement of 15 statements about spatial orientation in everyday life, such as “I am good at giving directions”, indicating whether they strongly agreed or disagreed, using a 7-point Likert-scale. After reverse scoring the items, the responses were summed and divided by 15 to derive an average score between 1–7.

Participants then completed a *Digital Experience* (Moffat et al., 2001) questionnaire composed of three items. These items included the following questions: “How often do you use electronic devices (smartphones, tablets, consoles, and computers)?”, “How often do you play video games?”, and “How often do you play computer games that involve VE technology (e.g., flight or driving simulators)?” Participants rated each item from 0 to 7, to obtain a maximum score of 21 on this questionnaire.

## BENEFIT OF CURIOSITY ON ROUTE MEMORY IN CHILDREN

We also assessed participants' *interest* in exploring virtual environments using the same single item questionnaire completed prior to VR immersion (i.e., "On a scale from 1[lowest] to 10 [highest], how much do you enjoy discovering new environments?"). Similarly, *character appeal* was assessed using the same single item questionnaire completed after exposure to VR immersion [i.e., Did you like the characters? using a scale ranging from Not at all (0) to Extremely (10)].

Table 1.

*Mean Descriptive Characteristics (standard deviation in parentheses) of Children with Low and High Trait-level Curiosity*

Characteristic	Low Curiosity Group	High Curiosity Group
	<i>n</i> = 21	<i>n</i> =21
Age	10.33 (0.58)	10.19 (0.51)
Sex	15 Boys/6 Girls	8 Boys/ 13 Girls
Interest Type-Curiosity trait	13.38 (0.33)	17.42*** (0.52)
Deprivation Type-Curiosity trait	13.66 (2.87)	15.23 (2.49)
Total Curiosity trait	27.04 (3.55)	32.66*** (3.27)
<i>SBSODS</i>	4.71 (0.85)	4.80 (0.83)
<i>HVO</i>	22.76 (2.55)	20.90 (3.78)
<i>Corsi BTT Forward</i>	4.90 (0.87)	4.95 (0.80)
<i>Corsi BTT Backward</i>	4.78 (0.90)	4.78 (1.05)
Digital Experience	9.69 (4.23)	10.33 (2.74)
VR Interest	8.73 (0.23)	8.36 (0.86)
Character Appeal	9.64 (0.89)	9.40 (1.56)
<i>Child SSQ</i>	2.71 (3.24)	3.00 (1.77)

*Note: SBSODS = Santa Barbara Sense-of-Direction Scale, HVO = Hooper Visual Organization, Corsi BTT (F) = Forward Corsi Block Tapping Task, Corsi BTT (B) = Backward Corsi Block Tapping Task, Child SSQ = Child Simulator Sickness Questionnaire; Asterisks denote significant group differences, \*significant group difference ( $p < .05$ ); \*\* ( $p < .01$ ); \*\*\* ( $p < .001$ );\*\*\*\* ( $p < .0001$ ).*

The *Child Simulator Sickness Questionnaire* (SSQ; Hoelt et al., 2003) was also used to assess the severity of VR sickness experienced during the VR experiment. The SSQ measured oculomotor discomfort, disorientation, nausea, and fatigue experienced as a result of VR exposure. We scored this questionnaire by assigning each question a value based on the response. Each “No” response received a score of 0, each “A little” response received a score of 1, and each “A lot” response received a score of 2. A score of 1 or 2 reported for an item on the SSQ questionnaire indicated the presence of simulator sickness for the child.

Overall, the two children’s groups significantly differed only on the curiosity I-type trait score, but not on other variables (age, sex, spatial functioning, digital experience, character appeal, and SSQ). Importantly, the two groups did not differ in terms of their prior interest towards immersive VR.

## 2.2 Materials

A computer-run VR application was designed on the 3D Unity © engine (ver. 2017.2.0.f3; see specifications on <https://www.vive.com/ca/>). This application allowed active exploration of virtual environments with a lightweight HTC VIVE mobile headset and handheld controller, with continuous button press and heading rotation, for an easy-to-use control interface. The VR application included nine Virtual Environments (VEs) previously used for assessing route memory in adults (Meade et al., 2019). The nine VEs consisted of three types of styles: city streets, mall corridors, and park trails (see Figure 1). They were all topographically similar with an average size of 234 m<sup>2</sup>, with six intersections in each of the nine maps.

The VR application included three exploration conditions (study phases) that varied in terms of uncertainty level (low, medium, and high) at intersection points (see Figure 2). At each intersection, we displayed pictures of cartoon characters, or solid colours, on seven different flags aligned horizontally at a height of 3 meters. We randomly assigned the location

of a cartoon image on one of the seven flags at each intersection, in order to encourage the participant to perform a visual search. In the *Low Uncertainty Condition*, only one character was displayed on one of the flags at the entrance to each intersection; the other six flags were simply a variety of different colors. In the *Medium Uncertainty Condition*, we showed three cartoon images at the entrance to each intersection (with the remaining flags varying in color). In the *High Uncertainty Condition*, we showed seven cartoon character images (Superman, Spiderman, Batman, Spider-Gwen, Hulk, Ironman and Black Panther) at the entrance to each intersection. Here participants could encounter any one of the seven cartoon characters on the road as they explored the selected path.

[Figure 1 goes here]

[Please place Figure 2 below Figure 1]

## 2.3 Measures

### 2.3.1. VR-based measures for each uncertainty condition

The aim of the study was to assess the influence of the uncertainty manipulation (low, medium, and high; within-subject factor) on spatial route memory performance in both High and Low Trait-Curiosity children (between-subjects factor). The primary dependent variable of interest was the accuracy in re-tracing the same route at retrieval that had been travelled during encoding (see Figure 3). To obtain this measure of spatial memory performance, the overlap between the routes travelled by each participant at encoding and retrieval, for each condition, was calculated to produce a “*percent overlap*” value for each environment (detailed procedure explained in Meade et al., 2019). A higher “percent overlap” value is indicative of better memory for the routes travelled at encoding. The *route overlap score* was then corrected for the number of direction changes for each participant. The number of direction changes was counted for each study phase of each participant. The following formula was applied: corrected Wayfinding score = (Wayfinding performance) \* (Number of

direction changes/6). Six is the maximum number of changes of direction that can be made by a participant.

[Figure 3 goes here]

Participants were also invited to rate their *intrinsic motivation* elicited by each uncertainty conditions using two questions with a rating scale from 0 to 6 [e.g., Was the low uncertainty condition your preference? Participants self-rated on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 4 (absolutely); Was the low uncertainty condition the most satisfactory to make your predictions of character appearances at intersections? Participants self-rated on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 4 (absolutely)]. Each participant's *intrinsic motivation* score was tabulated as the sum of ratings from these two questions, for an overall score ranging from 0 to 8.

### **2.3.2 Individual difference measures administered post-VR immersion**

We administered the *Igroup Presence Questionnaire (IPQ)* to determine the extent to which participants felt present while exploring the VR environments (Darken et al., 1999; Schubert et al., 2001). Participants were instructed to rate each statement (e.g., “In the computer generated world, I had a sense of being there”, I felt present in the virtual space”) from a scale of 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much).

Finally, participants completed a two-item questionnaire evaluating the *emotional experience* elicited by the characters displayed during map exploration in VR; With 1) *Perceived positive emotion for succeeded predictions* [i.e., Were you happy when the character you chose appeared?] rated on a scale ranging from -3 (extremely negative) to 3 (extremely positive) and 2) *Perceived negative emotion for failed predictions* [i.e., Were you disappointed when the character you chose did not appear?] rated on a scale ranging from -3 (extremely negative) to 3 (extremely positive). Again, the scores from the two items were averaged, thereby providing an ‘emotional valence score’ ranging from -3 (extremely negative) to 3 (extremely positive). We included these questionnaires to assess whether the

subjective VR experience across the three different uncertainty conditions influenced memory for the paths travelled.

### **2.4 Procedure**

Throughout the entire VR experiment, participants were seated in a comfortable chair that could turn a full 360° circle, which was placed in the center of a testing room. Following verbal instruction of how to use the VR headset, participants were given unlimited time to complete a training phase with the VR equipment, designed to help them learn how to navigate in the virtual space. A single handheld VR controller was sufficient to navigate in the environment. To move forward, participants were instructed to press the Trackpad Button of the controller. To change their direction, participants had to rotate their head in the desired direction, as well as physically rotate in the spinning chair with their legs. We advised participants to take as much time as needed in the training phase in order to become comfortable with the environment. Participants practiced aiming at flags with the hand controller and selected flags with the Trigger of the controller. The flag selection action allowed us to track within our VR experiment, which character was chosen and predicted by the child as the one who will appear during the new direction, and ensured that the VR application reflected our manipulated probabilities (100%, 33%, and 14%) for predictions. Immediately following the training phase, the experimental session began.

There were two main phases during the VR experiment: A study/encoding phase (90 secs) followed by a filler task (60 secs), and then a retrieval phase (90 secs) in which participants re-traced the exact route taken at encoding. During the study phase (i.e., the route of the path taken at encoding), participants actively explored nine environments for 90 seconds each (i.e., they decided the path of travel and exerted full motor control through the track pad of the VR controller). After exploration, a message indicated the end of the exploration/study phase and participants were then asked to count backwards as a filler; this



was done to prevent rehearsal of the route just travelled. Immediately after counting backwards, participants were placed in the same VR environment again, at the same starting point as in the Study phase, and were instructed to re-trace their exact path travelled, within the 90 seconds allotted for each retrieval trial.

Each participant explored a total of 9 maps, with the retrieval test for each one immediately following its encoding phase. Encoding trials were blocked by condition type (3 maps in the Low Uncertainty, 3 maps in the Medium Uncertainty, and 3 maps in the High Uncertainty conditions). The order of the three uncertainty conditions was counterbalanced across participants. The total time spent in VR was thirty-six minutes. Two children were evaluated during a given experimental session. While the first participant was immersed in VR, the other completed the neuropsychological tests as well as the questionnaires. Then the roles reversed.

## **3. Results**

### **3.1 Intrinsic Motivation Score and Route Memory Performance**

#### ***3.1.1 Intrinsic motivation ratings***

We conducted analyses to serve as a manipulation check that our uncertainty conditions elicited varying levels of motivation to explore spatial routes. We conducted a 2 (Curiosity Group: low, high; between-subjects) X 3 (Uncertainty Condition: low, medium, high; within-subject) mixed ANOVA examining participants' self-reported motivation "to explore and correctly predict character appearances at intersections" as the dependent variable (see Table 2 for means; see Figure 4). We found a significant main effect of Uncertainty Condition,  $F(2, 80) = 14.36$ ,  $MSE = 131.52$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2_p = 0.26$ . Participants rated both the high ( $M = 4.62$ ,  $SE = 0.39$ ;  $t(80) = -5.33$ ,  $SE = 0.66$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and medium uncertainty ( $M = 3.14$ ,  $SE = 0.65$ ;  $t(80) = -3.09$ ,  $SE = 0.66$ ,  $p = .005$ ) conditions to have elicited greater motivation compared to the low uncertainty condition ( $M = 1.09$ ,  $SE = 0.39$ ).

Further, motivation scores were the highest in the high, relative to the medium uncertainty condition,  $t(80) = -2.23$ ,  $SE = 0.66$ ,  $p = .031$  (see Table 2 for Means).

There were no significant main effect of Curiosity Group,  $F(1, 40) = 0.45$ ,  $MSE = 0.51$ ,  $p > .50$ , or Curiosity Group X Uncertainty Condition Interaction,  $F(2, 80) = 0.54$ ,  $MSE = 4.98$ ,  $p > .50$ . These results indicate that our manipulation of uncertainty did indeed elicit varying levels of motivation, and these did not differ across the Curiosity groups.

Table 2.

*Mean Motivation Scores and VR Experience Ratings (standard deviation in parentheses) in Children with Low and High Trait Curiosity within each Uncertainty Condition*

	Low Curiosity Group	High Curiosity Group
<b>Intrinsic Motivation Scores</b> ( <i>max. score = 8</i> )		
Low Uncertainty Condition	0.86 (1.52)	0.42 (0.74)
Medium Uncertainty Condition	2.19 (2.04)	1.80 (2.15)
High Uncertainty Condition	3.00 (2.51)	3.81 (2.42)
<b>Self-rated VR Experience</b>		
IPQ total score	7.90 (8.33)	17.00* (07.21)
Character prediction-related Emotional valence score	2.00 (0.84)	1.85 (1.10)

*Note: IPQ = Igroup Presence Questionnaire; \* significant group difference ( $p < .05$ ).*

### 3.1.2 Route overlap (memory) performance

We then conducted a 2 (Curiosity Group: low, high; between-subjects) X 3 (Uncertainty Condition: low, medium, high; within-subject) mixed ANOVA examining Corrected Route Overlap score as the dependent variable. See Table 3 for means.

Table 3.

## BENEFIT OF CURIOSITY ON ROUTE MEMORY IN CHILDREN

*Mean Route Memory Scores (standard deviation in parentheses) in Children with Low and High Trait Curiosity within each Uncertainty Condition*

	Low Curiosity Group	High Curiosity Group
<b>Route recall score (percent overlap)</b>		
Low Uncertainty condition	25.80*(12.51)	34.49 (10.68)
Medium Uncertainty condition	33.42 (14.32)	27.51 (7.65)
High Uncertainty condition	25.35* (9.16)	32.32 (10.29)

*Note.*\* significant group difference ( $p < .05$ )

There was no significant main effect of Uncertainty Condition on Route Memory score,  $F(2, 80) = 0.28$ ,  $MSE = 113.61$ ,  $p = .761$ ,  $\eta^2p = 0.01$ , nor was there a significant effect of Curiosity Group,  $F(1, 40) = 2.46$ ,  $MSE = 135.01$ ,  $p = .125$ ,  $\eta^2p = 0.06$ . There was, however, a significant Group X Uncertainty Condition interaction,  $F(2, 80) = 5.88$ ,  $MSE = 113.61$ ,  $p = .004$ ,  $\eta^2p = 0.13$  (see Figure 4).

[Figure 4 goes here]

To better understand the interaction, we conducted a paired sample  $t$ -test comparing Route Overlap Memory score in each of the three Uncertainty conditions (low, medium, and high), separately for each Group (Low and High-Trait-Curiosity). For the Low Curiosity Group, participants' memory for routes travelled tended to be the best in the medium uncertainty condition ( $M = 33.42$ ,  $SD = 14.32$ ) relative to low ( $M = 25.80$ ,  $SD = 12.51$ ),  $t(20) = 1.77$ ,  $SE = 4.32$ ,  $p = .044$ , Cohen's  $d = -0.38$ , and high conditions ( $M = 25.35$ ,  $SD = 9.16$ ),  $t(20) = 3.04$ ,  $SE = 2.65$ ,  $p = .006$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.67$ . Performance in the low and high conditions did not differ significantly,  $t(20) = 0.12$ ,  $p > .900$ .

In contrast, for the High Curiosity Group, participants performed worst in the medium uncertainty condition ( $M = 27.51$ ,  $SD = 7.65$ ) relative to both low ( $M = 34.49$ ,  $SD = 10.68$ ),

and high ( $M = 32.32$ ,  $SD = 10.29$ ) conditions,  $t(20) = 2.31$ ,  $SE = 3.02$ ,  $p = .031$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.51$ , and  $t(20) = 2.18$ ,  $SE = 2.21$ ,  $p = .041$ , Cohen's  $d = -0.48$ , respectively. We did not find any significant differences between low and high uncertainty conditions,  $t(20) = 0.64$ ,  $p > .500$ .

Looking at the interaction in another way, independent samples  $t$ -tests revealed that Low Trait-Curiosity participants performed worse than High Trait-Curiosity participants in both the low,  $t(41) = -2.42$ ,  $SE = 3.59$ ,  $p = .020$ , Cohen's  $d = -0.75$ , and high uncertainty conditions,  $t(41) = -2.32$ ,  $SE = 3.01$ ,  $p = .026$ , Cohen's  $d = -0.72$ . However, the two groups did not significantly differ in the medium uncertainty condition ( $p > .10$ ).

Given our goal of determining whether route memory performance, intrinsic motivation, and sense of presence in VR (measured by *IPQ*) were related to various individual difference indices pertaining to spatial navigation and digital media use, we ran a series of Pearson correlations. We observed a positive significant correlation between route recall performance and *intrinsic motivation* ( $r = 0.47$ ,  $p = .002$ , with  $\alpha = 0.03$  [Bonferroni adjustment was applied when determining significance]); importantly, this was true only for the medium uncertainty condition (see Figure 5). In addition, a negative relation was observed between the curiosity-I trait score and route memory performance for the medium curiosity condition ( $r = -0.32$ ,  $p = .033$ , with  $\alpha = 0.03$ ), providing additional evidence to our finding that children of Low-curiosity performed best under this state. The inverse was true for those in the High-curiosity group. All other correlations were non-significant (all  $p > .05$ ).

[Figure 5 goes here]

### 3.2 Group Difference on Measures Administered Post-VR Immersion

The two groups differed significantly only on the *IPQ (Igroup Presence Questionnaire)*. We found that those in the High-Trait Curiosity group reported a greater sense of presence ( $M = 17.00$ ,  $SD = 7.21$ ) while being immersed in VR, relative to children with Low-Trait Curiosity ( $M = 7.90$ ,  $SD = 8.33$ ),  $t(40) = -2.16$ ,  $p = .037$ , Cohen's  $d = -0.67$  (see Table 2). In contrast, the groups did not differ in terms of their rating of emotional experience related to their correct predictions of a character's appearance,  $t(40) = -0.47$ ,  $p > .600$ .

#### 4. Discussion

In the last decade, there has been a growing interest in how curiosity might influence memory and learning. In the current study, we constructed a game-based experiment using virtual environments, from which uncertainty of motivational objects was manipulated to influence state curiosity. We manipulated state curiosity by increasing the level of uncertainty in correctly predicting the appearance of a cartoon character, as participants explored a path in a virtual environment. We measured the effect of state curiosity created in these environments, on spatial memory for routes travelled, in children with low and high trait curiosity.

Children with low and high trait curiosity were asked to actively explore virtual environments containing varying levels of uncertainty. We then assessed memory for routes travelled. Children in the high-trait curiosity group performed the best in both high and low uncertainty environments, suggesting that these children are able to benefit from non-optimal states of exploration. Importantly, in environments with medium uncertainty, children with low-trait curiosity were able to perform as well as those with high curiosity. Results highlight an important influence of individual differences on cognitive task performance (route memory) in environments with varying levels of uncertainty.

As suggested by past work, we predicted that an optimal level of uncertainty regarding the presence of cartoon characters in the medium uncertainty condition would confer the greatest benefit to route overlap, relative to low and high conditions (Gruber et al., 2019; Jirout & Klahr, 2012; Kreidler et al., 1975; Wu & Chen, 2016). These predictions were in line with the findings by Jirout and Klahr (2012), who claim that children are more inclined to explore a novel environment when some information about the surrounding is provided prior to exploration, compared to when little to no prior information is revealed. That is, a ‘medium’ or optimal level of uncertainty about the environment is the most useful in eliciting levels of curiosity. Although we did not observe a significant main effect of uncertainty condition, or group differences in route memory performance, we did find a significant crossover interaction. As predicted, we found the medium uncertainty condition to benefit memory for routes, more so than the conditions (environments) with low and high curiosity – however this was true only in children of low trait-curiosity. To our surprise, children of high trait-curiosity performed the worst in the medium uncertainty condition, and higher in the low and high uncertainty conditions. Finally, we also found that those in the high-trait curiosity group reported a greater sense of presence while being immersed in VR, relative to children with low-trait curiosity.

### **4.1. Optimal Uncertainty as a Booster for Spatial Memory in Children**

Our pattern of findings is in line with previous findings revealing that children, youth, and adults with high relative to low trait curiosity show high academic achievement, and are often high performers on various cognitive tasks, particularly when the cognitive tasks tap on explorative processes (Von Stumm, 2013; Von Stumm & Ackerman, 2013; for review, Mussel, 2022).

Prior research in spatial learning in young adults (for reviews: Chrástil & Warren, 2012; Smith, 2019), suggests that active exploration (relative to passive where one is simply

guided to a path; no volitional control of movement) enhances memory for routes travelled and location of landmarks by a way of requiring greater attention and decision-making strategies (Sauzéon et al., 2015). Research in children also shows that they must first learn how to direct attention to spatial cues when navigating, suggesting that attention is a general ability that is important in navigational tasks (Heth et al., 1997). Cornell and colleagues (1989) showed that encouraging six- to twelve-year-old children to direct attention to proximal landmarks (i.e., landmarks near the route) rather than distal landmarks (i.e., landmarks seen from far away), helped them to retrace a route more successfully. In light of the findings of the current study, we propose that in addition to attention and decision-making, curiosity-driven spatial learning is another critical component underlying the benefit of active exploration. Behavioural evidence in favour of this position is also provided by studies examining the gaming effect in children. For instance, active exploration of an environment is reported to be highly beneficial to children, if elements of gamification such as finding motivational objects are introduced into the task while exploring the environment (Fornasari et al., 2013; Proulx et al., 2017). A recent study on the PokemonGo® game also revealed that greater curiosity elicited by the game increased the quality of the spatial representation of the environments explored by the children (Blasko et al., 2018).

Furthermore, neural evidence in favour of curiosity-driven spatial memory stems from the Prediction Appraisal Curiosity and Exploration (PACE) framework (Gruber et al., 2019). This neurocognitive theory suggests that curiosity can be triggered by a surprising contextual change or detection of a new context, signaled by the anterior hippocampus, or by the detection of an abstract knowledge gap, signaled by the anterior cingulate cortex (Gruber and Fandakova, 2021). Appraisal of the triggered event as negative leads to behavioral inhibition and anxiety. While, appraisal of the event as salient and valuable for the future leads to the subjective experience of curiosity and recruitment of the dopaminergic circuit, which serves

to promote explorative and information seeking behaviour. Thus, curiosity-induced dopaminergic neuromodulation of the hippocampus is believed to aid in the consolidation of memories for both the target stimulus and any incidental information encountered during a curiosity state. When children of low-trait curiosity made the prediction as to which character will appear as they explored the selected path, the anticipation of the cartoon character, particularly in the medium uncertainty condition, served as valuable information for future, ultimately enhancing their memory. The relatively poorer performance of this group, in the low and high uncertainty conditions, could be due to appraisal of the event as lacking a critical knowledge gap (in the low uncertainty condition) and as an overwhelming event (in the high uncertainty), leading to a reduction in engagement. These results are consistent with the findings from Jirout and Klahr (2012) who also observed that an optimal level of uncertainty peaks curiosity in children, while too little or too much information attenuates levels of curiosity as recently stressed in developmental curiosity-driven learning models (respectively, Gotlieb & Oudeyer, 2018 ; Gruber & Fandakova, 2021; see also Baer & Kidd, 2022).

Having a direct manipulation of curiosity on memory offers a real methodological and statistical advantage such as overcoming the limitations of pre and post subjective evaluation of curiosity states that are frequently assessed in Trivia question paradigms (Fastrich et al., 2019; Murayama et al., 2014; 2019). Additionally, the use of direct manipulation rather than subjective reports avoids the possible confound of results related to metacognitive inaccuracies, documented in children (e.g., Kuhn, 2000)

### **4.2. Curiosity, Individual Differences in Spatial Memory and Sense of Presence**

To the best of our knowledge, our observation of individual differences in terms of feelings of presence in a VR environment is new. Interpersonal variability in reported VR presence has been shown across sex, and video game experience (see Li et al., 2020 for review).



Often these individual differences have been invoked as explanations for differences in spatial abilities. These spatial abilities cannot account for our data as no differences were observed across our curiosity groups, on small- (spatial working memory and spatial visualization) or large-scale (everyday sense-of-orientation) spatial tasks.

Alternatively, the sense-of-presence advantage in high curiosity group could reflect their increased attention-based exploratory capabilities, as suggested by past work (e.g., Baer & Kidd, 2022; Jach et al., 2022; Jirout & Klahr, 2012; Kashdan et al., 2018). As such, the present individual variability in route memory and VR presence deserves further exploration in future work in order to elucidate the specific curiosity-trait related cognitive mechanisms underlying sense of presence.

Further, as suggested by Jirout and Klahr (2012), the benefit conferred by an optimal state of curiosity on memory hinges on individual differences, that is, the trait-curiosity of the child. A critical finding of our paper is that memory in children of high-trait curiosity was worst in the medium uncertainty condition, and better in the low and high conditions. To our knowledge, this is the first study to report such a nuanced finding regarding the influence of curiosity on route memory. Based on the findings of our study, we can conclude that for children of high-trait curiosity, being immersed in an environment of medium uncertainty does little to benefit spatial route learning.

We reason that our results observed in children of high-curiosity are a product of the type of exploration engaged by the child, more than the curiosity state evoked by the environment (Kashdan et al., 2018, Jach et al., 2022). For example, Hsiao and colleagues (2017) found that high learners exhibited a higher roaming entropy, indicative of complex paths and extensive active exploration of virtual environments. In addition, children of high-trait curiosity in our sample reported a greater sense of presence while being immersed in VR, relative to children with low trait-curiosity. Presence is typically seen as a

multidimensional construct, including several components such as agency, enjoyment, emotional engagement, and vividness of the virtual environment, all contributing to the overall sense of feeling present in immersive VR (Lessiter et al., 2001). As highlighted by Smith in his review (2019), presence is a function of how much visual attention is oriented towards the virtual environment, thus offering evidence to our view that attention based explorative behaviour underpins route learning in high trait-curiosity children. Future studies should precisely examine the types of explorative strategies engaged by children of high-trait curiosity in various environments (e.g., route exploration driven by a saliency of landmark) to specify the roaming strategy that confers the greatest benefit to route learning.

As mentioned above, the application of the statistical method of “roaming entropy” (Freund, et al., 2013) for detecting differences in movement trajectories in active exploration of space could be a relevant way to investigate the effects of interpersonal variables (i.e., curiosity-trait) and of uncertainty variables (i.e., elicited curiosity) during the critical exploration phase. Nevertheless, the use of this method will require some adaptations, especially to account for differences in content and size of virtual environments.

Finally, we had not predicted individual differences related to the curiosity-trait on reported feelings of presence within VR. These could be better captured and understood using the *Immersive Tendencies Questionnaire* (Witmer and Singer, 1998), although it would require adaption to allow implementation in children.

### **4.3. Conclusion**

Results suggest that individual differences influence cognitive task performance in environments with varying levels of uncertainty. Our primary results showed that an optimal uncertainty level exists to improve children's memory for routes travelled, and that this differs depending on a child's trait-level curiosity. For those with low trait curiosity, memory is best in medium relative to low or high uncertainty environments, whereas the inverse is true in

children with high levels of trait curiosity. Of note, we showed this in children, using an immersive virtual reality paradigm, demonstrating its utility in scientific research. Second, our work highlights critical inter-individual differences pertaining to trait curiosity and spatial memory performance, which vary as a function of the level of uncertainty provided by the environment. Our findings highlight the importance of individualizing curiosity-based interventions, particularly for psychoeducational or cognitive improvement purposes. Further, an equal ratio of male and female children in our sample lends generalizability of our findings to the general population. This first study specifying the intricate role of individual differences on state curiosity and route memory suggests that future research should consider the dynamic nature of trait-curiosity on spatial performance.

### **Acknowledgments**

We are very grateful to the children and their parents for agreeing to participate in this study. We would also like to thank Anouche Banikyan and Emma Tison for their help with data collection.

The data necessary to reproduce the analyses presented here are publicly accessible, as are the materials necessary to replicate the findings. These are available from author HS upon request. The analytical code necessary to reproduce the analyses presented in this paper is not publicly accessible. However, the JASP files (statistical outcomes) are available from author HS upon request. The analyses here were not preregistered.

## References

- Arce, T., & McMullen, K. (2021). The Corsi Block-Tapping Test: Evaluating methodological practices with an eye towards modern digital frameworks. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 4, 100099.
- Baer, C., & Kidd, C. (2022). Learning with certainty in childhood. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2022.07.010>
- Blasko, D. G., Lum, H. C., McGuire, M., Eichler, T., Landers, K., & Davis, K. (2018). Pokémon Go as a Tool to Study the Social and Cognitive Factors that Impact Spatial Navigation. *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting*, 62, 1221-1225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541931218621280>
- Boyd, J. L. (1981). A validity study of the Hooper Visual Organization Test. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 49, 15–19. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.49.1.15>
- Buheji, M. (2019). *Designing a curious life*. AuthorHouse Press.
- Chrastil, E. R., & Warren, W. H. (2012). Active and passive contributions to spatial learning. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 19, 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-011-0182-x>
- Cornell, E. H., Heth, C. D., & Broda, L. S. (1989). Children's wayfinding: Response to instructions to use environmental landmarks. *Developmental Psychology*, 25, 755-764. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.25.5.755>
- Darken, R. P., Bernatovich, D., Lawson, J. P., & Peterson, B. (1999). Quantitative measures of presence in virtual environments: the roles of attention and spatial comprehension. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 2, 337–347. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cpb.1999.2.337>
- Düzel, E., Bunzeck, N., Guitart-Masip, M., & Düzel, S. (2010). Novelty-related Motivation of Anticipation and exploration by Dopamine (NOMAD): Implications for healthy aging.

*Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 34, 660-669.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2009.08.006>

Fandakova, Y., & Gruber, M. J. (2021). States of curiosity and interest enhance memory differently in adolescents and in children. *Developmental Science*, 24, e13005.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.13005>

Farran, E. K., Courbois, Y., Van Herwegen, J., & Blades, M. (2012). How useful are landmarks when learning a route in a virtual environment? Evidence from typical development and Williams syndrome. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 111, 571-586. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2011.10.009>

Fastrich, G. M., Kerr, T., Castel, A. D., & Murayama, K. (2018). The role of interest in memory for trivia questions: An investigation with a large-scale database. *Motivation Science*, 4, 227-250. <https://doi.org/10.1037/mot0000087>

Fornasari, L., Chittaro, L., Ieronutti, L., Cottini, L., Dassi, S., Cremaschi, S., . . . Brambilla, P. (2013). Navigation and exploration of an urban virtual environment by children with autism spectrum disorder compared to children with typical development. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 7, 956-965. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rasd.2013.04.007>

Gruber, M. J., & Fandakova, Y. (2021). Curiosity in childhood and adolescence—what can we learn from the brain. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 39, 178-184.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2021.03.031>

Gruber, M., Gelman, B., & Ranganath, C. (2014). States of Curiosity Modulate Hippocampus-Dependent Learning via the Dopaminergic Circuit. *Neuron*, 84, 486-496.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2014.08.060>

- Gruber, M., Valji, A. and Ranganath, C. (2019). *Curiosity and learning: A neuroscientific perspective*. In: Renninger, K. Ann and Hidi, Suzanne E. eds. *The Cambridge Handbook of Motivation and Learning*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 397-417
- Hegarty, M., & Waller, D. (2006). Individual differences in spatial abilities. In P. Shah & A. Miyake (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of visuospatial thinking* (pp. 121–169). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Heth, C., Cornell, E. H., & Alberts, D. M. (1997). Differential use of landmarks by 8- and 12-year-old children during routine reversal navigation. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 17, 199-213. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jevp.1997.0057>
- Hoeft, R. M., Vogel, J., & Bowers, C. A. (2003, October). Kids get sick too: a proposed child simulator sickness questionnaire. In *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting* (Vol. 47, pp. 2137-2141). Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Hsiao, I. Y., Lan, Y. J., Kao, C. L., & Li, P. (2017). Visualization analytics for second language vocabulary learning in virtual worlds. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 20, 161-175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2016.04.010>
- Jach, H. K., DeYoung, C. G., & Smillie, L. D. (2022). Why do people seek information? The role of personality traits and situation perception. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 151, 934–959. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0001109>
- Jansen-Osmann, P., & Fuchs, P. (2006). Wayfinding behavior and spatial knowledge of adults and children in a virtual environment: The role of landmarks. *Experimental Psychology*, 53, 171–181. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1618-3169.53.3.171>

- Jansen-Osmann, P., & Wiedenbauer, G. (2004). The representation of landmarks and routes in children and adults: A study in a virtual environment. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 24*, 347–357. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2004.08.003>
- Jirout, J., & Klahr, D. (2012). Children’s scientific curiosity: In search of an operational definition of an elusive concept. *Developmental Review, 32*, 125-160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2012.04.002>
- Jirout, J. J. (2020). Supporting early scientific thinking through curiosity. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, 1717.
- Kang, M. J., Hsu, M., Krajbich, I. M., Loewenstein, G. F., McClure, S. M., Wang, J. T. Y., & Camerer, C. F. (2008). The Wick in the Candle of Learning: Epistemic Curiosity Activates Reward Circuitry and Enhances Memory. *SSRN Electronic Journal, 1*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1308286>
- Kashdan, T. B., Stikma, M. C., Disabato, D. J., McKnight, P. E., Bekier, J., Kaji, J., & Lazarus, R. (2018). The five-dimensional curiosity scale: Capturing the bandwidth of curiosity and identifying four unique subgroups of curious people. *Journal of Research in Personality, 73*,130–149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2017.11.011>
- Kreitler, S., Zigler, E., & Kreitler, H. (1975). The nature of curiosity in children. *Journal of School Psychology, 13*, 185-200. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4405\(75\)90002-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4405(75)90002-3)
- Lauriola, M., Litman, J. A., Mussel, P., De Santis, R., Crowson, H. M., & Hoffman, R. R. (2015). Epistemic curiosity and self-regulation. *Personality and Individual Differences, 83*, 202-207. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.04.017>



- Lessiter, J., Freeman, J., Keogh, E., & Davidoff, J. (2001). A cross-media presence questionnaire: The ITC-Sense of Presence Inventory. *Presence: Teleoperators & Virtual Environments*, 10, 282–297. <https://doi.org/10.1162/105474601300343612>
- Li, P., Legault, J., Klippel, A., & Zhao, J. (2020). Virtual reality for student learning: Understanding individual differences. *Human Behaviour and Brain*, 1, 28-36. <https://doi.org/0.37716/HBAB.2020010105>
- Lisman, J. E., & Grace, A. A. (2005). The Hippocampal-VTA Loop: Controlling the Entry of Information into Long-Term Memory. *Neuron*, 46, 703-713. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2005.05.002>
- Litman, J., Hutchins, T., and Russon, R. (2005). Epistemic curiosity, feeling-of-knowing, and exploratory behaviour. *Cogn. Emot.* 19, 559–582. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930441000427>
- Loewenstein, G., Adler, D., Behrens, D., & Gillis, J. (1992). Why Pandora opened the box: Curiosity as a desire for missing information G. Loewenstein (Ed.). The psychology of curiosity: A review and reinterpretation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116, 75–98.
- Marvin, C. B., & Shohamy, D. (2016). Curiosity and reward: Valence predicts choice and information prediction errors enhance learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 145, 266-272. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000140>
- McGillivray, S., Murayama, K., & Castel, A. D. (2015). Thirst for knowledge: The effects of curiosity and interest on memory in younger and older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, 30, 835-841. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039801>
- Meade, M., Meade, J., Sauzeon, H., & Fernandes, M. (2019). Active Navigation in Virtual Environments Benefits Spatial Memory in Older Adults. *Brain Sciences*, 9, 47. <https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci9030047>

- Merten, T. (2005). Factor structure of the Hooper Visual Organization Test: a cross-cultural replication and extension. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, 20, 123-128.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acn.2004.03.001>
- Michon, P.-E., & Denis, M. (2001). When and why are visual landmarks used in giving directions? In D. R. Montello (Ed.), *Spatial Information Theory*, 2205, 292–305. Berlin: Springer Berlin Heidelberg. [https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45424-1\\_20](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45424-1_20)
- Mullaney, K. M., Carpenter, S. K., Grotenhuis, C., & Burianek, S. (2014). Waiting for feedback helps if you want to know the answer: the role of curiosity in the delay-of-feedback benefit. *Memory & Cognition*, 42, 1273-1284. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-014-0441-y>
- Murayama, K., & Kuhbandner, C. (2011). Money enhances memory consolidation – But only for boring material. *Cognition*, 119, 120-124.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2011.01.001>
- Murayama, K., FitzGibbon, L., & Sakaki, M. (2019). Process Account of Curiosity and Interest: A Reward-Learning Perspective. *Educational Psychology Review*, 31, 875-895.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-019-09499-9>
- Murayama, K., Sakaki, M., Yan, V. X., & Smith, G. M. (2014). Type I error inflation in the traditional by-participant analysis to metamemory accuracy: A generalized mixed-effects model perspective. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 40, 1287-1306. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036914>
- Mussel, P. (2022). Processes Underlying the Relation between Cognitive Ability and Curiosity with Academic Performance: A Mediation Analysis for Epistemic Behavior in a Five-Year Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Intelligence*, 10, 23.  
<https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence10020023>

- Oudeyer, P. Y. (2007). What is intrinsic motivation? A typology of computational approaches. *Frontiers in Neurorobotics*, 1, 1. <https://doi.org/10.3389/neuro.12.006.2007>
- Piaget, J., Inhelder, B., Langdon, F. J., & Lunzer, J. L. (1967). *The Child's Conception of Space (Norton Library, No. 408)*. New-York, USA: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Proulx, J. N., Romero, M., & Arnab, S. (2016). Learning Mechanics and Game Mechanics Under the Perspective of Self-Determination Theory to Foster Motivation in Digital Game Based Learning. *Simulation & Gaming*, 48, 81-97. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046878116674399>
- Sakaki, M., Yagi, A., & Murayama, K. (2018). Curiosity in old age: A possible key to achieving adaptive aging. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 88, 106-116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2018.03.007>
- Sauzéon, H., N'Kaoua, B., Arvind Pala, P., Taillade, M., & Guitton, P. (2015). Age and active navigation effects on episodic memory: A virtual reality study. *British Journal of Psychology*, 107, 72-94. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjop.12123>
- Schubert, T., Friedmann, F., & Regenbrecht, H. (2001). The experience of presence: Factor analytic insights. Presence. *Teleoperators & Virtual Environments*, 10, 266-281.
- Shohamy, D., & Adcock, R. A. (2010). Dopamine and adaptive memory. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 14, 464-472. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2010.08.002>
- Smith, S. A. (2019). Virtual reality in episodic memory research: A review. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 26, 1213-1237. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-019-01605-w>
- Stahl, A. E., & Feigenson, L. (2015). Observing the unexpected enhances infants' learning and exploration. *Science*, 348, 91-94. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa3799>

- Vasilyeva, M., & Lourenco, S. F. (2012). Development of spatial cognition. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, 3, 349-362.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1171>
- Von Stumm, S. (2013). Investment traits and intelligence in adulthood assessment and associations. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 34, 82–89. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-0001/a000101>
- Von Stumm, S., & Ackerman, P. L. (2013). Investment and intellect: A review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 139, 841–869. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030746>
- Witmer, B. G., & Singer, M. J. (1998). Measuring presence in virtual environments: A presence questionnaire. *Presence*, 7, 225–240. <https://doi.org/10.1162/105474698565686>
- Wu, K.-C., & Chen, H.-C. (2016). How curiosity and uncertainty shape children's information seeking behaviors. *Library Hi Tech*, 34, 549-564. <https://doi.org/10.1108/lht-11-2015-0110>